

Comparative Review of Market Assessments Methods, Tools, Approaches and Findings

August – October 2012, World Food Programme

SWOT ANALYSIS of

Emergency Market Mapping Analysis (EMMA), Market Information and Food Insecurity Response Analysis (MIFIRA) and World Food Programme Trader Survey (WFP TS)

	EMMA	MIFIRA	WFP TS
Strengths	<p>Operational tool: directly informs response options</p> <p>Market mapping approach facilitates data analysis for response analysis</p> <p>Analyses supply and demand sides</p> <p>Flexible tool, adaptable to contexts and markets</p> <p>Offers a broad range of response options both in-kind and cash, as well as market support activities</p> <p>Risk analysis including non-market factors for response analysis</p> <p>Cost efficient?</p>	<p>Operational tool: directly informs response options</p> <p>Decision-tree approach facilitates data analysis for response analysis</p> <p>Analyses supply and demand sides</p> <p>Adapted to slow-onset/chronic food insecurity crises</p> <p>Evidence-based tool with a quantitative approach</p> <p>Narrows the response options (this can be a weakness too)</p> <p>Key component on population preference for different forms of food aid and market access</p> <p>Strong gender component</p>	<p>Adapted to slow-onset/chronic food insecurity crises</p> <p>Provides good understanding of critical market systems/chains at macro (regional, national) and meso levels</p> <p>Offers a broad range of response options both in-kind and cash, as well as market support activities</p> <p>Provides recommendations on monitoring systems, advocacy on food policy, improvements for market information systems</p> <p>Scenario-development component informs response options, taking into account non-market factors</p> <p>Evidence-based tool with a quantitative approach</p>

Weaknesses	<p>Requires strong leader and staff</p> <p>Can involve a large amount of resources in terms of staff, funding and time</p> <p>Depends on availability and quality of secondary data</p> <p>Local/micro analysis — cannot be generalised</p> <p>Identifying the most relevant market systems can be difficult</p> <p>Lack of monitoring of EMMA results and programme achievements</p> <p>No scenario-development component</p>	<p>Difficult to implement for non-market specialists</p> <p>Depends on availability and quality of secondary data</p> <p>Few studies conducted</p> <p>Quantitative methodology: time- and resource-consuming</p> <p>Not adapted to rapid-onset crises</p> <p>Focuses only on food market</p> <p>Local/micro analysis — cannot be generalised</p> <p>Long and technical guidance</p> <p>Narrows the response options (this can be a strength too) and no market support option</p> <p>Lack of monitoring of MIFIRA results and programme achievements</p> <p>No scenario-development component</p> <p>Doesn't study non-market factors</p> <p>Depends on availability and quality of secondary data</p>	<p>Requires strong leader and staff</p> <p>Can involve a large amount of resources in terms of staff, funding and time</p> <p>Depends on availability and quality of secondary data</p> <p>Not a response analysis tool as stand-alone tool</p> <p>Focuses on the supply side</p> <p>Not adapted to rapid-onset crises</p> <p>Quantitative methodology: time- and resource-consuming</p> <p>Some non-market factors are not taken into account (nutrition)</p> <p>Complex and non-intuitive response analysis plan</p> <p>Macro results cannot be used to local contexts — local feasibility study is needed</p> <p>Lack of monitoring of WFP TS results and programme achievements</p>
Opportunities	<p>Adapted to slow onset and part of preparedness (Philippines and Cambodia)</p> <p>Many EMMA studies done (more than 20) and lots of staff trained</p> <p>Case studies and studies drawing on lessons learnt</p>	<p>Some agencies invested for developing requisite skills</p> <p>Strong demand analysis component that could be used by other response analysis tools</p> <p>Can be used as baseline and as preparedness tool</p>	<p>Can be complemented with other WFP tools in food security and market analysis (EFSA, HEA)</p> <p>Can be combined with emergency response analysis tools</p> <p>Different objectives: baseline or source of secondary information, monitoring systems, preparedness, advocacy to inform food policies</p>

	<p>Complements existing information/monitoring systems</p> <p>Can be used as baseline and as preparedness tool</p> <p>Short guidance developed for practitioners</p> <p>Flexible enough to include elements of feasibility study or programme design elements</p>	<p>Flexible enough to include elements of cash-transfer feasibility study or programme design elements</p> <p>Identifies key indicators and key markets to monitor</p>	
Threats	<p>Usefulness of the results is highly dependent on many factors, such as staff capacity, timeliness and coordination with other emergency assessments</p> <p>“Good enough” approach can lead to market analysis errors</p> <p>Interrelated markets not studied</p> <p>Even in a rapid-onset crisis, it requires a minimum amount of secondary data</p> <p>Use for other contexts (value chain): comparative advantage with common tools (value chain approach)?</p>	<p>Too technical — some agencies want a more simplified approach: Development of MIFIRA currently on hold</p>	<p>Macro results cannot be used to local contexts — it requires a local/response option study</p> <p>Guidelines (2009 version) do not take into account response analysis</p>