

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

<b>Weaknesses</b>	<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>
<b>Opportunities</b>	<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>
<p><b>Threats</b></p>	<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>