# Report from the inaugural Markets and WaSH Learning Event

Event held in Nairobi, Kenya on October 13, 2015

Report circulated November 18, 2015

## Contents

# I.    Introduction

This report summarizes the presentations and discussions that took place during a learning event on market-based programming targeting key humanitarian stakeholders in the WaSH sector. Held on October 13, 2015 at the IFRC office in Nairobi, the event was organized under the umbrella of the Markets in Crises (MiC) Community of Practice and was the result of a cooperative effort between ACF, the IRC and Oxfam. Established in 2013 by the IRC and several other agencies, the MiC CoP is a group of diverse stakeholders interested in what happens to markets in emergency contexts that hosts an online library, a discussion forum and occasional events. The Nairobi workshop was the group's third in-person learning event and the first to focus on the WaSH sector. Held just before the Global WaSH Cluster's (GWC) annual meeting, the event was well attended, with 36 participants representing local and international NGOs, the private sector, donors and UN agencies.

Since most of the tools for and approaches to market assessment and market-based humanitarian programming have been developed by food security actors, other sectors, such as WaSH and shelter, have been relatively slow to shift away from conventional in-kind responses to more market-based approaches. The objective of this event was for the WaSH sector to take stock of its progress to date and to identify opportunities to expand market-based initiatives. Presentations on the range of tools and approaches available were followed by discussions on guidance needs, M&E and what's needed to move the markets agenda forward in the WaSH sector. This document briefly summarizes each session of the workshop in the same order as the event agenda. The full slideshows used during the event can be accessed here, and additional resources and workshop-related documents are included in this report's annex.

Following the event, the GWC voted to form a Technical Working Group (TWiG) dedicated to market-based programming. This is an exciting output and offers a good forum for anyone interested in helping to advance the market-based programming agenda within the WaSH sector to do so. A draft TWiG ToR has been communicated to the GWC Coordinator to maintain the momentum and plan of action from this event (i.e. gathering case studies and evidence, building capacity of WaSH technical and managerial staff, designation of a robust monitoring and evaluation framework, and strengthening inter cluster coordination with other sectors, OCHA and CaLP).

## II.  Market-based programming presentation summary

Markets are crucial to people's survival just about everywhere in the world. They supply people with essential items and services for meeting basic needs and protect livelihoods by providing tools, inputs and services needed for livelihoods activities and by providing jobs and opportunities for wage labor, or linking sellers to buyers.

In the humanitarian context, the term "market" has some specific connotations. First, humanitarian actors are interested in **"critical" market systems** specific to a certain good or service that are important for people's basic survival. **Market systems** include not only the **value chain** – all of the steps and actors involved in the production, processing, distribution and consumption of the good or service in question – but also **the market environment** and **key infrastructure, inputs and services** that are crucial for the market system's function. In addition, there is an implicit geographic aspect to markets. Everything procured for humanitarian programming comes from some market, somewhere. However, **market-based programming** really refers to programs that work through markets that are close to the people who are affected by a disaster. This means local or sometimes regional/national-level markets – generally, the more local, the better the benefits.

Market-based programming aims to promote healthy markets, which are characterized by three main qualities. They are (1) **inclusive** of the most vulnerable members of crisis-affected populations, including displaced people, women and youth; (2) **Resilient** markets that can provide high quality basic goods and services and recover quickly following shocks, will allow affected populations to better help themselves during and after crises; and (3) **Responsive** to consumer preferences, able to bring in more goods/services to the local area in a timely manner when demand is high, and with a sufficient number of actors to avoid collusion. We sometimes use the words "competitive" and "integrated" to describe this idea.

The **market-based programming spectrum** includes **market-integrated relief** programs, i**ndirect support through markets** interventions, as well as **market strengthening and development** efforts, which often refer to longer-term programs in economic recovery contexts. Programs that are not market based are not sourced or delivered through local/national market systems, and/or do not help to support or strengthen those systems. There are sometimes good reasons not to work through markets, though these cases are quite rare. There humanitarian community increasingly recognizes that humanitarian assistance should be delivered through local/ regional markets unless there is a really good reason *not* to do so.

There is a strong evidence base for market-integrated relief programming, particularly cash transfer programming and its variants. Because it transfers power to beneficiaries, it is known to provide them with dignity, choice and flexibility. Such programming also kick starts the long-term recovery of markets and can help to ease social tensions, since market actors and community members, and not just direct aid recipients, benefit. It also has the pragmatic benefits of being cost efficient (for agencies as well as for beneficiaries) and contributing towards post-crisis economic rehabilitation (multiplier effect).

There are a number of commonly-held concerns about cash programming in particular, including that it leads to inflation, anti-social uses like alcohol consumption and heightened security or corruption risks. However, by and large these fears are not backed up by the evidence and can largely be mitigated through careful program design and implementation.

## III. Market assessment tools presentation summary

Post-crisis market assessments are increasingly considered a best practice among humanitarian actors. Numerous guidelines for humanitarian assessments include questions about market system function. On the other hand, market assessments on their own do not give you all of the information that is necessary to design a program; they are just one component of a broader emergency assessment.

Market assessments can tell you if markets have the capacity and are functioning well enough to support cash or voucher programs; what (if anything) is impeding market function; how markets behave over time, which can help actors to interpret observed changes in market dynamics; as well as how to support disaster risk reduction efforts in pre-crisis contexts. Information from market assessments can be used to design market-based programming, with all of the associated benefits. Typically, market assessments will focus on a set of key questions related to issues like the impact of a specific crisis on selected market systems, constraints on the market system, market integration, competition/market power and expandability, or the market system's ability to increase supply to meet an increase in demand.

A range of tools/guidance documents for market assessments is available. Contrary to popular belief, one need not be an economist or a market specialist to use these tools; most are designed to be accessible to anyone with strong leadership and analytical skills and knowledge of the humanitarian context. There is no single "right" tool for a given situation; though each tool is intended for certain optimal situations, all are based on similar principles of market analysis. In addition, all can be adapted to fit different contexts.

Two initial rapid assessment tools - Oxfam GB's 48-hour Tool and IASC's Multi-sector Initial Rapid Assessment (MIRA) - include some questions about markets. More in-depth post-crisis assessment tookits include the IFRC's Rapid Assessment of Markets (RAM), designed to be carried out within 3 weeks of a crisis, as well as two more extensive toolkits intended for slightly later in the crisis, the Market Assessment Guidance (MAG), another IFRC product, and the widely-known Emergency Market Mapping and Analysis (EMMA) Toolkit. The recently-produced Pre-Crisis Market Mapping and Analysis (PCMMA) guidance document, co-developed by the IRC and Oxfam, explains how to adapt existing market assessment tools for the pre-crisis context in order to support preparedness and/or disaster risk reduction efforts. Finally, CRS's MarkIT toolkit, though focused on the food security sector, is probably the most extensive market monitoring guidance document available. To date, the WaSH sector has practiced the use of EMMA when examining water market system in the context of the Horn of Africa drought and the Syrian refugee crisis in Lebanon and Jordan, and has carried out PCMMAs in Zimbabwe and Kenya, which examined shocks associated with a disease outbreak and drought respectively. Oxfam, CaLP and the IRC are developing a document that compares and contrasts these different tools; this should be finalized by the end of 2015.

In humanitarian contexts, market assessments focus primarily on what happens to market systems in crisis times. This determines to what extent the response can be delivered through local market systems and what actions humanitarian actors can take to help to restore market system function and/or to help strengthen markets in order to the impact of future crises on market systems. Most of the assessment approaches rely on market system maps as a visualization tool – generally, a pair of before (baseline) and after (emergency) market systems maps is produced for each market system studied to help illustrate the crisis's impact on the market system and to facilitate analysis and recommendation development.

Case studies of two Oxfam-led market assessments – a PCMMA study in Zimbabwe and an EMMA in Kenya – were presented to help illustrate the value and potential applications of market assessments in practice.

## IV.   Examples of market-based WaSH programming

The market-based programming spectrum was explained, and participants were asked to brainstorm examples of each type of programming that were specific to water, sanitation and hygiene programs specifically. This table includes some of the clearest examples that resulted from that discussion.

In addition, ACF presented a case study of market-integrated relief based on its hygiene voucher programming the in Ukraine, and Sanivation presented an example of market strengthening and development programming from Kenya.

| The Market-based Programming Spectrum (with examples from the WaSH sector) | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Type of programming** | **Description** | **General examples** | **Examples from the WaSH sector** |
| **Non-market-based programming** | Any type of humanitarian response that is not delivered through (local) markets and/or that does not help to restore or strengthen markets | In-kind assistance (not locally procured)<br><br>Sourcing contracts for service delivery from outside the crisis-affected area | **Water**: Direct drinking water provision (if not locally procured)<br><br>**Sanitation:** Distribution of NFI or hygiene kits (if not locally procured)<br><br>**Hygiene:** Construction of latrines in rural areas using a large contracted company from a distant city |
| **Market-integrated relief** | Provision of basic needs assistance to crisis-affected people that is delivered through local market systems | Local and regional procurement for in-kind distributions<br><br>Cash and vouchers<br><br>Cash for work | **Water:** Provision of water vouchers; contracting local water truckers to deliver water<br><br>**Sanitation:** Local procurement of materials for latrine construction; cash for work for pit digging; cash grants for labour; provision of sanitation material vouchers (commodity)<br><br>**Hygiene:** Provision of hygiene vouchers (value, commodity); cash grants for hygiene items |

Markets and WaSH Learning Event report    November 2015

| Type of programming | Description | General examples | Examples from the WaSH sector |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Indirect support through markets** | Temporary interventions to help restore market functioning, often directly targeting market actors | Targeted support to market actors (grants, loans, transport subsidies, temporary storage)<br><br>Some types of cash for work (e.g., restoration of major supply routes) | **Water:** Cash or vouchers to support water providers with transport and storage; cash grants to support initial water treatment by producers and vendors<br><br>**Sanitation:** Linking local builders with concrete wholesalers who can offer good prices for large volume sales; supply chain support (transport, logistics); start-up cash for local tradesmen to make slabs for toilet construction<br><br>**Hygiene:** Provision of grants to vendors for transport, restocking and/or storage in post-crisis setting |
| **Market strengthening and development** | Interventions that address observed gaps and/or weaknesses in market systems in order to improve and/or expand their resilience and ability to support livelihoods | Employment creation / enterprise development<br><br>Increasing scope of and access to financial services<br><br>Development of supply and value chains<br><br>Developing productive assets | **Water:** Training water vendors on appropriate water treatment; advocacy for improved regulation of the water market<br><br>**Sanitation:** Training of sanitation workers on latrine emptying, faecal sludge management and safe waste handling; creating and supporting market system model for reusing waste; support regulation for quality services; facilitating sanitation firms' access to credit for expensive equipment<br><br>**Hygiene:** Community projects to reuse waste to develop marketable products; income generating activities involving the production of WaSH items (water filters, soap, sanitary napkins); developing and implementing rating systems for the hygiene of restaurants; engaging communities in the policy and regulation of water and sanitation |

## V.    Summaries of afternoon discussion sessions:

### a.  Monitoring and evaluating the benefits of market-based WaSH programming

Market-based programming is believed to offer a number of benefits for affected communities. These relate to the efficiency of delivery (such as improved access or availability) and the effectiveness of the impact once the commodity or service has been delivered.  However, there are also expected benefits in the longer term, because market based approaches are expected to contribute towards positive impacts on livelihoods and economic recovery. However, apart from the theory and anecdotal evidence, there is little empirical evidence to support the validity of these assumptions, which can be attributed to the fact that there is no accepted M&E framework to assess the benefits of market-based programming or to compare market-based with conventional in-kind emergency responses.

There is therefore a need for the development of an M&E framework to monitor and evaluate the 'added value' of a market approach in achieving WaSH outcomes in humanitarian responses, which is relevant to humanitarian/ donor agencies and market actors as well as the beneficiaries themselves. The focus of this discussion was on a) the expected benefits of market-based programming in relation to WaSH, b) the parameters that can be used to monitor these benefits and c) whether the approach respects beneficiary choice/preferences and dignity. A key concern of the monitoring will be to ensure that the market-based response upholds gender equity and specific concerns and needs of women, girls, men and boys and vulnerable groups.  The M&E framework should therefore assess how well gender, protection and the needs of people with disabilities are addressed by market-based programming.

Participants identified a need for a holistic M&E framework for monitoring of:

a) **Program outcomes**; monitored by tangible indicators that are directly quantifiable as a result of project activities.  Examples of outcome indicators include the number of risk reduction plans based on risk assessment, and an increased number of emergency responses developed and implemented based on market-based analysis and programming.

b) **Impacts** monitored as a result of the **efficiency and effectiveness of program delivery** relating to criteria of speed, cost and quality and **additional benefits** related to livelihood opportunities for market actors and market system rehabilitation. Potential indicators include the number of beneficiaries receiving goods/services from critical market system actors and the number of people employed by market actors involved in provision of goods/services for humanitarian relief.

c) **Additional benefits for the local economy** as a result of the combination of the above (multiplier effect) are the least tangible impacts but nevertheless need to be taken into account. Opportunities may exist to utilize Oxfam's Contribution to Change Methodology, which identifies how interventions have resulted in wider and longer term ex-post improvements based on stakeholder consultation.

To effectively collect information that is specific to the market it is considered appropriate to focus on indicators that are of direct relevance to market actors themselves. In this way, these market actors have a vested interest in collecting the relevant information rather than perceiving the M&E as an additional burden, which could lead to the development of mistrust regarding who is using the information and for what purpose.  Pre-crisis market mapping and analysis was considered to be an important activity that provides baseline data for monitoring of these outcomes and future impacts.

### b. Assessment tools/guidance

Despite the existing variety of assessment tools and frameworks available for market-based approaches in the humanitarian sector, there is still relatively low uptake overall for various sectors, including the WaSH sector. As such, the overall aim of this session was to capitalize on what existing resources there are and what else is needed to ensure the WaSH sector can use and optimize its programs through a market-based approach lens.

The session was steered by the overall question of "What else would you need to apply market-based approaches in your WaSH programs?" in order to identify knots that can be untied by a common WaSH sector effort. For the first part of the session, participants brainstormed on what (i.e. resources, tools, guidance, ICT) would be needed in order for their staff to design and implement market-based humanitarian WaSH programs. A brief presentation of existing tools/guidance had been done in an earlier session and participants added additional tools/resources to the list of existing resources.

For the second part of the session, participants 'closed gaps' by matching what was available in terms of resources with what was initially identified as a need. This exercise raised awareness of existing tools while trying to identify gaps. In addition to resources, participants identified gaps and opportunities that could be addressed by WaSH partners to capacitate WaSH field staff with implementing markets-based approaches in humanitarian WaSH interventions.

**The overall conclusions and recommendations from this session were:**

**Sufficient guidance:** Available tools and guidance are largely sufficient for the WaSH sector. Some examples of tools already used by the WaSH sector include RAM, MAG, EMMA and PCMMA.

**Raise awareness & practical training**: The real need is for awareness raising and practical simulation/training at all levels of the WaSH sector. The WaSH Cluster could potentially play a major role in this. A clear request from a key donor (OFDA) at the meeting was to prioritize capacity building for the Field Support Team members in order to raise the profile of market-based programming in WaSH, and to coordinate training efforts with other sectors and with WaSH Cluster Regional/Country coordinators. Furthermore, designate and equip WaSH professionals with a 'coherent package' to increase the capacity and will for market-based programming – a 'pick up and go' package, inclusive of tools, guidance, key terminologies explained and Q & A briefs, along with the implementation of pilot studies to inform evidence, lessons and thus uptake.

**Capacity building:** carry out and systemize capacity self assessments and investment plans across strategic WaSH actors – in particular the Cluster Field Support Team, Cluster Coordinators, international and local NGOs, local Governments and the private sector in order to prepare for and implement programming across the market-based programming spectrum.

**Transitioning**: bridging emergency and development market-based programming in WaSH with more guidance, systems and evidence (potential collaboration with UNDP). Monitoring of market systems prior to emergencies can help to support preparedness efforts while allowing teams to be trained (e.g. by rolling out PCMMA in countries with predictable crises).

### c. Enablers/blockers of market-based programming in WaSH

The market-based programming spectrum session (outcome presented in the table on page 6-7) was an enlightening exercise, as the diverse participants at this event communicated many tangible ideas, which are either ongoing and/or have potential for the future, which the WaSH sector needs to embrace.

However, there is still the challenge and task of 'converting the unconverted' to adopt market-based programming in WaSH. A shift is needed at all levels so that assessments are routinely conducted with a market lens and recommendations implemented, rather than opting for the familiar approach of buying tens of thousands of hygiene kits to distribute to affected populations.

In this discussion session, participants identified the **enabling factors and blockers** for market-based programming in WaSH and discussed how to address these **gaps**, along with specific **opportunities** moving forward. The group also touched on the broader humanitarian discourse on **multipurpose cash**. This discussion intended to present which **preconditions and factors within the enabling environment** the WaSH sector would require to meet our WaSH objectives given the multipurpose agenda. Unfortunately, because of the limited time this was only discussed briefly, so this could be something the GWC markets TWiG could address further.

**Blockers** that attendees identified included a lack of awareness, knowledge and capacity; the fact that current SOPs and NGO/donor bureaucracies support the 'status quo' of in-kind responses; the vested interests across different stakeholders like water truckers and government authorities; the lack of expertise in market-based programming among WaSH specialists, outside of a small niche group; the competing demands across the different sectors within each organization; the lack of technical and senior management buy in; lack of trust in the quality of materials locally available; and fears about insufficient quality assurance/control.

**Enablers** to advance competencies and capacity in market-based programming included senior management, technical, donor and cluster level buy-in; the urban context – a breeding ground for WaSH market-based programming; documentation and dissemination of evidence, case studies and best practices; capacity self-assessments and capacity development plans; and routinely carrying out PCMMA, EMMA, and rapid market assessments in the project life cycle of humanitarian-recovery-development responses.

Unfortunately time for discussions of what **preconditions and factors in the enabling environment** were necessary in order to embark on multipurpose cash programming was quite short. Nonetheless, the following represent some indicative thoughts and ideas from the limited discussion that took place. Household-level preferences and priorities would need to be recognized; community engagement and social mobilization would need to be a key milestone pre/during/post; donors would need to be willing to allocate funding for the community engagement activities required with market-based programming; a unified approach to vulnerability profiling and selection criteria across the diverse range of sectors; a robust technical monitoring plan (covering both quality and quantity); and relatively strong competencies across the sector from country offices, to regional offices, to headquarters.

This event took place one day before the Global WaSH cluster meeting in Nairobi, and representatives from the MiC meeting presented a session on market-based programming at the GWC meeting. This session focused on what market-based programming entails and the spectrum specific to WaSH, before presenting key recommendations developed by learning event participants.

**The key conclusions and recommendations** from this discussion session are listed here. These were shared during the markets presentation at the Global WaSH Cluster meeting and have since helped to inform the draft TOR for the cluster's new Markets TWiG**.**

**Evidence building**: Capitalize on existing evidence and build more evidence on WaSH market-based programming across the humanitarian-recovery-development-preparedness continuum in different contexts. Consider the multiplier effect in evaluations of "cost effectiveness" and "risk management." Develop evaluation tools and indicators that can be integrated into existing frameworks and tools.

**Community of Practice**: Encourage more WaSH practitioners to join or participate in MiC, CaLP and the planned GWC TWiG.

**Investment/leadership**: Commitment from key decision makers to invest in markets capacity building roll out is key. This includes GWC members, national wash cluster coordinators, donors, government, the private sector and possibly others. PCMMAs should be proactively carried out in countries where the WaSH Cluster is activated. At the upcoming Humanitarian Summit, ensure the WaSH sector raises the issues of market-based programming in WaSH.

**Integration/Coordination**: The humanitarian sector requires cross-sectoral integration to embed cash and market-based programming, which requires the equal involvement of the WaSH Cluster, OCHA, CaLP and all NGOs. Transfer and integration of expertise with Logistics, FSL, and Protection/Gender at organizational and inter-cluster levels are required. One could consider the path the "Gender Marker" roll-out took. Current SOPs and NGO bureaucracies lead to the old status quo of in-kind response, the need for adapted procurement policy and procedures to encourage market-based programming (internal, donor, sector including coordination).

**Private sector**: Increase dialogue and engagement with the private sector, thus enabling the private sector to understand opportunities in humanitarian situations, especially, but not limited to, urban emergencies. Merge and integrate secondary data analysis from the private sector and/or map market actors relevant to WaSH. Develop knowledge of informal and formal actors via national platforms.

**Community inclusion**: most importantly, ensure affected populations' participation in market analysis to yield user-centered program designs, prioritization of needs and modalities. Ensure community engagement and accountability are considered within market-based approaches (e.g., via two-way feedback mechanisms, the voice of communities from all different wealth groups and vulnerabilities).

# Annex

| | **WASH AND MARKETS LEARNING EV**ENT PARTICIPANT LIST TUESDAY, OCTOBER 13TH,10 AM-5 PM, IFRC OFFICES, NAIROBI | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Family name** | **First name** | **Current employer** | **Current job title** | **Email** |
| 1 | Akudago | John | Samaritan's Purse | WASH Technical Advisor | jakudago@samaritan.org |
| 2 | Angioletti | Andrea | Solidarités International | Emergency Wash Coordinator | aangioletti@solidarites.org |
| 3 | Auerbach | Becky | Sanergy | Business Development and Partnerships | becky@saner.gy |
| 4 | Boeckler | Fabian | Plan International Germany | Team Leader, Disaster Risk Management | fabian.boeckler@plan.de |
| 5 | Buttle | Mark | Save the Children | Senior Humanitarian WASH Advisor | m.buttle@savethechildren.org.uk |
| 6 | Chow | Jack | Oxfam | regional plumber | jchow@oxfam.org.uk |
| 7 | Data | Richard | International Rescue Committee | Environmental Health Coordinator | Richard.Data@rescue.org |
| 8 | Deniel | Karine | ACF | WASH specialist | kdeniel@gmail.com |
| 9 | Dyer | Kit | NCA | WASH Adviser | kit.dyer@nca.no |
| 10 | Earwaker | Paul | Sanivation | Strategic Advisor | paul@sanivation.com |
| 11 | Gardiner | Polly | Loowatt Limited | COO | polly@loowatt.com |
| 12 | Gitau | Mercy | Concern Worldwide | WASH Technical Advisor | mercy.gitau@concern.net |

| | Family name | First name | Current employer | Current job title | Email |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Hakspiel | Diego | Sanivation | Refugee Camp Lead | diego@sanivation.com |
| 14 | Heelham | John | Concern Worldwide | WASH Engineering Advisor | john.heelham@concern.net |
| 15 | Isaksen | Arild | Norwegian Church Aid | Emergency coordinator | arild.isaksen@nca.no |
| 16 | Kahia | James | IRC | Technical Advisor | james.kahia@rescue.org |
| 17 | Kuklov | Vadim | Sanergy | Associate Product Designer | vadim@saner.gy |
| 18 | Lamb | Jenny | Oxfam | Water & Sanitation Engineering Advisor | jlamb@oxfam.org.uk |
| 19 | Matemo | Charles | Action Against Hunger | Head of WaSH Department | washco.ke@acf-international.org |
| 20 | Mathenge | Penninah | IRC | Technical Advisor | penninah.mathenge@rescue.org |
| 21 | McDonald | Cheryl | Oxfam | Global WASH advisor | cmcdonald1@oxfam.org.uk |
| 22 | McSorley | Brian | Oxfam | WASH Coordinator | bmcsorley@ocfam.org.uk |
| 23 | Megnassan | Beth | CARE Australia | Emergency WASH and Gender Advisor | Beth.Megnassan@care.org.au |
| 24 | Mutiso | Lilian | Self | Consultant | lilianmutiso@gmail.com |
| 25 | Parkinson | Jonathan | OxfamGB | Senior WASH Programme Development Strategist | jparkinson1@oxfam.org.uk |
| 26 | Pereira | Sunny | ACF | Technical Advisor | spereira@actionagainsthunger.org |
| 27 | Reade | Alan | GOAL | Regional WASH Coordinator | areade@goal.ie |

| | Family name | First name | Current employer | Current job title | Email |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 28 | Rueck | Johannes | German WASH Network | Network Coordinator | johannes.rueck@washnet.de |
| 29 | Scriven | Kim | ELRHA | Humanitarian Innovation Fund Manager | k.scriven@savethechildren.org.uk |
| 30 | Sloane | Emily | IRC | Emergency Markets Officer | emily.sloane@rescue.org |
| 31 | Wadegu | Francis | GOAL Kenya | WASH Officer | fwadegu@ke.goal.ie |

# Agenda: Markets in Crises Learning Event on Markets and WaSH Programming

| Agenda for Markets and WaSH learning event | | |
|---|---|---|
| **Time** | **What** | **Purpose** |
| 9:30-10 AM | Arrival and registration | |
| 10-10:15 AM | Opening remarks | Introduce the Markets in Crises Community of Practice and explain the genesis of this event |
| 10:15-10:45 AM | Introduction to Markets | Introduce the basic concepts of market-based programming, including definitions, in order to establish a common understanding to support the rest of the workshop |
| 10:45-11:15 AM | Presentation of mini-case studies | Provide curated illustrations of what we mean by the different categories of market-based programs |
| 11:15-11:30 AM | BREAK | |
| 11:30 AM-12 PM | Group work | Get all participants to be thinking of possible program strategies for each technical area within WASH which fits into the three types of market-based programming; to surface innovative ways that markets can be used in water, sanitation and hygiene programming |
| 12-1 PM | Overview of tools used for market analysis | Everyone has a basic understanding of what we mean by market analysis, guidance and resources available to undertake market analysis; and how it helps us design market-based programming; and to identify any recognized gaps in knowledge/experience in market analysis which may affect WASH programming |
| 1-2 PM | Lunch | |
| 2-3 PM | Group Work Round 1 | To identify priority gap areas or opportunities for the WASH community to focus on in developing post-workshop workstreams. Options include: |
| | | Gaps in WaSH-specific market-based programming/assessment guidance or training |
| | | Measuring outcomes in market-based programming |
| | | Enabling factors for market-based WaSH programming |
| 3-3:15 PM | BREAK | |
| 3:15-4:15 PM | Group work round 2 | Participants switch to another of the discussion groups outlined above |
| 4:15-5 PM | Recap - sharing of results from discussion sessions and close | To share conclusions and plans for progressing the markets and WaSH agenda based on the day's discussions |

# Resources on market-based programming

**Market-based programming**
- Oxfam and WFP's overview of the market-based programming spectrum
- The Markets section of the Cash Learning Partnership website
- The EMMA website
- The Markets in Crises Community of Practice (listserv and resource library; registration required)

**Cash Transfer Programming**
- CaLP CTP Training – Level 1 and Level 2
- CaLP's CTP project cycle tools and guidelines
- Humanitarian Practice Network's Good practice Review – CTP
- IFRC's Guidelines for cash transfer programming
- ODI's High-Level panel final report – Doing Cash Differently

**Markets and WaSH**
- Oxfam's introductory guide to market analysis and WaSH
- CaLP's scoping study of cash transfer programming in the WaSH and shelter sectors

**E-Learning and videos**
- Introduction to Market Assessment Course in English, Spanish, Arabic and French
- Rapid Assessment of Markets (RAM) Course in English
- Microlinks Market Analysis and Value Chain Project Design in English
- Microlinks Learning Value Chain Basics Courses in English
- Webinar on PCMMA
- PCMMA Microlinks Summary
- Logistics Cluster's Market videos
- IFRC's Introduction to Market Assessments video
- Assorted videos on EMMA

**Humanitarian Market Assessment Tools & Guidance**
- The 48-hour Tool
- Emergency Market Mapping Analysis (EMMA) Toolkit in English and French; Pre-Crisis Market Mapping Analysis (PCMMA) Guidance Document in English
- Rapid Assessment of Markets (RAM) in English
- Market Analysis Guidance (MAG) in English
- MarkIT: Price Monitoring, Analysis and Response Kit in English

**Markets in Crises**
**Community of Practice**

**Overview**
The Markets in Crises Community of Practice (MiC) is an online forum for sharing information and collaborating on all aspects of market awareness and engagement in pre-crisis, emergency and recovery contexts. The MiC was created as an independent community to include a wide range of stakeholders engaged with markets in crises environments; including NGOs, donors, academics, UN agencies, and the private sector. It was specifically created to fill a niche that has historically been ignored by both emergency responders and development actors and it is hoped that MiC will facilitate links between those whose work focuses on crisis responses and those who are more concerned with longer term market functioning and development work.

**Initial Areas of Focus**
The MiC aims to create a broad platform for discussion and collaboration across a range of actors. For that reason, we do not promote one approach or tool over another or advocate for specific issues. The initial focus of the MiC is to:
- Create space for mutual exchange, learning, and constructive feedback on market-related topics through the Dgroups platform;
- Build a library of technical resources and support the dissemination of useful information to members;
- Foster greater collaboration among organizations to improve market-sensitive programming in practice;
- Expand members' networks and create linkages for joint activities, research, and advocacy as members desire; and
- Connect organizations and fora focused on one part of the humanitarian-response-to-development spectrum so that a broader market-based community is created.

**How to Join**
The MiC is a community of practice open to anyone interested in markets, crises, market development and/or emergency response. You can join the MiC online community, and gain access to the library, at https://dgroups.org/dfid/mic/join.

**History**
In March 2013 a group of NGOs, UN agencies, donors and private sector actors interested in markets in emergencies came together to share their experiences in applying market-sensitive approaches to humanitarian programming. One of the key outputs of this learning event was the recognition of a need for a common platform for cross-agency discussion, sharing, and collaboration around markets. A working group was then created, consisting of ICRC, Mercy Corps, Oxfam, Concern, Practical Action, CaLP, IRC, FAO, WFP, CRS, Save the Children, Action Against Hunger, and GFSC, to discuss how to move forward in establishing a Community of Practice (CoP) to continue the spirit of market-oriented collaboration founded at the learning event. A second learning event was held in April 2014 to carry forward the priorities of the initial meeting and to come to consensus on the Community of Practice. Following a survey of all interested parties the MiC was officially created in February 2014 with a Board of Directors consisting of representatives from Action Against Hunger, International Rescue Committee, Mercy Corps, ODI, and Oxfam.

# Markets: Some key Terminology

| Term | Definition | Source |
|---|---|---|
| Market | Any formal or informal structure (not necessarily a physical space) in which buyers and sellers exchange goods, labour or services for cash or other goods. The word 'market' can simply mean the place in which good or services are exchanged. However, in EMMA, markets are defined by forces of supply and demand, rather than geographical location e.g. 'imported cereals make up 40% of the market'. | **Emergency Market Mapping and Analysis (EMMA) Toolkit, Mike Albu** |
| Market system | A market system is a network of market actors, many buyers and sellers – not only one chain – supported by infrastructure and services, interacting within a context of institutions or rules that shape the actors' trading environment.<br>A market system involves a market or value chain, the market services (e.g. transport, finance, information, extension services) provided to support the chain, and the environment (e.g. infrastructure, natural or policy environment) that enables or disables the functioning of the chain. | **GEM Toolkit, Oxfam GB** |
| Market Support | Response modalities that enhance market functionality, improving households' ability to purchase food, sell crops and generate income | **World Food Programme** |
| Beneficiary | A person who it is intended will benefit from programmes or interventions. | |
| Target group | The mass of emergency-affected women, men and children who it is intended should ultimately benefit from the emergency response. Usually, these are the most vulnerable or severely affected individuals and households in a disaster area. Often, the target population is disaggregated into more clearly defined target groups with different situations and needs. Note: indirect humanitarian responses may involve assistance to market-actors who are not part of the target population. | **Emergency Market Mapping and Analysis (EMMA) Toolkit, Mike Albu** |
| Direct intervention | Interventions that directly assist affected people, e.g.:<br>▪ In kind distributions<br>▪ Cash or vouchers<br>▪ CFW & FFW<br>▪ Shelter, WASH, nutrition programmes etc. | **Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) Glossary**<br>(adapted from EMMA toolkit) |
| Indirect intervention | Activities with traders, officials, policy makers and others to benefit affected people, e.g.:<br>▪ Rehabilitation of key infrastructure, restore transport links, bridges etc. | **Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) Glossary** |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | ▪ Grants or loans for businesses to restore stocks, repair premises or vehicles | (adapted from EMMA toolkit) |
| **Multiplier effect** | The knock-on advantages or benefits that result from stimulating markets (through cash transfer programming) for every $1 given to beneficiaries, 0.20 might go to a trader, 0.20 to a processor, and 0.40 to a producer. | **Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) Glossary** |
| **Preparedness** | The knowledge and capacities developed by governments, professional response and recovery organizations, communities and individuals to effectively anticipate, respond to, and recover from, the impacts of likely, imminent or current hazard events or conditions. | **United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction** http://www.unisdr.org/ |
| **Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)** | The concept and practice of reducing disaster risks through systematic efforts to analyzse and manage the causal factors of disasters, including through reduced exposure to hazards, lessened vulnerability of people and property, wise management of land and the environment, and improved preparedness for adverse events | **International Strategy for Disaster Reduction - United Nations** http://www.unisdr.org/ |
| **Cash transfer** | Cash transfer programming is the name given to any programme where cash, or cash-equivalents (vouchers), are provided to beneficiaries. | **Finance Guidelines on Cash Transfer Programming- Oxfam GB** |
| **Humanitarian** | The objectives of humanitarian action are to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity during and in the aftermath of man-made crises and natural disasters, as well as to prevent and strengthen preparedness for the occurrence of such situations. Humanitarian action has two inextricably linked dimensions: protecting people and providing assistance (see Humanitarian response). Humanitarian action is rooted in humanitarian principles - humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence. | **The Sphere Project** *Glossary of the Handbook* |
| **Economic security** | A household or community is economically secure when conditions allow it to meet its essential economic needs in a sustainable way, without resorting to strategies which are damaging to livelihoods, security and dignity. | **Guidelines for Cash Transfer Programming - IFRC and ICRC** |
| **Resilience** | Activities to promote resilience enhance communities' capacity to cope and recover after a disaster strikes. | **Reducing Risks, Saving Lives: Our approach to disaster risk reduction - Save the Children** |