

PILOT REPORT

for

Emergency Market Mapping and Analysis (EMMA) *(Formerly known as 'Rapid Market Analysis Toolkit')*

Pilot 1

Trans Nzoia District, Kenya.

Study Period: April 2-21



Pilot participants (left to right) Vivien, Lili, Naila, Gabriel, Karri, Kennedy, Anita & Dee
(missing from the photo: Francis & Mary)

Report Date and Author: 7 May 2007, Anita Yeomans, Practical Action Consulting

Contents Page

Acknowledgements	3
1. Introduction	4
1.1 Pilot One Context – Kenya Conflict.	4
1.2 Pilot One Participants.....	5
2. Technical Feedback on EMMA Performance and Use.....	5
2.1 What Needs Clarification and Modification	5
2.2 What Worked Well.....	11
3. Training	12
4. Pilot Organisation	12
4.1 Pre-Pilot Information and Organisation	12
4.2 Transport and Accommodation	12
4.3 Pilot Teams and Field Work	13
4.4 Pilot Timetable and Time Needed to Complete The Analysis	13
5. Conclusions on EMMA Performance and Use – did Emma work?.....	13
6. Recommendations and Next Steps	14

Annex 1: Flow Chart to Indicate Where EMMA Starts

Acknowledgements

This Pilot Test in Kenya was the result of the combined effort of many people. Starting with the authors of the tool kit, Mike Albu and Emmet Murphy, of Practical Action Consulting, who endeavoured to deliver a framework which is practical, accessible, but not loose the technical rigour required for such analytical process: not always an easy exercise! Thanks also to members of The Advisory Committee who have also given extensive and detailed comments on the draft toolkit prior to field testing, especially: Camilla Knox-Pebbles, Chris Leather and Pantaleo Creti (Oxfam); Heloise Troc (Save the Children UK); Leslie Adams (Independent Advisor / Facilitator and Coach); Nana Skau (Echo); Mary Atkinson (British Red Cross) and Paul Harvey (ODI).

I know that the organisers of this project, Karri Goeldner Byrne (IRC) and Lili Mohiddin (Oxfam), having themselves worked hard to make the pilot happen, would like to thank the IRC intern Elisabeth Grimard for all the great administrative support provided during this process.

A special thank you goes to the organisations that supported this learning process by providing some excellent participants for the Kenya Pilot, namely: CHF, Mercy Corps, WFP and IRC-Kenya.

Despite curfews and extensive scaling-up of field operations, the IRC office of Kitale, Kenya, provided our pilot teams with tireless support. We'd especially like to thank Charles (Logistics), John (Administration), and Bruce (Programme Manager), but also all the other staff members who made us feel most welcome.

Last but not least, for their patience, energy and commitment to the testing of the tool kit in Kenya, we sincerely thank the Pilot One participants, who have significantly contributed towards making a stronger tool: Naila Mohammed and Kennedy Yogo (CHF); Mary Muyoka and Francis Kahihus (IRC); Dee Goluba (Mercy Corps); Gabriel Ekuwam (Oxfam) and Vivien Knips (WFP).

1. Introduction

The purpose of this report is to analyse participants' use of the toolkit, what did and did not work well, as well as pilot training and organisation, and recommend adaptations to the tool kit or next pilot. Specifically:

1. The appropriateness of the tool in meeting information needs in a timely fashion
2. The time taken to apply the tool
3. The technical capacity of the field teams and their ability to use the tool
4. The reaction of traders to the tool
5. The level of tool user-friendliness

The reader is reminded that the objective of EMMA is to assess emergency needs -- **including both immediate consumption needs and livelihood /recovery needs**. The level of focus on either aspect depends on the context, the scope, the staff leading the assessment, and as well as other factors.

1.1 Pilot One Context – Kenya Conflict.

Kenya was chosen as the first pilot location because it was felt that another good opportunity to field test in a conflict situation, with the logistical support of a host organisation (IRC), may not arise again in the next 3-6 months of the pilot phase. Although Pilot Participants arrived when the initial shock from the elections was over, it was felt that the conditions in the Kitale area were fluid enough that teams should be able to pilot the tool successfully. More specifically, the reports on the ground were unclear, and differed as to whether those affected were all receiving adequate assistance, and whether the situation could be classified as 'emergency' or 'early recovery'. At the time, the only alternative option was to go to Cameroon, however, without any logistical support in-country, Kenya was felt to be the better option.

As the focus for Pilot One was primarily *on getting the right balance between the technical rigour of the tool and the time needed to complete the analysis*, participants endeavoured to work through the steps in the toolkit, one by one, and use the annexes, so that they could be precise in their technical analysis of the tool kit, its scope for use and methodology. The information documented in this report was collected during a series of daily group meetings, during which participants had the opportunity to feedback findings, specifically on:

- Their interaction with the toolkit, i.e. use of questionnaires, understanding of toolkit steps, etc.
- Situation analysis update. Teams shared key findings from fieldwork.

Information discussed here is also drawn from participants' anonymous, individual evaluations of how they used and understood the toolkit, and what they thought of training and pilot organisation.

Pilot One provided a wealth of interesting and varied feedback and one outcome was a name change from RMAT to EMMA (Emergency Market Mapping and Analysis). This was a decision taken by the pilot participants who felt EMMA to be both more appropriate and pleasing to the ear! Other important products of the Kenya Pilot are the following documents which can be found on the D-Groups website

www.dgroups.org/groups/RMAT:

- Summary of Key Findings: for a very brief overview of Pilot One
- EMMA Pilot Analysis Report – Kenya Dairy (Market System) Sector Report
- EMMA Pilot Analysis Report – Kenya Credit (Market System) Sector Report

Finally, following the valuable critical feedback from pilot participants, the most noteworthy outcome of the pilot was that the structure of the tool was significantly revised. A new, draft flowchart for EMMA can be found in Annex One.

1.2 Pilot One Participants

Pilot participants represented a variety of organisations, skills and experience. Everyone used the tool kit for the first time, so the ‘participants’ also include the EMMA Project Leaders, Karri (IRC) and Lili (Oxfam) and Pilot Test Facilitator, Anita (Practical Action). Despite considerable efforts by the Project Leaders to encourage more in-country participation in the pilot, only four out of ten participants were already working in Kenya prior to this study:

1. Naila Mohammed	Senior Programme Manager	CHF (HQ USA)
2. Kennedy Yogo	Programme Officer	CHF (Kenya)
3. Mary Muyoka	Public Health Specialist	IRC (Kenya)
4. Francis Kahihus	Capacity Building Programme Manager	IRC (Kenya)
5. Karri Goeldner Byrne	Technical Director Economic Recovery	IRC (HQ UK)
6. Dee Goluba	Emergency Team Leader	Mercy Corps
7. Gabriel Ekuwam	Business Support Project Supervisor	Oxfam GB (Kenya)
8. Lili Mohiddin	Emergency Food Security & Livelihoods Advisor	Oxfam GB (HQ)
9. Anita Yeomans	Pilot Test Facilitator	Practical Action
10. Vivien Knips	Food Security and Market Analyst	WFP (HQ Rome)

2. Technical Feedback on EMMA Performance and Use.

2.1 What Needs Clarification and Modification

Within the first few days of interaction with the tool kit, teams began to experience a variety of challenges so the time spent in the field was reduced to make time for more reflection and discussion.

The Introduction

The main challenge for participants was to understand the **entry point for use** of the toolkit, when it should be used and in which situations, and how it should fit into their organisations’ approaches to assessment. Identifying the appropriate language to describe the different phases of the emergency and response, has also proved challenging, and the team continues to struggle with this when discussing the “entry point” of the tool for practioners.

Initially at least, it was not helpful to participants’ understanding of EMMA’s entry point, that the Kenya Pilot participants found limited unmet emergency needs in the area under review¹, probably because the assessment was conducted about two months after the end of hostilities.

Whilst it is difficult to give a definitive timeframe on when the tool kit can be used (immediately after the crisis, one week later, one month..?), the group concluded that the introduction should provide more guidance on how EMMA should be used in different response phases.

The confusion over where EMMA fits into their organisations’ existing assessment methodologies was further exacerbated by elements of the initial *Markets & Livelihoods*

¹ All pressing needs were in the process of being planned for by organisations or the government.

Baseline and Initial Situational Analysis, which were similar to the existing Livelihoods Approach. For further analysis, see 'Step 1...' below.

Teams chose to analyze markets important for livelihoods. Upon reflection, for the purposes of this pilot test, it would have perhaps been more relevant and interesting to have **analysed the impact of the existing in-kind food and non-food distributions on the local markets**, especially considering that some IDPs were not prepared to return to their homes for fear of their safety, and the local, national and regional markets appeared to have suffered minimal disruption following the conflict (with perhaps the exception of the local maize market system).

Lastly, during the pilot, teams picked up on several issues which they felt should be discussed in the introduction:

- There are critical issues to consider when using EMMA in conflict-sensitive areas which Pilot Teams felt needed mention in the introduction. For instance, a good understanding of the social dynamics between groups in the target location is particularly important in conflict-sensitive areas, where the potential to aggravate existing tensions can be high;
- Scale of the crisis will be one of the determinants of type and depth of information collected, i.e. a national-scale disaster will likely require analysis that a small, localised crisis may not.
- Participatory approaches to assessment and planning need more prominence in the Introduction, and the rest of EMMA, if 'classic assessment pitfalls' are to be avoided. For instance, target groups often prioritise their needs very differently from those assumed by 'foreign NGO workers' and care must be taken to understand the reasons for doing so. Private sector participation in decision-making is also often neglected.
- Co-ordination is essential and examples need to be given throughout EMMA, as well as the introduction, especially in market-based interventions, where another organisation may be planning on similar assessments, purchases, or CBIs (which, for example, could lead to price rises as agencies compete for local skills or resources).

Recommendations:

- EMMA should clarify the different information needs required for market analysis at different entry points.
- In the introduction, rather than give timelines of tool kit use, offer example scenarios of the different ways in which EMMA could be used. Hopefully, this way there will be less confusion over when the toolkit can be used.
- Put an example of the market map in the introduction (some participants felt that this would've helped them to better understand what EMMA was trying to achieve).
- Instead of timeframes, use context indicators as to when EMMA should be used
- Avoid overlapping with existing assessment methodologies by re-designing the tool kit so that it is clear where organisations' existing assessments are used.
- Indicate a clear entry point for EMMA in the Introduction by use of a flow diagram.
- Throughout EMMA, remind the reader to avoid the problem of 'classic assessment mistakes', such as planning with inadequate consideration of seasonality, or not selecting the right productive market systems for analysis, which are crucial to EMMA.

In the Introduction -

- Describe the different approaches to using EMMA in conflict and natural disaster. For example, a thorough understanding of conflict dynamics and security is a prerequisite to EMMA in conflict, and in natural disaster there are often specific institutions, government or NGOs, that exist to co-ordinate natural disaster relief efforts (they may be weak or relatively new but nevertheless deserve recognition and support), through which EMMA should be co-ordinated.
- Mention how the scale of the crisis will affect the type and depth of analysis for EMMA.
- Highlight the importance of gender and participatory assessment, planning, design, implementation and monitoring early on.

- Highlight the importance of co-ordination in assessment, planning, etc.

Layout and Style

In general, participants found EMMA to be too bulky with not enough case studies and guidelines on how to read tables and the market maps.

Though the Key Analytical Questions at the beginning of each section were fine, some team members didn't like the specific questions listed underneath (often repeated in the annexed questionnaires), which do not always relate to the particular market or situation in question, so several participants suggested a change of layout for each step:

- Indicators or prompts of what needs to be understood at the beginning of each section, could replace both the Key Analytical and Key Questions, for example, *'In this section you need to know who the traders and service providers in your market system are and how they are linked to each other and your target groups...'*
- At the end of each step to remind the reader what should know or understand at this point.
- Design a checklist (and annex) to help the reader remember the issues that need to be discussed with market system actors and avoid repetition in the main text.

During their fieldwork, teams combined Steps 2 and 3 (Part B and C): Rapid Market Analysis and Market Diagnosis. Fieldwork indicated that whilst in the process of problem analysis with traders or households, suggested outcomes and possible solutions were also discussed, therefore it would make sense to combine these sections in the toolkit. Further, discussion indicated some repetition of questions between these sections. See Steps 2 and 3 (Part B and C) below for more information.

Recommendations:

- Insert more guidance on how to read tables and diagrams. For example, a market map or table of data without explanation and example can be confusing. Case studies next to tables or diagrams can support learning.
- Re-consider layout of questions for each section (see above).
- Combine Rapid Market Analysis and Market Diagnosis to one section.

Tool Kit Language

Throughout the tool participants found the language too 'high brow' and technical, replacing words and phrases with simpler and more commonly used terms. In some cases, the language used needed explanation, particularly economic terms. Participants grasped meanings quickly with contextualisation, so simpler language and more case studies should help clarify unfamiliar terms.

Recommendations:

- A glossary and abbreviation list will be added to the next draft EMMA.
- Run a complete edit of the language used to make it accessible to everyone.

Step 1 Market Selection (Part A)

The initial stage of EMMA was the most challenging - the Market & Livelihoods Baselines / Initial Situational Analysis / Market Selection - this section was found to be confusing, overlapping with existing methodologies. It started to explain, in part, how to do a Livelihoods assessment, but not in full. For participants already familiar with the Livelihoods Approach some of the questions seemed repetitive and at other times lacking enough guidance on, for example, gap analysis and the importance of seasonality and how to do a seasonal calendar.

The participants not so familiar with some of the emergency assessment methodologies were understandably confused at times. This was a good reminder of the fact that, in reality, **staff with emergency experience and training are not always the first 'on the ground.'** Following a crisis, sometimes the development practitioners are the first ones to respond

because they are already in country. If the tool kit is to assume relatively little knowledge of emergency assessment methodologies, then regular reminders of important issues to consider, referenced and with examples, need to be given throughout the tool.

Some participants felt this section's approach 'patronising', that the tool kit shouldn't need to tell its audience how to do an emergency assessment. The original aim of this section was to ensure that assessment teams **selected the right market for analysis** by listing ALL the market systems in the household. For instance, when thinking of asset replacement following large-scale destruction of productive assets, the 'fish market system' must be analysed fully before looking at the 'boat market system'. Teams countered that, this listing of each groups' critical market systems as seen in Tables 2 and 3, could also be done using existing tools, such as the HEA², which already assess, amongst other things, the sources of household income/benefits and consumption / purchases / expenses, thereby producing the same results.

The **mention of markets so soon in the assessment was not found to be helpful** by emergency practitioners who felt that this section seemed to be putting '*markets before people*'. Though market systems are made up of people, some participants said that identifying critical 'needs' during initial rapid assessments, rather than 'markets', was not only a familiar concept, but produced the same results: identification of unmet critical needs and market selection for further analysis. **However, if existing assessment methodology is to be used, then EMMA would still need to remind the reader to recognise the importance of livelihoods during the emergency assessment process as this is an element that is often poorly analysed.** This was a key point in the discussions, whereby we realised that participants understood use of the toolkit in different ways, namely:

1. EMMA to be used for assessment during the **emergency phase**. This would likely not require such in depth livelihood analysis and listing of market systems used by each livelihood group, prior to market mapping, i.e. if refugees' immediate emergency needs include lentils or blankets, is it be a priority or a necessity, to list all of the market systems each livelihood group interacts with prior to analysing the lentil or blanket market systems? Rather, immediate needs, gaps, would be measured against Sphere's minimum standards in disaster response.
2. EMMA to be used for assessment during the **early economic recovery phase**, which would require a thorough understanding of which market systems are important to the target population; particularly their productive market systems.
3. EMMA to be used for assessment in that grey area in between phases: the **gap between emergency and early economic recovery**. Here the tool kit bridges the gap between assessments of emergency needs and deeper livelihoods analysis, used for protection of 'risk to livelihoods' like the stress sale of assets.

The debate on what to do and when, during and shortly after the crisis is not new, and organisations approach responses differently, depending on their mandate, and how the situation evolves. For instance during the emergency phase, Oxfam's EFSL³ Teams would prioritise life saving responses but also very quickly begin to analyse the impact of the crisis on livelihoods, the depth of analysis depending on a range of factors such as severity of the risk to lives, capacity of organisation in crisis context, logistics, etc. Whereas other organisations would focus completely on meeting emergency needs and their livelihoods specialists would arrive once those basic needs have been met.

Recommendations:

² HEA – Household Economy Approach, Save the Children-UK, Food Economy Group (FEG)

³ Emergency Food Security and Livelihoods

- Step 1 (Part A) should guide the reader towards existing assessment guidelines to complete prior to using EMMA.
- Step 1 (Part A) should offer examples of particularly important initial assessment tools that provide information crucial to market selection, i.e. refer to an annex on seasonality which offers an example seasonal calendar and case study to illustrate how to interpret the information so as to avoid planning inappropriate responses (such as CfW programme which clashes with upcoming harvest), risk analysis, etc.
- Improve clarity of what is meant by Early Economic Recovery or other terms used to identify the entry point of the tool. The language used should make it clear that EMMA is about how we work with livelihoods/ economic activities in emergencies.
- Identify why the participants saw the toolkit in different ways -- was it because of the pilot context, the way the tool was presented, lack of clarity over language, or other factors?
- Ensure that EMMA gives appropriate guidelines on the entry point of the tool (emergencies where immediate needs and early economic recovery needs are identified), as well as what it can and cannot do (i.e. where it stops).

Step 2 Market Analysis (Part B) and Step 3 Market Intervention (Part C)

These sections are discussed together because Pilot Teams, more or less, combined these sections during the pilot. As mentioned in 'Layout and Style', the main problem participants had was in understanding the market map and various tables due the level of language and the lack of clear explanation of how to interpret them. Table 12, for example, was not used at all because teams hadn't understood its purpose (which was to analyse competition in a given market).

In the same vein, participants wanted to see a clearer explanation on how to decide **whether to use cash-based initiatives** and didn't feel that the tool kit was explicit enough in this regard. Discussion resulted in the conclusion that the general environment for 'cash feasibility' or appropriateness is as important as identifying the potential for one specific market to handle increased demand. Issues such as conflict, how cash is used in the local economy and managed within the household, target groups' preferences for cash versus in-kind, etc. are more generic and could be asked during the initial assessment phase, before starting EMMA.

Some participants noted that in the emergency phase, much of the market mapping exercise for emergency commodities is usually done by their **logistics teams** who are experts in understanding supply chains, market competitiveness and integration. Participants then asked how logistics teams would be integrated into the EMMA? Team members agreed that the way logisticians work can be quite different in each organisation; some take part in the assessment phase and some, mostly from the bigger humanitarian organisations, are tasked as 'service providers', receiving requests for given quantity of items to source⁴.

For most logisticians to be involved in EMMA, training on the objectives of the tool kit would be essential because, usually, the objective of a logistician is to provide the requested goods or services at *'in a timely fashion, at the best possible price, for the best possible quality'* and not to factor in support options for strengthening the market system. For instance, in Ghana following last year's floods, imported US rice was 15% cheaper and of better quality than the local variety, so for the same money, much more US rice could be bought, for more beneficiaries. US rice would be the efficient choice for logisticians, unless they are given clear objectives to do otherwise.

Next, the **Market Map** requires a little work:

- the 3-levels to be labelled and explained (1. Institutions, Rules, Regulations, Norms, 2. Market Chain Actors, 3. Services and Infrastructure) ;

⁴ The UN's JLC and logistics clusters can also be a valuable source of market actor information during crisis phases.

- to give a case study that shows the target group to be producers as well as consumers (2-way arrows);
- add 'social / cultural' as a norm to be considered.

Other suggested adaptations were:

1. to provide a case study and guidance on analysis of 'service' markets, such as credit, transport or labour;
2. to highlight, with case study, that price rises along the market chain aren't always bad, they can indicate added value;
3. guidance on 'unacceptable price rises'.
4. guidance on understanding the knock-on affects of programmes (inflation, price changes, etc).

Participants expressed the need for **a more thorough decision-making tool**, one which brings together relevant information from the Initial Emergency Needs Assessment and Market Mapping & Analysis. The suggested format⁵ is a Response Analysis Matrix which includes: intervention points/responses, target groups, modalities/options for addressing problem, feasibility, probable market response, key assumptions and time to realise impact.

Here it may be possible to take into account the comments of one participant in the evaluation: *technically it would have been realistic if the tool took in consideration other possible interventions (beside CBI as a replacement or alternative to food or in-kind) that will lead to similar results that you will achieve from CBI – for example, interventions like capacity-building, infra-structure and environment, change in policies, business practice improvement, etc.*

Lastly, one participant suggested that the tool needs to be stronger in showing the link to longer term planning, when to start phasing out. A valid point; this may be because the section on monitoring was not yet available to Pilot One Teams.

Recommendations:

- Insert a reference to existing tools which analyse 'cash feasibility'⁶ before Market Selection. Annex 'cash feasibility' tool for easy access and to promote use.
- Annex a guide on EMMA and Logisticians and continue to request for participation by emergency logisticians on the pilots.
- Introduce tool: Response Analysis Matrix.
- Complete Monitoring Tool.

Annexes

With the exception of Annex C (see below), participants tried, but ultimately didn't use most of the annexes for one, or a combination, of the following reasons:

1. They'd already understood the information they were required to gather from the main document (a repetition of questions from the main text and the questionnaire).
2. They had enough experience to not need a questionnaire.
3. Questionnaires were too long and complicated:
 - The language doesn't reflect the way we really speak to people, also taking into account how challenging translation can be, for example, '*What were the main foodstuffs...your household consumed then?*' could be asked more easily and directly – '*What did you eat last week/yesterday/today?*' Or '*Have any agencies intervened to alleviate the situation yet?*', would really be asked '*So, who is helping*

⁵ Is a revision of Part C's Table 16: Potential Interventions (some of you may not have this).

⁶ For example: Table 3 (p.16) in Oxfam's *Cash-Transfer Programming in Emergencies (2006)*, edited by Creti, Jaspers.

you now? These questions would need to be elaborated upon to understand gender divisions, etc.

- Questions were not asked in a practical order. A comparison of 'before' and 'after' the crisis is often expressed by the interviewee in one go, as opposed to a lengthy description of the situation before the crisis, followed by a return to the same particular issues, after the crisis.

It was also suggested that the title 'survey' in each annex was misleading and should be changed to 'questionnaire'.

Recommendations:

- Combine the questions in the main text with the 'surveys' in the annexes to produce a suggested guideline of issues you need to address (as noted in 'Layout and Style').
- Ensure questions relating to the same subject, i.e. food consumption pre and post-crisis, are listed together.
- Simply the language in the questionnaires to a more user-friendly style.
- Change title of each annex to omit 'survey', replace with 'suggested guidelines....' or 'questionnaire...'

2.2 What Worked Well

Although there are many interesting suggestions for the adaptation of EMMA, participants unanimously agreed that they had all learned something in the process and that the pilot would influence the way they did future assessments. In that sense, the tool kit was successful because participants said that it highlighted issues relating to market analysis that are not always well understood by emergency aid workers.

Layout and Style

Teams liked the use of the Key Analytical Questions in each section as they focussed thought on the issues at hand. One participant found the use of tables helpful for organising and analysing information, adding that they *would be best with the changes we proposed*.

Step 2 Market Analysis (Part B) and Step 3 Market Intervention (Part C)

Market Mapping was by far the most popular tool in the kit, with participants finding more scope for its use than the toolkit had originally intended. Mapping was seen as a 'door-opener', bringing a wider range of intervention points and highlighting the inter-dependence of the consumer, producer, trader, etc.

In the evaluation, most participants said they enjoyed working on the Market Analysis; one person commenting in a way that was echoed throughout the pilot that as a non-economist, the section on market structure and performance was stimulating and insightful.

Annexes. Annex C: *Market System Mapping Guide* was found to be very helpful. Though participants disagreed on whether or not it was too lengthy, everyone felt that the explanation (p.2) of what a market system actually is (market actors, infrastructure and services, institutions/rules), shed a lot of light on the entire document and should be brought into the introduction.

Some participants felt Annex D: Trader Questionnaires to be useful as they helped the reader to focus on what kind of information was needed.

3. Training

A written evaluation of the toolkit, teaching points and pilot organisation was conducted. Most participants said that they needed more explanation for the initial part of the tool kit prior to using it, and a slower pace, and others felt that training was not an issue, rather that it was the challenges in using the tool kit already mentioned. Teaching of Market Analysis (Part B) and Market Intervention (Part C) was satisfactory.

Most participants said that we had started the field work too soon and should've taken more time to understand the toolkit before going to the field (the managers of the toolkit had not anticipated so many challenges at the start).

It should be noted that, in addition to the previously mentioned challenges participants had with the beginning of the tool kit, some had not had time to read the document properly before starting the pilot. This was either due to late arrival on the team, lack of preparation due to various time constraints, or that the updated version had been sent to participants relatively late.

Lastly, some of the repetitiveness of questions already noted in this report could have been identified earlier had we gone through the entire tool in detail before starting field work. Instead, in the training, we broke the tool down into three stages and only noticed much later that questions were repeated.

Recommendations:

- Ensure copies of the tool kit go out to participants at least 3 days in advance of the Pilot.
- Before starting fieldwork, ensure adequate training and understanding of the tool kit.
- Prompt participants to read the tool kit before attending the Pilot.
- Go through the entire tool in detail before starting field work.

4. Pilot Organisation

4.1 Pre-Pilot Information and Organisation

The tool kit and supporting situation information was sent out too late to ensure all participants had chance to read it.

Recommendation:

- Ensure that organisations give pilot participants adequate support and information prior to and during the pilot.

4.2 Transport and Accommodation

There were some organisational hiccups on the pilot, mostly with accommodation and travel to Kitale. All of the participants complained about the initial standard of accommodation and subsequent moves to different hotels. Everyone appreciated transportation being readily available at all times.

Although accommodation was an issue, our hosts had scaled-up their activities in the area of study shortly after the conflict and were understandably stretched to their limits during our stay. However, Pilot Participants very much appreciated the IRC-Kitale office staff and their efforts to accommodate such a large team.

Recommendations:

- Reduce the expectations of future pilot participants with regards to standards of accommodation as this cannot always be guaranteed.

- At the same time, Pilot Organisers will continue to make the best efforts possible to ensure accommodation and transport is satisfactory.

4.3 Pilot Teams and Field Work

In general, participants learned a lot from working in teams, however, in the evaluation some felt that certain members of the team were too dominant and didn't give quieter or less experienced members a chance to express themselves without criticism.

Getting a good understanding of the situation in the areas of study took more time than the actual market mapping and analysis. Had Pilot One comprised of more members already actively involved in the emergency action, preferably based in Kenya, a lot of time would have been saved in familiarisation and identifying needs. It was also noted that the teams were missing the presence of logistics specialists, preferably a Kenyan logistician, with a basic understanding of local and national markets. However, for future pilots it will continue to be very difficult to pull critical staff away from emergency response duties.

Recommendations:

- For future pilots, endeavour to give more space to all participants to express themselves freely.
- Try to make the next pilot 'real time' with more in-country, emergency participants, including at least one national logistician.
- Provide hard copies of background reports and/or internet facilities and time to gather these reports once relevant markets have been selected.

4.4 Pilot Timetable and Time Needed to Complete the Analysis

Most participants felt the timetable to be too hectic, with not enough time for analysis, individual reflection, and rest! Once the baseline data had been gathered, the actual market mapping and analysis exercise only took a few days, because of the relatively short distances to travel and the fact that some participants had already gathered a lot of data from traders during the initial assessment.

Recommendations:

- For future pilots, provide more time for analysis and reflection at base.
- Ask participants to do preparatory research before the start of the pilot, and provide time/internet connection to allow for follow-up secondary research.
- For future pilots, try to include more in-country, emergency participants who have already completed initial emergency assessments and identified critical needs, target groups, areas, etc. So that more time can be spent on market mapping and analysis. This may reduce the time needed to test the tool kit to an estimated 2 weeks.

5. Conclusions on EMMA Performance and Use – did Emma work?

Looking back to the purpose of the pilot test, did EMMA work? As a reminder, during the pilot test we wanted to understand:

1. The appropriateness of the tool in meeting information needs in a timely fashion
2. The time taken to apply the tool
3. The technical capacity of the field teams and their ability to use the tool
4. The reaction of traders to the tool
5. The level of tool user-friendliness

Concerning question 1, participants gave a wide range of feedback. A common comment was that the tool, in its current state, may be too complicated to use in emergency, more specifically as one participant put it: *the tool had many steps and tables that could theoretically help one pull apart and extract data or elements...[however] it didn't help guide us to decisions or help us better interpret the market.*

Pilot teams considered the tool appropriate if used at the right time, meaning if the focus of the tool is on emergency, then EMMA should not be used too long after this phase. One person added that implementation shouldn't be left too long after the EMMA as the information loses its validity.

The two EMMA Analysis Reports were produced by pilot teams, on the Dairy and Credit market systems, though clearly flawed due to the shift in focus from field work to technical analysis of the tool kit at base, the reports indicated that EMMA did encourage the reader to analyse market systems critical to the target group and predict *how markets are likely to respond to potential interventions*⁷. However, as aforementioned, EMMA didn't prompt or promote analysis of current in-kind interventions in order to potentially advocate for the switch to CBIs, nor consider related, existing long-term interventions in either the dairy or credit sectors⁸

Due to the challenges faced by the teams in using the tool, it was difficult to measure 'timeliness', however once teams had selected the critical markets for analysis (the most challenging part), the Market Mapping and Analysis only took a few days, so one could assume that with a proper understanding of the purpose and scope of the tool kit, EMMA would not take long to complete (taking team size and distances to travel etc. into account).

Concerning feedback from participants about how traders reacted to the tool, most reported difficulty in answering the question because they had modified and 'translated' the questionnaires and tool. In the same vein, the tool was not generally considered to be user-friendly due to the confusion on the entry point for EMMA, the complicated, lengthy and technical language, and lack of clear explanation and case study to illustrate complex issues. That said, most agreed the Market Mapping was a very visual, helpful and user-friendly tool.

Technically, some participants found the tool a challenge and more guidance is needed on how to search for information on specialist subjects such as labour or credit market analysis. Similarly, most struggled with understanding how to analyse market competitiveness, integration and understanding when prices rise are unacceptable

Lastly, on the final day of the pilot, the new structure of the tool kit was presented to participants, who responded positively, both in group discussions and their individual evaluations, agreeing it to be *more efficient* and appropriate in meeting information needs on time.

In conclusion, as the tool kit was used during Pilot One, EMMA was not yet an entirely appropriate or timely tool for meeting information needs in a post-conflict, early economic recovery context, yet it did stimulate some valid, interesting analysis. EMMA needs to be clearer in introducing its scope and aims, more user-friendly in terms of the language used, explanation of economic analysis and support to decision-making processes.

6. Recommendations and Next Steps

- Edit and adapt the tool kit according to feedback from Pilot One and analyses contained in this report. Share a rough draft with the Advisory Committee by 26 May.
- The next pilot should take place no earlier than May 26 to give time to adapt the tool and will last for 14 days.

⁷ However clear guidance on analysis of microfinance needs to be reference in the next draft EMMA as the team analysing the credit system

⁸ Although this may also be due to the lack of time for thorough analysis.

- The next pilot should be planned so that all participants have a chance to read EMMA thoroughly before arrival.
- Participants should ideally be already working in the pilot country and have completed initial rapid needs assessments prior to the start of the pilot (however, it's recognised that this is not possible for every participant). Emergency response, economic and logistic staffs are particularly encouraged to participate.
- There will be a video conference meeting of the Advisory Committee on 22 May in three locations: Washington, London and Geneva. The agenda of the meeting will be essentially to review the results of the first pilot and discuss the new version of the tool.

Annex 1: Flow Chart to Indicate Where EMMA Starts -- DRAFT

