On 17 November 2011, Ministers in charge of food and agriculture of ECOWAS member countries, Chad and Mauritania, adopted in Conakry the “Charter for Food Crisis Prevention and Management”. The Charter was then approved at the 40th Ordinary Summit of ECOWAS Heads of State and Government held in Abuja on 16-17 February 2012. This was the completion of a long process of inclusive dialogue and negotiation facilitated since 2006 by the CILSS Executive Secretariat and the Sahel and West Africa Club Secretariat (SWAC/OECD).

The “Set of Instruments for Food Crisis Management” is a tool aimed at facilitating the application of the Charter, for which concerned parties committed to « define response options and instruments through the strategic framework for food crisis management depending on food crisis origin and causes ». To this end, they committed to « support the Food Crisis Prevention Network (RPCA) that produces and regularly updates a set of instruments including all options for and types of intervention ». The set of instruments aims to encourage a better use of response instruments based on the nature, importance and scope of each food and nutritional crisis.

This set of instruments is the result of the analysis and synthesis conducted by an expert panel, under the auspices of the RPCA and facilitated by the SWAC Secretariat, in particular Mr. Sibiri Jean Zoundi, Principal Administrator, and Ms. Coralie David, Policy Analyst on Food Security. The process has built on numerous exchanges, including electronic consultations, and various contributions, in particular from non-governmental organisations co-ordinated by OXFAM. The document was then validated at the RPCA meeting on 13 April 2012, that gathered experts from network members as well as other researchers and practitioners.
**STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK FOR RESPONSE ANALYSIS**

**STRUCTURE** of the set of instruments

**THIS TOOL IS COMPOSED OF THREE PILLARS:**

1. **DIRECT AND IMMEDIATE SUPPORT** to the most vulnerable affected populations;
2. **POST-CRISIS SUPPORT** and prevention of food and nutritional crises;
3. **INFORMATION SYSTEMS** for food and nutritional crisis prevention and management.
1. DIRECT AND IMMEDIATE SUPPORT TO THE MOST VULNERABLE AFFECTED POPULATIONS

Measures proposed in this pillar aim at mitigating the effects of food and nutritional crises on the most vulnerable households by reducing social, physical, moral and psychological impacts resulting from crises, in particular by avoiding losses of human lives. These emergency measures focus on improving both food availability and access to food for the most vulnerable affected populations.

2. POST-CRISIS SUPPORT AND PREVENTION OF FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL CRISES

Medium-and long-term measures proposed in this pillar aim to support the recovery of affected populations and to prevent future food and nutritional crises.

3. INFORMATION SYSTEMS FOR FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL CRISIS PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT

These measures and actions aim to better characterise and understand food and nutritional crises, their importance, scope and evolution. A deeper understanding of each crisis is a precondition for improving choices of instruments and better targeting response instruments proposed in the first two pillars. Information systems also facilitate the monitoring and the evaluation of interventions.
1. DIRECT AND IMMEDIATE SUPPORT TO THE MOST VULNERABLE AFFECTED POPULATIONS

**Objectives:**
- Provide temporary, emergency assistance to the most vulnerable populations.
- Support food security needs and livelihoods.
- Stabilise food prices and support domestic producers.
- Stimulate the local economy.

**Approaches:**
- Food for Work (FFW) transfers or vouchers
- Food subsidies
- Cash transfers
- Nutrition interventions
- Early recovery and reconstruction
- WFP and FAO interventions

**Advantages:**
- Easy targeting
- Leaves some choice to beneficiaries
- Opportunities to make agreements with traders
- Allows for increased investment.
- Potentially good governance.

**Disadvantages:**
- Requires strong management capacities and good governance.
- May interfere with existing livelihood strategies.
- Risk of smuggling to neighbouring countries.
- High logistical costs.
- Difficult targeting.

**Note:**
- Requires banks' trust in certificates produced by warehouses, which may not always be possible.

2. POST CRISIS SUPPORT AND PREVENTION OF FOOD and NUTRITIONAL CRISES

**Objectives:**
- Transform food aid into assets.
- Promote on-farm and off-farm food production.
- Increase resilience.
- Reduce the risk of inflation.
- Build markets;• successful examples in South America

**Approaches:**
- Multi-peril crop insurance
- Income-generating activities
- Emergency situation;
- Presence of banks in rural areas.

**Advantages:**
- Can increase agricultural production.
- Low risk of inflation.
- Cheaper than general input subsidies.
- Requires good capacities to ensure financial viability.

**Disadvantages:**
- Requires strong management capacities and good governance.
- High interest rate.
- Requires hospital and insurance, to people with limited financial capacity.
- High cost;•difficult to scale down or remove - should be limited in time.
- High political cost of scaling down or removing food subsidies - important to set a bottom price above which the subsidy is provided; • risk of smuggling to neighbouring countries.

**Note:**
- Requires good management capacities and low corruption - in particular related to agricultural and food security policies.
- Requires good capacities to ensure financial viability.
- High risk of inflation.
## 3. INFORMATION SYSTEMS FOR FOOD AND NUTRITIONAL CRISIS PREVENTION AND MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>OBJECTIVES</th>
<th>SITUATIONS / CONDITIONS TO USE THIS INSTRUMENT</th>
<th>ADVANTAGES</th>
<th>DISADVANTAGES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market information systems</td>
<td>Data collection on food prices and quantities and other market indicators on local, regional, national and international markets.</td>
<td>• Provide data on prices and other market indicators.</td>
<td>• Dedicated institution; • Good coordination.</td>
<td>• Allows for the implementation of instruments enhancing market functioning, such as warrantage; • Allows producers and economic agents to access market information to sell their production at or negotiate better prices; • Allows for the analysis of price transmission mechanisms and market fragmentation.</td>
<td>• Requires good management capacities; • Requires good communication infrastructure to ensure that the information is disseminated widely.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Datasets on households and nutritional surveys</td>
<td>Data collection on household vulnerability and socio-economic conditions.</td>
<td>• Identify vulnerable households to ensure better targeting of policies and programmes.</td>
<td>• Dedicated institution; • Good coordination.</td>
<td>• Ensures better targeting and better budget allocation.</td>
<td>• Expensive; • Requires good technical capacities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food stock information systems</td>
<td>Set up a regular monitoring of food stocks in each country on a sample of producers, traders and consumers.</td>
<td>• Develop a barometer to follow the evolution of food stocks and food stock practices.</td>
<td>• Existence of food reserves managed by the government and private actors.</td>
<td>• Guarantees data comparability across time; • Improves the reliability of the food security analysis.</td>
<td>• Difficult data collection</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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