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About SEEP

Our Vision
Markets that provide opportunities for all people to engage and prosper

Our Mission
To empower our members to become effective agents of change and to enhance their collective ability to accelerate learning and scale impact
Over to You
Shemina Armarsy
Coordinator, Humanitarian Standards Partnership,
hsp@sphereproject.org
Joint Webinar: LEGS, HSP and The SEEP Network

Thursday, April 19, 2018 - 0900 – 1000 (US EST)
What is the Humanitarian Standards Partnership?

A collaboration between:

**Sphere** – Sphere Handbook

**MERS** – Minimum Economic Recovery Standards

**LEGS** – Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards

**CPMS** – Child Protection Minimum Standards

**INEE** – Minimum Standards for Education

**MISMA** – Minimum Standard for Market Analysis
What is the Humanitarian Standards Partnership?

Humanitarian standards allow humanitarian actors to be held accountable to the people they serve;

HSP partners standards share a universal rights-based approach;

They enable humanitarians to put people at the centre of the response.
What is the Humanitarian Standards Partnership?

HSP standards are coherent and complementary. Together they cover the key areas of humanitarian response:

- Humanitarian Charter
- Protection principles
- Core Humanitarian Standard on Quality and Accountability
What is the Humanitarian Standards Partnership?

• How are HSP standards designed: broad consultation process
• When to use them: at all stages of humanitarian response
• What for: proposal writing, programme design, monitoring, advocacy, etc.
• By whom: all type of organizations
• How to get hold of them: Handbooks, website, HSPapp
What is the Humanitarian Standards Partnership?

**Purpose of the Partnership:** improve the quality and accountability of humanitarian action through an increased application of humanitarian standards

- **Coherence**: no repetitions, only complementarity
- **Cross-references**
- **Joint training, outreach** for humanitarians to know they can use multiple set of standards
- **Crucial linkages** at the outset of an emergency
HSP partners of MERS and LEGS

**Sphere**: 20 languages, 4th edition to be launched this year

**CPMS**: Child Protection in emergencies. 14 languages, 50 countries. Current revision

**INEE**: Education in emergencies. 22 languages, 110 countries

**MISMA**: Cash transfer and market analysis
What is the Humanitarian Standards Partnership?

Complementarity of Standards in response:

Supporting Syrian and Lebanese youth aged 15-18 years old living and working on the streets in Lebanon

- Child protection and economic recovery collaboration
- Economic recovery (MERS), Child protection (CPMS), Education (INEE)
What is the Humanitarian Standards Partnership?

Please visit:

Contact Humanitarian Standards Partnership:
hsp@sphereproject.org
Quality, Accountability and Complementarity

Karri Byrne
Senior Markets Systems Advisor,
karri.byrne@gmail.com
The Minimum Economic Recovery Standards
Third Edition

Promoting Quality and Accountability Through Minimum Standards for Economic Recovery and Livestock in Emergencies
Webinar  April 19, 2018
History of the MERS

Rooted in past humanitarian emergencies and protracted crises

• Need to create knowledge base for economic recovery in crisis settings

• Launch of the consultative process in 2007
The Need for Guidance

Accessible and adaptable solutions for multiple contexts

• Need for industry standard that establishes an accountability mechanism

• Rise in number of at-risk populations

• Integration of market systems into resilience building efforts
The Minimum Economic Recovery Standards

Industry consensus on economic recovery for the humanitarian sector

- Not intended to be prescriptive
- Audience:
  - Humanitarian practitioners
  - Economic development practitioners
  - Cross-sectoral practitioners
MERS Timeline

2007
With funding from USAID, SEEP convened a task force to develop the first draft of the economic recovery standards.

2009-2010
SEEP organized regional consultations throughout the world to review the Standards and field tested them in Jordan, Ecuador, Kenya and Indonesia. First edition was born

2011
MERS became recognized as a sphere companion

2012-2014
With funding from USAID, SEEP implemented a training program to promote greater awareness and uptake of MERS

2016-now
with funding from USAID, SEEP engaged practitioners globally to revise the standards and published the third edition of the Standards
Major Revisions to the Standards

- Cash transfers and digital payments
- IDPs and refugee populations
- DRR and Resilience
- New tools
- “Market Systems”
Structure of the Standards

Core Standards
- Standard 1: Humanitarian programs are market aware
- Standard 2: Efforts are coordinated to improve effectiveness
- Standard 3: Staff have relevant skills
- Standard 4: Do no harm
- Standard 5: Intervention strategies for target populations are well defined

Assessment and Analysis Standards
- Standard 1: Prepare in advance of assessments
- Standard 2: Scope of assessment is determined by how data will be used
- Standard 3: Fieldwork processes are inclusive, ethical, and objective
- Standard 4: Analysis is useful and relevant
- Standard 5: Immediate use of results
- Standard 6: M&E occurs throughout the program cycle

Enterprise and Market Systems Development Standards
- Standard 1: Send market systems staff immediately after a crisis
- Standard 2: Implement market systems analysis early and adapt frequently
- Standard 3: Be risk aware
- Standard 4: Work with existing market actors and use integrative approaches
- Standard 5: Support visibility and growth of enterprises and market systems

Asset Distribution Standards
- Standard 1: Asset programming responds to identified needs
- Standard 2: Asset programming activates recovery without undermining local markets
- Standard 3: Productive assets are protected
- Standard 4: Asset replacement is fair and transparent
- Standard 5: Assets expand and diversify livelihoods

Financial Services Standards
- Standard 1: Demand for financial services is understood
- Standard 2: Support local supply for financial services
- Standard 3: Use existing formal financial service providers for cash transfers
- Standard 4: Understand local rules, norms, and support functions
- Standard 5: Follow consumer protection regulations

Employment Standards
- Standard 1: Decent employment is promoted
- Standard 2: Interventions are labor market-based
- Standard 3: Job sustainability is supported
Core Standards

Standard 1
Humanitarian programs are market aware

Standard 2
Efforts are coordinated to improve effectiveness

Standard 3
Staff have relevant skills

Standard 4
Do no harm

Standard 5
Intervention strategies for target populations are well defined
Assessment and Analysis Standards

- **Standard 1**: Prepare in advance of assessments
- **Standard 2**: Scope of assessment is determined by how data will be used
- **Standard 3**: Fieldwork processes are inclusive, ethical, and objective
- **Standard 4**: Analysis is useful and relevant
- **Standard 5**: Immediate use of results
- **Standard 6**: M&E occurs throughout the program cycle
Enterprise and Market Systems Development Standards

**Standard 1**
Send market systems staff immediately after a crisis

**Standard 2**
Implement market system analyses early and adapt frequently

**Standard 3**
Be adaptive and risk aware

**Standard 4**
Work with existing market actors and use facilitation approaches

**Standard 5**
Support viability and growth of enterprises and market systems
Asset Distribution Standards

**Standard 1**
Asset programming responds to identified needs

**Standard 2**
Asset programming stimulates recovery without undermining local markets

**Standard 3**
Productive assets are protected

**Standard 4**
Asset replacement is fair and transparent

**Standard 5**
Assets expand and diversify livelihoods
Financial Services Standards

- **Standard 1**
  Demand for financial services is understood

- **Standard 2**
  Support local supply for financial services

- **Standard 3**
  Use existing formal financial service providers for cash transfers

- **Standard 4**
  Understand local rules, norms, and support functions

- **Standard 5**
  Follow consumer protection regulations
Employment Standards

- **Standard 1**: Decent employment is promoted
- **Standard 2**: Interventions are labor market-based
- **Standard 3**: Job sustainability is supported
Example of applying MERS – Oxfam in Zimbabwe

Project to incorporate market thinking into WASH programming (funded by OFDA). Focus on bringing market-based programming into emergency preparedness and disaster risk reduction through pre-crisis market analysis.

- Ex post facto comparison of program activities with MERS standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CORE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Humanitarian programmes are market aware</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Efforts coordinated to improve effectiveness</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Staff have relevant skills</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Do no harm</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Interventions for target population well defined</td>
<td>FULL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ASSESSMENT &amp; ANALYSIS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 - Prepare in advance of assessments</td>
<td>PARTIAL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 – Scope determined by how data will be used</td>
<td>FULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – Fieldwork processes are inclusive...</td>
<td>FULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – Analysis is useful and relevant</td>
<td>FULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 – Immediate use of results</td>
<td>FULL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 – M&amp;E occurs throughout the program cycle</td>
<td>FULL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY: FULL = 100% / PARTIAL = > 50% / LOW = < 50%
Example of MERS as an advocacy tool

• Resilience program in Ethiopia was using a market systems approach, but was getting a lot of push back from local govt officials on their “facilitate, don’t give away” approach

• A MERS training was given in the local language for senior government officials

• When they came to understand the organization was using industry best-practice, they became much less obstructionist and a stronger development partner
UNHCR Minimum Criteria for Livelihoods Programming

- UNHCR’s Minimum Criteria (MC) for Livelihood Programs guides UNHCR’s implementing partners to demonstrate greater impact through market-based, results-oriented livelihoods programming.

- The MERS served as foundational standards for the MC development; several standards are integrated into the MC.

- 2018: SEEP Partnership with UNHCR to Mainstream MERS across Livelihoods programming; includes revisions to the MC for further alignment with MERS.
Minimum Criteria and Relevant MERS Standards
More Information

To download a free copy of the handbook, please visit mershandbook.org

✓ Download PDF of MERS
✓ Purchase the hardcopy of the handbook
✓ Download the HSPApp

www.seepnetwork.org
resilientmarkets@seepnetwork.org
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Cathy Watson
Coordinator, Livestock Emergency Guidelines
coordinator@livestock-emergency.net
The Livestock Emergency Guidelines and Standards (LEGS)
The Importance of Livestock in Livelihoods

- 1 billion people worldwide

- Impact of disasters:
  - Indian Ocean tsunami: thousands of livestock killed; barns, pasture destroyed; markets disrupted
  - Turkana, Kenya 2017: half a million goats, sheep, cows, and camels
The Aim of LEGS

To support the saving of lives and livelihoods through two key strategies:

1. Help to identify the most appropriate livestock-related interventions in emergencies
2. Provide standards, actions and guidance notes for these interventions based on good practice
The Core Standards and Technical Chapters all include:
Minimum Standards, Key Actions and Guidance Notes
The LEGS Approach

Stage 1
Initial Assessment

Stage 2
Response Identification

Stage 3
Analysis of Technical Interventions & Options

Stage 4
Monitoring and Evaluation

Tools for the LEGS Approach...
Initial Assessment Checklists

1. Role of livestock in the livelihoods of the affected community
2. Nature and impact of the emergency
3. Analysis of local context, capacities, and systems

Plus: Checklists and indicators for each technical chapter
The LEGS Participatory Response Identification Matrix (PRIM)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical Interventions</th>
<th>Livelihoods Objective</th>
<th>Rapid Response</th>
<th>Rehab Aid</th>
<th>Early Action</th>
<th>Emergency Phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Destocking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the PRIM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technical options</th>
<th>Livelihoods objectives</th>
<th>Emergency phases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immediate Benefits</td>
<td>Protect assets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destocking</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vet support</td>
<td>****</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>****</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td>****</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consider the three LEGS objectives against each of the technical options.

Set the phases of the emergency – these differ for slow-onset, rapid-onset and complex emergencies.

With stakeholders, add scores to show how much the technical option could impact on each LEGS objective.

With stakeholders, add arrows to the relevance of the technical option across the different phases of the emergency.
Figure 8.1 Decision-making tree for feed options

Is there a shortage of livestock feed?
- Are indigenous supplementary feeding practices sufficient to cope with needs or do they not exist?
- Do sufficient funds exist to provide adequate supplementary feed to achieve nutritional objectives for the duration of the emergency?
- Can safe sources, storage, and transportation of feed be assured?
- Are local feed sources available?
- Is transport available?

No action (unless outstanding questions can be addressed)
- Are there sufficient logistical, supervisory, and management support systems for establishing a feed camp?
- Are there sufficient resources to maintain the camp for the anticipated duration of the emergency?

Emergency feeding in situ
- Can secure, community-managed distribution processes be established?

Emergency feeding in feed camp

Note: The result “no action unless outstanding questions can be addressed” does not necessarily mean that no intervention should take place, but rather that further training or capacity building may be required in order to be able to answer “yes” to the key questions.
LEGS Project current activities

- **LEGS secretariat**: website, mailings, communications and awareness raising

- **Publications and research**: briefing papers, translations

- **Dissemination** of LEGS Handbook 2\(^{nd}\) Edition

- Promotion of **evaluation and impact assessment** using LEGS tools and indicators

- **LEGS Training programme**...
LEGS Training Programme

Training of Trainers

- For: LEGS Trainers
- 26 TOTs: 500 LEGS Trainers in 80+ countries

3-day Training

- For: practitioners
- 290+ in 50+ countries

Awareness Sessions

- For: decision-makers and donors
- 15+

On-line modules

- For: practitioners
- Gender and livestock
LEGS Uptake

Key reference in different regions in Africa, Asia, the Middle East, and Latin America:

- International organisations: FAO, OCHA, OFDA, ECHO, DFID, ICRC, World Bank...
- NGOs: CARE, CAFOD, Trócaire, World Animal Protection, VSFs...
- National governments: e.g. Ethiopia; Kenya; India; Indonesia; Vietnam...

...in donor appraisal, design, implementation, and evaluation of emergency interventions
1. Example of economic impact: Commercial destocking in southern Ethiopia

- US$186 per household from livestock sales
- Uses: food for people and livestock; trucking stock to distant grazing
- 79% used for goods and services from local suppliers – supporting local markets
2. Example of livelihoods impact: Restocking in Kenya

- 400 families: 20 sheep/goats, 1 donkey
- Target: female-headed households

Results 1.5 years later:

- Herd increase 76-81%
- Dependence on other sources of food down from 84% to 58%
And yet....

These positive impacts are not reflected in humanitarian funding:

- Ethiopia: livestock 1-4% of total humanitarian requirement
- Kenya: agriculture (including livestock) 3-32% of total requirement
Importance of timely and appropriate livestock-based responses:

- Protect and rebuild livelihood assets
- Support local market systems and integrate with other economic recovery activities
- Can improve nutritional resilience and reduce dependence on food aid: *Feed livestock to reduce need to feed children*
- Can be cost-effective: *For every $1 spent on destocking in Ethiopia, $311 saved in aid and animal losses*
LEGS Videos
LEGS Contacts

- LEGS website: [www.livestock-emergency.net](http://www.livestock-emergency.net)
- LEGS on Twitter: @TheLEGSProject
- LEGS Mailing List: sign up on the website or contact the LEGS Administrator: [Admin@livestock-emergency.net](mailto:Admin@livestock-emergency.net)
- LEGS Coordinator: [Coordinator@livestock-emergency.net](mailto:Coordinator@livestock-emergency.net)

Photo credit: David Hadnill
Use the Q&A feature at the bottom of your screen to pose questions

After the webinar, all registrants will receive an email with a link to the webinar for on-demand viewing; a web post will also cover any unanswered questions.
Join the MiC community

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
Upcoming SEEP Events

Our EMMA Analysis Isn’t Quite Answering Our Questions… Can Anybody Help?
Webinar
May 16th

Up to the Standards?: Humanitarian Standards for Market Assessment and Analysis
Webinar
May 29th

SG2018: The Power of Savings Groups
Kigali, Rwanda
May 22 – 24

2018 SEEP Annual Conference
Arlington, VA
Oct 1 – Oct 3
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