

HIGH AND VOLATILE FOOD PRICES

FAO SUPPORT TO COUNTRY LEVEL CONTINGENCY PLANNING



HIGH AND VOLATILE FOOD PRICES

FAO SUPPORT TO COUNTRY LEVEL CONTINGENCY PLANNING

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of FAO.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACRONYMS	iv
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	v
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	vi

HIGH AND VOLATILE FOOD PRICES

FAO SUPPORT TO COUNTRY LEVEL CONTINGENCY PLANNING

1. Background.....	1
2. FAO Supported Contingency Plans - The process	2
3. Contingency Planning: Principles and Guidelines	4
4. Contingency Plans for “At risk” countries: Key Trends and Issues	5
4.1 Vulnerable / target groups.....	6
4.2 Productive Safety Nets	7
4.3 Activities to boost agricultural production and marketing in the medium term.....	10
5. Conclusions and Recommendations.....	15
REFERENCES	16
ANNEXES.....	17

ACRONYMS

CAADP	Comprehensive Africa Agricultural Development Programme
CSO	Civil Society Organisation
CPF	Country Programme Framework
EU	European Union
HFPCP	High Food Price Contingency Plan
HLTF	High Level Task Force
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OCHA	Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
PoA	Plan of Action
TCP	Technical Cooperation Programme
WFP	World Food Programme
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This exercise was initiated by the former Director of FAO's Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division (TCE), Laurent Thomas and guided by Jeff Tschirley, Chief of the Rehabilitation and Humanitarian Policies Unit in FAO.

The design, implementation and analysis of the contingency planning exercise was carried out by Neil Marsland, Alexandra Guyetsky, Alexander Jones and Aziz Arya.

Inputs were provided from a large number of staff in government agencies who took the time to discuss priority agricultural sector interventions for their countries with FAO teams. The FAO country representatives, Emergency coordinators and their teams played a key role in gathering the information necessary to complete this report.

Valuable comments, information and inputs to the report were received from colleagues working in different divisions at FAO HQ in Rome, in particular the Policy and Programme Development Support Division, Agricultural Development Economics Division, the Investment Centre Division and The Trade and Markets Division. TCE desk operations officers facilitated contacts with field colleagues to ensure a timely and complete response in the countries.

Rome
March 2012

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

After decades of relative stability, international food prices escalated in 2007 into 2008 before dropping and then rising again. This new environment of high and volatile food prices calls for new measures to protect the food security of the world's poorest food consumers.

As part of global efforts to address the situation, FAO has embarked on a three pronged strategy: information; advice and policy seminars and; programmatic responses. As part of the programmatic work, FAO has been working with governments in a number of high risk countries to develop contingency plans for the agricultural sector. These High Food Price Contingency Plans (HFPCPs) have two key programmatic elements: first **productive safety nets**: targeted programmes designed to support household food security and boost agricultural production in the short term. Second, longer term (2 – 5 year) measures aimed at increasing resilience in the context of high food prices by **improving the efficiency and capacity of the domestic agricultural sector**.

The HFPCP work draws on the wealth of experience that FAO has gained in helping countries respond to the food price crisis of 2008. Of particular importance in this regard is the EU Food Facility under which FAO was responsible for implementing 30 projects totaling € 228 million (approximately USD 314 million) in 28 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America.

The process of developing country level contingency plans for high and volatile food prices began in March 2011. The FAO initiative was linked to a broader process coordinated by the High-Level Task Force and involving OCHA, WFP and FAO. 30 “high risk” countries were identified and HFPCP guidance was drawn-up, translated into French and Spanish and sent out to FAO country teams. FAO country staff worked with government counterparts to identify appropriate productive safety net and medium term sector support programmes. In 23 out of 30 countries, HFPCPs were successfully completed. These documents represent an important foundation for future engagement and action¹.

Key vulnerable groups: In each country, populations at particular risk due to high food prices were identified. Of all the vulnerable groups identified, three stood out in terms of the frequency with which they were mentioned: (1) poor farmers (net food buyers) - reported by 18 out of 23 countries; (2) urban and peri-urban poor - reported by 14 countries; and (3) internally displaced people (IDPs) - reported by 11 countries. Other vulnerable groups include pastoralists, artisanal fisherfolk, landless labourers, refugees and returnees.

Productive safety nets: Immediate provision of production inputs, including seeds, fertilizer and fishing and farming equipment are the most popular interventions in the short-term. Over 90% of all country contingency plans include provision of quality seeds and over 60% include the provision of or access to tools, equipment and land. For many countries, availability and production of sufficient inputs for livestock, such as feed, and access to necessary animal health services are high priority also. The various short-term productive safety net interventions included in the 23 country contingency plans envisage a total budget of USD 641 million.

Medium term support to agricultural production and marketing: Activities are proposed in four main areas: input sector development; programmes for animal production and fisheries development; reducing post-harvest losses and improving downstream activities, and; improving market infrastructure and information. Of these, support to input sector development was indicated as a key priority by 19 out of 23 countries. Other high priority areas include support to crop diversification and horticulture, irrigation system development, improved veterinary

¹ Details of all the contingency plans for the 23 countries are contained in a companion document “High and Volatile Food Prices FAO Support to Country Level Contingency Planning: Country Level Summary Response Plans” (October 2011).

services, reducing post-harvest losses through storage and processing improvements and improving market information availability and access. In sum, the medium-term activities proposed in the 23 country contingency plans envisage a total budget of **USD 1 393 million**.

The phenomenon of high and volatile food prices is unlikely to disappear any time soon. This places a responsibility on FAO to assist national governments in combating the problems caused. As far as FAO programmatic support is concerned a two pronged approach is recommended. First, medium term investments to boost agricultural production should begin NOW as an early action measure which will reduce the impact of rising international food prices as this inevitably takes place in the coming years. Second, the various productive safety net activities should be used in conjunction with social safety nets to reduce the impact of transitory price spikes as these occur within the overall context of rising prices. If carefully done, productive safety nets can stimulate efficiency and capacity improvements within the agricultural sector, thus helping to promote the longer term goals of FAO programmatic support.

I. Background²

Between 1975 and 2000 food prices remained substantially stable on a month-to-month basis, although trending downwards over the longer term. This situation continued into the early 2000's, however, since 2007, world food prices have shown new trends. In 2007 the FAO Food Price index³ rose above 130 for the first time since 1996. Unlike 1996, however, the index kept increasing until it hit an unprecedented peak of 224 in June 2008. The index then dropped to below 150 from December 2008 before climbing again to a new high of 238 in February 2011, following which it eased slightly to 225 points in September 2011.

Figure 1: FAO Food Price Index



This new era of international food price movements is thus characterised by two features – high levels of nominal and real (deflated) prices and unprecedented volatility in price movements. This new environment calls for new measures to combat the effects of food price movements on the world's food consumers – particularly the poor in developing countries, as well as helping producers to produce and deliver more food to the market place.

In the light of this, FAO has embarked upon a three pronged strategy. First: **Information** - the FAO Food Price Index and associated indices for separate commodity groups remains the key global barometer of food price movements. Released every month, the FAO food price indices play a key role in informing markets and policy makers. Since the food price crisis of 2008, FAO has ramped up the frequency and variety of information products to heighten awareness at global level of the food price issue. World Food Day 2011: "Food Prices: From Crisis to Stability" is the latest example of this⁴. Second: **Policy advice and policy seminars** - during 2011 FAO has organised 12 policy consultations throughout all the regions and sub-regions. These seminars were designed to raise awareness of and exchange ideas on the various policy measures which can be undertaken to combat high and volatile food prices. They were attended by high level government officials from the ministries of agriculture, trade and finance as well as representatives of NGOs, CSOs, International Organizations, private sector, farmers'

² The Contingency Planning process was guided by staff from the Emergency Division and Investment Centre of FAO in Rome and implemented at country level by FAO country teams. For any further details on the process and comments on this paper, please contact Neil.Marsland@fao.org

³ Food Price Index: Consists of the average of 5 commodity group price indices (meat, dairy, cereals, Oils and fats and sugar) weighted with the average export shares of each of the groups for 2002-2004: in total 55 commodity quotations considered by FAO commodity specialists as representing the international prices of the food commodities noted are included in the overall index.

⁴ Other examples include the launch of the online and freely accessible National Basic Food Price Tool with over 0.1 million records (78 countries, 1 098 series) in the database and the Global Food Price Monitor, a regular monthly electronic bulletin on market and food security situation in developing countries.

organizations etc. FAO has also produced and disseminated policy guidance⁵ Finally, **programmatic responses** – the first wave of which were Technical Cooperation Projects (TCPs) delivered by FAO and partners in various countries in 2008 - 09. This was followed up by work under the EU Food Facility in 2009 – 2011, in which FAO was responsible for implementing 30 projects totaling € 228 million (approximately USD 314 million) in 28 countries in Africa, Asia and Latin America. Since March 2011, FAO has been working with a number of countries to develop **Contingency Plans** covering short and medium term programmes. These plans have been developed in a total of 23 countries where large numbers of the population are deemed to be at high risk of food insecurity due to high and volatile food prices.

The outputs of this Contingency Planning process are the focus of this document.

2. FAO Supported Contingency Plans - The process

Contingency planning may be defined as:

A process, in anticipation of potential crises, of developing strategies, arrangements and procedures to address the needs of those adversely affected by crises⁶.

The process of developing country level contingency plans for high and volatile food prices began in March 2011. This FAO initiative was linked to a broader process coordinated by the High-Level Task Force Coordinator involving OCHA, WFP and FAO. The first step in the process was to develop a methodology for identifying countries which were at high risk of acute food insecurity due to food price movements. FAO identified 85 countries at risk, using an index derived from a risk equation and supporting empirical data⁷. The results of this exercise was then compared to the list of “at risk” countries identified by WFP and OCHA.

A high degree of overlap between the countries was evident, as illustrated in Box 1:

After having identified a list of 30 or so countries felt to be at particularly high risk, contingency planning guidance and a template was developed in English and translated into French and Spanish. The template was then dispatched to FAO Offices in the concerned countries, and FAO staff in country worked with government counterparts to identify short and medium term priorities in the food and agriculture sectors. The completed contingency plan templates were then sent back to FAO HQ for compilation and analysis. The first presentation of the results of the process was at an informal donor meeting held at FAO HQ on June 21. This current document gives full details of the key elements of the plans.

⁵ “Guide for Policy and Programmatic Actions at Country Level to Address High Food Prices” (FAO 2011).

⁶ Choulerton R. “Contingency Planning and Humanitarian Action: A review of practice” – HPN Network Paper 59, March 2007.

⁷ Annex 1 explains the methodology.

Box 1: Overlap between FAO, WFP and OCHA “At risk” countries

The following table indicates the degree of overlap between the lists of countries at risk produced by FAO, WFP and OCHA. The countries in column a are those where all three agencies agree that these countries are high risk. High risk is defined as appearing in the list of 40 countries as defined by WFP AND the top 50 high risk countries as defined by OCHA AND the top 50 high risk countries as defined by FAO. The countries in column B are those which two of the three agencies listed as being at high risk (as defined above), whilst the countries in column C. were defined as high risk by only one out of three agencies*.

Column A	Column B	Column C
Afghanistan	Cambodia	Armenia
Burundi	Angola	Bangladesh
Central African Republic	Benin	Cameroon
Chad	Burkina Faso	Cape Verde
Comoros	Congo, Rep.	Dominica
Congo, Dem. Rep.	Côte d'Ivoire	Ghana
Djibouti	Egypt -C	Honduras
Eritrea	Georgia	Jordan
Ethiopia	Mauritania	Kiribati
Gambia	Senegal	Korea, Dem Rep.
Guinea	Sudan	Nepal
Guinea-Bissau	Tajikistan	Morocco
Haiti	Tanzania	Nicaragua
Kenya	Timor Leste	Nigeria
Lesotho	West Bank and Gaza	Maldives
Liberia		Mali
Madagascar		Pakistan
Malawi		Papua New Guinea
Mongolia		Samoa
Mozambique		Solomon Islands
Niger		Swaziland
Rwanda		Syria
Sao Tome and Principe		Uganda
Sierra Leone		Uzbekistan
Somalia		Zambia
Togo		
Yemen		
Zimbabwe		
TOTAL = 29	TOTAL = 15	TOTAL = 25

* METHODOLOGICAL NOTE: Pakistan, DPRK and OPT do not fall in the top 50 FAO countries. Pakistan is ranked as 60 and DPRK as 61. OPT has a low rank (85) due to missing data.

The contingency plans presented in this document are the outcome of a consultative process between FAO staff and specialists with Government counterparts. This process has been underpinned by price and vulnerability analysis and discussion of response options.

3. Contingency Planning: Principles and Guidelines

The scope of the Contingency Planning process at country level is informed by a number of important considerations concerning FAO's mandate and comparative advantage. In developing country level contingency plans, FAO took undertook **response analysis** to identify planning priorities with government counterparts. This involves deciding on and justifying certain types of responses to given problems. HFPCPs facilitated by FAO should be:

- appropriate to the problems,
- appropriate to FAO's mandate and responsibilities,
- sensitive to the capacities of the Organization and of partners, and;
- in line with existing programmatic and policy frameworks already in place in country.

Problem focus

This can be divided into short term problems faced by vulnerable groups and longer term more structural problems being faced by the agricultural sector. For the former, the focus has to be on responses which demonstrably assist those at risk of food insecurity due to high food prices. This assistance should come through supporting livelihoods in an appropriate way. For the latter, the assistance needs to be justified in terms of increasing the efficiency of various aspects of agricultural systems to reduce the impact of high and volatile food prices on domestic consumers.

Mandate and Responsibilities

FAO has a mandate to implement and coordinate responses in the agricultural sector with both a short-term vulnerability focus and a longer term structural focus. In all cases improvement in overall nutritional status and reduction of hunger is a core goal and all interventions with which FAO is involved should be judged against this. There is also a responsibility to coordinate with agencies operating and leading in related areas. From a corporate perspective, good coordination with WFP either as co-lead (with FAO) of the food security cluster at country level and/or bilaterally is essential. For all intervention types, a strong relationship with Government is a cornerstone of FAO activity, as is close collaboration with international and national NGOs. In relation to the more structural medium term interventions, FAO's coordination with IFAD, other UN agencies and the IFIs is pivotal.

Capacity

One of the key lessons of the EU Food Facility is that it is much easier to scale up from existing programmes and projects than to start afresh. This should be a key consideration in deciding on which agencies (FAO, other UN agencies, national government bodies, international and national NGOs) take the lead for which aspects of implementation of HFPCPs.

Programmatic Frameworks

FAO supported interventions in the Contingency Plans should demonstrably support key national and international programmatic frameworks including:

- The HLTF Comprehensive Framework for Action
- National CAADP Compact (Africa only)
- National Agricultural Policy / Programme
- National Agriculture/Food Security Investment Framework
- National Programme for Food Security (where this exists)

- The FAO Country Programme Framework (CPF)⁸
- The FAO country Plan of Action (PoA)⁹

Programmatic areas for FAO involvement

In the light of the mandate of FAO and the problem focus highlighted above, country level HFPCPs should cover two broad areas of intervention as follows. In the short term (6 – 24 month period) emphasis should be on productive safety nets, whilst in the medium term (2 – 5 years) the focus should be on activities which improve the efficiency and output of the agricultural sector.

The following section highlights the key features of short and medium term interventions included in the country level contingency plans which have been developed by FAO country teams and government counterparts during 2011.

4. Contingency Plans for “At risk” countries: Key Trends and Issues

This section outlines the features of the Contingency Plans which have been developed for 23 “at risk” countries by FAO country teams and Government counterparts. The first part of the section highlights the key target groups for interventions under the various plans. This is followed by a description of the short term (6 – 24 month) productive safety net interventions and then finally the longer term (2 – 5 year) activities designed to boost the agriculture sector.¹⁰

8 The CPF guides FAO programming at country level. It is usually a 5 year programme.

9 The PoA guides FAO programming in emergency and rehabilitation settings. In countries where there is also a CPF, the PoA represents the emergency and rehabilitation part of this.

10 These areas are included as priorities under the Comprehensive Framework for Action (CFA) and also the recently published Report of the Secretary General : “Agriculture development and food security: progress on the implementation of the outcome of the World Summit on Food Security”. (A/66/277, August 2011). Productive safety nets using targeted input support are highlighted in output 2.1 of the CFA and activities to boost agricultural production and marketing in the medium term. are highlighted in output 2.2.

4.1 Vulnerable / target groups

Table 1: High Food Prices: Vulnerable Groups

Country	Poor farmers (net food buyers)	Artisanal fisherfolk	Urban and peri-urban poor	Pastoralists	Landless labourers	IDPs	Refugees	Returnees
Afghanistan	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes		
Burkina Faso	Yes		Yes	Yes				Yes
Burundi	Yes		Yes		Yes			Yes
Chad	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes
Djibouti	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes	
DPR Korea								
DRC	Yes		Yes			Yes		
Ethiopia	Yes		Yes					
Gambia	Yes		Yes					
Guinea Bissau	Yes							
Guinea	Yes							
Haiti	Yes		Yes			Yes		
Nepal	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	
Niger				Yes		Yes		
North Sudan	Yes					Yes	Yes	Yes
South Sudan	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes
Sierra Leone	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Somalia			Yes	Yes		Yes		
Syria	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
Timor Leste	Yes	Yes	Yes					
Togo								
Uganda	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
Yemen				Yes	Yes	Yes		
Total (no. of countries and % of total)	18 (78%)	4 (17%)	14 (61%)	8 (35%)	3 (13%)	11 (48%)	5 (22%)	6 (26%)

Overall, the three primary vulnerable populations identified across all regions are: (1) poor farmers (net food buyers) as reported in 18 out of 23 countries; (2) urban and peri-urban reported by 14 of the countries; and (3) internally displaced people (IDPs) as reported by 11 of the countries. Other vulnerable groups include pastoralists, artisanal fisherfolk, landless labourers, refugees and returnees.

Regionally:

In the 8 countries from the **Eastern and Horn of Africa** region¹¹, the four most frequently mentioned vulnerable groups are: (1) poor farmers, (2) urban and peri-urban poor, (3) pastoralist and agro-pastoralists communities in South Sudan, Uganda and Somalia, and (4) IDPs across most of the region.

¹¹ Burundi, Chad, Djibouti, Ethiopia, N. Sudan, S. Sudan, Somalia and Uganda.

In the 8 countries located in the **Western and Central Africa** region¹² the three most frequently mentioned vulnerable groups are: (1) poor farmers, (2) urban and peri-urban poor, and (3) pastoralists, particularly in the Sahel area of Burkina Faso and Niger.

In **Syria and Yemen** the main groups identified as vulnerable are: (1) small herders and agro-pastoralists, (2) IDPs, (3) female headed households, and (4) urban and peri-urban poor, many of whom are unemployed, dependent on daily wage labour (both agri- and non) and have limited incomes.

In the three countries of the **Asia and Pacific** region¹³ the two most prevalent groups of vulnerable people are: (1) poor and marginalized farmers, particularly small-holder cash crop and subsistence, and (2) urban and peri-urban poor, particularly children, pregnant and lactating women, elderly, large families with a high dependency ratio, people with prolonged illness and disabilities.

In **Afghanistan**, the three largest groups of vulnerable people are: (1) the rural poor¹⁴, in particular share-croppers and landless farmers, female headed households and large families; (2) 800,000 nomad pastoralists known as Kuchi and (3) IDP population, which is estimated at 385,129 persons/ 63,248 families as of 28 February 2011.

In **Haiti**, the three primary vulnerable groups are: (1) poor rural farmers, of which an estimated 25 to 30 % are considered to be food insecure, (2) 3 million urban poor, of which 40% are slum dwellers and peri-urban poor, and (3) people displaced by the earthquake (about 170,000 families, or 680,000 people), of which about 39% are considered food insecure.

4.2 Productive Safety Nets

Introduction:

Safety nets are a sub-set of broader social protection mechanisms. Most safety nets come in the form of non-contributory transfers and they are aimed at protecting vulnerable groups from falling into destitution. In the context of high food prices, such groups would include net food buyers such as landless labourers, smallholder farmers, pastoralists and the urban poor.

There are two broad types of safety nets: social and productive. Social safety nets can be either food and /or cash based, and within social safety nets there are two further sub-categories: conditional and unconditional resource transfers. Unconditional (but usually targeted) resource transfers include General Food Distributions; food vouchers or cash grants. The objective here is primarily the preservation of critical livelihood assets and ensuring physical survival, although there may be other secondary effects. Conditional resource transfers on the other hand require an in-kind exchange of labour power – Food For Work and Cash for Work, or are linked to asset building (such as building human capital – food plus education - through school feeding). The objectives of conditional transfers are normally more balanced between preserving lives and building assets.

The difference between social and productive safety nets is that the primary objective of the latter is to alleviate household food insecurity and hunger through direct support to the agricultural productive capacity of households.

The term “Productive safety nets” essentially means targeted input distribution. This aims primarily at boosting

12 Burkina Faso, Guinea, Guinea Bissau, Gambia, Niger, Sierra Leone, Togo and the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC).

13 DPR Korea, Nepal and Timor Leste.

14 7.8 million of whom are food insecure and a further 9.2 million borderline food insecure (Source: WFP 2011).

access to food through food production and/or preserving and increasing the asset base (in the case of livestock interventions) with a secondary objective of increased income through sales. The target groups for such schemes could be any net food consuming household with access to some land on which to grow crops or vegetables and / or with livestock. This would include peri-urban and urban households. During the response to the food crisis of 2008, the inputs provided through FAO productive safety net programmes included high quality food crop and vegetable seeds; hand tools and farm machinery; vaccines and veterinary equipment; animal feed and fertilisers. These inputs can be provided in a number of ways. The most common ways are: direct distribution; using vouchers in input trade fairs, and; using vouchers with local suppliers. Credit schemes may also be used where there is already a base to build on. Inputs are sometimes distributed with “seed protection rations” – which are food rations to ensure that the inputs are used for agricultural production.

In practice, social and productive safety nets may be used in sequence to save lives and support livelihoods of targeted populations. A good example of this is targeted input distribution followed by a general food distribution. As prices rise and access to food is compromised, productive inputs are distributed to households at the start of the cropping season to boost household availability of food. The impact of this measure will not be felt until three – four months after the initial distribution of seed and fertiliser as this is the time taken for planted cereals to reach maturity and to be harvested. In the meantime, food access is supported through food aid.

Key Features of the country level Contingency Plans:

Table 2: Productive Safety Net Interventions¹⁵

Country	Production inputs ^A	Tools, and farm machinery	Veterinary support ^B	Animal feed and fertiliser	Livestock (distribution)	Extension and training ^C	Irrigation rehab ^D	TOTAL BUDGET (USD Million)
Afghanistan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		\$103
Burkina Faso	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	\$21
Burundi	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes			\$34.5
Chad	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	\$15.5
Djibouti	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	\$11.25
DPR Korea	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes		\$5.5
DRC	Yes	Yes				Yes		\$49.5
Ethiopia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				\$75
Gambia								N/A
Guinea Bissau	Yes					Yes		\$2.15
Guinea	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes		N/A
Haiti	Yes	Yes						\$15.5
Nepal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$2.25
Niger	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		\$12.3
North Sudan	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		\$19
South Sudan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		\$26.3
Sierra Leone	Yes	Yes		Yes				\$1
Somalia	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	\$211
Syria	Yes		Yes	Yes				N/A
Timor Leste	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		\$9.8
Togo								N/A
Uganda	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	\$23.4
Yemen	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	\$2.7
Total	21 (91%)	14 (61%)	14 (61%)	18 (78%)	11 (48%)	12 (52%)	7 (30%)	\$640.65

As shown in Table 2, immediate provision production inputs, including seeds, tools, fishing and farming equipment and fertilizer are the most popular interventions in the short-term. Over 90% of all country contingency plans include provision of quality seeds and over 60% include the provision of or access to tools, equipment and land. For countries that rely on the animal production sector, availability and production of sufficient inputs, such as feed, and access to necessary animal health services are critical. The various short-term interventions included in the 23 country contingency plans envisage a total budget of USD 640.65 Million.

¹⁵ This table summarises a wealth of activities proposed by country teams. For a fuller picture of the proposed country level activities, readers are referred to the companion document entitled: *Country Level High Food Price Contingency Plans for the Agricultural Sector: Summary Matrices* (forthcoming).

A Fertilisers, seeds and fishing equipment.

B Vaccines and veterinary equipment and personnel

C Farmer Field Schools important here. Topics include post harvest handling, marketing and distribution as well as production.

D Rehab/dev. (inc. water wells).

Regionally:

Most of the 8 countries located in the Eastern/Horn and Western/Central Africa region prioritise the targeted provision of inputs such as seeds, hand tools, fertilizers, either through direct distribution or vouchers and trade fair arrangements. This is highly relevant for the large numbers of marginalised smallholders and agro-pastoralists in these regions. Similarly, one of the largest and most vulnerable groups in these regions, the pastoral community, are largely dependent on livestock as the main source of livelihood and need to either ensure that livestock productivity is sustained through adverse conditions with appropriate input and veterinary services, or alternatively, to diversify their activities or else seek alternative livelihoods. Many interventions, especially in the Sahel area, South Sudan, Uganda and Somalia seek to support pastoralists by restocking their livestock to minimize depletion of assets, and ensuring they can maintain these assets by providing feed and access to Vaccines and veterinary equipment and personnel.

In both **Yemen** and **Syria**, small herders, agro-pastoralists and IDPs are targeted by contingency plans in terms of animal feed and access to animal health services. Another portion of IDPs and a significantly large group of vulnerable urban and peri-urban poor are given safety net support through the provision of inputs and rehabilitation of irrigation and water harvesting systems.

As well as input distribution, training and support in post-harvest processing, marketing and distribution is highlighted in contingency plans of **DPRK** and **Nepal**. These actions can add value to the more mainstream safety net interventions. **Timor Leste** differed slightly from the other 2 countries in the **Asia Pacific** region with additional focus given to interventions in support of small scale livestock production and artisanal fishing.

In the **Afghanistan** Contingency Plan, poor and vulnerable farmers are targeted to receive inputs (certified crop/vegetable seeds), small animal stock and receive training on the optimal use of land and water sources, which is especially important given the semi-arid environment. Pastoralists receive support to their main source of livelihood through provision of animal feed and health services, as well as assistance with adding value and marketing their production surplus. The total estimated budget of all proposed productive safety net interventions is USD 103 Million.

In **Haiti**, proposed interventions focus on the provision of agricultural inputs, especially seeds and tools, multiplication of seeds, restoration of irrigation systems, animal production support such as provision of feed and veterinary services. The total estimated budget is USD 15.5 Million.

4.3 Activities to boost agricultural production and marketing in the medium term

Introduction:

The overall objectives here are (i) to develop agricultural production systems to increase production and productivity and (ii) improve the functioning of marketing systems for the increased production. Sub-objectives include:

- Increasing income of poorer and more vulnerable producers, thus increasing access to food through increased purchasing power.
- Increasing the availability of domestically produced food, thus reducing import requirements and lowering prices.
- Stabilising prices and supplies and smoothing income streams for producers.

There are four basic thematic sub-headings here:

- a) Programmes for inputs and related crop production services
- b) Programmes for animal production and fisheries inputs
- c) Reducing post-harvest losses and improving downstream activities
- d) Improving market infrastructure and information

Programmes for inputs and related crop production services'

About 80% of the 60 countries which were the subject either of Inter Agency Assessment missions or rapid appraisals conducted in the context of the EU food facility in 2008 - 2009 rated enhancing farmers' access to production inputs as a high priority¹⁶. Such programmes are normally seen as being one part of a broader and integrated production package that considers the agricultural production system as a whole. Key measures to increase agricultural production undertaken in the response to the 2008 crisis included:

- Input market development
- Mechanisation and farm equipment
- Support to fertility and land management, including conservation agriculture
- Crop diversification / high value / horticulture
- Integrated Pest Management
- Irrigation rehabilitation and development
- Water harvesting

Programmes for animal production and fisheries inputs

The FAO dairy price index rose to above 230 earlier in the year (its highest level since the peak of 2007 – 08), and whilst it has dropped off slightly in recent months it still remains at historically high levels. Prices of meat have been rising almost continuously since early 2009 and are now at historically unprecedented levels. The high price of feed has contributed to this. To address these issues, a number of areas of support are relevant, including:

- Support to the feed market
- Support to breeding stock
- Support to veterinary services
- Support to aquaculture and capture fisheries

Reducing post-harvest losses and improving downstream activities

Reduction of post harvest losses and improved processing and value addition has a high potential for increasing overall food availability and increasing incomes of producers. Total fish losses due to discards, post-harvest losses and spoilage may reach 40% of landings in some cases. FAO studies have shown that in Kenya about 95 million litres of milk, worth about USD 22.4 million are lost each year (Source: FAO, 2009).

The two key areas for assistance in this area are:

- Improvements in storage and collection centres to reduce post-harvest losses
- Improved processing and value addition

16 Source: "Responding to the Food Crisis: synthesis of medium term measures proposed in Interagency Assessments" (FAO 2009).

Improving market infrastructure and information

High food marketing costs and hence higher food prices due to poor market infrastructure is a major issue in many countries. It may be of particular concern to those in protracted crisis or in post-conflict situations, where roads and physical market places have been destroyed or damaged due to conflict. This is definitely the case in Liberia and Afghanistan for example. Access to improved market information has beneficial effects for both producers and consumers. Improved market information systems can reduce agricultural marketing margins and price volatility and increase farm prices and marketed volumes.

Significant improvements in this field can be made by focusing support on priority areas including:

- Rehabilitation of roads and bridges
- Construction / rehabilitation of market collection points and storage facilities
- Rural radio and mobile phone market information support

Table 3: Contingency Plan Summary Table: Measures to boost the agricultural sector in the medium term: 2 – 5 years¹⁷

Country	Programme Area													TOTAL BUDGET (USD Million)
	Inputs and Crops TOTAL = USD 515m			Animal Production and Fisheries TOTAL = USD 282m			Post-Harvest Losses and Downstream TOTAL = USD 102m			Market Infrastructure and Information TOTAL = USD 175m				
	Input Market Development	Fertility and Land Management	Crop Diversification	Irrigation	Feed Market	Increase Breeding Stock	Veterinary Services	Aquaculture	Reduced P-H Losses	Processing and Value Addition	Rehab of Roads/Bridges	Market and Storage Facilities	Market Information	
Afghanistan	Yes			Yes		Yes	Yes							\$110
Burkina Faso	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes			Yes	\$153
Burundi	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$85
Chad	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	\$65
Djibouti	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$115.6
DPR Korea	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes	\$12.4
DRC	Yes	Yes												\$102
Ethiopia		Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes							\$120
Gambia														N/A
Guinea Bissau	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$25
Guinea	Yes													N/A
Haiti	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				\$209.08
Nepal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$62.2
Niger	Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes		\$57.5
North Sudan	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$118.5
South Sudan	Yes													N/A
Sierra Leone	Yes		Yes	Yes				Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$7.6
Somalia	Yes	Yes				Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes	\$110.9
Syria	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A
Timor Leste	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	\$21
Togo														N/A
Uganda	Yes			Yes			Yes		Yes				Yes	N/A
Yemen			Yes	Yes				Yes					Yes	\$18
TOTALS (Countries)	19 out of 23 (83%)	12 (56%)	14 (61%)	14 (61%)	10 (43%)	12 (56%)	14 (61%)	12 (56%)	14 (61%)	14 (61%)	4 (17%)	11 (48%)	15 (65%)	\$1392.82

17 To keep the table digestible, it captures most but not all of the activities and areas included in the country level contingency plans. Full details of the activities in the country plans, readers are referred to in a companion document: Country Level High Food Price Contingency Plans for the Agricultural Sector: Summary Matrices (forthcoming).

Table 3 shows that of all the activities, input sector development is the most commonly highlighted. This involves increasing the market availability of high quality locally produced seed suited to local conditions, and improving availability of fertiliser to farmers. Support to input sector development was indicated as a key priority by 19 out of 23 countries. Other high priority areas include support to crop diversification and horticulture, irrigation system development, improved veterinary services, reducing post-harvest losses through improved storage and processing improvements and improving market information availability and access. In sum, the medium-term activities proposed in the 23 country contingency plans envisage a total budget of **USD 1 393 million**.

Regionally:

In **Eastern and Horn of Africa**, input market development, support to veterinary services and market information support, are priority areas in the medium-term plans for seven of the eight countries drawn from the region. Over half of the countries in the region also proposed improved processing and value addition support, irrigation rehabilitation and development, support to the livestock feed and breeding market and construction/rehabilitation of market collection points and storage facilities. The total proposed budget for countries in the region is USD 615.1 Million.

A majority of the seven countries from the **Western and Central Africa** region indicated that the development and support of the input market is their priority in the medium-term. Over half the countries also indicated crop diversification/high value horticulture development, improvements in storage and collection centres to reduce post-harvest losses, and improved processing and value addition techniques in their medium-term plans. Other designated activities include construction/rehabilitation of market collection points and storage facilities and improved market information support. In total, the indicative budget for all proposed activities in the region is USD 243.1 Million.

DPR Korea, Nepal and Timor Leste in the **Asia and Pacific** region all proposed programmes for animal production and fisheries inputs, particularly in terms of support to livestock breeding, veterinary services and aquaculture. For crop production, all three countries propose input market development, conservation land management, crop diversification and integrated pest management (IPM) as medium-term activities. Additionally, each country has highlighted improvements in storage and collection centres to reduce post-harvest losses and has acknowledged the need to improve market information. The total proposed budget for all activities in the region is USD 95.6 Million.

Both **Syria** and **Yemen** emphasized irrigation development and support to crop diversification and horticulture in their plan to support crop production services. Both countries also propose to support aquaculture as well as plans to improve availability of market information, with a total indicative budget of USD 18 million for all proposed activities.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

As noted in the recently published “State of Food Insecurity in the World 2011”, the phenomenon of high and volatile food prices is likely to continue¹⁸. This places a responsibility on FAO to assist national governments in combating the problems caused. As far as FAO programmatic support is concerned a two pronged approach is recommended. First, medium term investments to boost agricultural production should begin NOW as an early action measure which will reduce the impact of rising international food prices as this inevitably takes place in the coming years. Second, the various productive safety net activities should be used in conjunction with social safety nets to reduce the impact of transitory price spikes as these occur within the overall context of rising prices. If carefully done, productive safety nets can stimulate efficiency and capacity improvements within the agricultural sector, thus helping to promote the longer term goals of FAO programmatic support.

¹⁸ Demand from consumers in rapidly growing economies will increase, population continues to grow, and any further growth in biofuels will place additional demands on the food system. On the supply side, there are challenges due to increasingly scarce natural resources in some regions, as well as declining rates of yield growth for some commodities. Food price volatility may increase due to stronger linkages between agricultural and energy markets, as well as an increased frequency of weather shocks. SOURCE: State of Food Insecurity in the World 2011: Key messages.

REFERENCES

Agriculture development and food security: progress on the implementation of the outcome of the World Summit on Food Security. (A/66/277, August 2011).

Choulerton R. "Contingency Planning and Humanitarian Action: A review of practice" – HPN Network Paper 59, March 2007.

Guide for Policy and Programmatic Actions at Country Level to Address High Food Prices" (FAO 2011).

Responding to the Food Crisis: synthesis of medium term measures proposed in Interagency Assessments" (FAO 2009).

State of Food Insecurity in the World 2011.

ANNEXES

Annex I. An Index to Identify Countries at Risk of Food Insecurity due to High Food Prices¹⁹

I. Introduction

High food prices affect all countries but effects are felt in some countries more than others. An attempt has been made to identify countries where the impact of high food prices could be severe and beyond the coping capacity of national governments. This is the first part of a two part exercise. The second part is a guide (currently under development) will assist FAO country teams to develop contingency plans in high risk countries.

The index used in this paper has been developed with the understanding that FAO is in the process of developing a more comprehensive index to identify countries where external assistance may be required. Once fully developed (May – June 2011), this index shall be used to systematically rank countries based on their vulnerabilities and the need for external assistance²⁰.

The theoretical underpinning of the selection criteria used to construct the current index is derived from a generic risk equation, which is defined as follows.

$$R(fi) = H(ah) \times E(a) \times V(ah)$$

Where:

R (fi) = Risk of food insecurity

H = hazard

“h” = severity and magnitude of the hazard including its temporal extent.

“a” = the geographical region affected by the hazard

E = Exposure to the hazard (i.e. the number of people or proportion of the population located in area “a”)

V = People’s vulnerability to the hazard. i.e. the ability of people to cope with hazard “h” in area “a”

Translating this to the issue at hand can be expressed as:

Risk of food insecurity of a *country’s* population is a function of food prices level over a given period x level of exposure of the country to the food prices x the ability of the population of the country to cope with the food price levels in that period.

For the purposes of early warning and initial identification of countries likely to be at risk, it is not necessary to compute the level of high food prices. Rather, indices of exposure and vulnerability to those prices, should they occur, can be relied upon to identify countries likely to be at risk. With this in mind, a simplified equation with a reduced set of variables may be formulated as follows:

Risk of food insecurity, R(fi).

$$R(fi) = \frac{1}{2} (E(CM-GDP, FMI, CM-Forex) + \frac{1}{2} V(Urb, GHI, Pov)$$

19 This note was developed by the Emergency Division and the Investment Centre of FAO, Rome in March and April 2011.

20 Troubat Nathalie, FAO/EST 2011, *The Early Warning Index for External Assistance Requirements (EWEAR)*, Forthcoming paper.

Both components, exposure and vulnerability, have been assigned equal weights.

Where:

E = Exposure as a function of

- (i) Cereal Import requirement as a ratio of GDP (CM-GDP);
- (ii) Fuel Import Index (FMI);
- (iii) Cereal import dependency per capita (CM-K)

V = Vulnerability as a function of

- (i) Urbanisation Index (Urb);
- (ii) Global Hunger Index (GHI);
- (iii) Population below USD 1.25/day using purchasing power parity (Pov).
- (iv) Cereal Import requirement as a ratio of foreign exchange reserves (CM-Forex).

Normalisation of the Index

Not all variables of the index are expressed in a common denominator, which necessitates normalisation to avoid scale bias. The paper uses the min-max methodology to eliminate scale bias. The min-max methodology is explained as follows:

$$F(X) = Ax + B$$

Where, $F(X)$ = the resulting score

$$A = \frac{\text{Score Range (Max - Min)} \times \text{Observed}}{\text{Max} - \text{Min}} - 1$$

$$B = 1 - A$$

Weights

The following weights have been assigned to each of the variables in the index. The weights for each of the index components may be altered to reflect expert opinion/judgement.

Indicator	Weight, %
Exposure	50
a. Cereal import as a ratio of GDP (CM-GDP)	30
b. Fuel Import Dependency Index (FMI)	35
c. Cereal Import Dependency per Capita (CM-K)	35
Vulnerability	50
a. Urbanisation	15
b. Global Hunger Index	30
c. Poverty line USD 1.25 PPP	30
d. Cereal import bill as a ratio of foreign exchange reserves (CM-Forex)	25

II. Components of the Index

II. 1. Exposure

This component of the index captures the degree of exposure of the country to the effects of high cereal and fuel prices. Data limitations at this stage did not allow a full range of risk factors to be included in the index but the following variables are considered to serve the stated purpose of this paper.

a. Cereal import bill as a ratio of GDP (CM-GDO)

Cereal import dependency is estimated using balance sheet methodology, which takes into account total domestic production, consumption, stock build up/draw down and trade (FAO/GIEWS). The overall cereal import bill is chosen because cereals characteristically account for very high proportions of staple food (in some countries roots and tubers are also important but these are not normally internationally traded). The cereal import bill as a ratio of GDP is a good indicator of a country's dependency on cereal import in relation to the value added in the economy. Indeed a country with high food import dependency may have other well-developed sectors, which may not contribute to its vulnerability. Therefore, it is important to deflate cereal import dependency by GDP.

b. Fuel Import Dependency Index (FMI)

Exposure to the effects of international fuel costs is captured by this index. In the context of rising fuel prices, high reliance on imported fuel can have a number of deleterious effects on domestic food security. First, high energy prices erode household purchasing power and reduce capacity to access energy and other essential consumption requirements. Second, they increase the costs of food processing. Third, fuel prices have indirect bearing on the cost of food production through (lagged) increases in fertiliser prices. Finally, fuel prices increase food transportation costs, which may particularly affect food deficit and land-locked countries.

c. Cereal Import Dependency per Capita (CM-K)

A high cereal import dependency per capita, suggests that the country will rely on and hence suffer from changes in international market prices. On the other hand a country with low per capita cereal dependency ratio would imply that much of the country's consumption needs are met from domestic production and hence less affected by variations in international prices.

II. 2. Vulnerability

a. Urbanisation

The hypothesis here is that the higher the urbanisation in a country, the lower the capacity of the population to diversify their sources of food and choice of crops in response to varying terms of trade. In addition, a more urbanised population are relatively better organised to apply pressure on governments through demonstrations and riots.

b. Global Hunger Index (GHI)

The GHI, reported by the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI), is a simple average of three main nutrition indicators and hence is mostly based on the nutrition status of the population in a country.

$$GHI=(PUN + CUW + CM)/3$$

Where:

PUN = Proportion of the population that is undernourished (in %)

CUW = Prevalence of underweight in children under five (in %)

CM = Proportion of children dying before the age of five (in %)

The GHI ranks countries on a 100 point scale, with zero the best score (zero hunger) and 100 being the worst. The GHI is a very powerful structural indicator of food insecurity. Structural in a sense that it is independent from current shock and policy choices (Guillaumont, 2008)²¹. It is assumed that better nourished population will be better prepared to cope with an exogenous shock and hence the inclusion of the GHI in the index. IFPRI suggests the following categories of alarm measures.

GHI ≤ 4.9 Low	GHI = 5.0-9.9 Moderate	GHI = 10.0-19.9 Serious	GHI = 20.0-29.9 Alarming	GHI > 30.0 Extremely Alarming
--------------------------	-----------------------------------	------------------------------------	-------------------------------------	---

c. Population below USD 1.25 poverty line using Purchasing Power Parity (Pov)

Using Purchasing Power Parity Prices (PPP) to allow comparison across countries, this poverty line uses head-count index to estimate the percentage of people that live below USD 1.25/day. The estimate is based on macro level income and consumption data. Poverty is a powerful indicator of people’s resilience and hence vulnerability to exogenous shocks. A country with a relatively large proportion of its population is less likely to cope with price shocks, particularly in LIFDCs.

d. Cereal import bill as a ratio of foreign exchange reserves (CM-Forex)

The level of foreign exchange reserves indicates the capacity of a country to meet its import requirements. Countries with high cereal import bills as a ratio of foreign exchange reserves are considered to be less able to cope with the impact of high food prices than countries with lower ratios. It is not, however, assumed that all foreign exchange reserves are used for food imports, which is a political decision and varies across countries.

III. Sources of Data

Indicator	Source
Exposure	
Cereal Import Requirement	FAO/GIEWS, Latest estimates (Mar, 2011)
GDP	The World Bank and Economic Intelligence Unit (EIU)
Fuel Import Index	The World Food Programme (WFP), 2008 estimates
Foreign Exchange Reserve	The International Monetary Fund (IMF), country reports/updates
Vulnerability	
Urbanisation	The UN Population, The World Bank
Global Hunger Index	IFPRI
Poverty line USD 1.25 PPP	UNDP, Human Development Report 2010

Missing Data and Implications for the Index

For some countries there is missing data and relative weights are readjusted based on expert judgement to account for the missing information. In some cases like the Occupied Palestinian Territories (OPT) data is not available for most of the variables and in some other cases limited data is available for the two components of the index. In a few cases, like Somalia, Afghanistan, Eritrea and Korea DPR where only partial data is available, qualitative information and expert opinion based on past and existing FAO programmes have been used to adjust the index rank of a country.

The full index is not reproduced here. If readers would like to receive a copy of the index they should request this via e-mail from Jeff.Tschirley@fao.org

21 Guillaumont Patrick, An Economic vulnerability Index: its design and use for international development policy. WIDER Research paper 2008/99.

IV. Comparison of WFP, OCHA and FAO lists of countries at risk

The following table indicates the degree of overlap between the lists of countries at risk produced by FAO, WFP and OCHA. The countries in column a are those where all three agencies agree that these countries are high risk. High risk is defined as appearing in the list of 40 countries as defined by WFP AND the top 50 high risk countries as defined by OCHA AND the top 50 high risk countries as defined by FAO.

The countries in column B are those which two of the three agencies listed as being at high risk (as defined above), whilst the countries in column C. were defined as high risk by only one out of three agencies²².

Column A	Column B	Column C
Afghanistan	Cambodia	Armenia
Burundi	Angola	Bangladesh
Central African Republic	Benin	Cameroon
Chad	Burkina Faso	Cape Verde
Comoros	Congo, Rep.	Dominica
Congo, Dem. Rep.	Côte d'Ivoire	Ghana
Djibouti	Egypt -C	Honduras
Eritrea	Georgia	Jordan
Ethiopia	Mauritania	Kiribati
Gambia	Senegal	Korea, Dem Rep.
Guinea	Sudan	Nepal
Guinea-Bissau	Tajikistan	Morocco
Haiti	Tanzania	Nicaragua
Kenya	Timor Leste	Nigeria
Lesotho	West Bank and Gaza	Maldives
Liberia		Mali
Madagascar		Pakistan
Malawi		Papua New Guinea
Mongolia		Samoa
Mozambique		Solomon Islands
Niger		Swaziland
Rwanda		Syria
Sao Tome and Principe		Uganda
Sierra Leone		Uzbekistan
Somalia		Zambia
Togo		
Yemen		
Zimbabwe		
TOTAL = 29	TOTAL = 15	TOTAL = 25

²² Pakistan, DPRK and OPT do not fall in the top 50 countries according to the FAO index. Pakistan is ranked as 60 and DPRK as 61. OPT has a low rank (85) due to missing data.

Annex 2. High Food Prices Contingency Planning Template and Checklists

Introduction:

This checklist and template is designed to gather information on a number of key relevant issues. Country teams are encouraged to consult with partners, most importantly government counterparts, in order to gather the relevant programmatic information. Where available, country teams may also refer to the results of the Inter Agency Assessments (IAAs) and the rapid assessments done in the context of the EC Food Facility.

KEY ISSUES

- Who is at most risk of acute food insecurity due to high food prices?
- Where are they?
- Why are they at risk?
- What programmatic responses could FAO undertake (a) to support the livelihoods of the vulnerable in the short – medium term and (b) address relevant structural problems in the medium to longer term?
- With whom will FAO be working to implement these responses?
- What is the estimated cost of these responses? (general figures)

IMPORTANT INSTRUCTIONS FOR FILLING IN THE TEMPLATE

- Please keep to the supplied formats and within the maximum word limits for each section. Be accurate and to the point with your answers.
- Remember to consult with key stakeholders – most importantly government counterparts. Their involvement and buy-in to this exercise will be of critical importance IF it is necessary to activate one or more aspects of the contingency plan in the coming months.
- Please respect the deadline for filling in the template IN FULL – this must be back at FAO HQ by cob Friday 22 April 2011

High Food Price Contingency Planning Exercise for..... (country)

Drafted by: _____

Date: _____

Section A: Prices

A.1 How have food prices changed in comparison to one year ago?

Please present the results in the following table format (see below examples from Afghanistan as a guide).

Table 1: CPI in September 2008 compared to September 2007 (a year before)

Description	Percent point increase/decrease
OVERALL INDEX	+ 54.2
Food Index	+ 79.0
Bread and cereals	+ 147.9
Meat	+ 4.5
Milk, cheese and eggs	+ 18.2
Oils and fats	+ 35.7
Fresh and dried fruits	+ 15.5
Vegetables including tubers	+ 47.9
Sugar and sweets	+ 10.4
Spices	+ 21.6
Non-alcoholic beverages	+ 15.7
Cigarettes and tobacco	+ 2.4
Non-food Index	+ 15.0
Exchange rate Index	+ 1.1

Table 2: Agricultural commodity retail market prices (Afs/Kg.) Sept 2008 vs Sept 2007.

Commodity	Region	September 2007 (last year)	% increase on September 2007
Wheat	North	13.4	141.8
Wheat	North-East	13.5	142.6
Wheat	West	10.0	223.3
Wheat	South	13.8	129.1
Wheat	East	12.5	148.0
Wheat	South-West	13.2	140.5
Wheat	Overall	12.9	146.5
Beef	Overall	132.6	-0.9
Mutton	Overall	179.8	-0.4
Chicken	Overall	93.3	12.8
Agri. Labor	Overall	195.3	5.4
Urea	Overall	12.8	41.1
DAP	Overall	24.5	88.9

Source: FAAHM

A.2 What have been the main influences on the prices changes observed? (e.g. international price movements ; country or location specific factors such as level of harvest, policy issues).

PLEASE BE AS SPECIFIC AS POSSIBLE:

Please justify your answers here giving the sources of information: MAXIMUM 200 WORDS

A.3 According to expert opinion, what are the prospects for the next six months?

Increases at the same rate?

Accelerated increases?

Slowing or no increases?

Decreases?

Please justify your answers here giving the sources of information: MAXIMUM 200 WORDS

A.4 How much have agricultural input prices changed since the same time last year?

Please give an overall annual increase / decrease figure for the following:

Staple food crop seeds

Livestock feed

Fertilisers for staple food crops

Input type	Price (local currency) April 2011	Price (local currency) April 2010	% change

A.5 According to expert opinion, what are the prospects for the next six months?

Increases at the same rate?

Accelerated increases?

Slowing or no increases?

Please justify your answers here giving the sources of information: MAXIMUM 200 WORDS

Section B: Vulnerable Groups

B.1 Who is at most risk of acute food insecurity due to high food prices? Where are they?

Certain population groups in the country will be at more risk than others. In this section, you will need to explain which groups are the most vulnerable (numbers, types and location) and why. Please refer to the following categorisation; you may add further categories as required:

- Poor farmers (net food buyers)
- Artisanal fisherfolk
- Urban and peri-urban poor
- Pastoralists
- Landless labourers
- IDPs
- Refugees

Record the responses in a table format. Please use the following table.

Population groups	Location(s)	Numbers

B.2 Why are they at risk? and what are their coping strategies are they currently employing?

Please give a brief description as to why these groups are at risk. What are the coping strategies being used by these groups?

Population groups (from B.1)	Reasons at risk and coping strategies (max 100 words per group)

Template C.2. Productive Safety Net Intervention Types (6 – 24 months)

Population groups and locations	Key intervention types proposed*	Modes of implementation proposed*	Estimated time period for support (From when to when?)	Estimated budget for support (US\$)

C.3 Partners and Policy and Programme Frameworks: For each intervention and mode of implementation listed in Template C.1:

C.3.1. Please indicate key partners. Which agencies – including local and international NGOs and the private sector - will FAO be working with? Are there already good established relationships? What will be the relationship with existing agricultural / food security clusters?

C.3.2 Check for and clearly indicate conformity with the following:

- HLTf Comprehensive Framework For Action
- National CAADP Compact (Africa only)
- National Agricultural Policy / Programme
- National Agriculture/Food Security Investment Framework
- National Programme for Food Security (where this exists)
- National Poverty Reduction Strategy
- NMTPF / CPF
- FAO Plan of Action

Please use the following template to record this information, do not adapt unless necessary:

Template C.3. Partners and Programme Frameworks for Productive Safety Nets

Intervention type, mode, population group and geographical locations	Key partners (please indicate type of relationship and links)	Indicate conformity and support of key policy and programme documents

Section D: Activities to boost agricultural production and marketing in the medium term (24 months – 5 years)

D.1 What kinds of programmatic interventions are (a) appropriate to the needs of the agricultural sector in the medium term (24 months – 5 years) (b) in line with FAO's mandate and comparative advantage in the country and (c) in line with and supporting key policy and framework documents?

Please read the following text and complete Template D.1 on the next page as required.

When filling the template, please refer to your own experience with the 2008 response (EUFF, TCPs etc) plus the IAAs and rapid assessments where these exist and other relevant initiatives. You may also refer to section 2.2.2 above for guidance. Key interventions could include :

1. Programmes for inputs and related crop production services'

- Input market development
- Mechanisation and farm equipment
- Support to fertility and land management, including conservation agriculture
- Crop diversification / high value / horticulture
- Integrated Pest Management
- Irrigation rehabilitation and development
- Water harvesting

2. Programmes for animal production and fisheries inputs

- Support to the feed market
- Support to breeding stock
- Support to veterinary services
- Support to aquaculture and capture fisheries

3. Reducing post-harvest losses and improving downstream activities

- Improvements in storage and collection centres to reduce post-harvest losses
- Improved processing and value addition

4. Improving market infrastructure and information

- Rehabilitation of roads and bridges
- Construction / rehabilitation of market collection points and storage facilities
- Rural radio and mobile phone market information support

Template D.1 Agricultural production and marketing system support in medium term (24 months – 5 years)

THE FOLLOWING TEMPLATE IS AN EXAMPLE FOR PROGRAMMES FOR INPUTS AND CROP PRODUCTION SERVICES. THE SAME TEMPLATE SHOULD BE USED FOR INTERVENTIONS UNDER THE OTHER THREE HEADINGS ABOVE I.E.:

1. Programmes for inputs and related crop production services'
2. Programmes for animal production and fisheries inputs
3. Reducing post-harvest losses and improving downstream activities
4. Improving market infrastructure and information

Sub heading	Target areas and population groups	Key partners (please indicate type of relationship and links)	Time frame	Indicative budget	Indicate conformity and support of key policy and programme documents
Input market development					

Published by
Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

All rights reserved.

FAO encourages the reproduction and dissemination of material in this information product. Non-commercial uses will be authorized free of charge, upon request. Reproduction for resale or other commercial purposes, including educational purposes, may incur fees. Applications for permission to reproduce or disseminate FAO copyright materials, and all queries concerning rights and licences, should be addressed by e-mail to copyright@fao.org or to the:

Chief, Publishing Policy and Support Branch
Office of Knowledge Exchange, Research and Extension
FAO, Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy

Additional information on FAO's emergency activities is available at:
www.fao.org/emergencies

© FAO 2012



Preparing for, and responding to,
food and agriculture threats and emergencies

www.fao.org/emergencies