



Food Security Monitoring and Early Warning Systems (FSMEWS): Examples, Best Practices, Indonesia's Experience

Anne Swindale

July 2012

Scope of Work

- Survey international, regional and national examples
- Summarize best practices
- Describe Indonesian food security (FS) information systems
- Make recommendations to strengthen FS monitoring and early warning capacity

International FSMEWS Surveyed

- International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) Global Food Security Portal
- Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Global Information and Early Warning Systems (GIEWS)
- FAO World Food Situation
- Agricultural Market Information System (AMIS)
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)'s Economic Research Service (ERS)'s Global Food Security Briefing Room

Regional and National FSMEWS Surveyed

Regional

- Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) Asian Food Security Information System (AFSIS)

Country-level

- USAID's Famine Early Warning Network (FEWS NET)
- Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)
- WFP Cambodia

FSMEWS Best Practices (1)

- Collaboration, stakeholder networks, public and private sector actors, multi-disciplinary and cross-sector exchange
- Thorough baseline understanding of food security, livelihoods, vulnerabilities and markets
- Accurate timely data, food security and early warning indicators, national and sub-national, quantitative and qualitative

FSMEWS Best Practices (2)

- Specialized analysts, well-presented information: concise, minimum needed, narrative, contextualized, level of confidence
- Early warning linked to response, information linked to decision making processes

Indonesia's Experience (1)

Coordination

- Menko Food Security Council (FSC)
 - Inter-ministerial decision-making forum for FS monitoring and response
 - government institutions only
 - non-government (e.g, private sector) by invitation

Indonesia's Experience (2)

Baselines

- FS and vulnerability baseline: national 2009, NTT and NTB 2010
- Livelihood zones: NTT 2010
- Market flow study 2005, WFP Aceh logistics assessment 2011

Indonesia's Experience (3)

Data and reporting

- No FSMEWS
- A lot of data collected by a lot of institutions
- Forecasting based on time-series, lack good models
- Data presented without contextual or descriptive narrative

Conclusions (1)

- Lack of coordinated, integrated, multi-sectoral FS and nutrition strategy, policy and programming foundation
 - Need national and provincial technical FS coordination bodies
- Focus on food security monitoring
 - Food insecurity is a chronic issue
 - Acute food insecurity crises are infrequent

Conclusions (2)

- Better quality data - more timely and more accurate - and more accurate models required
 - Several on-going efforts to address

Recommendations (1)

1. Strengthen Market Price Monitoring system
 - a. IFPRI's Food Security Portal and FAO GIEWS price, production and trade tracking, forecasting and analytical data and tools
2. Collaborate with MOA Agricultural Marketing Information System (AMIS) focal points
3. Conduct intra-agency capacity-strengthening workshops
 - a. Analyze and combine quantitative and qualitative current and historical information
 - b. Write effective, action-oriented food security briefs and bulletins

Recommendations (2)

4. Strengthen baseline data and understanding
 - a. Quantify and explain effect of government trade and price policy on poverty and household FS
 - b. Conduct comprehensive production and commodity market networks analysis
 - c. Conduct livelihood profiling exercise for other highly vulnerable areas
5. Expand software capacity
 - a. Build capacity to use CS Pro