

Regional Lessons Learning Workshop Central and Eastern Africa

**Hosted by the regional
Food Security and Nutrition Working Group
13th – 14th November 2008
Nairobi, Kenya**

Workshop Proceedings Draft for Comment and Feedback

Funded by the Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification (IPC) Regional Implementation in Central and Eastern Africa project (Regional IPC Project) funded by the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), The UK Department for International Development (DFID), and the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO).

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) is an innovative tool to improve food security response strategies and decision-making by drawing together multiple indicators to provide a consistent and meaningful classification of food security situations. Since being developed by the Food Security Analysis Unit in Somalia, the IPC is being further developed as an analytical tool in a global effort to improve food security analysis and assessment approaches. An IPC Steering Committee under the regional Food Security and Nutrition Working Group (FSNWG) based in Nairobi has been supporting the regional development. To further support the development of the IPC in the region, ECHO, DFID, and CIDA are funding a Regional IPC Project implemented by FAO that works in close collaboration with partner organizations through the FSNWG IPC Steering Committee. The project supports IPC processes in Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda.

Capturing and disseminating best practices and lessons learned are central to the Regional IPC Project as this process aims to improve country and regional implementation and future IPC global development. The process started in November 2006 in Somalia and subsequently began in Kenya. Currently, each country under the Regional IPC Project carries out a national lesson learning exercise after its national IPC analytical workshop. The FSNWG hosted an IPC Regional Lessons Learning Workshop to capitalize on lessons learned across the project and in countries not directly targeted by the project in order to inform future regional IPC activities and contribute to the IPC global technical development. About 40 food security professionals including the country level (Burundi, DRC, Kenya, Southern Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda), the regional level and the global level participated in the workshop held in Nairobi from 13th to 14th November.

The main output of the workshop was the production of a SWOT style matrix comprising region-wide lessons and solutions by relevant thematic area that can help plan the next phase of the IPC roll-out. After cross fertilization across four thematic groups, the following outputs were produced:

Output 1: RE: The Roll-Out Process in Countries and the Region

Output 2: RE: Capacity Building and Training Needs and Approaches

Output 3: RE: Data Availability and Technical Issues

Output 4: RE: Use of the IPC in Decision Making

Country teams will use results generated above to develop more country based work plans.

INTRODUCTION

The development of the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification System (IPC) is part of a global process to improve food security response strategies and decision-making. The IPC is a standardized scale that integrates food security, nutrition and livelihood information into a clear statement about the nature and severity of a crisis and implications for strategic response. Since being developed by the Food Security Analysis Unit in Somalia, the IPC is being further advanced as an analytical tool in a global effort to improve food security analysis and assessment approaches. Central and eastern Africa has been targeted as a region for the development of the IPC owing to a strong humanitarian imperative and the possibilities to roll out the IPC based on existing national capacities and institutional frameworks. An IPC Steering Committee under the regional Food Security and Nutrition Working Group (FSNWG) based in Nairobi has been supporting the regional development. To further support the development of the IPC in the region, ECHO, DFID, and CIDA are funding a Regional IPC Project being implemented by FAO that works in close collaboration with partner organizations through the FSNWG IPC Steering Committee. The project supports IPC processes in Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda.

One core dimension of the Regional IPC Project is to capture and disseminate best practices and lessons learned to improve country and regional implementation and future global development of the IPC. This process builds upon IPC lesson learning activities that started in November 2006 in Somalia and subsequently in Kenya. Under the Regional IPC Project, each country carried out national lesson learning exercises after its national IPC analytical workshop.

Based on these experiences, as well as the lessons learned at the regional level and in countries not directly targeted by the project, the FSNWG, with funding through the Regional IPC Project, hosted an IPC Regional Lessons Learning Workshop to combine lessons learned across the project to inform future regional IPC activities and contribute to the global technical development of the IPC.

The **purpose** of the workshop was to review and learn lessons from the recent implementation and roll-out of the IPC in central and eastern Africa, to inform future IPC activities in the region, and contribute to the global technical development of the IPC. The **specific objective** of the workshop was to discuss, identify, and document experiences, lessons learned, and best practices established regarding the use and implementation of the IPC in eastern and central Africa.

To accomplish these objectives, about 40 food security professionals from 6 countries (Burundi, DRC, Kenya, Southern Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda), the regional level and the global level gathered in Nairobi from 13th to 14th November to participate in the workshop.

The general structure of the workshop was as followed: a half day of presentations of country and regional-level lessons learned and best practices established; a half day of discussions for agglomeration of lessons learned in break-out groups by thematic area [the roll-out process in countries and the region, capacity building and training needs and approaches; data availability and technical issues related to the IPC; and the use of the IPC in decision making]; and one day dedicated to cross fertilization across thematic groups followed by presentation of final outputs, and the preparation of statements by country teams. The workshop was hosted by the regional Food Security and Nutrition Working Group (FSNWG) and was sponsored by the Regional IPC Project funded by CIDA, DFID, and ECHO ongoing in the region since mid-2007. The workshop occurred seven weeks after the regional analytical event organized in September and was the last regional activities for the current phase of the project.

The proceedings provide a summary of presentations made and discussions held during the workshop. The workshop terms of reference, agenda, participant list, and materials are provided in annexes.

DAY 1: THURSDAY 13 SEPTEMBER 2008

MINUTES

- **Opening and Welcome**

- **Objectives, Introduction, and Structure of the Workshop**

Francesco Del Re (Regional Emergency Food Security Adviser and Project Manager for the Regional IPC Project, FAO REOA)

Francesco Del Re in opening the workshop welcomed all participants to the IPC Regional Lessons Learning Workshop as the Project Manager for the Regional IPC Roll-out Project. Before carrying on with his speech, he invited all participants to introduce themselves.

The workshop is being hosted by the Regional Food Security and Nutrition Working Group (FSNWG), an interagency working group covering central and eastern Africa. Six country teams comprised of food security practitioners were sponsored by the FSNWG and are currently at the workshop. They are joined by representatives of organizations working on food security issues at the global and regional level.

Purpose and objectives of the workshop

A lesson learned workshop has already taken place in each project country, and even few countries such as Kenya and Burundi have organized such workshops more than once. For its part, this is the first time the FSNWG has hosted such a regional meeting at which it looks to combine the lessons learned across the project to inform future regional IPC activities and contribute to the global technical development of the IPC. To achieve this, invited workshop participants have in the most part considerable experience with practical implementation of the IPC to significantly contribute to countries' lesson learned issues and best practices established, as well as to discuss and define lessons learned at the regional level from the Regional IPC Roll-out Project.

Specifically, the workshop's main objective is to discuss, identify, and document experiences, lessons learned, and best practices established regarding the use and implementation of the IPC in eastern and central Africa.

Structure of the workshop

The workshop is specifically structured around its objective and consists of the following activities:

- presentations of country and regional-level lessons learned and best practices established (1/2 day)
- discussions for agglomeration of lessons learned in break-out groups by thematic area [the roll-out process in countries and the region, capacity building and training needs and approaches; data availability and technical issues related to the IPC; and the use of the IPC in decision making] (1/2 day)
- Cross fertilization across thematic groups followed by presentation of final outputs, and to the preparation of statements by country teams (1 day)

LESSONS LEARNED AND BEST PRACTICES ESTABLISHED PRESENTATIONS

Each country is allocated 15 minutes to carry out a power point presentation of the lesson learned and best practices established from this year's implementation of the IPC roll-out project. Following an alphabetical order, Burundi is the first country to present followed by DRC, Kenya, Tanzania, Soudan (Southern), Soudan (Northern) and Uganda. Afterward the regional level presentation, the representative of IPC global partners shares some remarks with the participants.

The main points presented are recorded below.

A. COUNTRY LEVEL

1. Burundi

Methode Niyongendako (FAO)

Strengths:

1. Reference table introduced a neutral situation analysis standard in Burundi
2. Cartographic protocol harmonized colour to situation
3. It is now possible to compare food security across time
4. There is now a forum for transparent and concerted analysis with about 40 security specialists involved in national IPC workshops
5. Burundi uses various data and methodologies to classify food security

Challenges:

- o Indicators: for example access to water, availability and access to food difficult to understand
- o Data availability: nutritional surveys patchy; lack of statistics - linked to Burundi crisis
- o Data analysis: data mostly available at administrative level instead of natural region level or ZME
- o Determination of population estimates
- o Timing: Deadlines for analysis workshop, results dissemination, report;
- o Report Format
- o Transfer to government slow

What we've learned from the Question & Answer Session

Question & Answer Session

Question: *How do you see government bringing on board different ministries?*

Answer: There is need to recognize the current context in Burundi. The country is just coming out of a long crisis, and bringing on board government stakeholders is a major challenge. For the moment, the government is involved in IPC through training of its officers, data collection, and food security analysis. The government ought to be more involved and should start playing a coordination role sooner rather than later. For example, it is essential that government issues invitations to workshops, encourages participation and promotes IPC products, which are fundamental moves towards ownership. Also, after each national IPC analysis decision makers should be briefed so that they can formulate appropriate responses.

Question: *At what level do you do the IPC analysis?*

Answer: The IPC analysis is carried out at the natural region level for which data is generally not available. Also, it is not simple to combine the natural regions with the provinces since one region, for example, can consist of two provinces, and one province can be divided between two different regions. It should be noted

that data collection has been patchy because of the crisis, which makes the job difficult and challenging.

Question: *What is the format of your IPC report?*

Answer: Burundi produces two IPC reports; one is the analysis report (about 40 pages), and the other, a summary of the first report, runs about 19 pages and includes a chapter on responses options (not to confuse with an analysis of options).

2. DRC

Michel Disonama (FAO)

Constraints:

Technical:

- o No livelihood base studies
- o Lack of up-to-date and reliable data
- o Limited analysis skills and technical knowledge of IPC
- o Poor knowledge of food security concepts and tools

Logistical/administrative

- o Inadequate budget
- o Lack of financial decision making power of IPC working group

Institutional

- o Limited Government, UN System (UNICEF, WFP) and NGOs (Oxfam) financial contribution.
- o Lack of IPC information sharing and sensitization within institution
- o Lack of institutional decision making power of IPC working group

Recommendations

General:

- o Switch to an IPC analysis by province given the size of the country and the logistical challenges that ensue
- o Complete livelihood based studies
- o Establish provincial focal points
- o Build capacity at provincial level through training sessions

Workshops:

- o Provincial workshops:
 - Focal points partially fill out analysis template before the workshop
 - Plan for at least 4 days for the workshop of which 1 day for training, 2 days for group work and 1 day for plenary;
 - Prepare in advance the population tables
- o National Workshop:
 - Plan for 6 days of which 2 days for group work on verification and harmonization, 3 days for plenary and 1 day for sectoral presentations
- o Sustainability:
 - Strengthen decision making power of National IPC Inter-institutional Working Group
 - Call for financial contribution of other UN agencies and NGOs

What we've learned from the Question & Answer Session.

Question: *Did politics interfere in IPC analysis at provincial level?*

Answer: Politics has not really interfered with the IPC analysis, even at provincial level for that matter. There was only one incident [*complaints from an official who expressed fears that data collected may fall into the wrong hands*], which is mostly blamed on the lack of IPC knowledge among government officials. The incident emphasizes the need for more sensitization sessions with government in DRC.

Question: *Why do you have a problem of dissemination, sensitization?*

Answer: One major hurdle to IPC dissemination is the lack of information sharing within institution. The DRC team is currently encouraging stakeholders who participate in IPC activities to communicate with their office counterparts, and to also gather information on data available in their institution for use in IPC analysis. More NGOs and Government officials should actively participate. For example, the *Institut National des Statistiques* (INS) is crucial to the process and to government ownership of IPC. Focal points at provincial level are seen as essential to a successful roll-out in DRC given the need to organize data and produce a report at that level before the national workshop is organised. Broad dissemination and effective institutionalization will strengthen the analysis process.

Question: *How well is the information received? How did decision makers integrate information for response?*

Answer: So far IPC products have been received very well by the humanitarian community and government. The 2009 Action Plan has used IPC products to identify the priority areas.

3. Kenya

Mary Mwale (Government of Kenya)

Lessons learnt:

- Requires continuous technical support especially at district levels
- Allow 3-5 days for IPC analysis if based on livelihoods
- Need to organize separately IPC analytical workshop, subsequent to the food security analysis
- More time needed to develop response analysis
- Response planning still not eliciting adequate support

Recommendations:

- Map becoming too crowded and too technical. Make it a simple map
- Areas classified under the same phase should elicit similar responses according to problem context
- Percent beneficiary numbers per phase classification should be comparable
- Harmonize language for seasons in title across countries – “give and take”
- Changes have been welcomed but thresholds needed for all indicators to maintain IPC’s rigor

What we’ve learned from the Question & Answer Session.

Question: *Is the government financially participating in IPC implementation?*

Answer: In Kenya, a rapid assessment is completed before each IPC analysis. As IPC is being streamlined to government, they are financing 50% of the data collection costs. IPC is government owned, financed and controlled.

Question: How has the team adapted tools to collect information from 2006 to 2008?

Answer: Currently, direct indicators are not available, thus Kenya uses monitoring data from the government. Up to now, some training was carried out at the district level but major investment is needed to train at district level and conduct additional surveys. In that line, Kenya is studying ways to collect data in a standardized manner. The goal is to have in all districts enough IPC trained stakeholders to complete an analysis. One other priority is to address data problems related to diet diversity.

Question: Is IPC sustainable in Kenya?

Answer: Yes. The roll-out to the districts is the only major problem- getting to train all the right people-. IPC is incorporated in the Kenyan assessment system as well as in all food security communications.

Question: Are you aware that data on calorie intake is available in Kenya and could be used as a baseline?

Answer: Yes, we are aware of existing data on calorie intake. Unfortunately, it is not possible to use the data because it is not analysed at the district level.

4. Soudan (Southern)

Michael Roberto Kenyi Legge (Government of Southern Sudan [GOSS])

Limitations:

The roll-out process

1. Limited involvement of agencies in the role out process,
2. Limited participation of agencies in capacity building activities
3. Decentralising IPC analysis it to States
4. Limited linkages at all levels

Capacity building/training approach

1. Lack of consistency of trainees
2. Missing awareness raising for non-technical staffs
3. Continuity of the trainers –follow up
4. Lack of skill and resources for mapping activities at State level

Technical issues and data availability

1. No direct Vs indirect evidence
2. Lack of analytical framework for measuring food access and security
3. Difficult to access data
4. Poor data quality

Decision making for action

1. Limited institutionalisation
2. Lack of awareness
3. Need improve credibility and integrity

Solutions:

The roll-out process

1. Improve coordination among relevant agencies through the existing food security coordination mechanism (LAF, FS coordination forums, etc.) at GOSS and State level
2. Create better coordination mechanisms so that agencies could participate in capacity building activities
3. Continue capacity building activities at State level

4. Strengthen the existing institutional and structural linkages

Capacity building/training approach

1. Keep record of people trained at GOSS and State level and closely follow - up
2. Carry out awareness creation activities
Include in training a session on how to raise awareness
3. Develop capacity of focal points at State level to assist coordination at sub-national level
4. Provide more mapping solution (hardware, software and training)

Technical issues and data availability

1. Prepare guidance and training material and offer training
2. Strengthen partnership
3. Create awareness on IPC and its uses
Improve links with the existing coordination mechanisms
Improve the existing communication mechanisms

Decision making for action

1. Link IPC with the FSTS
2. Carry out awareness raising to high level decision makers
3. Peer review multi-sectoral involvement

What we've learned from the Question & Answer Session.

Question: *You said the government "owns" IPC; please tell us how.*

Answer: The government includes in its budget the Food and Income Security Baseline Assessment. After the budget is voted, the IPC technical working group comes up with a work plan for IPC activities. The government also provides human resources. However, there is still need for outside resources to help carry out activities with reasonable level of participation.

Question: *Why does the map make it look like Southern Sudan is food secure even though we know that there is a lot of food aid going to the area?*

Answer: The map featured in the presentation was completed in March 2008 and does not depict the current situation. Also, it's important to note that in Southern Sudan we classify based on what we see, including food aid (masking effect is not taken into consideration)

Question: *What are the NGOs involved in your country?*

Answer: FEWSNET, CRS, World Vision International, Save the Children UK, and Oxfam to name a few. We are working within the Livelihood Analysis Forum, and all NGOs dealing with food security and livelihoods are members.

5. Sudan (Northern)

Francesco Del Re (FAO-REOA)

Northern Sudan has not organized an IPC lesson learning workshop as of now, and is preparing the national analytical IPC workshop. For more information, see presentation on IPC implementation (go to annex 4 for details).

What we've learned from the Question & Answer Session.

Question: *Why didn't Northern Sudan send a representative?*

Answer: Two representatives (WFP, SIFSA) were appointed for this workshop but previous commitments prevented them from participating. The National IPC Workshop is scheduled for this month and they are working on the preparations.

6. Tanzania

Vedasto Rutachokozi (FAO)

Constraints:

Management/Institutional

- National IPC staff not recruited – FAO had to adjust
- Whose needs? Imbalance of timing between national activities and regional programmes
- Inadequate synergy between IPC and national FSNIS
- Inadequate discussion on modifying IPC to Tanzania context

Data availability and access

- Data gaps exist
- Not clear how IPC can support data access and quality control
- Inadequate synergy between IPC and national FSNIS
- Inadequate discussion on modifying IPC to Tanzania context

Capacity building

- Capacity building through introductory workshops and occasional template filling
- Thus no clear systematic skill development process on IPC
- Makes it difficult to measure individual / institutional improvements

Technical issues

- The IPC Reference Table is heavy on the “food utilization pillar” – with 6 indicators (CMR, dietary diversity, acute malnutrition, stunting, diseases and water), thus,
- Masks other key pillars “food availability and accessibility”
- No clear guidelines on prevalent diseases
- No clear examples on “direct” and “indirect” evidences on indicators

Way Forward:

Management/Institutional

- Consult national FSNIS to improve synergy and tailor IPC to national context and needs
- Develop action plan for all participants to contribute and commit to, while ensuring multi-sectoral representation.

Data availability and access

- Incorporate IPC methodologies in data mapping and in developing FSN database
- Use IPC generated products to update the FSN situation between RVAs
- Use IPC generated products to guide selection of indicators for the geographic focus of RVA in the country

Capacity building

- Develop systematic capacity building plan at all relevant levels
- Enhance on the job-capacity on RVA processes
- Formulate regional forum for IPC practitioners to share experience, to further build capacity

Technical issues

- Improve the disease reference outcome
- Expand the range of indicators
- Separate food availability and access
- Provide clear examples of “direct” and “indirect” evidences of reference outcomes

What we’ve learned from the Question & Answer Session.

Question: Does TZ have an early warning system or are you using IPC for that?

Answer: Yes, Tanzania has an early warning system which is within the Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives (MAFC). What is lacking right now is the synergy between IPC and the existing system. I believe that IPC can strengthen the system.

Question: What is the role of the NGO community?

Answer: We work within the Food Security Information Team (FSIT) which is open to all NGOs. Save the Children represents NGOs in the Multi Stakeholders Task Team (MSTT) drawn from the FSIT to provide oversight and technical guidance to the process of strengthening LFSNIS including the roll out of IPC in Tanzania. Oxfam for example has reactivated its membership with the FSIT this year and is involved in food security activities.

Question: Tanzania seems to be a food secure country; do you really need IPC? What are the justifications?

Answer: Tanzania has found the IPC useful and so far used it to improve on its established food security assessment. IPC communicates to decision makers the food security situation such as severity, magnitude, causes and others which are most relevant and essential for them to offer effective and efficient responses. Besides, because the report highlights where food security is a problem in the country, the Government looks to it for structural issues and development programs.

7. Uganda

Stella Sengendo (FAO)

Lesson Learnt:

The IPC implementation and roll-out process

1. Concrete steps need to be taken to improve ownership and institutionalizing of the IPC
2. Buy in by top officials is paramount to ensuring consistency, ownership and institutionalizing of IPC
3. The links between the Health, Nutrition and HIV/AIDS and the Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) clusters and the IPC TWG need to be created and strengthened.
4. Linkages with district level and local government for IPC rollout need to be created
5. Work within existing structures rather than create new ones as this ensures sustainability of project activities beyond project life
6. The effectiveness and efficiency of the IPC TWG can be improved through better methods of work
7. The validation process for the IPC Map took too long because FSAL was not represented

Data availability and technical issues

1. Lack of (updated) data limited the quality of the first IPC analysis

2. Impossible to carry out a livelihood based IPC analysis due to lack of data analyzed at such level.
3. Lack of livelihood information hampers more accurate population estimates
4. Map protocols not reconciling crisis and non crisis phases
5. Lack of report writing guidelines
6. Impact of humanitarian aid on food security situation difficult to evaluate
7. Crisis hotspots need to be identified and analyzed
8. Not clear what percentage of population determines phase

Capacity building and training needs and approaches

1. Number of training events and duration of training events is too short. Irregular
2. Technical backstopping crucial, especially because Uganda has a limited number of trained experts in IPC
3. TWG 's efficiency can be improved by equipping them with the tools to do the work
4. Facilitation and incentives can help motivate the TWG do the extra work in addition to their own thus improving commitment
5. A clear strategy is needed on how to employ skills and knowledge gained from regional training workshops

Use of the IPC in decision making

1. Sensitization on IPC of high level officials needs to be done well in advance of the national workshop so that when stakeholders are eager to use IPC product to inform decisions
2. Sharing of information between stakeholders, especially between international institutions/NGO and the Government of Uganda, and among NGOs is suboptimal
3. Government and NGO focal points capacity needs to be enhanced for increased confidence when carrying out IPC briefings

Recommendations:

The IPC implementation and roll-out process

- o Formulate a road map for full government ownership and leadership
- o Organize regular high level briefings and media campaigns on the IPC, its products and relevance.
- o IPC TWG membership to be formally drawn from the HN and HIV/AIDS and the WASH clusters.
- o Include district level and local government officials in IPC activities (awareness, training, data collection of information)
- o Work with district FSALs and DDMCs where such structures exist.
- o Support and facilitate district production departments to undertake the role of coordination of the food security issues
- o Create IPC Sector Working Groups/Sector Focal Point Persons (IPC SWG/SFPP) within the IPC TWG.
- o FSAL ought to formally send representation to the National IPC workshop to head the validation process and ensure the IPC map is endorsed by the end of the event

Data availability and technical issues

- o Support existing systems rather than coming up with a new data collection system and assist in developing guidelines/
- o Advocate for a rapid assessment twice a year
- o IPC TWG must carry out ground truthing before national IPC meta-data analysis to identify hot spots
- o FSAL clusters and DDMCs must produce food security reports for their areas periodically.

- Explore the possibilities of setting up a Livelihood Based Food Security and Nutrition Information System (LFSNIS)
- Non-crisis areas to be presented in first position in the final National IPC report so that readers get an overall view of the situation
- Call-out boxes for non –crisis areas should be included in final IPC map.
- Summary statements and the report should indicate the level of aid going into particular areas in order to better inform decision makers (but masking effect to be considered)
- Set up rule on what size of the population determines the phase classification of an area (regional level). A different rule may have to apply based on severity (crisis areas vs. non crisis areas).

Capacity building and training needs and approaches

- Increase training events and duration, train at different levels
- Technical backstopping still required and should move at district level
- Provide laptops and analysis packages to TWG
- Provide incentives: e.g. contracts signed with institutions to undertake IPC work (INCLUDE IN ToRs so that recognized as work done towards institutional food security activities)
- Develop strategy to guide the passing on of information and skills gained through trainings to other institutions and individuals in the country

Use of the IPC in decision making

- Provide regular follow-up and regular briefing with high level officials
- Create avenues allowing for feedback from decision makers and technical persons to inform further implementation of the IPC
- Participate in national events to increase visibility of the IPC
- Set up a food security bulletin/ newsletter
- Develop a strategy for dissemination for the IPC and its products.
- Market/present IPC products to increase appreciation for it.
- Prepare a media campaign as a way of popularizing IPC
- Equipping focal point persons with an IPC kit (Presentation, manuals guides, brochures, posters) to enable them do briefings on their own

What we've learned from the Question & Answer Session.

Question: *I believe that the strength of IPC lays in the fact that it brings in data from multiple sources as evidence for a food security analysis; thus, IPC is assessment neutral. Why would then the IPC Technical Working Group (IC TWG) in Uganda want to collect its own data?*

Answer: In fact, the IPC TWG does not intend to collect its own data but seeks to improve data collection in already existing structures assembling food security information such as the district production departments of the Ministry of Agriculture. The technical group only intends to guide on what information is relevant and the appropriate degree of analysis for optimal interpretation in food security analysis. IPC will of course continue to draw together multiple methods and data sources into an overarching meta-analysis of the situation, and the classification will still be based on the documentation of any and all available direct and indirect evidence of the IPC reference outcomes.

In a sense, the view is that IPC can contribute to improving data availability and quality for food security analysis in a country where information is regularly available for only about one third of it.

Question: *Are you identifying data duplication?*

Answer: Yes. However, there were only very few cases of the same data collected in the same area and around the same time. Agencies within the Food Security and Agricultural Livelihoods cluster generally exchange information on data collection efforts in order to avoid duplication. It is believed that with IPC, it is even less likely to happen in the future.

B. REGIONAL LEVEL

Francesco Del Re (FAO-REOA)

Strengths:

Regional IPC steering group

- FSNWG actively supporting the roll out of the IPC in the region through the IPC steering group
- IPC group members meeting on regular base and following activities
- Good collaboration and participation to important regional events
- Good Sharing of Information between members, creation of network and increase in use of information

Capacity building/training

- Extensive efforts with hundreds of participants exposed to IPC and good absorption
- Core number of trained people in each country
- Standardized Training exercise and User Guide developed
- Beginning of ToT and cross fertilization

Technical issues and data availability

- Very positive feedback and engagement in raising and solving technical issues
- Good contribution to Technical Manual Version 1.1
- Positive engagement in harmonizing analysis
- In general sufficient data availability
- Effort to dig out hidden information

Use of IPC products

- Early to draw conclusions
- Initial impressions of good acceptance in some country and in the region
- Better than before?

Constraints:

Regional IPC steering group

- Heavy workload of group members and lack of dedicated resources
- Follow up at country level from group members patchy
- Different level of collaboration from group members
- Global commitments not always transferred at regional level
- Still missing stakeholders at regional level

Capacity building/training

- Staff rotations and difficult to consolidate achievements
- Different entry level
- Need for baseline FS training?
- Streamline and more systematic approach?

Technical issues and data availability

- Many questions but few answers urgent solutions needed
- Need to identify temporary solution until final decision?
- Regional technical body? Liaison with global

- Still unused data in country?
- Vetting of products / quality control?

Use of IPC products

- Insufficient awareness and communication with potential users
- Different formats for outputs
- Doubts on quality expressed by some stakeholders

What we've learned from the Question & Answer Session.

Question: *Is it better than before? How are you planning to measure that?*

Answer: Indeed, it's better than before; the maps are obviously better if you consider the Kenya IPC maps for example. However, there isn't a baseline to make further comparison. There is a need to better document what is found in a country before the project and what is left behind after the project. Also, there was a mid-project evaluation on the IPC and the final product is yet to be delivered.

Question: *Could we generate sustainability by introducing IPC in universities, developing curriculums?*

Answer: It is critical to collaborate with higher learning in countries of implementation. As of now there is ongoing collaboration with several universities including the University of Nairobi, University of KwaZulu Natal, Egerton University, Sokoine University in Tanzania and Makerere University in Uganda among others.

Question: *Why isn't there a lesson learned presentation on the regional analytical workshop?*

Answer: A lesson learned presentation on the regional analytical workshop was actually anticipated. However, it was not possible to include this time around as the number of presentations were limited due to time constraints.

C. GLOBAL LEVEL REMARKS

Luca Alinovi (FAO-REOA)

Luca Alinovi welcomes again the workshop participants and the organizations they represent. After he mentions his contentment for taking part in the workshop and representing the global partner organizations, he underlines the importance of the tool IPC for the food and nutrition security community. He also hails IPC's capacity to improve food security analysis and understanding.

Commitment to the IPC essentially came out of a one day meeting attended by seven international food security oriented agencies. Since then IPC has moved at an incredible pace, and along the way an eighth agency has joined the global partners. The partners are often having consultative meetings on the tool, and they stay very committed to the development and roll-out of IPC in collaboration with governments and other agencies. The IPC roll-out is and will continue to be a demand-driven process and its further development will be driven by country experiences and feedback. And that is the reason for this particular workshop.

At the global level, the partners look to:

- Keep technical coherence to facilitate a roll out of a standard product
- Facilitate process not control it
- Ensure internal and cross agency consistency

- o Fill the gap through the creation of an internet forum, providing backstopping to countries where resources are limited, providing distance learning tools

It must be noted however that there is much work to do to translate partners' engagement at global level at the regional and country levels, and this will particularly be the global steering committee's mission.

DAY 2: FRIDAY, 14 SEPTEMBER 2008

THEMATIC GROUP TASKS

(Presented by Calum McLean)

The thematic groups for agglomeration of lessons learned in break-out groups are arranged as followed:

1. The roll-out process in countries and the region
2. Capacity building/training needs and approaches
3. Data availability and technical issues related to the IPC
4. Use of the IPC in decision making

The **aim** of thematic group task is to consolidate experience of countries structured around the four themes. This is to generate some region-wide lessons and solutions that can help plan the next phase of the IPC roll-out. It is also anticipated that country teams use results generated to develop more country based work plans.

The **task** of each team consists of carrying out a SWOT style analysis on the assigned theme and filling the matrix below:

	Strengths	Weaknesses/constraints	Solutions
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

For this exercise, issues that are common across most countries, thus have more general causes and solutions, are to be drawn out. The outputs expected include 1) a completed matrix and 2) a list of prioritized and ranked issues and the way forward.

CROSS FERTILIZATION ACROSS THEMATIC GROUPS

The cross fertilization session is a rotational review of **preliminary outcomes** of each thematic group in presence of group facilitators. The session gives participants the opportunity to review all style matrices by asking questions for clarification, pointing out inaccuracies, proposing issues/solutions that may have been omitted, and suggesting a priority ranking of issues. The complete matrix for each thematic group is available as an attachment to this document (See annex 4 for workshop materials).

GROUP PRESENTATIONS

Each group is allocated 30 minutes to carry out a power point presentation of the final list of prioritized and ranked issues and possible linked solutions/way forward.

Find below each thematic group matrix of priorities.

- 1. The Roll-Out Process in Countries and the Region**
- 2. Capacity Building/Training Needs and Approaches**
- 3. Data Availability and Technical Issues Related to the IPC**
- 4. Use Of the IPC in Decision Making**

RESPONSE ANALYSIS PRESENTATION

(Presented by Neil Marsland)

MINUTES

- **Final Discussion and Wrap-Up**
Francesco Del Re (FAO REOA)

Francesco Del Re begins the final discussion and review of the workshop by thanking all participants for a workshop rich in contribution. He then opens the floor to participants to share their thoughts on how to move forward. Alex Rees of Save the Children UK and Zoe Druilhe of FAO both representing the Global Steering Committee offer the remarks below:

- The workshop discussions have been particularly useful and the global committee will get a full report.
- It is important to recognize that the global, regional and country linkages are not perfectly structured to fit the needs of communication across the three levels.
- On the key issues such as mainstreaming and institutionalizing of the IPC, agencies represented at the global level (Save the Children, FewNet, Care...etc) are going to make significant progress by hiring staff to build capacity and linking to country level for greater participation (within 7-8 months).
- Stakeholders ought to come to an understanding for sharing data as it has proved to be essential to IPC.
- From now on the global level will have stronger and more coherent linkages with the regional and country levels to further advance the global development of the IPC and its roll-out in the region as stated in the IPC strategic framework.
- The response analysis project is a good initiative for the whole process given its links to IPC which enables consistent analysis and communication of situation analysis. IPC needs to be understood and used as a distinct stage of the analysis response continuum.
- Overall, global activities will continue the technical development of the IPC, support its roll-out and continue to provide technical support in countries.

Francesco Del Re then provides final comments and an overview of the future plans for the regional IPC project activities:

- Significant progress was achieved with the IPC in the region, both at the national and at the regional level, and recommendations produced through this workshop will be put into action.
- Regarding the current Regional IPC project, it is concluding at the end of this month (November). There is only one main activity remaining and it will take place in about one week:
 - *NGO training workshop.* To continue to strengthen the capacity and participation of NGOs in IPC activities, the project will be hosting an IPC training event through the Interagency Working Group focusing on NGO food security practitioners and decision makers.
- An independent review of the Regional IPC Project to evaluate the approach and successes of the project and suggest ways forward has recently been concluded. The final results of the review, which will provide further insight regarding the best practices and experiences learned from the IPC implementation to date, will be released soon.
- Funding is likely to be available from donors to continue moving the IPC process forward in the region for an additional 18 months. We have developed substantial capacity already in countries and at the regional level, and future project activities will focus on continuing to strengthen this capacity in further support for the IPC implementation in the region. The subsequent phase will also see that IPC is fully owned by and transferred to Government.

To summarize, the current project has entered its wrap-up stage, and will conclude with one final regional activity focusing on strengthening capacity of NGOs. At the regional and global level, steps to secure funding to continue to support IPC activities in countries and at the regional level are being taken, which should enable further development and strengthening of the IPC as a tool for harmonized analysis and advocacy within the region.

Francesco Del Re afterward thanks everyone from the countries, the regional level and the global level for their support and participation. He also extends his thanks to the workshop translators, secretariat, facilitators and focal points. Before declaring the workshop closed, Francesco Del Re expresses once again appreciation to ECHO, DFID and CIDA for funding the IPC project.

ANNEX 1: WORKSHOP TERMS OF REFERENCE

Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) Regional Lessons Learning Workshop 13th -14th September, 2008 Nairobi

Regional Food Security and Nutrition Working Group (FSNWG) Terms of Reference

Purpose

The purpose of the workshop is to review and learn lessons from the recent implementation and roll-out of the IPC in central and eastern Africa to inform future IPC activities in the region and contribute to the global technical development of the IPC.

Background

The IPC is an innovative tool to improve food security response strategies and decision-making by drawing together multiple indicators to provide a consistent and meaningful classification of food security situations. It classifies geographic areas and livelihood groups into one of five phases: Generally Food Secure, Moderately/Borderline Food Insecure, Acute Food and Livelihood Crisis, Humanitarian Emergency, and Famine/Humanitarian Catastrophe. The phases are general enough to accommodate a wide range of causes, livelihood systems, and political/ economic contexts, yet their distinction captures essential differences in implications for action.

Since being developed by the Food Security Analysis Unit in Somalia, the IPC is being further developed as an analytical tool in a global effort to improve food security analysis and assessment approaches. Central and eastern Africa has been targeted as a region for the development of the IPC owing to a strong humanitarian imperative and the possibilities to roll out the IPC based on existing national capacities and institutional frameworks. An IPC Steering Committee under the regional Food Security and Nutrition Working Group (FSNWG) based in Nairobi has been supporting the regional development. To further support the development of the IPC in the region, ECHO, DFID, and CIDA are funding a Regional IPC Project being implemented by FAO that works in close collaboration with partner organizations through the FSNWG IPC Steering Committee. The project supports IPC processes in Burundi, the Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC), Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda.

One core dimension of the Regional IPC Project is to capture and disseminate best practices and lessons learned to improve country and regional implementation and future global development of the IPC. This process builds upon IPC lesson learning activities that started in November 2006 in Somalia and continued after successive IPC analyses in Kenya. Under the Regional IPC Project, each country is undertaking national lesson learning activities after each national IPC analytical workshop, and by early November 2008 every country supported by the project will have completed a lesson learning exercise. Additionally, in August and September an Independent Project Review of regional project activities to date was completed, the results of which are an important component of reviewing project activities and will support lesson learning activities.

Based on these experiences, as well as the lessons learned at the regional level and in countries not directly targeted by the project, the FSNWG, with funding through the Regional IPC Project, will host an IPC Regional Lessons Learning Workshop to combine lessons learned across the project to inform future regional IPC activities and contribute to the global technical development of the IPC.

Objective

The specific objective of the workshop is to discuss, identify, and document experiences, lessons learned, and best practices established regarding the use and implementation of the IPC in eastern and central Africa.

Outcomes and workshop output

The outcomes of the workshop will be the following:

1. Strengthened national and regional understanding of IPC best practices through sharing lessons learned across the project and regional discussions with regional and country-level IPC experts about different experiences and best practices established across countries.
2. Future regional and global IPC implementation activities informed by documenting country and regional experiences and best practices with the process of IPC adaptation and utilization.
3. Global technical development of the IPC informed and recommendations for further refinement provided by documenting technical issues encountered and solutions proposed with country-level implementation of the IPC as currently laid out in the IPC Technical Manual.

The main output of the workshop will be the production of a regional lesson learning report documenting country and regional-level lessons learned and best practices established through the Regional IPC Project.

Participation

The workshop will include a total of about 35 participants from the country, regional, and global levels. Up to three participants from each country directly supported by the project will be invited to participate: Burundi; DRC; Kenya; Tanzania; and Uganda. Additionally, participants from other countries with experience in the IPC will also be invited to participate, including Somalia and Sudan. At the regional level, participants will include members of the Regional IPC Steering Committee and representatives of other organizations working with the IPC in the region. Globally, participants will include representatives of IPC global partner organizations.

All participants will be expected to have significant experience with hands-on implementation of the IPC to contribute to the presentation of country lessons learned and best practices established as well as discuss and define regional-level lessons learned from the Regional IPC Project.

Methodology

The workshop will be held for two days at a centralized regional location (Nairobi, Kenya). Country participants will be selected by the relevant food security coordination mechanism in each country. Each country and regional team should prepare in advance a written overview of their main lessons learned regarding the IPC to distribute at the workshop and a presentation of the main lessons learned to present as a starting point for group discussion.

The workshop will consist of the following activities:

- Presentations of country and regional-level lessons learned and best practices established
- Presentation of the main findings of the Independent Mid-Term Project Review of the Regional IPC Project

- Discussions in break-out groups about lessons learned in four key thematic areas related to the IPC: the roll-out process in countries and the region; capacity building and training needs and approaches; data availability and technical issues related to the IPC; and the use of the IPC in decision making
- Final summary discussion of conclusions of the break-out groups

The workshop will be hosted and facilitated by IPC sub-working group of the Regional FSNWG with organizational and secretariat support provided by FAO.

Logistics

The workshop will be held the 13 and 14 of November 2008 at a conference venue to be determined in Nairobi, Kenya. All questions and comments related to the workshop can be directed to the IPC Steering Committee Secretariat at FSN-GHA-WorkingGroup@fao.org with copy to Francesco Del Re at francesco.delre@fao.org.

ANNEX 2: WORKSHOP AGENDA

FSNWG Regional IPC Lessons Learning Workshop 13th and 14th November 2008 Nairobi, Kenya

Date/Time	Activity	Facilitator
Thursday Nov 13		
8:30-9:00*	Opening, welcome, and introductions	Francesco Del Re, FAO
9:00-9:30*	Objectives and structure of workshop <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purpose and background of the workshop, including overview of the lessons-learning process regarding the IPC roll-out in the region Intended output of the workshop Overview of structure and agenda 	Francesco Del Re, FAO
9:30-11:00*	Presentations and discussions of lessons learned by regional and country teams supported by the Regional IPC Project (15 minutes + 15 minutes discussion each) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Burundi presentation DRC presentation Kenya presentation 	Country, regional, global
11:00-11:30*	Tea	
11:30-1:00*	Presentations and discussions of lessons learned by regional and country teams supported by the Regional IPC Project, continued <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tanzania presentation Uganda presentation Regional presentation 	Country, regional, global
1:00-2:00	Lunch	
2:00-2:30	Overview of break-out group work methodology and intended outputs	
2:30-3:30	Initiate group discussions to discuss and agglomerate lessons learned about the four thematic areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The roll-out process in countries and the region Capacity building and training needs and approaches Data availability and technical issues related to the IPC Use of the IPC in decision making 	Facilitators: Jon Brass; Calum McLean; Cindy Holleman; Mark Gordon; Suleiman M. Francesco Del Re
3:30-4:00	Tea	
4:00-5:30	Continue thematic group discussions	Thematic groups
Friday Nov 14		
8:30-10:30	Cross-fertilization/Rotational review of preliminary outcomes of each thematic group in presence of group facilitators	Thematic groups
10:30-11:00	Tea	
11:00-12:00	Finalization of lessons learned and best practices established by each thematic group and preparation of presentations	Thematic groups
12:00-1:00	Country teams preparing statements	Country groups
1:00-2:00	Lunch	
2:00-3:00*	Presentation (15 minutes) and discussion (15 minutes) of the outcomes of the first two thematic groups	Presentation by group "rapporteur"
3:00-3:30*	Tea	
3:30-4:00*	Presentation (15 minutes) and discussion (15 minutes) of the outcomes of the second two thematic groups	Presentation by group "rapporteur"
4:00-5:00*	Final discussion and wrap-up	Francesco Del Re, FAO

* Denotes sessions that are open to donors and other participants not directly participating in a country or regional team.

ANNEX 3: WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

	Participant name	Country	Organization	Contact
1	Isaac Nzitunga	Burundi	MINAGRIE	Nzitungai@yahoo.fr
2	Methode Niyongendako	Burundi	FAO	Methode.niyongendako@fao.org
3	Melanie Rubavu	Burundi	WFP	Melanie.rubavu@wfp.org
4	Ndizeye J. Chrisostome	Burundi	Caritas Burundi (RESO)	izerespoir@yahoo.fr
5	Cecile Diaka	DRC	World Vision	Cecile_diaka@wvi.org
6	Jean Aunge	DRC	University of Kinshasa	Jearnaunge@yahoo.fr
7	Michel Disonama Sindo	DRC	FAO	Michel.Disonama@fao.org
8	Mary Mwale	Kenya	ALRMP	Mary.mwale@aridland.go.ke
9	M. Serah Kamau	Kenya	FAO	Serah.kamau@fao.org
10	Kithama Mbolu	Kenya		Kithamajm@yahoo.com
11	Michael Roberto Kenyi	Sudan (southern)	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry/GOSS	Mrkenyi@yahoo.co.uk
12	Yergalem T. Beraki	Sudan (southern)	FAO	Yergalem.beraki@fao.org
13	Juvenal Kisanga	Tanzania	WFP	Juvenal.kisanga@wfp.org
14	Caroline Kilembe	Tanzania	MAFC	Carockilembe@yahoo.com
15	Vedasto Rutachokozi bwa	Tanzania	FAO	Vedasto.Rutachokozi bwa@fao.org
16	Abraham Owino	Uganda	Makerere University	Ayowino@yahoo.co.uk
17	Alinaitwe John	Uganda	Office of the Prime Minister	Comdt2k@yahoo.co.uk
18	Stella Sengendo	Uganda	FAO	Stella.Sengendo@fao.org
19	Florence Rolle	Ethiopia	FAO	Florence.rolle@fao.org
20	Suleiman Mohamed	Regional	FEWS NET	Msuleiman@fews.net
21	Aida Ndiaye	Regional	FAO	Aida.ndiaye@fao.org
22	Calum McLean	Regional	FAO	Calum.mclean@fao.org
23	Elizabeth Narrowe	Regional	FAO	Elizabeth.narrowe@fao.org
24	Francesco Del Re	Regional	FAO	Francesco.delre@fao.org
25	Edwin Too	Regional	FAO	Edwin.too@fao.org
26	Cindy Holleman	Regional	FSAU	Cindy.Holleman@fsau.or.ke
27	Marc Gordon	Regional	WFP	Marc.Gordon@wfp.org
28	Tamara Nanitashvili	Regional	WFP	Tamara.Nanitashvili@wfp.org
29	Jon Brass	Regional	Oxfam	Jbrass@oxfam.org.uk
30	Alex Crosskey	Regional	PACAPS	Acrosskey@pacaps.org
31	Alex Rees	Global	Save the Children UK	A.rees@savethechildren.org.uk

	Participant name	Country	Organization	Contact
32	Neil Marsland	Global	FAO	Neil.marsland@fao.org
33	Zoe Druilhe	Global	FAO	Zoe.druilhe@fao.org
34	Luca Alinovi	Global	FAO	Luca.alinovi@fao.org
35	Nick Maunder	Donor	EC	Nick.Maunder@ec.europa.eu

ANNEX 4: WORKSHOP MATERIALS

The following eight country and regional presentations were distributed to all workshop participants.

1. Burundi
2. DRC
3. Kenya
4. Sudan (Southern)
5. Sudan (Northern)
6. Tanzania
7. Uganda
8. Regional

The following group presentations on lessons learned and best practices are attached to this document:

- 1. Group 1: The Roll-out Process in Countries and in the Region**
- 2. Group 2: Capacity Building/Training Needs & Approaches**
- 3. Group 3A: Data Availability Issues Related to the IPC**
- 4. Group 3B: Technical Issues Related to the IPC**
- 5. Group 4: Use of the IPC for 'Decision Making for Action**

The regional FSNWG can be contacted at fsn-gha-workinggroup@fao.org regarding receiving copies of any of these presentations.

**ANNEX 5: FSNWG REGIONAL IPC LESSONS LEARNING WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT
FEEDBACK FORM**

- 1. Did your country team receive sufficient guidance and direction for preparing country lessons learned for presentation at this workshop?**

- 2. Were the objectives and structure of the workshop clear and effective?**

- 3. Were the country presentations useful? Why or why not?**

- 4. Were the four 'thematic' themes identified relevant and useful?**

- 5. Was the group work around the thematic areas useful and beneficial?**

- 6. Did the group work/rotational review help your country refine country issues, priorities and solutions?**

- 7. Did the workshop achieve the objective of sharing lessons learned and best practices?**

- 8. Any other comments or feedback?**