



Summary of WFP Experience with the IPC during the NAF (2006)

Background:

In addition to Somalia, where the FSAU's Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) approach to food security was developed, WFP and FAO sought to explore the scope for applying IPC during preparation of the CAP Needs Analysis Framework (NAF) in four countries: Burundi, Cote D'Ivoire, Occupied Palestinian Territory and Uganda¹. This involved a two-day workshop on the NAF for FAO and WFP staff from these countries, including a half-day session of presentations and discussions on applying the IPC and development of an implementation plan for NAF and the IPC.

Other than Somalia, only OPT attempted to produce a very rough IPC at the national level during the CAP/NAF timeframe.

Challenges:

From this limited experience, the following main challenges in developing the IPC were identified:

- It was difficult to take on an additional, new task while working on the NAF, which is already viewed as a resource-intensive process.
- The available data in Cote D'Ivoire (mainly limited to the FSMS data) was considered too limited to compile the IPC; even in Somalia important data gaps were identified regarding food availability (imports, food balance sheet) and market linkages.
- The indicators/thresholds and labels for the different phases are not necessarily applicable to other countries. For example, in OPT there are no problems with mortality and wasting, so an attempt was made to identify alternative indicators. In Cote D'Ivoire, the proposed threshold for wasting is too high. However, it is not clear how useful the IPC would be for cross-country comparisons if the phases are tailored to each country's context.
- The indicators on food access are insufficient.
- There was insufficient information and backup from experienced staff. The ½ day training was a useful introduction but more training would be required to apply the IPC. Also, in the case of OPT neither the WFP or FAO staff who actually worked on the IPC attended the workshop.
- The FSAU guidance does not help much with the "how to" of filling in the IPC, including the process on how to facilitate a workshop with all stakeholders. Also,

¹ Subsequently, Burundi dropped out because there was no CAP NAF country.

more guidance is needed to help determine the appropriate level of analysis (national? regional?), and the “convergence of evidence” approach is considered highly subjective.

- In Somalia, the IPC does not necessarily provide WFP with the information that it requires for programming, in part because the FSAU assessment format/questions are different than WFP’s.

Future Plans:

In Cote D’Ivoire, the CO plans to hold a workshop in mid-January to develop a stakeholder-driven IPC. This would include data from a recent MICS survey.

In OPT, there may be scope for returning to the IPC after the CFSVA is finished. However, it would probably take 6 weeks to gather/analyze all the data at the governorate level.

In Uganda, the IPC is viewed as a good tool which has already been discussed (although not in detail) at a meeting of the Food Security Group. If it were to be piloted, it would need to become more multi-sectoral rather than mainly focused on food security (e.g. cover water and sanitation).

Discussions are underway to apply the IPC in Indonesia during the EFSA planned in mid December.