



Kenya Food Security Steering Group  
(KFSSG)

# REPORT ON THE IPC LEARNING and PLANNING WORKSHOP

23<sup>RD</sup> -25<sup>TH</sup> OCTOBER 2007.

OLIVE GARDEN HOTEL, HURLINGHAM, NAIROBI



EC/FAO Food Security Programme - Phase II  
*'Food Security Information for Action'*

## **1. Introduction and Objectives**

The Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification (IPC) tool was developed by FAO's Food Security Analysis Unit (FSAU) in Somalia, initially in response to the drought crisis in the Sool Plateau of Northern Somalia in late 2004. The IPC tool seeks to add rigour and transparency to food security analysis, and through the use of a standard set of outcome indicators, introduces a level of comparability across (and between) countries that has not been possible previously. The IPC does not provide a new analysis system, but rather an evidence-based framework for analysing existing sources of food security data.

The Government of Kenya is committed, through the KFSM structure, to implement the IPC as part of its on-going food security information system, incorporating primarily the ALRMP Early Warning System (EWS) and the bi-annual assessments. The IPC was applied as the classification system for the bi-annual assessment for the first time in February 2007 (short rains assessment), which was also the first time that the IPC has been used outside of the context of Somalia. This first phase was completed with a Learning Workshop conducted in April 2007<sup>1</sup>, which fed in to the second phase of the process during the long rains assessment of August 2007. The first learning workshop focussed primarily on data collection issues; the further development/ adaptation of the IPC tool; response analysis; planning the next phase of the IPC roll-out; and linkages with the region and global levels.

As a result of the inputs from the April Learning Workshop, some changes were made in the long rains assessment process. These centred on an enhanced meta-data analysis before the fieldwork (which shifted the emphasis on the fieldwork towards data gap filling and verification), and the first step towards building capacity at the district level by inviting 2 district-based DSG officials to the analysis workshop after the field work was completed.

This report captures the main discussion points and resolutions of the second learning workshop that had the following objectives:

- Review the short rains assessment process with an emphasis on the new aspects of meta-data analysis, response analysis and capacity building
- Plan the next phases in the IPC roll-out process, with detailed planning for the next assessment (short rains 2007/8)

The expected outcomes of the workshop were:

- Workshop report
- Detailed workplan for the next assessment
- A blue-print for district-level capacity building for the next 2 years

---

<sup>1</sup> See KFSSG Report on the IPC Learning Workshop, 23-26th April 2007.

## 2. Main Discussion Points

### 2.1. Identified Issues

The first session was a free flowing discussion to identify key aspects of the assessment and IPC analysis process that require attention. These were:

- **Response analysis/planning:** Current system is not helpful, and tends to encourage the 'ritual' of providing a wish list of responses from the different line ministries in the DSG to the assessment team ('must come up with something for them' syndrome). There is no critical analysis by the field team or later at the Nairobi/National level. This is exacerbated at the district level by being the last thing the assessment teams do, and not enough time is allocated to the process. The result is repetitive, unprioritised wish-lists, often taken from district development plans, that do not attract funding from Government or international donors.
- **Decentralisation issues:** Participants agreed that in general decentralisation of the assessment and analysis process is a good idea, provided that checks and balances are put in place to ensure credibility/objectivity and rigour/quality. Related issues include:
  - resource requirements for districts to carry out the assessments
  - computers at the district level to carry out the data analysis and store data
  - harmonising the data collected at district level: need to provide more guidance and clarity on data collection and analysis
  - Capacity building required on food security assessments, analysis and using the IPC tool for classification; and on institutional development and links to the national level.
- **Data Issues (See also 2.3):**
  - Access to data from line ministries can be problematic; cannot change the format of the data currently and timing can also be an issue.
  - Need to request data in timely way to ensure that data is available before the field teams leave
  - Need to increasingly incorporated health data from regular monitoring into the assessment process
  - Data collection templates need revising before the next assessment
- **Structural/ Institutional issues:**
  - Need to formalise the engagement between the KFSSG at the national level and the DSGs in the districts, including information flow.
  - Need to strengthen preparedness at both national and district levels (Sector Working Groups)
  - Sector Working Groups need strengthening to avoid coordination problems as agencies work in parallel
- Data analysis should be done outside of Nairobi and participants should all be accommodated within the venue to allow work to continue into the evenings when required

## 2.2. Vision and Long-term Plan

To frame the discussion, the participants were reminded about the three potential scenarios (below) that were considered during the Learning Workshop in April, and the decision to focus on the third:

1. Continue as we are.
2. Decentralization to District-based process, with a remote quality control function at the National level. The district assessments would be done by the technical arm of the DSGs, using harmonised methodology, analysis (IPC) and reporting. Districts reports would essentially be compiled together to provide the national overview.
3. In between 1 and 2: Decentralization to the district level with hands-on guidance and verification/support from HQ. This would also involve meta analysis of existing data for the national report.

The Long Rains Assessment 2007 took the first step towards building capacity at the district level by including district officials in the food security analysis and IPC classification at the national level. However, to root the process in the districts, capacity should be transferred from data collection to final analysis at the district level.

After some debate it was decided to pilot the capacity building process in 8 districts spread throughout the country – one in each of the existing clusters that are defined along broad livelihood zones:

Cluster	Recommended Pilot District
Northern Pastoral	Marsabit
Northeastern Pastoral	Garissa
Northern Agro-Pastoral	West Pokot
Marginal Eastern	Kitui
Coast	Taita Taveta
Southern Agro-Pastoral	Kajiado
Lake Basin	Busia/ Budal'angi
Transitional Eastern (extra)	Tana River (flood and drought prone)

These districts were selected on the basis of known good analysts in the DSG/ALMRP and for representativeness of their respective livelihood zones. A minimum of four district officials would be trained in each district in the next (short-rains) assessment, and participate in the national level analysis. A total of 18 line ministry and agency (WFP, FAO, FEWSNET) personnel have been trained in IPC analysis and be available to build capacity of the DSGs during the assessment, as well as lead teams in the non-pilot districts in the normal assessment process.

The long-term plan will be to expand the capacity building by a further 8 districts in the long rains assessment, and by another 8 (or 16) the following season until all the ASAL and Lake Basin districts are completed. This process is anticipated to take 2 years to complete (4 seasons), but could be slightly accelerated depending upon uptake:

Season	Districts/National	No. Personnel Trained
Short Rains 2007/8	8 Pilot Districts Nairobi Analysis	32 District Level 24 National Level
Long Rains 2008	8 New Districts (16 total) Nairobi Analysis	32 District Level (64 total) 12 National Level (36 total)
Short Rains 2008/9	8 (or 16) new districts (24 or 32 total)	32 (or 64) District level (96 or 128 total)
Long Rains 2009	Remainder	

Structured learning/reviews will be held after each expansion phase to feed into the planning process. After this period of capacity building, the assessment process should be fully decentralised, with the national level focussing on quality control and verification, which would include peer review at the district and national levels (and possibly at the cluster level).

### **2.3. Review of Meta-Data Analysis and Data Requirements**

As recommended by the April Learning Workshop, key Nairobi-based analysts met together before the long rains assessment to conduct a meta-data analysis. An initial brain-storming on this process identified the following issues:

- Workshop attendance was poor, mostly due to a lack of clarity of purpose
- Availability of data was patchy, with some datasets not being available and others with gaps
- Different aggregation level of data (district, division, livelihood)
- More positively it identified gaps in data and solutions, and refined the data requirements from the field.
- Quality of data: including time required to clean data and harmonising/ identifying inconsistencies, such as market prices coming of different types (farm gate, market retail and market wholesale)
- Harvest and yield: compared to targets rather than long-term average – skews results

***The overall conclusion was the importance of requesting data in a timely way from data sources (eg ALRMP, ministries, Sector Working Groups) and being specific about data requirements.***

The introduction and roll-out of the GIEWS WorkStation was also discussed as a means to improve on data sharing for assessments and other purposes.

The below table summarises the data requirements that have been identified and the source.

### **2.4. Review of Response Analysis Process**

The overall problem with the way response analysis is undertaken are:

- It is either not done at all, or is very rushed
- There is no critical analysis or prioritisation
- There is no uniformity and no guidance provided on how to develop a response analysis
- This results in wish lists that are repeated each assessment and often don't get funded.

Other issues include:

- No M&E/impact of interventions that were recommended by the assessment report are done or fed into the next round of assessments: this gives the impression that partners do not respond to the assessment's findings and that nothing is going on
- The assessment report is not currently used to market or promote action or mobilise resources: suggestion of developing a separate section for response analysis to give it more profile plus what interventions have been implemented.
- Response planning causes delays in releasing the assessment report
- Low capacity of SWGs to develop response analysis and plans, and non-function of the Disasters SWG
- Suggestion to more clearly market response analysis and plans at specific audiences at district and national level

## Data Requirements

Sector	Indicator	Source	
		Nairobi	Field
<b>Health and Nutrition</b>	<b>Nutrition:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Acute: wt/ht (and ht/age)</li> <li>Acute: MUAC</li> <li>Chronic: wt/age</li> <li>Supplementary feeding</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MoH/UNICEF surveys: 4 planned for short rains period</li> <li>ALRMP: Time Series data</li> <li>CHANIS (MoH)</li> <li>UNICEF/WFP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> <li>Fill any gaps with ALRMP in district (MoH)</li> <li>Fill/update any gaps: District Health Officer</li> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
	<b>Morbidity:</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Disease Prevalence time series data for 2007 for District and possibly Division</li> </ul>
	<b>Crude and &lt;5 Mortality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>National Registrar of Births and Deaths</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Office of the President: District and Division; Calculate CMR/10,000/day for last 6 months; calculate &lt;%MR for last 6 months</li> </ul>
	<b>Dietary Diversity Index</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pilots with ALRMP (not started and only few districts)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>N/A</li> </ul>
	<b>Coping Capacity Index</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALRMP (some doubt over collection in all districts)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fill gaps as required</li> </ul>
	<b>Hazards</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALRMP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RATs/DSG</li> </ul>
	<b>Civil Insecurity</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALRMP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RATs/DSG/Police</li> </ul>
Food Security/ Agriculture/ Livestock	<b>Food Access and Availability:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Crop harvests/yields</li> <li>Cereal prices:</li> <li>Livestock Prices:</li> <li>Meat:cereal ratio</li> <li>Milk Availability</li> <li>Stocks</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MoA – current season with long term average for season</li> <li>ALRMP</li> <li>MoA</li> <li>NCBP</li> <li>ALRMP</li> <li>LINKS/MOLFD</li> <li>ALRMP</li> <li>ALRMP</li> <li>FEWSNET</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Fill in gaps/verify</li> <li>RATs/DSG</li> <li>RATs and NCBP</li> </ul>

<b>Water and Sanitation</b>	<p>Water Access and Availability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Distance to source</li> <li>Pasture to source</li> <li>Prevalence water borne diseases</li> <li>Main Sources of water</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALRMP</li> <li>ALRMP</li> <li>N/A</li> <li>WESCOORD</li> </ul>	<p>N/A</p> <p>N/A</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>District Water Officer? MoH Morbidity data</li> </ul>
<b>Livelihood Assets</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Livestock holdings/ TLUs</li> <li>Desease prevalence and body condition</li> <li>Migration patterns</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ALRMP</li> <li>ALRMP</li> <li>ALRMP</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Verify with DSGs</li> </ul>
<b>Rainfall Performance</b>	<p><b>Remote sensing:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>RFE, NDVI, Rangeland, Crop WRSI, No rainy days and start of season</li> <li>Forage estimates</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FEWSNET</li> <li>LEWS</li> </ul>	N/A
<b>Education</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enrollment</li> <li>School closure eg from conflict</li> <li>Attendance and reason</li> <li>Expanded School Feeding programme: compare with attendance data</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>MoE/ Education SWG</li> <li>MoE/Education SWG</li> <li>Teachers Service Commission thru SWG</li> <li>MoE/SWG</li> </ul>	N/A

### 3. Way Forward

#### 3.1. Immediate Plan for Short Rains Assessment 2007/8

##### 3.1.1. Meta-Data Analysis Process

- Each Sector Working Group and data source agency nominated a focal point(s) who collectively will form the meta-data analysis group:

Sector Working Group/Agency	Focal point(s)
WESCOORD	Eliud Wamwangi (MoW&I)
H&NSWG	Francis Wambua (MoH)
ALSWG	Didacus Ityeng (MoLFD); Osanya (MoA); Mathunmbi (MoA)
Education	Abdi Abat/ Lawrence Baraza (MoE)
FAS	Allan Kute (WFP)
Disasters	Phillip Tarus (OP/Relief and Rehab)
FEWSNET	Nancy Matunga
ALRMP	Kennedy Karani
FAO	Tom Awuor/Wilfred Oluoch
World Vision	Imeji Zacharia/ Jacqueline Rioba

- Formal letter to be sent out from the KFSSG Chair to the SWGs and Department/agency, requesting specific data with a deadline of 16th November. Formal letter to be followed up directly by focal points;
- The Meta-Data Analysis group will meet on the 21st November at 10am (or as close to that date as possible depending upon how the deadline from the SWGs is adhered to. The objective of the meeting will be;
  - Review the data (quantity and quality)
  - Develop an analytical framework
  - Finalise the data checklists for the field work
- Conduct a Meta-Data Analysis Workshop from 27-28th November:
  - Analysis of data for the overall assessment
  - Outlook for the Mid-season (updated IPC map)
- In a separate, but related initiative, continue with the roll-out of the GIEWS WS at the national level, starting with a capacity assessment in key government ministries.

##### 3.1.2. Response Analysis and Monitoring (3Ws)

- a) **Whose doing what where:** information to be requested at district level with other data requirements:
- Who: agency
  - What: sector/activities/beneficiary numbers
  - Where: physical location of activities
  - Information to be restricted to activities related to what was recommended in the previous district report
  - District Development Officer (DDO) to be targeted for this information
- b) **Response analysis.** The following were identified as ways forward at the district level:
- Invest more time in developing response analysis in the districts:
    - Separate out responses that are already part of the district development plan

- Identify interventions to target specific funding sources at district levels (eg CDF, LATIF, Contingency funds)
- Identify national level priorities (eg major infrastructure like roads) and identify possible sources of funding, such as the MTEF or donor support.
- Include a separate chapter in the final national report on response analysis that clearly identifies activities and funding sources at different levels
- Training for SWG Members on response analysis (FEWSNET/USAID):
  - Response analysis by sector
  - Develop “how to” guidelines for national and district levels
  - Develop formats for SWG and DSG reports
- Training at district level to include spending more time on response analysis with the 8 pilot districts during the next assessment, and feed experience into SWG training; and to include peer reviewing response analysis with the situation analysis at district and national levels
- **Response analysis to follow four steps:**

**i. Response analysis matrix developed by livelihood and IPC phase:**

Cause (immediate/underlying) by sector	Appropriate Response	Justification (analysis)

- ii. **Prioritisation:** Cross sectoral and according to Criteria (below to be developed further):
  - High impact
  - Addresses multiple areas/sectors
  - Practical and within expected resources and timeframe (6 months between assessments)
  - Links to and supports longer-term policies and development strategies
  - Builds the resilience of the most vulnerable
  - Capacity exists on the ground (or can be developed quickly)
  - Appropriate to the context and current situation
  - Not being currently addressed
  - Must not undermine or degrade the environment/ natural resource base, and if possible should enhance
  - Should not undermine womens’ welfare or productive capacity
- iii. **Potential Resource Identification:** each prioritised response to be costed and potential funding sources identified (eg CDF, LATIF, MTEF, donor etc)
- iv. **Peer Review at district and national levels:** To be undertaken alongside the peer reviews for the situation analysis/IPC classification

**3.1.3. Field Work in Pilot Districts and Other Districts**

- An extensive training on data collection, analysis and classification will take place during the week of 14th January. Four members of the technical DSGs from the eight pilot districts will be invited to attend, together with the field team members who are Nairobi-based.

- Fieldwork will commence on 21st January and continue to 16th February. Teams will spend a minimum of 10 days in each of the pilot districts such that a full data collection, analysis, classification and response analysis process can take place.
- A data analysis workshop will take place in Nairobi from 19-22 February. Four members of the technical DSGs from the eight pilot districts will be invited to attend, together with the field team members. Results will be rigorously peer reviewed and followed by an external review panel.
- Final report writing will follow during the week of 25th February.

#### 4. Immediate Outputs

- A brief workshop report will be drafted and circulated for comment
- KFSSG and KFSM will be briefed on the 13th and 15th November respectively
- Work towards a joint proposal for the long-term capacity building process of DSGs.

#### Appendix: Participants

	Name	Organization	Phone	email
1	Tom Awuor	FAO/ALRMP	0722 960440	mrcoduor@yahoo.com
2	Liz Uimbia	ALRMP/FAO	0722 842490	lizuibia@yahoo.com
3	Wilfred Oluoch	ALRMP/FAO	0722 519657	Wilfred.oluoch@gmail.com
4	Thandi Githae	MoW&I	0722 900754	Githae@water.go.ke
5	Imeji Zacharia	World Vision	0735 235783	Zacharia_imeje@wvi.org
6	Jacqueline Rioba	World Vision	0729 010805	Jacqueline_rioba@wvi.org
7	Eliud Wamwangi	MoW&I	0722 830220	ewamwangi@water.go.ke
8	Francis Wambua	MoH	0724 514016	francwambua@yahoo.com
9	Tom Ochieng	WFP	0733 628632	Tom.ochieng@wfp.org
10	Joyce Owigar	WFP	0724 521769	Joyce.owigar@wfp.org
11	James Kimathi	WFP	0722 227075	geoffrey.kimathi@wfp.org
12	Lameck Abraham	MoW&I	0725 984836	Calibreface@yahoo.com
13	Nancy Mutunga	FEWSNET	0722 760765	nmutunga@fews.net
14	Joao Manja	WFP	0735 100356	Joao.manja@wfp.org
15	Calum McLean	FAO/ALRMP	0733 760000	Calum.mclean@fao.org
16	Justus Mathumbi	MoA	0722 980313	jmathumbi@yahoo.com