



**Note for the Record**  
**Tajikistan IPC Regional Workshop**  
**Gharm, Rasht (DRD) - September 15 – 16, 2009**

**Agenda:** See annex.

**Workshop participants:** Agriculture Department (Rasht, Tojikobod, Jirgatal, Nurobod, Tavildara); Association of Invalides (Rasht); Dehkan Farms Association (Tojikobod, Jirgatal); German Agro Action (Gharm); Global Partner (Rasht); Mercy Corps (Gharm); MSDSP (Regional Office); OSCE (Gharm); Red Crescent (Rasht); Statistics Department (Nurobod); UNDP CP AO (Gharm); WFP (HQ, Dushanbe & Rasht LO); EC - Joint Research Centre

**Session highlights:**

**Day 1**

1. Opening of the floor

- Cedric Charpentier (WFP) clarified the objective of the workshop: Participants will be asked to discuss food security in the region, a complex issue which touches upon the work of various partners and stakeholders working in different fields of expertise.
- Advised that the workshop will not be driven by presentations but rather focus on an interactive and open discussion among participants.

2. Food security review session

- A quick review on the key concepts of food security (three pillars of food security; the food security and nutrition analysis framework; other relevant terms such as livelihood, shocks, coping etc.) for participants with little or no food security background
- This introductory session generated a lively discussion among participants about how best to understand food security in the Tajik (and particularly in Eastern DRD) context. Some of the points raised include: agricultural production as the primary factor defining food security in Tajikistan; food availability versus food access issues; inadequate diet leading to food insecurity; chronic (or non-emergency) food insecurity; and etc.
- The animated discussion not only reflected the participants' interest in the workshop but also facilitated the introduction of the IPC approach; it was presented as a methodology that can guide a discussion among experts with diverging views and different entry points to the question of food security in a more structured way to eventually reach consensus.

### 3. Introduction to the IPC

- Presentation was modified to cite specific examples, i.e. evidence for districts Tojikobod and Jirgatal gleaned from the pre-filled analysis templates of the national workshop. For instance, indicators regarding food access were listed and participants were prompted to evaluate the relevance and validity of those indicators and also propose alternative indicators.
- The reference to specific district data triggered an active discussion among the participants who could relate to them in a concrete manner based on their local knowledge. However, the general overview of the IPC approach was a bit lost in the debate as participants were too occupied in challenging/questioning the presented figures for each indicator. Nonetheless, participants could easily progress into the main discussion because of the concrete examples – e.g. it was noted that the average price data for food commodities is not comprehensive enough to be relevant for the region and should include sugar and salt.
- It was necessary to clarify the valid time period of a given IPC analysis lest the final phase classification map is understood as a static picture (the IPC analysis reflects the current situation with a projection on the likelihood for change in the imminent future – how much forward looking an analysis should be will differ according to the context).

### 4. Feedback and instructions on homework for Day 2

- Participants gave positive feedback to the open discussion and expressed interest in the IPC approach as a means to guide them.
- Cedric Charpentier (WFP) underlined that the flow of information should be ideally bottom-up and thus the results emanating from the national workshop can be challenged with counter evidence from the regions/districts. He also encouraged participants to think about the utility of an IPC analysis which is regularly updated. For instance, what will be the use of a phase classification map that is updated every three months?

## **DAY 2**

1. Group Work – Clusters E (Jirgatal, Rasht, Tajikobod & Darvoz) & F (Tavildara, Nurobod)
  - Group work discussion on i) clustering of districts; ii) phase classification of each reference outcome on the reference table adjusted to Tajik context as agreed upon at the technical workshop which took place in August 2009; and iii) data gap progressed well.
- Presentation of group work:

DRD Clusters				
Cluster	E		F	
Level of analysis	National Workshop	Regional Workshop	National Workshop	Regional Workshop
Clustering of districts	Jirgatal Rasht Tojikobod(Darvoz)	- Rasht & Tojikobod - Jirgatal	Tavildara Nurobod	No change proposed in terms of clustering
Indicator 1	3	3	3	3
Indicator 2	1	2	2	2 – More than 50% increase  Proposed change to the indicator Phase 1= more than 0.08 ha, Phase 2= between 0.08 and 0.06 ha, Phase 3= less than 0.06ha. Nothing for phase 4 and phase 5
Indicator 3	NA	2	2	4 – but input from bank specialist necessary
Indicator 4	1	2	2	2 – Proposal for changing indicator to income through sale of agricultural production with new thresholds Phase 1= more than 130 TJS, Phase 2= 130 -90 TJS, Phase 3= 90-40 TJS. Nothing for Phase 4 & 5.
Indicator 5	1	2	2 (? / changes in threshold)	2 – Proposal for changing threshold Phase 1= more than 20% with low diversity, Phase 2= 20-50% with low diversity, Phase 3= more than 50% with low diversity. Nothing for phases 4 & 5.
Indicator 6	2	2	2 (? / inputs from hospitals and statistics department needed)	2 – Input from hospitals and Statistics Department necessary
Indicator 7	1	2	2 (meal number didn't change but quality of meal decreased)	2 to 3 – Number of meals didn't change but quality of meal may have decreased.
Indicator 8	2	2	1	2 Changes proposed: Phase 2 should be same as Phase 1 with the following text: "Traditional coping mechanisms that are part of livelihood strategy (increased sales of livestock and harvest, wages, remittances)"
Indicator 9	2	2	2	2 Proposed change: making sure that translation in Russian is changed from risk to hazard
Indicator 10	NA	1	1	1 Proposed change: for Phase 2 add the following examples: political demonstrations and petty crime

- Summary of discussion points for Cluster E
  - Jirgatal should be considered as a separate cluster given the composition of ethnic groups, geography, duration of winter, road access etc. A case in point: 800 ha of potatoes were frozen, contrary to expectations for a good harvest (the Government announced that there will be a 40% increase in potato harvest at the national level which does not reflect the problems at the sub-national level). This highlights the utility of the exercise; i.e. it highlights the discrepancy between the official data at the national level and the reality in the regional and/or district level.
  - Phase classification agreed among participants is in accordance with the result of the national workshop: Phase 2 for Rasht, Tojikobod, and parts of Jirgatal and Phase 3 for parts of Jirgatal.
  - It was proposed to review the IPC analysis every three months and replicate the workshop in other districts and regions.
  - Regarding the reliability and regularity of the data collected and reviewed: Obtaining information from banks, markets and hospitals may be easy but gathering household level data is more costly. It was proposed to conduct a household level survey twice a year – once during the planting season and once after the harvest.
  - Market information should be obtained from regular markets in the respective districts but also from the weekly regional market (one day per week) where imports from Krygyzstan are available as well.
  - Additional stakeholders to invite in the next round of meeting include representatives from hukumat, the Statistics Department and Land Committee, environmental specialists, veterinarian specialists, militia hospital and medical staff and bank representatives (for information regarding remittances)
  - The following additional indicators should be included: harvest, imported food to the valley, purchasing power.
  
- Summary of discussion points for Cluster F
  - Main livelihoods for Cluster F: beekeeping, livestock and crop production..
  - Average price for basic food commodities was 8 Somoni (two years ago) whereas now it is 17 Somoni which is equivalent to 50% increase. However, given the impact of the high food price crisis, average price of three or five years ago should be the point of reference.
  - Overall, Cluster F should be classified as Phase 2.
  - It was proposed to change indicator 4 from daily wage labour rate to income through sale of agricultural production. However, agricultural production is only one of the main income sources and information on livestock should also be considered. Further, Goskomstat (Statistics Department) may have the relevant data but the figure could be exaggerated. Question could be included in existing agricultural surveys or household surveys.
  - Participants should have been provided with the workshop materials (e.g. analysis templates, data gap questionnaire, adapted reference outcome/proxies table) in advance so they could present whichever

relevant data they have at the district level to the wider group. As a matter of fact, there are data available at the sub-national level which are missing at the national level and not captured by Goskomstat.

- It was clarified that this workshop aimed to introduce the tool to the key food security stakeholders in the field and explore their interest in utilizing it in the near future. Participants agreed that the feedback on the IPC approach for understanding food security in the region is positive enough to consider a second round of such a workshop aiming for a full-fledged and detailed analysis.

## 2. Conclusion + follow-up action points

- Participants agreed on repeating the exercise (i.e. analysis workshop) with a four months time frame (October; February/March; June/July).
- Each workshop will cover two clusters (of districts) and will take place in different locations on a revolving basis (the next workshop will take place in Jirgatal tentatively on October 25, 2009).
- Other participants who were missing at this workshop will be invited in the next round of the exercise (e.g. representatives from the banks, hospitals, Statistics Department, Land Committee and environmental specialists).
- Next round of analysis workshop will produce a phase classification map and an accompanying explanation on how the consensus was reached (i.e. filled-out analysis templates).
- Adjusted reference table will be revised and circulated at least one week in advance of the next workshop to leave sufficient time for preparations by the participants.
- There is a need to ensure a systematic mechanism of checking the quality of data used for the analysis (it was pointed out at the plenary session of the group work presentations that the estimates for the indicators were not “precise” enough to reflect the reality in the region/district).
- Outstanding issues:
  - Organization of the next workshop to take place tentatively on October 25, 2009 for the Cluster Rasht, Tojikobod (and parts of Jirgatal) will be led by the representative of Jirgatal and the ensuing workshop for the Cluster Nurobod and Tavildara will be led by WFP (financial support for both events will be provided by WFP).
  - Once consensus has been reached on the situation analysis and the corresponding map has been produced, what to do with the final outputs? Participants agreed that the final results will be useful for future project formulation and fund raising with the donors across different agencies. It was proposed to invite head of districts to the next round of meetings to ensure the buy-in of the local decision makers.

## ANNEX 1: Workshop Agenda

### “Integrated Food Security Phase Classification Regional Workshop”

**Date:** September 15 – 16, 2009  
**Venue:** Rasht Regional Training Center, Regional CoES Department  
**Time:** Day 1: 14h00 – 18h00  
 Day 2: 08h00 – 13h00

#### Objectives:

- To introduce the IPC approach to food security practitioners in the region.
- To carry out a participatory IPC situation analysis at the regional level based upon technical consensus:
  - Review and validate the IPC situation analysis for Eastern DRD proposed at the national analysis workshop (clustering of districts, phase classification, pockets of food insecurity, etc.)
  - Identify gap in food security data at the regional level.
- To discuss the potential of establishing a local food security forum on the basis of the IPC approach.

#### Proposed audience:

Local government officials (Statistics, Agriculture, etc.)  
 Relevant UN agencies represented at the local level (UNDP, UN Security)  
 Relevant local NGOs and INGOs (ICRC, German AgroAction, MercyCorps)  
 Local representatives (Farmers, Water User Association, Jamoat, etc.)

Session number	Duration (minutes)	Title	Format	Expected results
<b>DAY 1</b>				
1	14 :00 – 14 :30	Welcome words, presentation of the program	Plenary with individual presentations	To welcome participants and to clarify expectations and objectives.
2	14 :30 – 15 :10	Review on Food Security	Plenary presentation with discussion	To review with participants some of the key concepts in understanding food security.
3	15 :10 – 16 :10	Introduction to the IPC (Part I)	Plenary presentation with discussion	To provide participants with a clear understanding of the IPC approach and its application in the local context.
4	16 :40 – 17 :40	Introduction to the IPC (Part II)	Plenary presentation with discussion	Same as above.
TEA BREAK 30 minutes				

5	17 :40 – 18 :00	<u>Homework:</u> Feedback on clusters; Reference Table for Tajikistan; and Information available for Eastern DRD	Plenary	To prepare participants for DAY 2.
<b>DAY 2</b>				
6	08:00 – 09:00	Feedback and evaluation of DAY 1	Plenary discussion	To feed back on homework and address any concerns or issues participants wish to raise.
7	09:00 – 10:15	1) Review and validation of national analysis workshop results 2) Review of secondary data available (Questionnaire to be completed simultaneously)	Group work (4 groups) - Cluster E (2) - Cluster F (2)	To review the results of the national analysis workshop and propose relevant changes.
TEA BREAK 30 minutes				
8	10:45 – 11:30	Identification of main structural causes, immediate hazards, and projection of food security conditions for the next season	Group work. 4 groups: - Cluster E (2) - Cluster F (2)	To identify the main structural causes for the food security situation in Eastern DRD and make projections for the next season.
10	11:30 – 12:15	Concluding the IPC situation analysis for Eastern DRD	Plenary with one group presentation per cluster and additional feedback from the other group	To reach consensus on the IPC situation analysis of Eastern DRD.
11	12:15 – 13:00	Wrap up and Next steps - IPC process in Tajikistan and national classification; - Linkage to decision making - Revision of Reference Table for Tajikistan - Possible creation of regional food security forum	Plenary discussion	To provide an opportunity for feedback on the workshop process & content and plan next steps.

## ANNEX 2: List of Participants

	Name	Title	Organization	Pphones
1	Muzaffar Nodirov	SPA	WFP	<a href="tel:918-64-33-52">918-64-33-52</a>
2	Malika Inoyatova	ME manager	MC Garm	<a href="tel:918-63-95-73">918-63-95-73</a>
3	Abdualimov M	Head	OO "Muhibjon"	<a href="tel:93-549-41-00">93-549-41-00</a>
4	Salohova F	Field Officer	GAA	918-83-38-18
5	Sharofova U	Field Assistant	OSCE	<a href="tel:918-61-43-29">918-61-43-29</a>
6	Tuichiev E	Head	Assosiation of Dekhon farm of Tojikobod district	<a href="tel:93-524-83-77">93-524-83-77</a>
7	Talbonov K	Head of Department	Agruculture Department of Tojikobod district	<a href="tel:918-87-78-43">918-87-78-43</a>
8	Saadulloev S	Head of Department	Agruculture Departmentof Nurobod district	<a href="tel:901-053-901">901-053-901</a>
9	Anvar Mirzoev	Security Coordinator	UNDP Garm AO	<a href="tel:907-501-070">907-501-070</a>
10	Khuseinov K	Mecial specialist	Emergency Department	<a href="tel:918-98-49-93">918-98-49-93</a>
11	Tibor Layeati	Field Officer	OSCE	985-170-147
12	Khushvahtov N	Agronomist	Agroprom of Tavildara district	93-547-37-57
13	Safolov K	Statistic specialist	Statistic Department	227-18-19
14	Asadullo Akobirov	Statistic specialist	Agroprom of Nurobod district	227-18-19
15	Siadhodjaev Sh.	Coordinator	"Hilloli Ahmar "	918-29-79-56
16	Borunov I	Manager WRM	MSDSP	918-39-48-54
17	Saidorov M	Head of Department	Agruculture Departmentof Garm district	907-31-01-48
18	Penner Mark	Director of Agriculture Programme	Global Partners	918-405-538
19	Bahriddin Sharipov	Translator		907-718-0-19