

**PROCESS GUIDELINES
FOR CONDUCTING WFP PILOTS OF THE
INTEGRATED FOOD SECURITY AND HUMANITARIAN PHASE CLASSIFICATION (IPC)**

BACKGROUND

Under the Strengthening Emergency Needs Assessment Capacity (SENAC) project, WFP is working closely with FAO and other partners to **develop, implement and advocate a commonly accepted, standardized tool for classifying food insecurity**. This is based on evolving the Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification (IPC) approach for situation analysis and early warning. The IPC identifies the severity, underlying causes, and expected trends in a country's food security and seeks to establish broad-based consensus among key stakeholders (e.g. governments, UN and NGO agencies, donors, the media) on the resulting food security (FS) analysis. It classifies situations into five phases: (1) Generally Food Secure, (2) Chronically Food Insecure, (3) Acute Food and Livelihood Crisis, (4) Humanitarian Emergency, and (5) Famine/Humanitarian Catastrophe. As currently designed, it is more sensitive to 'crisis situations' (Phases 3-5), and less so for medium to longer-term development planning (Phases 1-2).

The IPC has been used in Somalia for several years and is currently being piloted in several countries in the Greater Horn of Africa (GHOA). During 2007, WFP will lead country level pilots in different regions in order to generate lessons on how to adapt the IPC approach in other countries and situations¹. Specifically, the focus will be to:

- (i) Determine how best to establish linkages between the IPC consensus-building and process and ongoing WFP food security analysis, assessment, and monitoring/early warning exercises such as EFSAs, CFSVAs and FSMS. The goal is to refine and agree upon a standard approach for food security classification; and
- (ii) Provide further inputs and suggestions on how to improve the IPC as a tool for building consensus and setting standards situation and response analysis.

The pilots will feed into the collaborative process with FAO and other agencies on the development of the IPC, which includes refining the current IPC guidelines, and pursuing a global multi-partner strategy to roll-out the IPC approach from 2008 onward. WFP will give priority to building in-house capacity to participate in future IPC roll-out exercises.

In order to provide a structured approach to the pilots, and to guide country/regional management teams overseeing the IPC pilots and the technical teams undertaking the pilots, the following process guidelines are suggested. They outline the key phases, steps, timeline and indicative budget to be followed in future pilots. These

¹ Pilot countries will be selected to represent a range of different regions, livelihood systems and humanitarian contexts, including natural/man-made and slow-/sudden-onset disasters, that meet one or more of the following criteria: (1) countries with an ongoing crisis or with a high degree of vulnerability to food-security shocks; (2) countries that are preparing a new EMOP or PRRO; (3) countries where a CFSVA requires updating (i.e. using recent secondary data); or (4) countries with an established food security monitoring system interested in building inter-agency consensus on food security problems and associated responses.

complement, and draw heavily from, the IPC Technical Manual. (see: FAO/FSAU 2006. *Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification: Technical Manual Version I*. Nairobi, FAO/FSAU Technical Series IV.11. Available for download at: <http://www.fsasomali.org/uploads/Other/761.pdf>).

MAJOR STEPS AND TIMELINE

ODAN and ODAV will consult with regional and country office staff on proposed candidates for IPC pilots, as well as with key partners (FAO, UNICEF, SCF, Oxfam, CARE and FEWS NET). Each participating RB will be asked to designate one or more IPC focal points. As appropriate and possible, a ½-day awareness-raising workshop would be arranged for Regional Bureau staff (management and assessment/VAM staff) to introduce the IPC approach and tools. The workshop would be scheduled according to the availability of key actors in the RB, but preferably en route to a country pilot.

Once agreement has been reached on the countries and timing of the exercises, the following, steps and timeline should be followed (*not necessarily in sequential order, as shown in the timeline*).

A) Preparatory Phase

The steps below should take place a *minimum of two weeks before* the Situation Analysis phase begins to ensure sufficient time to contact interested partners and confirm their participation. For CFSVAs and FSMS, it is proposed that the IPC-related analysis would take place after data collection, during the stage where findings are validated with stakeholders. For an update of a CFSVA based on secondary data analysis, or other pilot activity taking place without or prior to data collection, key informant interviews should be conducted.

Step 1 – Hold an initial teleconference (HQ, RB, CO and consultant²) to clarify expectations, agree on the CO role and contact points, identify arrangements for administrative/logistical support, discuss the proposed FS analysis pilot team composition, and agree on the process for collecting/organizing data (see Step 5). These agreements would be reflected in a TOR developed by the CO.

Step 2 – Establish a Stakeholder Group. Existing inter-agency fora where WFP is active (e.g., food security sector groups, UN Cluster Groups, food-aid coordination committees) should be used, rather than creating new structures with new responsibilities. The CO should convene an introductory meeting with this group to brief them on the planned pilot, request nominations of technically competent staff to participate as members of the Technical Working Group (TWG – see Step 3), and present the draft TORs for the FS analysis pilot and TWG. This Stakeholder Group would meet regularly for the duration of the pilot to provide advice on key decisions and review progress. (Note: if there is no existing food security forum to consult, the CO would seek to establish an ad-hoc Stakeholder Group for the duration of the pilot.)

Step 3 – Establish a Technical Working Group (TWG). Members of the Stakeholder Group would nominate technically qualified staff to serve on the TWG,

²The involvement of a consultant familiar with the IPC approach, either participating as a pilot team member or providing technical backstopping via regular teleconferences, is envisioned.

and identify a chairperson. The TWG would conduct the FS analysis together, and should ideally be comprised of technicians with a wide range of sectoral expertise (e.g. nutrition, food security, markets, conflict analysis, agriculture, and others depending on the country context). The TWG should ensure that the FS analysis is conducted in an institutionally and politically neutral manner.³

Step 4 – Circulate and finalize TORs, in consultation with the TWG. For each task listed below and related procedural or administrative support, the TORs should specify the respective responsibilities of WFP HQ, RB and CO staff and TWG members, and the completion dates for each task. (For example, who is responsible for collecting and compiling secondary data, arranging meetings, and leading the response analysis and lessons exercises.) Ideally, an RB staff member would be included on the TWG, and an IPC consultant would take part in the first week of the exercise (or be available for regular teleconferences). The TOR should also include arrangements for obtaining peer review of the outputs by (i) a qualified IPC consultant and (ii) if feasible, selected members of the SENAC Advisory Group (AG).

Step 5 – Identify data requirements. The designated CO focal point(s) should closely examine and refine/update the existing IPC Reference Outcomes and Analysis Templates to make an initial list of what data are available in-country to support the situation and response analysis (from any and all sources, not just WFP), identify data gaps, and contact the TWG to see if other data are available to fill these gaps. They should ideally compile these data into a rough “data base” or excel sheet by administrative and livelihood zone.

B) Situation Analysis Phase

Step 1 – Conduct a ½ to 1 day awareness-raising/training workshop for the Stakeholder Group, TWG and other WFP CO and partner agency management and programme staff (awareness-raising session only). The first session of the workshop would familiarize participants with the overall objectives, concepts and processes; the second session would provide opportunities for technical staff, including the TWG members, to discuss any questions/concerns regarding the range of tools available for building consensus and a common approach (including existing IPC tools) and to be advised on the expectations of the team responsible for the pilot exercise. This meeting would preferably be facilitated by a person with IPC experience.

Step 2 – Identify spatial and socioeconomic units of analysis. The TWG should agree on the appropriate spatial and socioeconomic units of analysis (e.g., administrative boundaries, livelihood zones, agro-ecological zones, households, individuals, etc.) and make an initial determination of areas in the pilot country that are likely to be experiencing the same level of food insecurity based on recent analyses, assessments or monitoring information. It may be easier to begin with identifying any potential ‘crisis areas’ and then conduct the prioritisation exercise for non-crisis areas.

Step 3 – Compile all relevant data. For each priority area, the TWG should compile all relevant and available secondary that could provide direct and/or indirect evidence in support of a particular categorization (using the IPC categories as an initial template). The TWG should also provide recommendations on the need to collect primary data—and the reasons why. Sub-steps include:

³ Ideally, the TWG should be located in a government-led institution to foster government ownership and institutional sustainability. However, for purposes of the pilot, it may be necessary to form an ad-hoc group without an established institutional ‘home’.

- (i) Review the “key reference outcomes” (e.g. crude mortality rate, acute malnutrition, disease, food access/availability, etc.) to determine which are available and applicable to the country context, as well as any indirect evidence (e.g. proxy indicators) that could be used to support the situation analysis;
- (ii) Indicate the level of comparability of the indicators to assist in the evaluation and interpretation of existing data (as input into Step 4); and
- (iii) Complete the IPC Analysis Template on “Analysis of Key Reference Outcomes and Evidence”, including data sources and assigning a Reliability Score to each piece of evidence based on age, methodology and origin.

Step 4 – Evaluate/interpret/analyze evidence. For each area, the TWG should:

- (i) Review all of the evidence on the Analysis Templates and make a ‘best assessment’ of which Phase the area is in (along with any Early Warning statement) based on a process of convergence of evidence. If the team has any major disagreements in determining the phases or early warning levels, document these in writing and refer these concerns to the IPC support consultant and the AG peer reviewer; and
- (ii) Obtain comments on the completed draft Analysis Template from the IPC technical consultant and the AG peer reviewer (if any).
- (iii) When data collection has not occurred, or if required to verify the initial findings of the analysis, carry out selected field visits with key informants.

Step 5 – Complete IPC Analysis Templates parts 2 and 3. For each area, the TWG should complete parts 2 and 3 of the Analysis Templates, which identify effects on livelihood strategies and livelihood assets. These templates will help guide response analysis, as well as provide additional information to describe the situation.

Step 6 – Produce map and population tables. Using the IPC cartographic protocols, a country-wide map (or for an EFSA pilot, a map covering affected areas) should be produced including the Phase Classification, Early Warning Levels, and Call Out Boxes. As well, population tables should be completed showing the estimated number of people in various food security classification phases.

Step 7 – Submit FS situation analysis to technical peer review. The draft FS Situation Analysis should be presented to a small group of stakeholders (including technical people and decision makers) who were not a part of the TWG. This is not a formal presentation of the findings, but a peer review to allow for presentation of the evidence and findings and solicit any expert feedback, including the possibility of having to make adjustment in the analysis (that can be technically substantiated with evidence). The TWG should then finalize the results in consultation with the IPC consultant and the AG member as appropriate.

Step 8 – Write report and circulate results. Following finalization of the Analysis Templates and map, a brief FS situation analysis report should be written summarizing the findings and process, and the results should be circulated widely to the food security forum, government, donors and other interested agencies, with a clear indication that it is an IPC-pilot. The final analysis templates and map would be attached.

C) Response Analysis Phase

Within 2-4 weeks of completing the Situation Analysis phase, a follow-up exercise would be undertaken to identify the appropriate responses (ideally including senior programming staff and a member from the Situation Analysis pilot team). This would involve two main steps:

Step 1 – Review and refine IPC Analysis Templates. The Analysis Templates created during the Situation Analysis should be reviewed and refined with any further information that may guide Response Analysis. Part 1 of the Analysis Templates will clearly illustrate the severity of the situation along with the particular configuration of outcomes that are leading to the Phase Classification. Parts 2 and 3 of the Analysis Templates identify the main immediate hazards and underlying causes and the effects on livelihood strategies and livelihood assets, which will help inform immediate and medium/long term interventions. Overall, the IPC Strategic Response Framework provides a generic guide as to the main elements of a response strategy for a particular Phase.

Step 2 – Hold a ½ to one day workshop to review/finalize the response analysis with managers and programme staff, members of the IPC Stakeholder Group and the TWG as well as other interested parties. Broad agreement could also be sought on (i) what priorities should be assigned, both within and between the proposed response categories (short and medium/long term), (ii) the number and profile of target groups for each category of assistance, and (iii) which implementing agency/actors would be involved. Although the exercise would not seek to develop the response plan for any specific agency, the final IPC Analysis Templates could subsequently be used as the launchpad for WFP's (and other agencies') programming decisions.

NOTE: The IPC is a tool for Situation Analysis, and provides linkages to Response Analysis. Specific protocols have not yet been developed for Response Analysis, but are expected to be developed over the coming year. Country experiences on conducting Response Analysis will contribute to these developments, and as such it is important to document the process.

D) Post-Pilot Lessons Exercise

As input to a final workshop (late 2007/early 2008) on lessons from piloting a standard FS classification approach, a two-part lessons-learned report would be prepared for each pilot country covering technical issues and lessons from users/decision-makers, respectively.

Step 1 – Technical Lessons. Shortly after the situation and response analysis exercises, a summary of mainly technical lessons should be prepared by the pilot team and circulated to the TWG. This should identify:

- (i) whether the resources allocated to the exercise were sufficient to develop the outputs;
- (ii) overall difficulties in applying the current IPC guidelines to prepare the templates, map or population tables, including reaching agreement on how to assign the phases and early warning levels;
- (iii) which changes were made to the key reference outcomes, and why; and

- (iv) recommendations on how to improve future pilots, and on ways to institutionalize the process for standardizing FS analysis in the country.

Step 2 – Users Lessons Workshop. Shortly after the results of the response analysis exercise are circulated, a workshop would be held to develop lessons on the IPC process from the perspectives of users, based on the PASS It On “After Action Review” method (modified as appropriate). This would be a light, roundtable 1/2 to 1 day exercise with CO and partner decision-makers, ideally conducted by (or in consultation with) the RB PASS It On focal point and, if possible, with an IPC team member. The lessons should address the overall level of satisfaction/buy-in by the stakeholders and their interest in further similar exercises and/or IPC training.

Sample Timeline for IPC Country Level Pilot

Phases	Activity/Steps	Weeks 1-4	Week 5	Week 6	Week 7	Week 8	Week 9-10	Wks 10-14	Week 16	Week 22-23
Preparatory Phase	1. Hold initial teleconference with team HQ/RB/CO	■								
	2. Establish/consult stakeholder group									
	3. Establish Technical working group (TWG)									
	4. Circulate and finalize TORs	■								
	5. Examine data requirements	■								
Situation Analysis	1. Conduct Awareness-raising/training workshop WFP/CO, Stakeholders, TWG		■							
	2. Identify spatial units of analysis		■							
	3. Compile all relevant data into Template 1		■	■						
	4. Evaluate/interpret/analyze evidence			■	■					
	5. Complete IPC analysis Templates 2 & 3				■	■				
	6. Produce IPC map and population tables				■	■				
	7. Technical backstopping		■	■	■	■				
	8. Submit FS analysis to technical peer review				■	■				
	9. Write FS situation analysis report and circulate					■	■	■		
Response Analysis	1. Review and refine IPC analysis templates							■		
	2. Hold 1-2 day workshop							■		
Post-Pilots Lessons Exercise	1. Technical lessons (by TWG)								■	
	2. User/decision maker lessons workshop									■
	3. HQ IPC core team review of lessons (current and previous lessons) – feedback loop to next pilot									■