Insights from the 3rd IPC Global Event - EXPO Milano 2015

This year edition of the IPC Global Event, held on the 20th of May in EC-JRC Headquarters in Ispra (Italy), was attended by around 50 participants, including representatives of global IPC stakeholders, partner and resource partners, regional inter-government bodies (CILSS, IGAD, SAARC and SICA) and national government representatives.

In the morning, the discussion involved Government representatives from 6 countries, who highlighted the added value of the IPC Chronic Food Insecurity Classification and focused on: (i) Distinction between chronic and acute food insecurity situations; (ii) Use of multi-sectorial information and analyses based on technical consensus; (iii) Identification of data gaps and good practices for data collection methods; (iv) Identification of the key drivers of chronic food insecurity, which allow to better inform medium- and long-term planning, policies and programmes.

Country representatives also shared their plans for using IPC Chronic findings in 2015 and 2016 to guide the development of key planning and policy documents, including: Agricultural development/Investment Plans and Strategies, National Development Plans, Food Security and Nutrition Policies and Action Plans, and Sub-national level plans and projects.

In the afternoon, the discussion focused on the learning and feedback from the first round of IPC Nutrition country pilots, conducted in Kenya, South Sudan, and Bangladesh. The main feedback received is that the IPC Acute Malnutrition Scale has been very useful for countries since it has not only helped classify acute malnutrition outcomes based on an international scale, but it has also helped identify key malnutrition contributing factors. Two of the three countries that piloted the tool have already started using it in their policy and programming, even though the tools have not been finalised yet. It is expected that the IPC Acute Malnutrition Classification will be finalised by December 2015.

The event concluded with a round of statements from representatives of the Regional Inter-government Bodies, namely CILSS, IGAD, SAARC, and SICA, who shared their perspectives on the progress achieved in the framework of the IPC Global Strategic Programme (2014-2018) and their expectations for the next three years. Even though new and existing partners expressed a strong interest and engagement in the implementation of IPC, additional efforts are needed to promote the uptake of IPC at institutional and policy level.

Editorial Note
IPC Partners’ Perspectives

The IPC initiative was born and is rooted in field experience. In IPC we always seek to place participation, consensus and cooperation at the center of our activities. It is in this spirit that, in this issue, we have decided to give voice and a face to partners and colleagues who support and implement IPC at country, regional and global level, day by day.

In particular, we feature IPC technical developments and success stories by providing first-hand experiences through short interviews with resource partners, IPC Global Support Unit members and other colleagues directly involved in field work.

For instance, Gianpietro De Cao, DG DEVCO Programme Officer, explains why the European Commission decided to renew its support to the IPC; Erminio Sacco, FAO Chief Technical Advisor, describes how IPC is helping shape the humanitarian response in South Sudan; Mokotla Ntela, IPC Regional Coordinator, talks about IPC advancements in Mozambique; and Jerry Argüello, IPC Regional Coordinator, provides an overview of IPC implementation and expectations in Latin America.
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IPC Quality Assurance, Compliance and Learning Strategy

The IPC Global Support Unit (GSU) has developed a Quality Assurance, Compliance and Learning Strategy to respond to the decision makers and users’ call for a mechanism to assess and improve the confidence, compliance level, and overall quality of the IPC food insecurity analysis across countries and regions.

The strategy is a core element of **Outcome 3 of the IPC Global Strategic Programme 2014-2018: Technical Development, Quality and Compliance**, which aims at strengthening the relevance and rigour of IPC as its use and application grow throughout the world. The strategy is conceived as an add-on to the several quality assurance mechanisms that have been developed and are implemented by countries as integral part of the IPC core functions and protocols launched with the IPC Version 2.0.

Such strategy relies on four pillars, as shown by the following diagram:

- **Pillar I – Training**: lays the groundwork for capacity strengthening of IPC Analysts and other stakeholders through the [IPC Certification Programme](#), which includes trainings, cross-country learning exchange, and development of academic course curricula on IPC tools and procedures.
- **Pillar II – Real-Time Support and Quality Reviews**: focuses on real-time technical support to countries as well as real-time quality reviews of IPC products in order to strengthen the quality and confidence level of IPC acute and chronic analyses, prior to the validation and release of IPC final products. **Real-time IPC Quality Reviews** can be also conducted on special circumstances such as in response to contentious results, which may especially occur in situations of extreme acute food insecurity, or in case of severe emergency situations where there is a break-down in the technical consensus process. In these particular cases and upon demand, the IPC GSU may activate an *IPC Global Emergency Review Committee* with the task of providing guidance and recommendations to the Country IPC Technical Working Group.
- **Pillar III – Retroactive Quality and Compliance Reviews**: foresees the implementation of reviews of IPC products already developed, in order to provide recommendations and guidance to the countries for future improvements of technical, process and institutional aspects. In particular, **Retroactive IPC Quality Reviews** are conducted to evaluate the overall quality of IPC analyses that have been already released with the purpose of identifying potential areas for improvement and suggest actions for future acute analysis exercises. On the other hand, the **IPC Compliance Review** aims at identifying whether stakeholders fully apply the IPC standards when generating food security analyses. The IPC Compliance Review strives to create some flexibility in the use of IPC standards for those countries that face particular circumstances, while ensuring that the core IPC principles are not lost.
- **Pillar IV – Technical Developments and Updates**: foresees ongoing technical development and updates of IPC tools, procedures, training material and guidance notes, based on feedback provided by countries and other stakeholders involved in IPC implementation and ongoing learning.

> Visit the IPC Quality & Compliance webpage
IPC Indicative Analysis: A new exceptional IPC prototype protocol

Based on countries’ experience, the IPC Global Support Unit acknowledges the need for IPC Analyses in exceptional situations, when conditions of conflict, civil insecurity or limited humanitarian access prevent updates to country IPC analyses due to absence of reliable outcome evidence. Nevertheless, there are cases where a Country IPC Technical Working Group (IP TWG) may need to update past IPC analyses and make credible projections based on current contributing factor analysis. In this case and where the Country IPC TWG analysis goes through an IPC GSU-led Real Time Quality Review, the analysis may be considered and released as an Indicative IPC Analysis.

The objective of the IPC Indicative Analysis protocol is precisely to allow IPC classification in exceptional contexts, where conditions of conflict, civil insecurity or limited humanitarian access lead to the absence of reliable and up to date outcome evidence, which are necessary to conduct high quality IPC analyses.

This new protocol is under discussion and review for inclusion as an exceptional IPC protocol.

The first IPC Indicative Analysis was released in June 2015, when the IPC GSU successfully concluded an external Real-Time IPC Quality Review of the Current IPC Acute Food Insecurity Analysis in Yemen, which was conducted by the National IPC Technical Working Group (IPC TWG) from the 25th of May to the 2nd of June 2015. This support was requested by the Yemen IPC TWG, in light of indications of rising levels of acute food insecurity and the need to update the acute food insecurity overview in the country, based on high-quality analysis and technical consensus, in order to adequately inform response planning (for more details see p.6).

The results of the IPC Quality Review clearly showed that the Yemen IPC Acute Food Insecurity Phase Classification was mostly plausible, based on well-articulated analyses of trends and contributing factors to support the inference of the current situation, thus updating the IPC Analysis of February 2015. However, such analysis should be considered only as an Indicative IPC Analysis, because it is not substantiated by the minimum evidences required for a rigorous IPC analysis, mainly due to the lack of access to reliable and up to date outcome data. > Read more

Donor’s Perspectives: EC-IPC Partnership to meet hunger reduction challenges

The hunger reduction challenge requires an integrated approach to address immediate and underlying causes of food and nutrition insecurity. In particular, there is a clear call for actions and accountability to accelerate the world’s progress on chronic food insecurity and malnutrition. The Global Nutrition Report (2014) acknowledges that there is a lot of available information on nutrition, but it also points out that such information is too fragmented and there are critical gaps to be filled. Furthermore, the 2014 State of Food Insecurity in the World Report highlights that an important lesson learned drawn from countries experiences is that food insecurity and malnutrition are complex inter-related problems that cannot be resolved by a single stakeholder or sector.

In this context, the European Commission (EC) and FAO are working together to help meet these challenges. The IPC initiative, through FAO, greatly benefits from EC support. According to Gianpietro De Cao, DG DEVCO Programme Officer, “IPC is the best existing tool for analysing food and nutrition security. This is why the EC is investing in its development 10 million Euros through the INFORMED program, funded under the Global Public Goods and Challenges thematic programme”.

The EU is placing resilience as a central objective of development and humanitarian assistance. “Resilience building among vulnerable communities will be pursued by tackling root causes of food insecurity and malnutrition. EC will address this commitment both in the geographical and thematic programmes” Mr. De Cao says. “In particular, the Pro-resilience Action (PRO-ACT) initiative is a crucial component of the EC Annual Action Programme for Food and Nutrition Security and Sustainable Agriculture”. Such initiative aims at addressing food insecurity in countries in post-crisis situation and at supporting vulnerable populations to become more resilient, thereby linking relief rehabilitation and development.

In this context, “the exercise of identifying and selecting countries in need and allocating funds is annual and sequential: it is based on a technical analysis of the food security situation, completed by an assessment of EU response capacity. The criteria are: evidence-based needs assessment, nature of food and nutrition crisis, capacity and complementarities assessment. The evidence-based needs assessment is conducted through the Cadre Harmonisé for West Africa and the IPC for the rest of the world. Therefore IPC is playing an important role in DEVCO decision processes”.

According to Mr. De Cao, one of the major challenges that the IPC partnership needs to face is the measurement of the effectiveness of IPC tools in relation with changes in Government approaches and responses. “While IPC was initially conceived for orienting the emergency responses, mainly externally driven, we have now a more comprehensive tool which could be used for policies design too”. Talking about the future of IPC, Mr. De Cao adds that “a tool that allows comparison of different IPC analyses would help us for different reasons: we would be able to evaluate the development of IPC, how it has gradually improved and, most important, it would allow us to challenge Governments about the responses. If an area is considered vulnerable in different consecutive analyses, then there is no reason for calling it an emergency, continuing to rely on external aid. That area must become a priority for Government’s intervention. In this sense, IPC would become a major advocacy tool. This is even more valid for the chronic vulnerability, for example in the drought prone regions, like Sahel and Horn of Africa”. 

The hunger reduction challenge requires an integrated approach to address immediate and underlying causes of food and nutrition insecurity. In particular, there is a clear call for actions and accountability to accelerate the world’s progress on chronic food insecurity and malnutrition. The Global Nutrition Report (2014) acknowledges that there is a lot of available information on nutrition, but it also points out that such information is too fragmented and there are critical gaps to be filled. Furthermore, the 2014 State of Food Insecurity in the World Report highlights that an important lesson learned drawn from countries experiences is that food insecurity and malnutrition are complex inter-related problems that cannot be resolved by a single stakeholder or sector.

In this context, the European Commission (EC) and FAO are working together to help meet these challenges. The IPC initiative, through FAO, greatly benefits from EC support. According to Gianpietro De Cao, DG DEVCO Programme Officer, “IPC is the best existing tool for analysing food and nutrition security. This is why the EC is investing in its development 10 million Euros through the INFORMED program, funded under the Global Public Goods and Challenges thematic programme”.
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According to Mr. De Cao, one of the major challenges that the IPC partnership needs to face is the measurement of the effectiveness of IPC tools in relation with changes in Government approaches and responses. “While IPC was initially conceived for orienting the emergency responses, mainly externally driven, we have now a more comprehensive tool which could be used for policies design too”. Talking about the future of IPC, Mr. De Cao adds that “a tool that allows comparison of different IPC analyses would help us for different reasons: we would be able to evaluate the development of IPC, how it has gradually improved and, most important, it would allow us to challenge Governments about the responses. If an area is considered vulnerable in different consecutive analyses, then there is no reason for calling it an emergency, continuing to rely on external aid. That area must become a priority for Government’s intervention. In this sense, IPC would become a major advocacy tool. This is even more valid for the chronic vulnerability, for example in the drought prone regions, like Sahel and Horn of Africa”.
**Recent and Upcoming Events**
- South Sudan IPC Level 1 Training, 23-26 June 2015
- Somalia IPC Acute Analysis, 2-8 August 2015
- Somalia IPC Nutrition Pilot, 8-12 August 2015

**Relevant Resources**
- South Sudan: Update of the Projected Acute Food Insecurity Situation Jan-March 2015
- Kenya: Projected Acute Food Insecurity Overview - March 2015
- Somalia: Projected Acute Food Insecurity Overview - June 2015
- Sudan: Current Acute Food Insecurity Overview - April-June 2015
- Sudan: Current Acute Food Insecurity Overview - May-June 2015
- Sudan: Projected Acute Analysis - July 2015
- South Sudan: Current (April 2015) and Projected (May-July 2015) and (Aug-Sept 2015)
- South Sudan: Update of the Projected Acute Food Insecurity Situation Jan-March 2015
- Uganda: Chronic Food Insecurity Overview - February 2015
- Brief on IPC in ECA 2015

---

**IPC in East and Central Africa**

**IPC shapes humanitarian response in South Sudan**

In South Sudan, for the past two years the IPC has become the basis for deciding geographical locations and reach of the emergency interventions. Indeed, IPC has been designated by Government as the sole recognized methodology.

As nutrition information is fully integrated in the food security analysis, the IPC helps prioritizing efforts across the broad spectrum of data produced in South Sudan.

For instance, the Minister of Agriculture formally releases IPC reports upon clearance at Cabinet of Ministers’ level. “IPC information has helped avert a famine last year and currently the entire narrative of the crisis response plan by the humanitarian community has been shaped and updated around the IPC analysis, as recognized also by the UN Undersecretary for Humanitarian Affairs” said Erminio Sacco, FAO Chief Technical Advisor in South Sudan.

The humanitarian community in South Sudan revises their funding needs based on updated IPC information. The Food Security and Livelihoods Cluster members (Local and International NGOs) also revise their work-plans and budgets in direct response to updated IPC information.

Moreover, FAO and WFP utilize IPC products to guide and inform emergency response programming. For instance, FAO targeted 100% of the population classified in IPC Phases 3 (Crisis) and 4 (Emergency) and about 20% of populations classified as Phase 2 (Stressed) with their emergency seeds and tools kits; vegetable kits and fishing kits. As for WFP, it targeted 100% of populations classified in Phase 4 and 41% of the population classified in Phase 3.

In addition, IPC represents also an effective advocacy tool. Since IPC products are endorsed by both the Government and humanitarian development partners, that can formulate strong messaging for their advocacy campaigns and lobby for the needed policy changes. Having a unified voice helps to highlight the magnitude of the emergency situation in South Sudan for all stakeholders, from the UN Undersecretary for Humanitarian Affairs and aid managers to journalists. Indeed, national and international media covering the crisis in South Sudan regularly refer to IPC results, since they offer clear and evidence-based figures and facts.

**Official release of the IPC Chronic Food Insecurity Analysis results in Uganda**

The results of the IPC-Chronic Analysis conducted in Uganda from December 2014 to February 2015 have been officially released. The analysis workshop was attended by 47 participants: 29 from Local District Governments, representing all regions of Uganda, and 18 IPC Technical Working Group (IPC TWG) members.

The approach drew together all available food security information from reliable data sources. The chronic food insecurity classification was based on convergence of evidence of current and previous information related to a 10-year period (2005-2015), culminated in a meta-analysis of the overall food security situation.

The peer review and quality assurance done by the IPC TWG and the IPC Global Support Unit has also been accomplished in 2 months following the analysis.

The main issues faced during the analysis were: the lack of adequate data to cover the 10-year period and the inconsistency of data collected year after year using different indicators, methodologies, and data sources.

The country was mainly classified as Level 3 - Moderate Chronic Food Insecurity (CFI), with the exception of Karamoja and the Central Region which were classified as Level 4 (Severe CFI) and Level 2 (Mild CFI) respectively. Over 30% of the total population of Uganda faces chronic food insecurity.

A cross-check of Chronic and Acute analysis results shows that the population in Karamoja has been consuming persistently a diet lacking in quality and quantity. Indeed, Karamoja has repeatedly been classified as Phase 2 of the IPC-Acute Analysis (Stressed). For instance, the IPC Acute Analysis held in September 2014 indicated that 48% of the population in Karamoja was in phase 2 (Stressed), while 12% was in Phase 3 (Crisis). The indices and indicators used to undertake the Acute analysis reflect inadequate food and a persistent inability to meet minimum micro and macro nutrient requirements due to frequent recurrence of acute malnutrition over a number of years, that has resulted into stunting.

---

> Read More
**IPC in Southern Africa**

**IPC advancements in Mozambique**

In Mozambique, following the IPC Level 1 Training held in November 2014, the Technical Secretariat for Food Security and Nutrition (SETSAN) decided to conduct an IPC Acute Food Insecurity Analysis from the 22nd to the 26th of June 2015, after conducting a quantitative survey on food insecurity affected areas in Mozambique. “The quantitative survey was designed to capture information valid for provinces taking into account that the provinces analysed were divided into three clusters; districts affected by floods, districts affected by drought and districts where recorded rainfall was normal” explained Mokotla Ntela, IPC Regional Coordinator for Southern Africa.

Mr. Ntela also explained that “the overall objective of the IPC Acute Analysis was to provide the food insecurity situation of the affected areas in Mozambique and produce findings that will be presented at the upcoming SADC Regional Vulnerability Assessments and Analyses Dissemination Meeting”. The Meeting is scheduled to be held from the 21st to 24th of July 2015 in Johannesburg, South Africa, where SADC Member States gather together to share finding of their various food security analyses for a consolidated picture of food insecurity in the region.

The IPC Acute Analysis exercise in Maputo was held at SETSAN Headquarters. The analysis was attended by representatives from the central level as well as SETSAN focal points from various provinces of the country; including Cabo Delgado, Inhambane, Maputo, Namibia, Sofala, Tete and Zambezia.

SETSAN also invited a Portuguese-speaking certified IPC Analyst, who is a member of the SADC Regional Vulnerability Assessments Committee, to co-facilitate the exercise as part of the Cross-Country Learning Exchange initiative in the region. Mr. Ntela was the other co-facilitator of the analysis workshop. The exercise was made possible thanks to the support of SETSAN and of the FAO Office for Disaster Risk Reduction/Management in Southern Africa.

> Read more

**IPC Support to CH in West Africa**

**IPC-CH expanded collaboration on Acute Malnutrition Analysis**

**IPC and CILSS**, with the collaboration of the FAO Office in Niger, conducted a pilot on the IPC Acute Malnutrition Classification in Niamey, between the 4th and the 8th of May 2015. The pilot was carried out as a training workshop covering 3 regions of Niger, namely Tillaberi, Tahoua, and Maradi. A total of 30 staff members from 21 organisations, including the Nutrition Directorate of Niger, UNICEF and ACF regional offices for West Africa, and CILSS representatives participated in the pilot, which was facilitated by IPC Global Support Unit staff.

The pilot was successfully implemented and lessons learned were documented. It was useful to have representation and inputs from regional staff of some of the lead nutrition agencies, such as ACF and UNICEF. In general, participants appreciated the IPC Acute Malnutrition Classification tool and the depth of nutrition analysis allowed by the tool.

During the workshop, it was recommended to carry out an IPC Acute Malnutrition analysis alongside the next Cadre Harmonisé food security analysis in Niger. Additionally, there were recommendations on additional indicators to be included in the IPC Acute Malnutrition tool and suggestions to have thresholds for at least some of the contributing factors to enhance the analysis.

The major challenge faced during pilot was the lack of data. The main source of IPC Acute Malnutrition outcome indicators was the annual National Nutrition Survey of 2014, which only covered anthropometric indicators. For all contributing factors, the analysts needed to rely on the DHS Report of 2012, which limited the analysis of slow changing contributing factors.

The annual nutrition survey in Niger is typically carried out during the lean season (June-August) and the results are available by September. The Cadre Harmonisé food security analysis is carried out bi-annually, in March and in November, covering different seasons. The IPC Acute Malnutrition classification may be integrated with one of the Cadre Harmonisé food security analysis cycles but, in order to improve the complementarity of the two classifications, the timing of the nutrition surveys or the timing of the food security analysis needs to be adjusted.

> Read more
Updates from the Regions and Countries

IPC in Asia and Near East

Real Time Quality Review in Yemen: IPC Indicative Analysis

The Yemen IPC Technical Working Group (IPC TWG) requested the IPC Global Support Unit (IPC GSU) to carry out a Real-Time IPC Quality Review as an added quality assurance step in the validation process of the IPC analysis of the acute food insecurity situation in Yemen, as for June 2015. This support was required in light of indications of rising levels of acute food insecurity and decision maker’s need for an updated IPC acute food insecurity situation analysis in the country.

The IPC GSU-led Quality Review team, including the IPC GSU pool of food security officers and two additional experts from global partners, WFP and FEWS NET, took up the call and conducted an external real-time quality review from the 4th to the 8th of June 2015, immediately following the finalization of the IPC Analysis.

The Real-Time IPC Quality Review showed that the Yemen IPC TWG made the best use of the available data and presented well-articulated evidence on contributing factors, including trends on insecurity, displacement, price increases, lack of fuel, and decreases in employment. Although evidence included is often qualitative, analyses of trends of contributing factors were successfully used to support inference of current food insecurity situation in the country, updating the IPC Analysis of February 2015.

The Yemen IPC TWG effectively engaged in a full IPC process and followed IPC Protocols, but given the absence of outcome indicator data and the minimum evidence base required for a rigorous IPC Analysis, the findings cannot be said to be an IPC-Acute Classification product. However, the IPC GSU recommended the release of the results as an IPC GSU cleared Indicative IPC Analysis (see p.3).

An “Indicative IPC Analysis” is a new prototype IPC Protocol that the IPC GSU is piloting specifically to address the needs of cases like presented by the current case of Yemen.

Further, the IPC Quality Review Team could not corroborate the number of the people that the National IPC TWG estimated at the different IPC Phases because of the lack of reliable and up to date evidence supporting the National IPC TWG’s assumptions.

The difficulty of gathering household and individual level data in Yemen, in the context of the ongoing conflict and civil insecurity, was the main reason for lack of evidence. IPC partners are urged to use creative and outreach data collection efforts to gather up to date and reliable evidence on food consumption, livelihood change, nutrition and mortality which are indispensable for high quality IPC Classification of acute food insecurity situations.

Despite these key technical considerations, the IPC GSU-led Quality Review team confirmed that the Indicative IPC Analysis for Yemen provides invaluable information and will be useful to:

- respond to Yemen’s decision makers and stakeholders need for information on the food insecurity situation in order to inform their emergency response;
- lobby for evidence collection in order to update the IPC analysis as soon as possible.

Most of the key recommendations made by the IPC Quality Review team were incorporated by the Yemen IPC TWG that updated the analysis accordingly and released it on the 17th of June 2015.

Relevant Resources

- Yemen: Current Acute Food Insecurity Situation Sept 2014 - Feb 2015
- Tajikistan: Current (Jan-March 2015) and Projected (April-Sept 2015) Acute Food Insecurity Situation
- Yemen: Indicative IPC Acute Food Insecurity Situation Analysis - June 2015
- Brief on IPC in Asia 2015

Regional Overview

- In order to support the efforts of the countries to identify areas of improvement for achieving better quality IPC products, the IPC Global Support Unit (IPC GSU), in collaboration with WFP, has initiated a process of retroactive IPC Quality Reviews for countries regularly producing IPC products. Under this initiative, the first retroactive review has started in Bangladesh in mid-June 2015 and it is due to start in Tajikistan from mid-July 2015.
- Two trainings on IPC-Acute were conducted in the Region in the last quarter: the IPC Level 1 Training held in Bangladesh from 4 to 7 April 2015 and the IPC Tailored Training in Afghanistan, from the 8th to the 11th of June 2015. The Afghanistan IPC tailored training was recommended by the IPC Global Support Unit in the framework of the IPC Technical Quality Review Mission to Afghanistan.
- On the 18th of April 2015, the British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC) in Afghanistan, while reporting on the food security situation in the country, referred to the results of the latest IPC-Acute Analysis conducted in the Afghanistan in September 2014. The news highlighted that, as per the IPC analysis, Badakhshan is the only province classified in Phase 4 (Emergency) and, overall, 23.4% of people are food insecure: Phase 3 or higher. The news in Farsi language is available here.
IPC in Latin America and Caribbean

IPC added value and future plans in the Region

IPC implementation is quite new in Latin America and Caribbean (LAC), indeed, while the introduction process in the Region started in 2010, the first IPC activities took place in 2012.

Jerry Argüello Delgado, IPC Regional Coordinator in Latin America and the Caribbean, talked about future plans and expected added value of the IPC in the Region, where “the IPC-Acute Classification is relevant when a stress situation occurs, generated by events such hurricanes, earthquakes, and floods. In such situations, decision makers are required to identify prompt actions in the short-term period and the IPC-Acute provides them with the right information to perform their tasks”.

On the other hand, IPC-Chronic Classification is of relevance on medium- and long-term basis. “Most of the food and nutrition security-based strategies and resource allocations in Latin America are generally guided by poverty estimates and health and demographic surveys” said Mr. Argüello. “A holistic scenario of food and nutrition security, combining multi-sectoral information and their spatial convergence, has always been lacking”.

The IPC-Chronic approach has the potential to provide it, according to Mr. Argüello. “This is particularly important because, despite several existing food security and nutrition programmes in the Region, chronic malnutrition and chronic food security in some areas remain very high. The IPC-Chronic analysis allows decision makers to address the persistent limiting and underlying factors of food insecurity in the policy and programme design”.

Moreover, the roll-out of the IPC Chronic has shown the need for better food security information systems for local, national and regional decision making platforms in LAC. More investments are required to generate a continued flow of reliable food security-related data. “The implementation of the IPC Chronic Scale could create opportunities for standardizing data collection methods, thus allowing comparison of the evidences collected across space and time. This platform could help governments in terms of a better allocation of their resources”.

Mr. Argüello also talked about the IPC Acute Malnutrition Classification, which however is not likely to be applied in the Region because of the low Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) rate. “The presence of a complementary classification scale for malnutrition situations equips decision-makers with a better understanding of both underlying and direct factors that affect nutritional vulnerability”.

Finally, Mr. Argüello described the future plans for IPC in Latin America: “Strengthening Government ownership, leadership and political commitment to the dissemination and utilization of IPC products is the main challenge we need to face and it is key to the future success of the in the SICA region”.

Another priority is represented by the “intensification of capacity building efforts, aimed at expanding the number of trained and certified IPC Analysts at national or subnational level”. In this context, LAC is the first Region where the IPC Training has been embedded in an academic course, i.e. the PRESANCA Master’s Degree course in food security.

> Read more

IPC Partners and Other Important Initiatives

Improved Global Governance for Hunger Reduction info pack updated

The Global Governance Programme’s info pack highlighting progresses achieved against its planned outcomes has been updated and expanded.

This information pack covers many of the initiatives resulting from the partnership between the European Union and the UN Rome-based Agencies, namely FAO, IFAD, and WFP. The programme encompasses a wide range of activities that take a coordinated, holistic approach towards food and nutrition security governance at the global, regional and country levels.

The info pack in its entirety is available here: http://www.fao.org/3/a-i3920e/index.html
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Coming Soon...

IPC Level 1 Training for Somalia FSC Coordinators in Nairobi, July 2015

The Somalia Food Security Cluster (SFSC) aims to be the primary source of information on the humanitarian response by addressing food insecurity, and by providing its members with a strategic vision and guidance in their response to the acute and underlying causes of crisis. In April 2015, the SFSC members expressed their interest in getting trained on IPC tools and procedures, since it would help them in their daily coordination work dealing with the results of food security assessments. For this reason, the IPC Global Support Unit (IPC GSU) will hold an IPC Level 1 Training for SFSC members in mid-July 2015, in Nairobi.

The trainees will also engage subsequently in the IPC-Acute Analysis organized by FSNAU from 3rd to 12th of August 2015 in Hargeisa, Somaliland. The entire FSNAU team and partners from all over Somalia will gather in Hargeisa to analyze the food security situation in Somalia using IPC tools, after the Post Gu Seasonal Assessment. Hence, it will be a good opportunity for trainees to be exposed to a practical application of IPC tools and procedures.

Following the participation in the IPC Level 1 Training and the Acute Analysis, all the participants that will pass the IPC Level 1 Online Test will fulfill the requirements to be certified as IPC Analysts, as envisaged by the IPC Certification Programme.

The IPC Level 1 Training will be attended by the SFSC team, UN agencies staff, and FSC partners’ representatives. The Lead Facilitator will be provided by the IPC Global Support Unit as well as the Co-facilitators, who will be selected among the candidates based in the Region who are on the path to get the Level 2 Certificate as IPC Trainers and Facilitators.
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About IPC

The Integrated Food Security Classification (IPC) is internationally recognized as a best practice in the global food security field.

The IPC is a set of analytical tools and protocols to analyze and classify acute and chronic food insecurity and nutrition linked to international standards. The IPC aims to inform decision makers on how severe the food insecurity situation is, who is food insecure, where they are and why they are food insecure. The IPC protocols also create a forum involving Government, UN, NGOs and civil society to conduct joint food security analysis to reach technical evidence based consensus on the nature and severity of food insecurity in their country.

Currently, the IPC is applied in around 20 countries in Africa, Asia, and Central America and the Caribbean.

The IPC has also benefited from the support of the governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain and Sweden.

Thanks for your subscription to the IPC newsletter! We value your continued engagement. Please circulate widely!

To modify your subscription choices or to unsubscribe, write to IPC@fao.org

The IPC Global Partners:

The IPC development and implementation is made possible by the support of:

- The IPC Global Partners:
  - ACF
  - CARE
  - EFSN
  - FSE
  - Oxfam
  - Save the Children
  - WFP

- The IPC has also benefited from the support of the governments of Australia, Belgium, Canada, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain and Sweden.