



Lessons Learnt From the Pilot Phase of Implementing IPC Pilots in Asia –

Practical tips for the key steps of the process

IPC Regional Support Unit (RSU), Bangkok,
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO),
FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific,
March 2013

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	3
2. Initial IPC awareness raising.....	3
3. Stakeholder mobilization during the pilot project inception.....	5
Stakeholder meeting arrangements	5
Stakeholder meeting agenda	6
4. Arrangements among the key partners	6
IPC Work Plan.....	6
IPC Technical Working Group TOR.....	7
IPC Core Analyst Team	7
IPC Steering Committee	8
Establishing the TWG	8
National IPC Coordinator/Consultant	9
Administrative and logistics support	9
Formal agreement with government IPC housing institution	10
5. Exchange visits	10
6. Preparation of data, defining core indicators and cut-offs, zoning	11
7. Planning and organization of IPC training courses and classification workshops	12
IPC training.....	13
IPC classification workshop content and work arrangements.....	13
Workshop opening and closing.....	14
Workshop venue, format and timing.....	14
Workshop facilitation, services and materials.....	15
8. Finalization of the IPC products	15
9. Planning and organization of IPC dissemination activities and IPC Open Days.....	17
Opportunities for IPC side events	17
IPC dissemination workshops	17
10. Lesson learning.....	18
Annex 1: Sample IPC Work Plan.....	19
Annex 2: Sample Technical Working Group Terms of Reference	20
Annex 3: Sample National IPC Coordinator/Consultant Terms of Reference.....	26
Annex 4: Sample of a formal agreement with a government housing institution	29

1. Introduction

The purpose of this document is to provide food security and nutrition practitioners conducting an IPC pilot with practical information on “what to do”, “how to do it”, “when to do it” and “pitfalls to avoid” for the essential steps of the process.

Analysts from Bangladesh, Cambodia, Nepal, Pakistan and the Philippines successfully piloted IPC in their respective countries during 2012 with technical support from the IPC Asia Regional Support Unit (RSU) and funding from the European Commission Directorate- General for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO). This check-list type compilation of suggestions and tips collected from these experiences is intended to serve as a user-friendly tool in support of a further expansion of IPC in Asia and other parts of the world.

The information has been divided into the subsequent chapters, reflecting main steps in the process of implementing an IPC pilot. Challenges exist during each of these steps, but they can be overcome successfully as clearly demonstrated by the achievements under project OSRO/RAS/102/EC (“Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) in Asia: Special Focus to Strengthen IPC Capacity”).

Numerous committed analysts and participants from multiple Asian IPC pilot countries actively contributed to the development of this document. The provided tips and suggestions are by no means intended to replace any pre-existing guidance by the IPC Global or Regional Support Unit. They should rather be seen as a practical add-on to the IPC Technical Manual Version 2 and other IPC Regional and Global Support Unit publications.

2. Initial IPC awareness raising

The successful piloting of IPC usually begins with awareness raising on the IPC processes and required steps leading towards the IPC analysis, the definition of the project goal and the presentation of the project team to the main stakeholder agencies.

- Awareness raising in each new pilot country starts with a briefing session to the agency country office that administers the IPC pilot project. In the case of OSRO/RAS/102/EC, an FAO administered regional project, the FAO Representations and their programming units in the respective countries were the **first point of contact**. The identification and introduction of respective focal persons within the IPC Regional Support Unit and the FAO Representations, as well as any required clarification on key administrative processes and individual responsibilities, are part of initial meetings.

- Subsequent **separate awareness raising sessions** are then to be held with WFP country offices (and their VAM units), as well as other potential key partners in the process. In most IPC pilot countries such meetings would include all other IPC global partner agencies and already identified key government stakeholder agencies.
- IPC country level awareness raising should also be closely **coordinated with regional technical officers** of respective international NGOs and UN agencies where existing (such as NGO regional food security and nutrition advisors, regional WFP VAM teams, etc.), as they can play an important **supporting role** in the process. Similarly, there may be international FAO/WFP/NGO staff now being posted in the pilot country that had previously been part of an IPC analysis elsewhere.
- Providing awareness raising event participants with printed **documentation materials** (such as IPC leaflets and brochures, IPC maps and reports from other countries, IPC training materials, etc), power point presentations and audio-visual materials is generally very useful.
- Detailed knowledge of any **prior exposure to IPC** within a new pilot country (for example previous attempts to use IPC Version 1) is an essential part of the preparations to plan awareness raising sessions on IPC Version 2.
- Four to ten **mission days by the IPC Regional Support Unit (RSU)** may be sufficient for the initial awareness raising process in a new IPC pilot country with ideal pre-conditions (pre-existing government body mandated and fully capacitated to carry out interagency-coordination in the food and nutrition security sector; ongoing close collaboration at technical as well as management level among respective government bodies, key UN agencies and NGOs). In other pilot countries significantly more time may be needed for IPC awareness raising.
- The outcome of this initial IPC awareness raising process is expected to result in a general **agreement on the pilot project scope**, preferred **institutional arrangements** (including the identification of a possible “institutional IPC home” in the country) and a clear plan for a subsequent project inception mission.
- The awareness raising process should lay the foundation for the establishment of an **IPC core stakeholder team**, consisting of key individuals and/or agency representatives that can help support the broader IPC process either technically or administratively.
- Identified key core team members should at least be **consulted** on and ideally be fully engaged in all subsequent steps, including the preparation of any proposals to be presented to a larger stakeholder group.

3. Stakeholder mobilization during the pilot project inception

Once the feasibility of conducting an IPC pilot has been established, a pilot project inception mission needs to be arranged. This should be led by an IPC technical expert, who would build on the earlier awareness raising process and ideally be able to continue supporting the IPC country team throughout all subsequent steps.

- An essential element of the inception mission is the organization of at least one broader **stakeholder meeting** for which all known potential stakeholder agencies (including relevant Government bodies, UN agencies, international NGOs, national NGOs, the Red Cross movement, the academe, donors, etc.) should be invited.
- Invitees for this meeting should include both, the agencies' **management**, as well as **technical coordinators** of their respective food security and nutrition related programmes.
- A sufficiently **wide stakeholder representation at the right level** is essential. In order to secure the presence of intended participants, invitations for this meeting should reach invitees at least two to three weeks prior to the event taking place.
- Highlighting in the invitations the importance of **multi-stakeholder engagement** during the IPC process and underlining the **added value of IPC** for food security related decision-making further helps to secure broad participation in the event.

Stakeholder meeting arrangements

- Such initial IPC stakeholder meetings should be **co-hosted** by a representative from a relevant technical government body, the WFP Country Director and the FAO Representative. In certain pilot countries it may be desirable that the Food Security Cluster Lead or an IPC global NGO partner acts as a meeting co-facilitator.
- Announcements in local donor and technical coordination forums, national food security newsletters, existing food security and nutrition related mailing lists, etc. can be used as additional means to **generate a wide participation** in the event.
- Adequate **infrastructure** (for power point and audiovisual presentations as well microphones allowing discussions in a larger group) would need to be ensured when selecting the meeting venue.
- All stakeholder meeting participants should be provided with adequate IPC **documentation materials**, including copies of the presentations. Setting up an IPC **information boot** should be considered if there is break in between presentations. The typical duration of an initial IPC stakeholder meeting is about 3 hours.

Stakeholder meeting agenda

- The agenda of the initial IPC stakeholder meeting should include the following elements:
 - An introductory presentation of IPC, the IPC added value in the pilot country, IPC tools, protocols and processes, as well as the key steps that are typically part of an IPC pilot.
 - Presentation of and discussion on possible IPC work plan elements, draft IPC Analyst Group / IPC Technical Working Group Terms of Reference components and an overview of project resources that can be made available to the pilot (in form of financial as well as national and international human resources for technical and administrative support during the training period, the analysis workshop, dissemination forums, etc).
 - Presentation of and discussion on the proposed institutional arrangements in the pilot country, including the identification of a national institutional home for IPC.

- The intended outcome of the meeting includes a **stakeholder consensus** to implement the IPC country pilot, and on immediate next steps and the proposed institutional set-up.

4. Arrangements among the key partners

Based on the outcome of the stakeholder discussions an IPC Work Plan, IPC Analyst Group Terms of Reference as well as National IPC coordinator/consultant and administrative support staff (where required) Terms of Reference need to be drafted, and then circulated and endorsed by the stakeholder group.

IPC Work Plan

- The IPC work plan needs to be sufficiently detailed and include **specific dates for all main activities** such as the training activities, exposure to other IPC pilots (where applicable), definition of geographic zones to be analyzed, preparation of indicators, data and phase cut-offs, analysis workshop, report validation, report dissemination events, etc. Key stakeholders should be consulted when setting these dates to avoid overlapping schedules. This is particularly important when timing the training and classification workshops.

- The initial IPC work plan needs to be **kept updated** and possibly further refined during the pilot period. However, modifications of any pre-agreed key activity dates need to be avoided as much as possible as this negatively impacts on the level of participation.
- A sample IPC work plan is provided in Annex 1.

IPC Technical Working Group TOR

- **Terms of Reference (TOR)** for any national IPC Technical Working Group (IPC TWG; alternatively named IPC Analyst Group in some countries) need to be adapted to the local context, but must include
 - a clear description of the IPC pilot background,
 - the chosen institutional arrangements including the name and role of the “IPC institutional home” in a country,
 - the criteria for selecting IPC analysts,
 - guiding principles for conducting the IPC analysis and
 - expectations placed on participating IPC analysts.
- The **composition and size** of an IPC TWG can vary depending on the country context. While some IPC pilots in Asia were conducted with only 15 to 25 analysts, particularly positive experiences were made with somewhat larger TWGs composed of 30 to 40 participating analysts, which allowed a successful classification of up to 25 provinces during a single analysis workshop.
- The TWG TOR should also include foreseen arrangements in terms of **supporting structures**, such as the identification of a body that takes on the role of an IPC Steering Committee, and where planned, the formation an IPC Core Analyst Team to prepare, facilitate and peer-review the tasks of the larger IPC TWG.

IPC Core Analyst Team

- The creation of an IPC Core Analyst team is not compulsory, but has generally been seen as a very effective and valuable tool in previous IPC pilots. An **IPC Core Analyst Team** should be composed of a small but dedicated group of experienced technical specialists (“IPC Champions”) from key partners, including the “IPC institutional home”, WFPs VAM unit, FAO and a limited number of selected NGOs and/or government agencies. The national IPC Coordinator should act as a facilitator of the core team in close collaboration with a technical representative of the “IPC institutional home”. Core team

members are to be given preference to any exposure to ongoing IPC exercises in other project countries.

IPC Steering Committee

- The body taking on the role of an **IPC Steering Committee** should be composed of both, technical as well as senior management representatives of key IPC stakeholders, including relevant government agencies, NGOs and the UN. It is preferably chaired by a senior government official.
- In order to **avoid duplications** by setting up parallel structures, the creation of an IPC Technical Working Group, an IPC Steering Committee and, where applicable, an IPC Core Analyst Team must to the extent possible build on already existing food security and nutrition related technical, coordination and networking bodies.
- Sample IPC TWG Terms of Reference are found in Annex 2.

Establishing the TWG

- The establishment of the IPC TWG should be initiated immediately after the endorsement of the TWG draft TOR. Specific individual follow-up may be required to ensure a **sufficiently broad representation** from the different stakeholder groups (Government, INGOs, national NGOs, UN, Red Cross Movement, the academe) and technical areas of expertise (Food Security, Livelihoods, Nutrition, Markets, Agriculture, Climate, Health, Water/Sanitation, Gender, Statistics, Policy, Disaster Response, etc).
- Members of the TWG must have strong **analytical capacity** and knowledge in their fields. This point needs to be specifically underlined when inviting stakeholder agencies to nominate IPC analysts as it strongly influences the overall functioning of the TWG and subsequently the quality of the IPC classification.
- Of equal importance is the pre-condition that members of the TWG must commit to **bringing IPC-analysis-related data/information** from their organizations and be able to attend the IPC training and classification workshops during the pre-set dates.
- In certain countries **donor representatives** may be interested to actively participate in the TWG or the IPC Steering Committee.

National IPC Coordinator/Consultant

- IPC pilots normally require the services of a **dedicated national IPC Coordinator / Consultant** for the entire duration of the project. A qualified candidate for this role therefore needs to be identified and contracted right at the beginning of the project.
- **Key tasks** of a national IPC coordinator include the planning, preparation, facilitation and documentation of individual elements in the processes that leads to the production and dissemination of an IPC narrative report and an accompanying IPC map.
- The national IPC Coordinator /Consultant should have several years of **practical experience** in food security and/or nutrition related information management and analysis. In addition he/she must have good planning, networking, **facilitation and knowledge building skills** and be experienced in organizing and implementing participative training/workshops. Familiarity with national agency procedures and processes, as well as the ability to effectively use spreadsheet software and produce documents in well written English are other success factors.
- Having national IPC Coordinators be **based in the government IPC housing institution** has in most pilots proved to be of great benefit to the project and is therefore generally the preferred arrangement. Close collaboration with the IPC Technical Working Group members and cooperation with counterpart national authorities, the organization administering the IPC pilot project, as well the IPC Regional Support Unit is essential.
- Sample TOR for a National IPC Coordinator are found in Annex 3.
- Representatives of key IPC stakeholder agencies, including in particular the “IPC institutional home” and WFP, should actively **participate in selecting** the national IPC coordinator.

Administrative and logistics support

- In addition there may be a need to temporarily **hire an extra person** that could provide country-level administrative, logistics and/or information management/communications support to the project. This may become necessary in particular during the time when trainings and/or the analysis workshops need to be organized. Regular administrative and operations staff of FAO Representations has been able to provide these **support services** in some countries that implemented IPC pilots in the past. Making use of in-

house capacities, where they exist, is generally being seen as the preferred option. Provisions need to be made to adequately compensate respective offices for these services.

- In exceptional cases there may be a need to contract **external technical service providers** to achieve certain tasks, for example technical translations of IPC documents or preparatory work in terms of data mapping.

Formal agreement with government IPC housing institution

- Depending on the country context, there may also be a need to draft and **adopt a formal agreement with the Government** partners. A sample of such an agreement is found in Annex 4.
- In other previous country pilots WFP, FAO and the Government counterpart agency opted for a **tripartite agreement**, while a simple **exchange of letters** between the government IPC housing institution and the organization administering the IPC pilot project may be sufficient elsewhere.
- Reaching a formal agreement with Government counterparts may be simple and quick in most pilot countries, but it can potentially be a relatively lengthy process depending on the context. Challenges are generally greater in countries without functioning government bodies that are specifically mandated to carry out inter-ministerial coordination activities related to food security and nutrition.

5. Exchange visits

IPC exchange visits, providing future analysts with an opportunity to be directly exposed to an ongoing IPC classification elsewhere, have been successfully used to facilitate the conducting of previous IPC pilots in Asia. Budget constraints may not allow all future IPC pilots to make systematic use of such exchange visits. However, if the opportunity to use IPC exchange visits exists, the following points should be considered in order to fully capitalize on the benefits of the exposure:

- Participating analysts should be fully committed and available to **play a lead role** in all steps of the subsequent country pilot.

- They agree to document **lessons learned** through the exposure and present practical recommendations for their own pilot to the TWG.
- Participants need to be experienced food security and nutrition practitioners and preferably be **active and committed** members of the IPC Analyst Core Team. The technical person leading the day-to-day activities of the pilot within the government IPC housing institution should be given the first priority when **selecting participants**. Additional slots may be assigned to the National IPC Coordinator and key experts from global IPC partners, other NGOs or government bodies.
- IPC exchange visits are most beneficial if they are timed to **take place at an early stage** of a new country pilot, ahead of the bulk of preparatory work for the classification.

6. Preparation of data, defining core indicators and cut-offs, zoning

- In previous IPC pilots in Asia a **minimum of four to eight weeks** were typically required for data mapping, the assessment of information reliability, identification of core and secondary indicators, the selection of geographic zones to be classified, the data preparation process and the definition of cut-off levels for each IPC phase.
- These efforts are aimed to eventually provide analysts conducting the IPC classification with **consolidated data sets in a ready-to-use format** for each proposed key and secondary indicator. The result of this process strongly impacts on the quality of an IPC analysis and as such is an essential success factor in any IPC pilot.
- During previous IPC pilots there has been a tendency to underestimate the time required to go through these processes. It is therefore recommended to initiate efforts in parallel with the establishment of the TWG and keep a **close track on the progress** being made. Having the IPC training and classification workshops timed with a gap in between them definitely benefits the conducting of activities, particularly the selection of indicators and the definition of cut-offs.
- Depending on the country context fairly **substantial technical support by an experienced IPC / food security expert** may be required to guide the national IPC coordinator and analyst core team through this process, which typically requires multiple core and/or TWG team meetings.
- Under exceptional circumstances it may be justified to **outsource a part of the preparatory work**, for example the initial data mapping exercise, to an external service provider. In some pilot countries there may, in addition, be a need to request the IPC

trainer to conduct a separate smaller workshop specifically focusing on locally adapted indicators and cut-offs.

- Data sets for all proposed indicators, along with cut offs, indicator definitions and where applicable, supplementing information should be made available in both, **hard and soft copies**. In case corrections or revision are made in these documents, it is essential to ensure that older versions are no longer used by analysts.
- The availability of data is a key element to be considered when **deciding on the geographic zones** to be classified by an IPC pilot. Other factors include the size and capacity of the TWG (30 to 40 analysts are even under good pre-conditions typically only able to analyze some 25 geographic entities during a 5 day pilot classification workshop) as well as user needs (if the classified geographic zones are too large users may see limited value in the product).

7. Planning and organization of IPC training courses and classification workshops

- The planning and organization of IPC training courses and classification workshops must **start sufficiently in advance** of the events. In previous IPC pilots a minimum of some two to four months of head time were seen as necessary to secure the presence of intended participants and the availability of a trainer, identify and contract a suitable venue, arrange logistics and services for the event and prepare the necessary workshop materials.
- Intended participants need to be informed of the training dates as soon as they are set, along with the dates for the subsequent classification workshop. It needs to be clear that the training and the classification **together forms the core element** of the IPC pilot and that it is essential for participants to be fully present during both stages of the process. Additional organizational and logistics details of the training and classification workshops can be communicated to participants at a later stage.
- The number of actively participating analysts needs to be limited to around 40 in order to **keep the training event manageable**. In addition, it may be beneficial to invite a limited number of observers to at least some of the presentations (these can for example include members of the IPC Steering Committee, donor representatives or the management of the government IPC housing institution).

- Having sufficient participating analysts with **local knowledge** of the geographic region to be classified is an important success factor that needs to be considered when inviting stakeholders to the training and classification workshops.

IPC training

- The typical **duration** of a basic IPC training is approximately four full days. However, many analysts that underwent this training in the past strongly recommend to systematically plan adding a 5th training day that focuses specifically on the country specific selection of indicators, the setting of cut-offs for the different IPC phases and the process of defining population percentages falling under the different IPC phases.
 - While the general **content** of IPC training sessions has been pre-defined by the IPC Global Support Unit, there is sufficient flexibility in the process to adapt it to the specific training needs within the TWG.
 - Depending on the country context and the capacity of analysts there may be a need to consider **adding more general capacity building** related to food security and nutrition conceptual frameworks. This may need to be done during a separate workshop in addition to the actual IPC training itself.
 - Continuing **interaction** between the trainer and the analysts helps to identify specific thematic areas that may require additional attention during the training process.
 - A tentative **activity schedule** covering the entire training should be provided to the analysts along with the invitations.

IPC classification workshop content and work arrangements

- The generally recommended duration of a pilot IPC classification workshop is five days.
 - The exercise typically needs to start with a short **recapitulation of the individual steps** in the analysis and classification process and the clarification of any issues that may have arisen since the training took place.
 - Before the actual classification can begin there also needs to be a clear understanding of and a general **consensus on the proposed key indicators** and respective cut-off levels for the different IPC phases. Up to half a day may be required for this process, during which any remaining related reservations are to be addressed.
 - Jointly going through the analysis of a first zone/province **in the plenum** may be considered if this is seen to further facilitate the classification.
 - The bulk of the workshop time is however to be spent for the analysis of data in the form of **group work**, whereby each group (composed of ideally 5 to 8 sector specialists covering all different thematic areas and types of agencies) is tasked to classify a number of pre-assigned geographic entities. Typically analyst groups require between 0.5 and 1 day for the classification of a province / geographic zone.

- Having **team compositions** and **assigned geographic areas** to be classified communicated to the analysts ahead of the event may be considered.
- One workshop day needs to be reserved for **quality improvements** in the classifications, which may in part be achieved by analyst groups peer-reviewing each other's draft worksheets. IPC trainers and workshop facilitators are required to closely guide individual analyst groups through the process.

Workshop opening and closing

- Opening and closing sessions of the training and classification workshops may be attended by a number of guest speakers and **VIP invitees**. The duration of the opening and closing sessions of the training workshop should however not significantly shorten the actual training time.
- The closing session of a classification workshop needs to be more elaborate, as it is to include a presentation of the produced IPC map, impressions from participating stakeholders, a discussion on next steps and **statements by government** representatives indicating how they wish to build on the pilot and possibly further institutionalize the IPC process.
- Individual **certificates** are normally expected to be handed out to participating analysts during closing ceremonies.

Workshop venue, format and timing

- The ideal IPC workshop venue should be sufficiently spacious for a comfortable learning process. It needs to be equipped with a good **acoustic system** and microphones that allow discussions within a larger group. Multiple **white boards and projectors** will be required for power point presentations by the trainer and for group work.
- The IPC training can be organized in a **retreat type** format, where participants are housed at or near the meeting venue, or it can take place in form of day-time sessions. The first option offers clear advantages in terms of team building and securing the presence of participants throughout the entire process. It may however require a somewhat higher budget.
- Given the above advantages, previous IPC pilot classification workshops in Asia were preferably organized in a retreat type format.
- IPC training and classification workshops can be timed to either take place right after each other or with a **break in between** them. Both options have been used in previous pilots. Timing the training and classification workshop with a break of at least 1 to 1.5

months in between them however offers significant advantages in terms of data preparation, which is a key factor for the quality of the analysis and classification.

Workshop facilitation, services and materials

- The National IPC Coordinator is normally expected to act as a **facilitator/host/hostess** during training and classification events. One to two additional persons are usually needed to provide administrative and logistics support during the workshops.
- In pilot countries where analysts are not sufficiently conversant in English, there may be a need to provide **simultaneous translation** during all workshops and have key documents (such as the analysis work sheet and possibly also the IPC Manual) made available in the local language.
- Good quality binding needs to be ensured when heavily used **documents** (such as the IPC Manual) are produced for pilot workshops.
- The consistent use of **IPC and IPC partner logos** on all workshop documents and visibility materials (including backdrops, training certificates, name cards, notebooks, bags, t-shirts, etc) is important. Existing visibility IPC RSU, IPC GSU as well donor guidelines need to be respected.
- A systematic **evaluation of trainings and training impacts** helps to maintain the quality of IPC workshops and identify possible knowledge gaps that can be addressed during subsequent sessions. A simple pre- and post-training assessment of participant's actual knowledge and understanding of the IPC concept and analysis process may be considered.

8. Finalization of the IPC products

Pilot IPC classification workshops are generally expected to produce worksheet drafts for each of the classified geographic entities, as well as a draft IPC map reflecting the main conclusions documented in the worksheets. A number of follow-up activities are needed to subsequently transform these outputs into the final IPC report:

- The final IPC Report (Communication Template) is limited to an overall length of some 12 to 16 pages. The **front-page summary** typically contains the report title, date, a summary of causes, context and key issues, the IPC map, a list of the IPC partner agencies that conducted the classification and IPC contact information to receive additional information regarding the analysis. This is followed by **narrative report parts** containing additional information including:

- Background
 - Objectives
 - Achievements
 - Recommendations for Next Steps for Analysis and Decision-Making
 - Description of the IPC process and methods, including details on stakeholder consultations, the Technical Working Group and related bodies, zoning, indicators and the phase classification itself
 - Overview of Food and Nutrition Security Key Findings and Issues
 - Summaries of findings by analyzed zone or province.
 - Where appropriate, population table, food security seasonal calendar, etc.
- A consolidated draft of the report, already containing inputs from the IPC core analyst team and the IPC Regional Support Unit, can usually be developed within one to two weeks of the classification workshop. An essential part of this task is the detailed **review of the information** contained in the individual worksheets. Possibly existing inconsistencies in any of the worksheets need to be clarified at this stage. It also needs to be ensured that the **Source and Reliability Score** for each piece of evidence have been assigned and that the overall confidence level of the analysis is clearly indicated.
 - The national IPC coordinator normally leads this process in close collaboration with the government IPC housing institution, the IPC core team and the IPC Regional Support Unit. Depending on the country context there may be a need for more substantial technical RSU support during these processes.
 - Following the **validation of the draft report** by the TWG, a consultative meeting with key decision-makers of the IPC Steering Committee needs to be held to present findings and make, if necessary, any evidence-substantiated revisions before a public release.
 - Depending on the country context additional **local level validation** may be required.
 - As part of the IPC quality assurance process the TWG is required to complete the **TWG Self Assessment Tool** after each analysis.
 - In addition there is the option of requesting a Technical Peer Review to evaluate the technical rigor and validity of the analysis.

9. Planning and organization of IPC dissemination activities and IPC Open Days

- Effectively linking the IPC to decision support benefits from an overall **communication strategy** that identifies
 - target audience(s),
 - potential opportunities allowing an aligning of analysis and dissemination schedules with the timing of when decisions are made, and
 - appropriate mediums for the distribution of the IPC products.
- Potentially existing **in-house resources** of key IPC partner agencies (such as communications officers of respective FAO Representation offices) proved to be valuable assets for the development of communication strategies in other IPC pilots.

Opportunities for IPC side events

- Full use of **existing forums and events** such as food security and nutrition related conferences and seminars, donor coordination meetings, government agency board, planning or high-level coordination meetings, humanitarian cluster coordination meetings, media trainings, etc. should be made to present the results of the IPC analysis before considering to organize a stand-alone IPC dissemination workshop.
- Some seminars, conferences or high-level planning meetings may present suitable opportunities for linkages in form of **IPC side-events**, including IPC round-table discussions, IPC Open Days, media briefings or IPC information stands.
- Possibly existing regularly published national **Food Security and Nutrition or Early Warning bulletins** may be an ideal tool to disseminate IPC results in certain pilot countries. Making appropriate and timely arrangements for integrating / attaching IPC maps and reports in / to such pre-existing publications is essential.

IPC dissemination workshops

- If a **stand-alone IPC workshop** is seen as the preferred option for disseminating the findings of the IPC classification, it needs to be thoroughly planned and organized in order to have an optimal impact.
- Invitations may need to reach respective agencies up to two months ahead of the event to secure the participation of decision makers at the desired level. The **venue and speakers** of an IPC dissemination workshop directly reflect on the perceived quality of the IPC products.

- If a media briefing is part of an IPC dissemination workshop, it needs to be appropriately timed for maximizing attendance and coverage. **Press briefings** taking place before noon are generally expected to produce the best results. This may however depend on the specific country context.
- Depending on the country context **social media**, including twitter and facebook, are seen as an increasingly important means to help disseminate IPC products.

10. Lesson learning

Lesson learning is an integral part of any IPC pilot. It is essential for the **planning of a subsequent consolidation and institutionalizing** phase, but also helps in the future development of the IPC Manual and other guidelines.

- The documentation of lessons learned is one of the sections within the IPC Technical Working Group **Self-Assessment Tool** that the TWG chair and analysts are required to complete after each classification.
- A separate IPC **lesson learning meeting** may be organized following the completion of an analysis.
- In addition, stakeholders should be encouraged to **share related observations** and suggestions for improvements throughout the entire pilot process.
- The **compilation and documentation of lessons learned** is typically one of the tasks assigned to the national IPC coordinator. This point may need to be specifically mentioned in his/her TOR.
- A **report on the lessons learned** during the IPC pilot needs to be produced and shared with all stakeholders and the IPC Regional Support Unit.

* * *

Annex 2: Sample Technical Working Group Terms of Reference

Terms of Reference (TOR)

for the IPC National Technical Working Group¹ (TWG) in the Philippines

Background:

The Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) is a set of tools and procedures to classify the nature and severity of food insecurity for decision support. This is a common approach to classify food security with a technical consensus based on transparent evidence-based analysis. The technical consensus is achieved by forming a multi-stakeholder IPC National Technical Working Group (IPC TWG) representing different thematic areas and expertise (food security, nutrition, livelihoods, markets, agriculture, water/sanitation, statistics, disaster, gender, etc) to conduct the IPC analysis and by consulting with key decision makers as part of the process.

The regional “IPC in Asia: Special focus to strengthen IPC Capacity” project was initiated with support from the European Commission Humanitarian Office (ECHO). Objective of this project is to improve food security programming through standardized food security classification and analysis in six focus countries, including the Philippines. In each of the IPC Asia project countries, the IPC TWG will be hosted by an existing institution, which prevents duplication and also strengthens these institutions.

In the Philippines the National Nutrition Council (NNC) under the Department of Health (DoH) has been identified as the institutional home for the IPC, while the IPC TWG tasks will be carried out by the national “Food and Nutrition Security Technical Working Group” (FNS TWG) to be formed through amendments in the Republic of the Philippines Special Order No. 270 S 2003 relating to the TOR of the existing Food Security & Vulnerability Information & Mapping Systems (FIVIMS) Task Force. To be fully equipped for this additional IPC role, the FIVIMS Task Force composition will furthermore be broadened, to contain also analysts from so far non-represented stakeholder agencies (including relevant additional Government bodies, Local NGOs / Civil Society / Private Sector, International NGOs, Academia, UN Agencies and Programmes, Technical Agencies, etc).

The amending of TOR and the broadening of composition will also be applied to the FIVIMS Steering Committee and FIVIMS Core Group, resulting in a FNS Steering Committee and FNS Core Group.

¹ Proposed name for discussion – Philippines Food and Nutrition Security Technical Working Group (FNS TWG)

Key TWG TOR elements:

1. The FNS TWG will be based in the National Nutrition Council. It will be chaired by ... (*person to be elected by the members of the TWG*). The chairperson should call a meeting of the TWG whenever an IPC analysis needs to be conducted. This can happen as part of regularly scheduled/planned analytical cycles (e.g., seasonal analysis) or in an ad hoc manner (e.g., sudden onset crisis).
2. The size of the TWG should be in the range of 15 to 25 members. The TWG is composed of technical experts representing key stakeholder agencies and relevant sectors. All related key thematic areas/expertise like food security, livelihoods, nutrition, agriculture and natural resources, markets, climate, WASH, disaster, health, social welfare, development planning, etc. will be represented in the TWG. It is important to ensure that various sectors and disciplines; institutions (UN, NGOS, Govt. etc) and geographic areas are well represented in the TWG. A list of potential member organizations for the technical working group is included in the last section of this TOR.
3. Members of the TWG must have strong analytical capacity and knowledge in their fields. All members of the TWG will undergo a comprehensive training on IPC Version 2 before work on IPC analysis can begin. The training is expected to be for 4 working days and the analysis section will last for a maximum of 5 working days. Thus, the TWG has to commit for a minimum of 2 weeks in order to complete the core activities of the IPC.
4. The TWG members will actively participate and contribute in selecting appropriate frameworks and corresponding relevant indicators in the Philippines context from the list of IPC version 2 indicators and other set of indicators proposed by sectoral experts to be used in the IPC analysis in the Philippines.
5. TWG members who attend the training and conduct the IPC analysis will be formally certified as Level 1 IPC Trainers.
6. Members of the TWG must commit to bringing IPC-analysis-related data/information from their organizations (and / or any source they deem fit) to the TWG. As an example the organization representing agriculture/food sector should commit to provide information on production, consumption, availability of food, etc; nutrition sector on malnutrition; WASH on water and sanitation; disaster on hazard situation; climate on rainfall, temperature; livelihood on income and livelihood changes; market on availability, price of the food products, etc;
7. Members of the TWG must commit to working together as a group conducting critical, unbiased analysis, with the data that has been brought by each member, using the IPC protocols and methods.
8. Furthermore, the TWG should engage in the analysis in an objective, non-biased manner, with their only concern being to classify and describe food security situations as accurately as possible.

9. A consultation with the IPC Steering Committee and other relevant bodies should be held before findings are released, allowing for any revisions to be made that can be substantiated with adequate evidence.
10. The TWG will meet in regular intervals as required.
11. The TWG member agencies will communicate to / facilitate regional and district offices to actively participate in / contribute to the food security analysis at the district level and best utilize the information generated for programming decisions.
12. The TWG will advocate/communicate to relevant agencies at central level to influence on the policy/programme decisions based on the IPC analysis and the Phase Classification map / reports.
13. The FNS Steering Committee will facilitate further institutionalization and coordination of the TWG after the phase over of the Asia Regional IPC Project in the Philippines.

Formation of the National Technical Working Group

- This TOR will be circulated to potential member organizations for their comments on TOR and request for the expression of interest to be the part of TWG.
- Once the nomination/interest is received from the organizations receiving TOR, a consultation meeting will be held during which the formation of the TWG is finalized and related details are agreed upon.

IPC TWG TOR Annex A: Technical Working Group Matrix

Chairperson & Hosting Organization:		Stakeholder Organization Representation (aim to include at least one representative of all applicable groups)				
		Government of Philippines (at all relevant levels)	National NGOs/ Civil Society/ Private Sector	International NGOs	United Nations Agencies and Programmes	Technical Agencies
Area of Expertise (Include as relevant)	Food Security					
	Livelihoods					
	Nutrition					
	Markets					
	Agriculture					
	Climate					
	Health					
	Water/Sanitation					
	Gender					
	Statistics					
	Policy					
	Disaster					
	Other (specify)					
		Number of organizations				

The above matrix will be circulated amongst humanitarian/development actors in the Philippines. Interested organizations are requested to fill in the details and submit it back to the IPC National Coordinator.

Further guidance for completing the TWG Matrix:

- a. Insert name and organization of TWG members according to their organizational affiliation and sectoral expertise.
- b. There can be multiple names in each cell. Not all cells need to be filled. A single member can be repeated in different areas of sectoral expertise.
- c. To achieve IPC Technical Consensus, ensure representation by at least one person from each applicable stakeholder group.
- d. Ensure that each relevant sectoral area is represented (insert additional sectors as relevant).

IPC TWG TOR Annex B: Potential members for the IPC national Technical Working Group and/or Steering Committee

A. Government of The Philippines

1. Department of Agriculture
2. Department of Health
3. National Economic and Development Authority (NEDA)
4. National Statistics Office
5. National Statistics Coordination Board
6. Department of Education
7. Department of the Interior and Local Government (DILG)
8. Department of National Defense (DND)
9. Department of Science and Technology (DOST)
10. Department of Trade and Industry (DTI)
11. Department of Labor and Employment (DOLE)
12. Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR)
13. Department of Agrarian Reform (DAR)
14. National Anti-Poverty Commission (NAPC)
15. League of Municipalities
16. ...

B. I/NGOs

1. Oxfam
2. Helen Keller International
3. Care
4. Save the Children
5. ...

C. NGOs/Network/Civil Society and Private Sector

1. Philippines Red Cross Society
2. Human Development Network
3.

D. DONORs

1. EC
2. ADB
3. ...

E. UN Agencies

1. WFP
2. FAO
3. UNICEF
4. WHO
5.

F. Others

1.
2.

Annex 3: Sample National IPC Coordinator/Consultant Terms of Reference



Food and Agriculture organization of the United Nations

Terms of Reference for Consultant/PSA

Name:
Job Title: National Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) Coordinator
Division/Department:
Programme/Project Number: OSRO/RAS/102/EC Regional IPC Project in Asia - Philippines component
Location: Manila, Philippines
Expected Start Date of Assignment: 1 September 2012 Duration: 31 December 2012
Report to: Kazuyuki Tsurumi, FAO Representative in the Philippines

General Description of task(s) and objectives to be achieved

The ECHO funded project “Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) in Asia” is expanding its focus from four Asian countries: Bangladesh, Myanmar, Nepal and Pakistan now to include the Philippines. The project aims to introduce IPC for standardized classification of food security for advocacy planning, and response in food security and nutrition interventions at national and regional levels.

Under the overall supervision of the FAO Representative in the Philippines and World Food Program’s designated official, the technical guidance of the Regional IPC Support Unit for Asia, in particular the Regional IPC Coordinator / Chief Technical Advisor, the Regional Food Security Analyst and the Senior Food Security Consultant in the FAO Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific (RAP), and under the direct supervision of the Designated Official of the National Nutrition Council, the National IPC Coordinator (IPC-NC) in close collaboration with the IPC Technical Working Group members and in cooperation with counterpart national authorities, will assist in the identification, development, and monitoring of all activities attendant to the project.

The National Coordinator will work closely with the national, regional and local officials of line agencies and local government units (LGUs) directly concerned with the implementation of the project, particularly in drawing their support and coordinating the activities of the project with the ongoing programmes of their respective agencies.

In the course of project implementation:

- By facilitating the drafting and approval of a Department Order, in coordination with partner agencies, on the establishment of an IPC National Technical Working Group (NTWG) and the national implementation of IPC in the Philippines;
- By taking the lead – in close collaboration with the National Nutrition Council (NNC) and other key stakeholders, including key IPC partner organizations – in the preparation of detailed project work plan updates on IPC for the Philippines;
- By working with the various IPC partners, particularly the NNC, FAO and WFP in ensuring the effective and efficient IPC implementation process, including the timely generation of detailed information needs and maps from project partners and relevant institutions, as outlined in the work plan;
- In providing technical support for the IPC analysis and assist in the production of the narrative analysis and IPC maps for the Philippines;
- In promoting awareness on the project activities by organizing awareness events, and ensuring that the project partners are fully involved in the implementation of project activities;
- In preparing the project work plan and progress reports as needed according to the FAO-WFP-ECHO reporting format and schedules;
- Perform other functions that the FAO Representative, WFP designated officer or Senior Emergency and Rehabilitation Coordinator may assign occasionally which may contribute to the better attainment of project objectives.

At the end of the Project

- In preparing a final report consolidating all project activities, findings and recommendations for future actions in line with reporting requirements of FAO, WFP and ECHO.

KEY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS

Expected Outputs:

- IPC project work plan updates
- Training/workshop proceedings and evaluations
- Mid-term report (end of October)
- Terminal/technical report consolidating all project activities
- End-of-Assignment report

Required Completion Date:

On or before 31 December 2012

REQUIRED COMPETENCIES

Academic Qualifications

The candidate must have an advance degree in any field of agriculture, economics, statistics, food security, nutrition, management or rural development.

Technical Competencies and Experience Requirements

The candidate should have at least 5 years practical experience in agriculture and food security, nutrition related information management and analysis. Familiarity with national agency procedures and processes will be a strong asset. Must have a good facilitation of knowledge building and management experience in organizing and implementing participative training/workshops and gender issues.

Must be computer literate with ability to use effectively word processing, spreadsheets and office automation equipment and software. Good oral and writing skills in English, Pilipino and knowledge of other dialects in the Philippines would be beneficial. Ability to prepare correspondence, reports and briefs related to project activities.

V2 09/10

Annex 4: Sample of a formal agreement with a government housing institution



STATEMENT OF AGREEMENT

A. Agreement title

Piloting of IPC Version 2 in Cambodia as part of the implementation of the “Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) in Asia: Special Focus on Strengthening IPC Capacity” regional project.

B. Parties of this Agreement

This agreement is made between

The Council of Agricultural and Rural Development in Cambodia (CARD),
Office of the Council of Ministers,
#41, Russian Federation Blvd,
Phnom Penh,
Cambodia,

and

The Representation of the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) in Cambodia,
Street No. 370,
Boeung Keng Kang I,
Khan Chamcarmon,
House No.5,
Phnom Penh,
Cambodia

C. Objectives of the Agreement

The IPC was originally developed in Somalia under the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) Food Security Analysis Unit (FSAU). This successful experience led to the development of a standardized IPC approach that is now being used in several countries.

The IPC provides global standards and protocols for food security analysis and classification using a food insecurity severity scale. It is being promoted and supported globally by partnership of UN agencies,

international NGOs and donor agencies active in food security analysis and action. Now in use at national and regional levels in parts of Africa, Asia, the Caribbean and Central America, the IPC is gaining momentum as a global tool supported and used by a growing number of governments, UN agencies, NGOs, donors and academic institutions.

For Asia, the regional project “Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) in Asia: Special Focus to Strengthen IPC Capacity” aims to improve Food Security programming through standardized food classification and analysis. The project is funded by the European Commission for Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO) and executed by FAO in close collaboration with the World Food Programme (WFP). Currently, there are four focus countries: Bangladesh, Myanmar, Nepal and Pakistan. However, due to a high level of interest from governments, stakeholders and donors, it was decided to expand the scope of the Asia Regional project to Cambodia and the Philippines.

During an IPC stakeholder meeting called by the Council for Agricultural and Rural Development (CARD) on 1 August 2012 representatives of the Royal Government of Cambodia, UN and NGO community confirmed the interest to pilot IPC Version 2 during 2012 and urged the IPC Regional Support Unit (RSU) to organize the related activities, in particular the training programme.

The IPC stakeholder consultations during August 2012 furthermore resulted in the identification of CARD as the institutional home of the Cambodia IPC, an IPC Cambodia Work Plan (*Annex A*) and Terms of Reference (TOR) for a National IPC Consultant in Cambodia (*Annex B*).

A second IPC Cambodia stakeholder meeting held on 1 October 2012 resulted in the endorsement of TOR for the Cambodian IPC Analyst Group (*Annex C*) that will conduct the analysis.

With this agreement CARD and FAO confirm their during the stakeholder consultation process expressed support for the piloting of IPC Version 2 in Cambodia as part of the regional “IPC in Asia: Special focus to strengthen IPC Capacity” project.

D. Scope of the Agreement

The scope of this agreement is directly linked to the overall objective of the project component to equip Cambodian IPC analysts with the tools and resources to pilot IPC Version 2 in Cambodia and, as a result of the process, to classify the nature and severity of food insecurity for decision support in line with IPC frameworks and severity scales.

The IPC training and analysis process will result in the production of an IPC map and IPC report. The IPC map and report will be considered a joint product of the IPC Analyst Group (IPC AG). The final decision on the type of IPC analysis (chronic or acute) to be conducted in Cambodia, as well as the zoning and geographical scope of the pilot exercise will be made during the IPC training. When taking this decision, the IPC AG can also propose to conduct a complementary classification as part of the pilot project (for example to conduct also a chronic analysis in case an acute analysis is selected as a first exercise).

The production and dissemination of the joint IPC map and report are at the same time the main output of the IPC initiative.

The Cambodia IPC map and report will be produced in English and Khmer language.

E. Obligations of CARD

The Council for Agricultural and Rural Development (CARD) has been identified as the institutional home for the IPC in Cambodia, while the IPC analysis tasks will be carried out by the Cambodian national “IPC Analyst Group” (IPC AG) to be formed through the broadening of the existing Food Security and Nutrition Data Analysis Team (FSN-DAT). To be fully equipped for this additional role, the FSN-DAT will, for the IPC tasks, be joined by additional analysts from so far non-represented stakeholder agencies (including relevant additional Government bodies, Local NGOs / Civil Society / Private Sector, International NGOs, Academia, UN Agencies and Programmes, Technical Agencies, Research Institutions, etc).

CARD will chair the IPC AG and as such call for meetings of the IPC AG whenever required for the piloting of IPC Version 2. In implementing the IPC activities under this Agreement, CARD shall be the lead National Government Agency. Detailed roles and responsibilities of IPC AG members are described in the endorsed TOR of the IPC AG.

CARD serves as the Secretariat to the IPC AG. The IPC AG Secretariat ensures, as part of its tasks, the circulation of IPC related documents and requests to all stakeholders.

CARD will facilitate the dissemination of the final IPC map/report, as well as the further institutionalization and coordination of the IPC processes in Cambodia.

F. Obligations of FAO

The IPC Asia Regional Project based in the FAO Regional Office in Bangkok will provide the required technical and financial support for the implementation of activities and services according to the approved work plan (*Annex A*).

A National IPC Coordinator shall be recruited by FAO, in collaboration with CARD and WFP to assist in the identification, development, implementation, and monitoring of project activities. The supervisory arrangements shall be determined in mutual consultation between CARD, FAO and WFP and described in the relevant terms of reference (*Annex B*).

The IPC Regional Support Unit will make available an IPC resource person in Cambodia who will be in charge of consolidating the analysis outputs into a narrative, analytical report and an IPC map. Interaction with CARD and WFP will be ensured through the nomination of respective focal points that the IPC resource person in Cambodia can consult during this process. The IPC resource person in Cambodia, with the support of the IPC Regional Support Unit, will be in charge of incorporating

comments, overall proofreading, editing and formatting as well as producing the final, publishable report.

G. Duration and Termination of Agreement

The arrangements described in this Agreement will remain in effect until the end of the agreed on activities in the IPC Cambodia work plan, or until terminated in writing by either party.

All core activities under this regional IPC project need to be completed prior to the end of 2012. Certain complementary activities may become eligible to be added for implementation during the winding down/phase over period from January to March 2013 if agreed on by stakeholders and approved by the donor.

Any amendments to this Agreement shall be effected by mutual agreement between CARD and FAO, in writing.

H. Annex

The following three attached, separate documents are integral parts of this agreement:

-Annex A: IPC Cambodia Work Plan

-Annex B: Terms of Reference (TOR) for the National IPC Consultant in Cambodia.

-Annex C: TOR for the Cambodian IPC Analyst Group.

I. Signatures

Based on the foregoing and in accordance with the scope and work plan of IPC Version 2 piloting in Cambodia, we confirm to commit and agree to the collaboration between CARD and FAO.

His Excellency Rath Virak,

Secretary General of the Council for Agricultural
and Rural Development (CARD)

Nina Brandstrup

FAO Representative in Cambodia

Date:

Date: