Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)

ACUTE FOOD INSECURITY SITUATION OVERVIEW

REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN

PROJECTED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PHASE</th>
<th>POPN ('000'S)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,357,401</td>
<td>49.76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,035,900</td>
<td>9.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2,491,741</td>
<td>23.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,881,429</td>
<td>17.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= 10% of Population

Key outcomes for the worst affected areas:
- Food Consumption: Overall
- Livelihood Change: No significant changes in Livelihoods
- Nutrition: It is Alarming where, GAM rates 9.0-19.5%, SAM rates 1.5-5.3%
- Mortality is very serious; CMR 0.06-1.72/10,000/day USMR 0.31-2.28/10,000/day

Summary of the causes, context and key issues:
- over all causes and key issues were:
  a) Harvest 2011 (deficit)
  b) Civil security - conflict escalation at border
  c) Inflation (market food prices)
  d) Seasonal factors (rains)
  e) Flooding and isolation of populations/markets
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**Key Findings and Issues**

(Briefly discuss key findings)

The projected trend of the food insecurity situation in the Republic of South Sudan based on assumptions of most likely scenarios is expected to deteriorate along the borders with the areas under emergency widening. In particular most of Eastern flood plains are forecasted to fall in phase 4 (emergency) with pockets in iron stone plateau, western flood plains and Nile Sobat corridor with about 17% (1.9 Million) of the population will likely be affected. The rest of the 2/3 of the country will remain in phase 3 (crises) totaling to 23% (2.5 Million). While the green belt and hills and mountains livelihood zones will remain in phase 2(stressed).

The under listed factors are the contributing agents to the deteriorating food insecurity situation in the country:

- Continuous conflicts at the border with Sudan likely to intensify resulting to high displacement, disruption of agricultural activities and trade
- Civil conflicts particularly in Jonglei, Warrap and lakes States due to cattle rustling
- Food access will be affected because of significant increase in market prices
- Inflation and increasing fuel prices due to devaluation of the South Sudan Pound
- The lean season lasting up to the next harvest in August
- Seasonal factors (rains – floods, isolation of population and markets)

**Methods & Key Issues**

(Write a brief description of the IPC Methods and challenges encountered during analyses)

The unit of analysis is the livelihoods zones and five or more persons per group from the very livelihood zone are involved in the analysis. The group consensus is reached through convergence of evidence, the data used in the analysis is from Central and State Governments, WFP, FEWSNET, FAO and NGOs located in the livelihood zone. The IPC analytical framework and acute food insecurity reference tables are used; this provides reference outcomes and general response objectives for five phases of acute food insecurity. The challenge is the availability of data especially the pre harvest and post harvest nutrition data and computing the population figures

**Processes, Institutions and Ownership**

(Discuss the process for IPC meta-analyses, including Technical Working Group composition and procedures, institutions involved, and ownership of findings)

IPC fast track training for the analyst was conducted in two days and the remaining 3 days were for analysis. The analysis was chaired by the coordinator of the livelihoods analysis forum from the National Bureau of statistics. Although there was poor attendance of this particular analysis by NGOs, never the less there was a significant number of stakeholders from Government institutions. The usual members of the TWG from the UN agencies and few NGOs were part of the process. They include the National Bureau of Statistics, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry, Ministry of Animal Resources and Fisheries, Ministry of Health, FAO, WFP and Intermon Oxfam. The Government of the Republic of South Sudan owns the map and is responsible for sharing and disseminating the product. All the stakeholders mentioned above are responsible for the analysis and are in agreement with the results of the analysis.

**Food Security Seasonal Calendar and Monitoring Implications**

(Inset seasonal calendar relevant to monitoring food security analyses in the coming year)

**Recommendations for Next Steps**

(Discuss expected and recommended next steps focusing on analytical activities, monitoring actions and linkage to action)

The technical working group team is discussing the possibility of changing the unit of analysis to administrative boundaries to solve the challenges experienced in computing population figures. In addition, the nutrition surveys done by many NGOs including Food security monitoring systems by WFP are done according to administrative boundaries. The new IPC focal persons need more training to enable them improves their monitoring skills.

**Contact for Further Information**

IPC Technical Working Group: kenyisolomon@gmail.com, lokugori@yahoo.com, mogigoalex@hotmail.com

IPC Global Support Unit: [www.ipcinfo.org](http://www.ipcinfo.org)
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Detailed Population Table

(Insert a detailed population table merging the population tables of all areas. Level of reporting should be the lowest administrative unit sub-divided by household food security situation groups when applicable)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimal 1</th>
<th>Stressed 2</th>
<th>Crisis 3</th>
<th>Emergence 4</th>
<th>Famine 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Zone</td>
<td>243120</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>189515</td>
<td>47670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron Stone Plateau</td>
<td>335918</td>
<td>293928</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>209949</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hills and Mountains</td>
<td>110,207</td>
<td>165,312</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>551,085</td>
<td>275,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Flood plains Zone</td>
<td>1,554,832</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>758,128</td>
<td>442,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green belt</td>
<td>65,133</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>131,916</td>
<td>32979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Flood Plain</td>
<td>140,099</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>349,507</td>
<td>108,3021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nile Sobat River</td>
<td>814,159</td>
<td>576,660</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>305,291</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Graphic Populations Percentage by Phases

[Graphic chart showing population percentages by phases for different regions]