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I. Summary

The Uganda national IPC analysis workshop was a successful event and a demonstration of good collaboration of the IPC units; the global, regional, and country level. We conducted the workshop facilitation as a team and exchanged information about opportunities and challenges experienced at different levels. The analysis findings illustrated overall improvement of the national food security situation. With the exception of Karamoja region which was classified under phase 3, all the other regions are now in Phase 1 and 2. An improvement was also noted for Karamoja region in the sense that the population in Phase 3 greatly reduced to below 700,000 people with moderate risk of slipping to Phase 4 compared to previous analysis findings1 where the population in Phase 3 was above 1 million with high risk of slipping to Phase 4. However, in areas classified under Phase 1 and 2 there were localized spots that can be classified under Phase 3. These spots are areas where people (relatively small numbers) have been affected by landslides and floods that destroyed their livelihoods. The areas are found at the foot of Mt. Elgon (Mt. Elgon region) and foot of Kabale highlands in western (South Western region) Uganda. These spot areas are receiving support for recovery from the government and humanitarian community. Generally, agencies are already adjusting their interventions by cutting down on relief efforts like food aid and intensifying other food assistance interventions mainly in Acholi and Karamoja regions.

II. Background

(1) Period of the workshop: April 26 to 30, 2010
(2) Validity period of Analysis: February to July 2010
(3) Objectives of the workshop:
   (a) Update the meta-data analysis with new data for the sub-regions

---

1 IPC analysis workshop of September 2009.
(b) Update the regional/national IPC map together with the analysis templates and summary statements based on the meta-data analysis

(c) Build capacity on the use of the IPC among the Uganda food security community

(3) Participants: over 50 participants from different stakeholders including Government, NGOs, UN, and Academia attended the workshop.

III. Observations

(1) Technical Analysis – The national teams have good knowledge of the technical analysis process. However, the analysis performance in some of the regions was constrained by limited data. The region was the unit of analysis but heavily reliant on district level data. My interpretation was that more data is available in the districts but wasn’t brought to the table due to communication challenges at the time of preparing for the workshop. The workshop was also convened hurriedly due to reasons beyond control of the organizers. Despite this constraint, the teams were able to make credible decisions based on convergence of evidence of the data available.

(2) Unit of Analysis – The region as administrative area is used as unit of analysis. This posed some challenge in determining the Phase for the whole region due to a mix of different livelihoods that potentially could be classified under different Phases. A livelihood zoning (LZ) assessment was completed end of last year by FEWSNET. The Food Security & Livelihoods Cluster (FSLC) members are studying the zoning report in order to make a decision about the application of LZ as unit of analysis in future.

(3) Experience of the technical specialists – Many of the technical specialists had received training from the national Technical Working Group (TWG) few weeks before the workshop. That round of training benefited about 180 specialists from 60 districts. For most of them it was their first time to participate in the national analysis. They illustrated good understanding of the analysis process but more time of practice is required to enhance their analytical skills. Further training of specialists from 34 districts that were not reached during the round of training is necessary to complete coverage of the whole country.

(4) Institutional Process – There was good representation of participants from the regions mainly of Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF), but the UN and NGO representation was relatively minimal. The government representatives demonstrated commitment and motivation in conducting the analysis. A senior government official closed the workshop, a demonstration that the government was
committed in embracing the IPC. In his closing remarks he committed his support in addressing the problems of data availability.

(5) Use of the IPC analysis products – It was noted that the use IPC products was limited especially at the district level. This is partly because of their little awareness about the tool and its products. This is an opportunity for creating more awareness about IPC and widely disseminating the products.

(6) Peer review of the products – The FSLC meeting is yet to be convened to review the products. During the previous analysis event the last day of the workshop was used for peer review but this time it was skipped and more time allocated to regional presentations. The national team was aware about the importance of the peer review process especially to get opinions and buying of most stakeholders before the products dissemination.

IV. Advice Provided

(1) Peer review of the products – We (Global & regional facilitation team) advised that a peer review event be organized immediately to vet the products. The national team proposed to conduct this event on May 10th or 11th 2010. The participants for the peer review will be the FSLC members and other food security and nutrition professionals from the academia and civil society.

(2) Workshop products dissemination – The analysis final products (map and report) will be finalized and ready for dissemination end May 2010. We advised the products be disseminated widely at national and district level. The dissemination should entail not only sharing the products as hard and soft copies but also organize short presentations to relevant influential audience at both national and district level. The FSLC could seek the global and regional support where appropriate. The FSLC already requested (global & regional) support for the national dissemination event.

(3) Data management – We advised that:
   (a) Conduct data mapping at district level, and establish what surveys are done periodically at that level.
   (b) Review and improve data collection formats used at district level
   (c) Establish an information system for sharing data between national, regional, and district level.
   (d) District officials to send data to FSLC for vetting before convening the national analysis workshops.
(4) Livelihood Zones – We advised the FSLC team to hasten review of the Livelihoods Zoning study and make a decision about its application in IPC analysis.

(5) Training – We advised immediate training of specialists from the remaining 34 districts in order to achieve complete national coverage. In future all trained staff should participate in the national analysis workshops.

(6) Communication about IPC events – We advised review and improvement of the communication process between the FSLC, agencies not represented at the FSLC and also the district officials.

(7) Technical analysis – We advised on the essence to set up district TWGs. These groups will drive awareness raising and interest of the IPC at district level as well as improving the data management process.

V. Lessons learnt

(1) It is critical for the FSLC to receive data, vet, and cover gaps before convening a national analysis workshop.

(2) It is necessary to establish focal points at district level to track, collect, update and perpetually manage data rather than just before the analysis workshops.

VI Conclusion

There is good government commitment especially the Ministries of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) and Office of the President but more efforts are necessary to bring on board other Ministries dealing with Water, Health, and social services, as well as the district administrations. Follow on support in training and technical analysis is necessary from the global and regional level.