

Moving Towards a Common Approach *for* Food Security Analysis and Response:

***The Contribution of the Integrated Food Security
and Humanitarian Phase Classification (IPC)***

***International Technical Meeting
Meeting Report***

21-22 March, 2007, Rome

Executive Summary

→ The IPC is widely regarded as an innovative approach for improving food security analysis and informing decision making. Developed originally in Somalia by FAO's Food Security Analysis Unit (FSAU) the IPC is now being adapted in the wider Horn of Africa region and beyond. Within the last year alone, specific country-level activities have taken place in Kenya; Sudan; Tanzania; Indonesia and Cambodia, in addition to a number of regional activities and consultations in East / Central and Western Africa.

The increased number of IPC initiatives originating at national level points to a strong demand for increased comparability, transparency and rigour in food security analysis within country. Initial implementation experiences highlight the value added of an evidence based, meta-analysis approach and the merit of anchoring this in field based experiences. For many agencies and national authorities the IPC has the potential to provide technical consensus and a common language for classifying the severity of food insecurity, as well as promoting clear early warning, improved information use and more strategic response.

However, the increased number of IPC initiatives, often spearheaded by different actors, highlights the need for a shared technical and institutional approach. This is required to ensure a common, comparable approach and outputs, the eventual outcome of which would contribute to more appropriate responses according to need.

In this context on 21 and 22 March, 2007, FAO hosted an International Technical Meeting titled *"Moving Towards a Common Approach for Food Security Analysis and Response: The Contribution of the Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification (IPC)"*. The purpose of the meeting was:

- To identify technical priorities and follow up processes for refining the IPC methodological approach based on contributions from a four week online technical consultation and ongoing country exercises.
- To identify strategic next steps in the global development of the IPC approach, including required elements for a global consortium in the area of food security analysis and response.

The meeting was attended by fifty participants drawn from thirteen international NGO's, agencies and academic centres including: Care International, EC Joint Research Centre, FAO, FEWS-NET, Food Economy Group, FSAU Somalia, ICRC, OCHA, Save the Children UK and US, Tufts University, USAID and WFP. The meeting was followed by a de-briefing with a number of interested donor representatives from the EC, CIDA, DFID and USAID.

The two day meeting focussed initially on technical issues, with the second day devoted to institutional aspects. To facilitate this FAO undertook a four week Online Technical Forum in advance of the meeting. This forum included all meeting participants in addition to over 100 additional experts in the area of food security, nutrition and livelihoods. These discussions resulted in the workshop background paper, as well as establishing a community of practice focussed specifically on IPC issues.

Concerning **technical issues** there was a broad consensus on the potential value added of the IPC approach for strengthening food security analysis using an evidence-based, meta-analysis approach. It was recognized that iterative efforts will be required to develop and refine the IPC approach, which should be informed by active learning at country level. Key outcomes from the discussions included:

- The technical utility of the IPC in its current form was appreciated and opportunities were identified for improvements and clarifications. Key issues included (i) the focus and purpose of the IPC, (ii) guidance on the underlying process of analysis and interpretation, (iii) how to strengthen IPC supporting tools including the cartographic map and population tables, (iv) clarifying degree to which IPC includes a response analysis and how the linkages to situation analysis and response planning.
- Specific issues that require future development and guidance were identified through working group exercises. Mechanisms to resolve technical issues were identified including the constitution of a technical working group and interim advisory panel and the continued use of the online technical facility for peer review and discussion.
- The relevance of continued learning from ongoing country level implementations was reinforced. It was recognised that greater efforts are required to actively distil the lessons and experiences of ongoing country and regional initiatives.
- Participants agreed that Version 2 of the IPC Technical Manual should be developed within the coming year.

Concerning **institutional issues**, agencies pledged their commitment to a common approach in developing the IPC and agreed on a multi-agency proposal for moving forward. Key outcomes included:

- FAO, WFP, Oxfam GB, FEWSNET, Save the Children UK, Save the Children US, Care International agreed on a multi-agency strategy to develop, implement and advocate a commonly accepted, standardized approach for classifying food insecurity to inform the allocation of resources according to need.
- Agencies recognised that the proposal provided a common starting point and that further engagement would be required for its development.
- In developing the proposal it was also recognised that specific attention should be given to support national and regional processes to ensure consistency. In this sense the global facility should be designed to complement existing capacities and structures at national and regional level.
- Moving forward agencies also emphasised the need to be inclusive to other partners and different actors e.g. donors, academia.
- In line with the technical discussions, agencies agreed that IPC development should be field-driven to facilitate action learning at country level.

Key workshop conclusions included:

- There is wide-spread commitment and active engagement amongst to move forward in a

common approach on IPC development.

- The successful IPC development will need to be demand driven at the country-level activities, supported by active learning.
- Specific attention should be given to support national and regional processes to ensure sustainable and consistent IPC approaches.
- The technical credibility of the IPC in its current form is appreciated, yet refinements and clarifications will be required in the immediate and longer term.
- The resolution of a number of technical and institutional issues is part of an ongoing process of deliberations between stakeholders.

Moving forward the following recommended steps emerged from the meeting:

<i>March 2007</i>	Feedback to donors including EC, USAID, DFID and CIDA on outcome of meeting.
<i>April 2007</i>	Consultation process to be launched and facilitated by FAO on the modalities of multi-agency project proposal.
<i>May 2007</i>	IPC special event at Committee on World Food Security meeting to engage with national representatives on IPC development.
<i>May 2007</i>	Interagency Meeting to develop programme proposal. June 2007: Finalisation of programme proposal.

In parallel, the following recommendations emerged to facilitate technical development:

<i>May 2007</i>	Refine proposed technical development plan recommended at International Meeting to address immediate and more substantive technical priorities.
<i>May 2007</i>	Identify institutional mechanisms for further technical development and peer review and agreement on time-line for activities.
<i>May - Oct. 2007</i>	Immediate Technical Activities including guidance notes, lesson learning templates, online forum continuation.
<i>May 2007</i>	Longer term technical issues including initial regional. Dec 2008 consultations and systematic country lesson learning.

Table of Contents

Background and Rationale	6
1. Food Security Analysis and Response: Key issues and the Contribution of the IPC	7
1.1 Food Security Analysis and Response: Some Key Issues	7
1.2 IPC in Context: Background and Strategic Direction	8
2. IPC Key Technical Issues	9
2.1 Introduction to IPC Technical Issues	9
2.2 Cross Cutting Technical Issues	9
2.3 Specific Technical Issues	11
2.4 Main outcomes on technical issues	15
3. Institutional Issues	13
3.1 Key Institutional Concerns regarding the IPC	13
3.2 Multi-agency strategy and wider institutional implications	13
3.3 Main outcomes on institutional issues	
4. Moving Forward on the IPC	15
4.1 Field Perspectives	15
4.2 Technical and Institutional Way Forward	16
Conclusions	17
Appendix 1: <i>List of Participants at IPC International Meeting, March 2007</i>	19
Appendix 2: <i>Workshop Agenda for IPC International Meeting</i>	21
Appendix 3: <i>Working groups composition</i>	23
Appendix 4: <i>Summary of Key Issues from IPC Online Technical Forum</i>	24
Appendix 5: <i>Working Group Reports on Technical Issues (Day 1)</i>	25
Appendix 6: <i>Proposal for a Multi Agency Strategy</i>	30

Background and Rationale

→ *In the cross-cutting fields of food security and humanitarian response, there are increasingly strong calls for improved analysis and the effective use of available information to ensure more appropriate and need-based responses.*

The IPC is widely regarded as an innovative tool for improving food security analysis and decision-making. Developed originally in Somalia by FAO's Food Security Analysis Unit (FSAU) the IPC is now being adapted in the wider Horn of Africa region and beyond by a number of international agencies and national authorities. For many agencies, the IPC has the recognised potential to provide technical consensus and a common language for classifying the severity of food insecurity. It also promotes clearer early warning and information use and more strategic responses

Initial IPC implementation experiences indicate that a shared technical and institutional approach can contribute to more appropriate responses according to need and with lower transaction costs.

In this context, FAO convened an International Technical Meeting of leading experts and partner agencies with the aim of distilling key technical priorities and charting a common approach for future IPC development. The meeting took place in Rome on

21-22 March, 2007 and was followed by a half-day briefing with donor representatives from the EC, DFID, CIDA and USAID.

The two-day IPC Workshop offered a unique opportunity for stakeholders to exchange views on the future development of the IPC. In preparation for this meeting FAO conducted a one month IPC Online Technical Forum (Appendix 1) to identify and discuss key technical and institutional issues related to the IPC amongst meeting participants, as well as a range of wider experts and agencies with a strategic interest in its development. Appendix 3 outlines the key findings of the IPC Online Technical Forum.

50 participants drawn from 13 international NGO's, agencies and academic centres attended the IPC workshop including: Care International, EC Joint Research Centre, FAO, FEWSNET, Food Economy Group, FSAU Somalia, ICRC, OCHA, Save the Children UK and US, Tufts University, USAID and WFP.

In introducing the meeting, Mr. Prabhu Pingali, Director of FAO's Agricultural Economics Division (ESA) stressed FAO's involvement in addressing food security in crisis contexts through its considerable normative and operational activities. Mr. Pingali welcomed the diverse range of representatives and agencies in attendance, noting that an effective IPC approach depends on

the combined expertise and inputs from a range of agencies.

Mr Guenter Hemrich (Facilitator) outlined the objectives and expected outputs of the meeting. Identified objectives included:

- Identifying technical priorities and follow-up processes to refine the IPC methodological approach based on contributions from the Online Technical Forum and implementation exercises.
- Identifying strategic next steps in the global development of the IPC approach, including required elements for a global consortium related to food security analysis and response.

Expected outputs included:

- Placing IPC thematic and institutional issues in a broader food security analysis context.
- Distilling thematic issues from IPC online forum and identifying ways to address them.
- Deepening understanding of institutional challenges related to IPC application.
- Proposing institutional options for a multi-agency collaboration and agreeing on the presentation of findings at a follow up donor meeting.

1. Food Security Analysis and Response: Key Issues and the Contribution of the IPC

1.1 FOOD SECURITY ANALYSIS AND RESPONSE: SOME KEY ISSUES

→ *Professor Dan Maxwell's keynote address focussed on key political, policy and technical issues in the broad area of food security analysis and response. The keynote address then raised a number of concerns of relevance to the workshop discussions on IPC.*

Prof. Maxwell reflected on some of the key issues raised in the seminal literature in the area of emergency response and needs assessment. Drawing from Darcy and Hoffman, According to Need (2003) it was recalled that:

- International humanitarian financing is not allocated equitably and does not tend to reflect comparative levels of need.
- There is no system-wide framework for judging the relative severity of crises and for aligning responses accordingly.
- Donors are skeptical about agency's assessments. Agencies doubt that objective assessments inform resource allocations.

Regarding emergency food security programming it was further highlighted that interventions were rarely based on analysis or designed to address needs; were often based on pre-existing interventions and often ignored existing information (Levine and Chastre, 2004)

Prof. Maxwell posed two

questions of central concern:

- Can we really do comparative analysis that truly enables impartial response?
- Can we link this analysis in a practical way to interventions?

In recognising the confounding political factors, as exemplified by the Greater Horn of Africa crisis in 2005-2006, Prof. Maxwell drew attention to technical and political aspects that could have enabled improved analysis and response.

Prof. Maxwell stressed the importance of contextual information and the importance of striving for 'good enough' rather than perfect analytical practices for strengthening analysis. In strengthening response, Prof. Maxwell cautioned against equating food security problems with a food gap and noted the continued repeated mobilisation of resources despite compelling evidence to the contrary.

In closing, Prof. Maxwell noted the unavoidable influence of security and geo-political concerns (including the media) in shaping response, in addition to the limiting constraints posed by weak agency capacities on the ground.

Pointing to some considerations for the way forward Prof. Maxwell recommended the following:

- Push for an analysis that ena-

bles impartial response, but does not downplay contextual knowledge; focus on "good enough" analysis.

- Prioritize good response analysis; justify the type of resources requested, not just the amount; evaluate actual resources used in response.
- Factor risk into the political economy of response; look for windows of opportunity to effect real change at the policy level.

The plenary discussion questions then centred on: the role of the media; limited financing for analysis and diagnostics in the humanitarian sector; the institutional separation of 'humanitarian' versus 'development' interventions.

1.2 IPC IN CONTEXT: BACKGROUND AND STRATEGIC DIRECTION

The IPC has been developed since February 2004 by the FAO Food Security Analysis Unit Somalia (FSAU) with a broad range of technical partners and donors including WFP, FEWS, European Commission, US AID and the local authorities.

Beyond the Somalia context, the IPC is now being adapted as an analytical and advocacy tool in the Horn of Africa context, in addition to other pilot countries. Previous regional adaptations of the IPC have taken place in the context of the CAP Horn of Africa drought appeal and the FAO Regional Plan of Action activity.

The development of the IPC is anchored in country level activities. Eastern and Central Africa has been prioritised for roll out of the IPC approach owing to a strong humanitarian imperative, existing regional and national capacities and institutional frameworks. A project proposal is now under discussion to support IPC development activities in Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda. The EC FAO programme also supports activities in Sudan and Ethiopia and is raising awareness of the IPC approach in West Africa. In addition, WFP is undertaking a number of pilot exercises outside of the African context - these include Cambodia and Indonesia.

The further development of the IPC is therefore part of an iterative learning process in which

the following agencies have played a significant initial role: FAO, FEWSNET, Oxfam GB and WFP. Within FAO, the IPC development planning process is led by the Agriculture and Development Economics Division (ESA) with support from FAO's Emergency Operations and Rehabilitation Division (TCE). At the regional level in Central And East Africa an interagency steering group has been set up through the Regional Food Security and Nutrition Working Group (FSN-WG) which acts as an important institutional mechanism. The steering group is serviced by a secretariat from FAO's Regional Emergency Office for Africa (REAO).

The scope of IPC development focuses on (i) country and regional implementation of the IPC approach (ii) global development of the IPC and related tools. Initial preparatory activities during 2007 have focussed initially on technical development, training, communications and partnership development. Beyond 2007, the project offers a platform for developing, implementing and advocating a commonly accepted, standardized tool for classifying food insecurity.

The technical development and adaptation of the IPC is also facilitated by a technical review process including an online consultative forum, IPC Online and a series on partnership meetings with donors and international agencies.

Moving forward, the following strategic concerns have emerged:

- There is a clear need to develop a common approach for classifying and communicating food security by developing, refining and applying the IPC amongst a number of agencies.
- There is a recognised need to develop technical aspects of the IPC, including adaptation requirements that might emerge from different contexts.

2. IPC Key Technical Issues

→ *A key objective of the meeting was to identify technical priorities and follow-up processes to refine the IPC methodological approach based on contributions from IPC Online Technical Forum, implementation exercises and the expertise of assembled participants.*

To this end an expert panel was convened to identify and elaborate on key technical issues related to the IPC. This was followed by a series of five parallel working groups which examined specific technical issues of concern.

Given the depth and variety of technical issues under discussion, the meeting was preceded by a four week IPC Online Technical Forum. The forum was a platform for meeting participants to engage with each other and a wider arrange of further experts to discuss and identify key technical issues related to the IPC.

Based upon these discussions a synthesis report was prepared which served as a background discussion paper for technical discussions. Refer to Appendix 3 for a synopsis of the IPC Online Discussions.

2.1 INTRODUCTION TO IPC TECHNICAL ISSUES

An expert panel was convened to identify and elaborate key technical issues related to the IPC based on the online discussions and in light of their own

experiences and expertise in the development and implementation of the IPC.

The panel consisted of Mr. Nicholas Haan (former Chief Technical Advisor, FSAU Somalia; Consultant FAO); Ms. Cindy Hollemann (Chief Technical Advisor, FSAU); and Ms. Joyce Luma (Chief, Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Branch, WFP).

Mr. Nicholas Haan reflected on the rationale for an IPC to inform more appropriate and timely responses to food security and humanitarian crises. In introducing the technical discussion, Mr. Haan pointed to the wide-spread interest in the development and application of the IPC and highlighted the potential opportunities that could be derived from reaching technical consensus and using a 'common language' in the area of food security analysis and response; the value of clearer early warning and situational analysis and the potential of improved strategic response interventions.

At the outset Mr. Haan noted a number of challenges that emerged from the development of the IPC. Mr. Haan noted the considerable expectations emerging from the IPC and argued that it should not be considered as the overall panacea to improved food security analysis and response. While the IPC provides a breakthrough in improved situation analysis, it also helps to identify information

gaps, for example, in the areas of baseline and early warning information and response analysis. The IPC at a minimum provides a platform for consolidating and drawing together improved information and to motivate improvement in related areas such as response analysis.

Notwithstanding the above challenges, a number of clear opportunities are evident. The IPC offers a platform to broker technical consensus by bringing analysts with different agency perspectives together. Consensual analysis has the potential to provide decision makers with clear and transparent evidence and options for response. Furthermore, ongoing country exercises in the Horn of Africa and beyond present opportunities for continuous technical refinement and improvement.

2.2 CROSS-CUTTING TECHNICAL ISSUES

Ms. Cindy Hollemann (Chief Technical Advisor, FSAU) and Ms. Joyce Luma (Chief, Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Branch, WFP) identified cross-cutting technical issues related to the IPC building on the IPC Online Technical forum discussions and drawing from their own expertise in the development and implementation of the IPC approach.

The following key themes emerged:

Focus and Purpose of IPC

The IPC is designed to address both food security and humanitarian concerns. There is a need to clarify the focus of the IPC in terms of whether it is a food security or humanitarian tool, or indeed both. Another concern is whether or not the IPC is a tool for comparing food security severity and to what degree it can also be a tool for risk assessment, based on an understanding of early warning questions.

The question of focus highlights the debate on the inclusion of acute and chronic aspects in the phase classification scale, since this may introduce temporal elements which may not be directly comparable. This raises challenges related to technical refinement. A number of solutions have already been put forward e.g. the introduction of new terminology for the phase classifications to reflect only on severity.

During the panel discussion, a note of caution was expressed on introducing such changes. While they may appear to be simple, they carry profound implications in terms of the utility, strategic focus and interpretation of an IPC analysis.

IPC Process of Analysis

IPC analysis is underpinned by a set of objective outcome indicators which aim to provide a transparent and technically neutral analysis for needs based responses, rather than negotiated responses driven by perceptions, political bias or expected

resources. In the analysis and interpretation of such indicators the guiding IPC principle is to use a range of indicators that lead to a 'generally correct' rather than 'precisely wrong' analysis. This means using the IPC approach for sound analytical conclusions backed by evidence rather than a narrowed debate on 'right' thresholds and weighting systems.

To this end, IPC analysis should be primarily concerned with convergence in the analysis of reference outcome (indicators) rather than convergence among indicators. This ensures that an analysis can be based on the contextual understanding of the relationship between different reference outcomes, their temporal interaction and the overall analytical 'story'. Guidance materials to inform analysis and interpretation should be identified.

Situation Analysis and Response Analysis

The IPC strategic response framework focuses on providing a generic framework to ensure that response interventions address immediate negative outcomes, support livelihoods and address underlying causes. An integral component of the IPC is the delineation of response analysis and response (options) analysis as distinct steps in the process of response, which logically fit between situation analysis and response implementation.

In this sense the strategic response framework is purposely designed to be generic, yet com-

prehensive enough to give broad guidance regarding appropriate response. The framework is a rudimentary component of this IPC and aims to offer a critical bridge to the area of response analysis. However the area of response analysis is still underdeveloped with little guidance for analysts and decision makers to prioritise/sequence appropriate interventions e.g. CAP NAF, Post Conflict Needs Assessments.

There is also a need to identify whether or not a response analysis is included in an IPC approach and who should conduct this. It should be realised that a response analysis requires different sets of skills that may also be specific to a given context. The current approach stresses a very generic approach to response with an identification only of the broad areas for intervention without actually specifying what an intervention may be. While there are some opportunities in ensuring that analysts covering situation and response analysis liaise and have an active dialogue, there is also a risk of overlapping both functions. This may compromise the focus and neutrality of the IPC analysis.

IPC Supporting Tools

The IPC approach is underpinned by a number of supporting tools to ensure a transparent and credible evidence base. The inclusiveness of the IPC approach in brokering technical consensus across multiple sectors is also significant.

Regarding IPC supporting tools, there are a number of opportu-

nities, issues and concerns.

IPC Analysis Templates:

The opportunities provided by IPC analysis template include (i) organising and simplifying complex information into an easily understood summary of evidence; (ii) drawing on a wide range of quantitative and qualitative information without prescribing a specific method; (iii) providing a transparent approach for classification based on evidence and supporting peer review; and (iv) coordinating action and monitoring progress.

Some possible challenges include (i) reducing subjectivity in the analysis template process; (ii) managing convergence of evidence where data problems exist; and (iii) the willingness of actors to engage in analysis process.

Priorities for next steps include: (i) establishing a global technical clearing house for technical guidance; (ii) issuing terms of reference for an IPC analytical group; (iii) revising the templates to ensure they are easier to understand - with particular focus on convergence of evidence issues; and (iv) providing guidelines on key technical issues including minimum partnership standards required to undertake IPC analysis.

IPC Cartographic Protocol:

IPC maps (cartographic protocols) communicate a large amount of complex information for decision making and can enable comparability across space (regions/countries) and time.

The IPC Map aims at providing a quick 'snap-shot' of the food security and humanitarian situation. It covers critical key information including severity, early warning, projected trends, magnitude and immediate/underlying causes. The map has a strong potential for communication, especially for the last two phases. However, some initial country level exercises have shown areas where the IPC map presentation could be improved. These include clarification on the difference between the IPC 'projection trend' and the 'early warning level' and a clearer depiction of the actual severity and magnitude of a situation.

Finally, regarding decision makers' use of the map, the following questions were raised: Should the IPC map be used with a narrative template? Are additional maps required for different audiences and different time durations? Will the map be presented as a print out or on a visual monitor?

IPC Population Tables:

The IPC Population Tables aim at providing decision makers with a consistent situation analysis of the 'population in need of assistance'. However there is little guidance on how population estimates can be conducted for a particular phase. Without this, an analysis may lack comparability across time and space and the overall magnitude of a situation may be unclear. This is an area for further work.

Key Issues in Plenary Discussion:

The plenary discussion raised a set of key concerns which were discussed by working groups:

- The extent and activities of IPC exercises currently ongoing outside of Somalia.
- The focus of the IPC and the incorporation of livelihood and nutrition aspects.
- The overlay of vulnerability and administrative maps in IPC analysis.
- The predictive capacity of the IPC and incorporation of early warning information.
- Understanding the demand for an IPC tool and clarifying what decision makers need in terms of information and analysis.
- The separation of situation analysis and response analysis and to what extent both discrete areas could be linked together.
- The scope for using the IPC for different crisis typologies
- The strategic significance of maintaining a combined food security and humanitarian focus.

2.3 SPECIFIC TECHNICAL ISSUES

Throughout the meeting parallel working groups focussed on specifying key technical issues and identifying the nature of the problem and opportunities to respond.

The working group exercises were informed by the initial IPC Online Technical Review and background reading notes and synthesis reports were provided

to each group.
Throughout the parallel working exercises the groups completed appropriate reporting templates detailing their findings

more substantive concerns on a number of issues.

(see Appendix 5).

A summary table was then prepared by the preparation team identifying the main technical areas highlighted and classifying the type of follow up strategy which might be foreseen in addressing each issue (See Table below). The follow up strategies varied from simple clarifications, to further technical guidance to

#	Key Issues Identified by Parallel Working Groups	Nature of Proposed Opportunities for Follow Up				
		Now	6Mths	1Yr	2Yr	3Yr
		Simple Clarification	Substantive Clarification	Technical Guidance Notes	Technical Working Group Review	Piloting & Field Testing
	Early Warning & Phase Classifications					
1	Labelling & Definition				x	x
2	Chronic / Multidimensional Factors				x	x
3	Early Warning /Projections			x	x	x
	Key Reference Outcome Indicators					
4	Clarify focus of IPC		x	x		x
5	Data Adequacy/Coverage			x		
6	Data Availability/Validity			x		x
7	Convergence in Analysis			x		x
8	Baseline Data Requirement			(x)		
	Strategic Response Framework					
9	Link in Situation Analysis & Response Analysis	x		x		
10	Clarify RA requirements at global / national level			x		x
11	Steps to guide interpretation			x		x
12	Understand how decision makers use IPC					x
13	Linking technical + program experts in analysis			x		x
	Analysis Templates					
14	Communications			x	x	x

3. Institutional Issues

→ *The second major objective of the meeting was to address institutional aspects. The specific workshop objective was to identify strategic next steps in the global development of the IPC approach, including required elements for a global consortium in the area of food security analysis and response.*

The plenary and working group discussions focussed on institutional aspects related to two key areas: (i) key thematic issues impacting on institutional considerations (ii) institutional issues related to the use and application of the IPC approach at national, regional and global level.

3.1 KEY INSTITUTIONAL CONCERNS REGARDING THE IPC

The first morning session was devoted to understanding some key concerns and basic principles that should be considered in the development of institutional arrangements for the IPC approach.

Prof. Peter Walker provided a key note introduction and put forward 7 basic 'good ideas' for any partnership arrangement.

This included:

- Net value must go up. All must benefit.
- Building trust with communication is worth it.
- Make sure we all agree on the purpose.

- One over arching conceptual model.

- Invite people for a purpose not organizations for politics.

- For complex systems, Delphic processes often beat reductionism.

- Changing institutions takes time. Persistence counts.

Based on the intervention by Prof. Walker the plenary discussion focussed on identifying basic concerns related to IPC institutional arrangements. This included greater awareness on:

Purpose of Partnership:

Agencies should have a clear understanding of the purpose of the partnership and should work together to forge a common starting point in the development of institutional arrangements.

Working Principles:

Agencies should agree on some clear basic principles to support institutional arrangements at the international, regional and national level.

Collaboration:

IPC development should have a multi-agency and multi-stakeholder approach, drawing from a plurality of methods and existing information. Institutional mechanisms are required to provide a platform for fostering technical consensus and appropriate response

Active Learning:

The development of the IPC should be field-driven and based

on lessons learned from solid experience. Lesson learning should be facilitated and reinforced by peer review to allow for transparency and credibility.

3.2 MULTI-AGENCY STRATEGY AND WIDER INSTITUTIONAL IMPLICATIONS

Mr. Chris Leather introduced a joint multi-agency proposal set out by FAO, WFP and Oxfam (Appendix 7) focussed on the development, implementation and adaptation of a commonly accepted, standardized approach for classifying food insecurity to inform the allocation of resources according to need.

In outlining the proposal Mr. Leather stressed the following key points:

-Added Value of multi-agency approach

- A way for organisations to work together to reach consensus on the food security and humanitarian situation and appropriate response

- Credible evidence-based country level analysis

- Enables global comparison of the severity and magnitude of food insecurity

- Links complex information to action

-Iterative process in applying and developing the IPC:

- Gradual approach;

- Learn lessons from field application;

- Lessons learned feed into technical development (aim: produce version 2 of the Technical Manual)

- Ongoing application & technical development

-Establishment of global level structures to facilitate development & application e.g.

- Technical Advisory Group, possibly with 2 tiers :

- A core group of 5-6 technical specialists;

- Broader group of senior representatives (to meet 1 or 2 times/year);

- Steering Committee: comprised of donors, WFP, FAO, and others partners

- To meet every 2 months to review progress;

- Implementation Structure: multi-agency technical unit:

- To provide technical support;

- To collate & communicate analysis at the global level;

A number of institutional concerns emerged on the basis of the presentation by Prof. Walker and Mr. Leather which related to (i) key thematic issues impacting on institutional considerations (ii) institutional issues related to the use and application of the IPC approach at national, regional and global level.

Key thematic issues impacting on institutional considerations

included:

- *Focus of IPC:* There was debate regarding the precise focus of the IPC as either a tool for humanitarian or food security analysis or both. It was noted that the IPC specifically integrates both food security and humanitarian aspects, which is fundamental to the basic approach.

- *IPC and Response Analysis:* The IPC is primarily a tool for situation analysis however a number of agencies also recognise the need to meet response analysis requirements.

Specific institutional concerns related to the use and application of the IPC approach included:

- *Institutional mechanisms at country level:* Appropriate institutional mechanisms at country level are foundational to ensuring the relevance of the IPC approach as well as buy in and feedback from national and local decision makers.

This has been the rationale around initial awareness raising initiatives within East and Central Africa. Here a common theme has been to reinforce the neutrality of IPC institutional structures e.g. location within specific ministry (e.g. Kenya).

- *Institutional mechanisms at international level:* The role of a global facility to support country and regional exercises was further recognised. The added value of inter-agency collaboration should be to ensure appropriate oversight and peer review of IPC activities.

This could be achieved through a number of light structures including a technical support unit, advisory group and steering panel.

4. Moving Forward on the IPC

4.1 MAIN OUTCOMES ON TECHNICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL ISSUES

→ *Concerning technical issues there was a broad consensus on the value added of the IPC for strengthening food security analysis using the evidence-based, meta-analysis approach. Key outcomes from the discussions included:*

- The technical utility of the IPC in its current form was appreciated and opportunities were identified for improvements and clarifications relating mainly to (i) the focus and purpose of the IPC (ii) guidance on the underlying process of analysis and interpretation (iii) how to strengthen IPC supporting tools including the cartographic map and population tables.
- Specific issues that require future development and guidance were identified through working group exercises (See Table 1). Mechanisms to resolve technical issues were identified including the constitution of a technical working group and interim advisory panel and the continued use of the online technical facility for peer review and discussion (See Section 4.3).
- The role of continued learning from ongoing country level implementations was reinforced. It was recognised that greater efforts are required to actively distil the lessons and experiences of ongoing country and re-

gional initiatives.

Concerning institutional issues, agencies pledged their commitment to work towards a common approach in developing the IPC and endorsed a multi-agency proposal for moving forward. Key institutional outcomes included:

- FAO, WFP, Oxfam GB, FEWSNET, Save the Children UK, Save the Children US, Care International agreed on a multi-agency strategy to develop, implement and advocate a commonly accepted, standardized approach for classifying food insecurity to inform the allocation of resources according to need.
- Agencies recognised that the proposal provided a common starting point and that further engagement would be required for its development.
- In developing the proposal it was also recognised that specific attention should be given to support national and regional processes to ensure sustainable IPC approaches. In this sense the global facility should be designed to complement existing capacities and structures and national and regional level.
- Moving forward agencies also emphasised the need to be inclusive to other partners and different actors e.g. donors, academia.
- In line with the technical discussions, agencies agreed that action learning at country level

is the critical in IPC development.

Participants agreed that Version 2 of the IPC Technical Manual should be developed within the coming year.

4.2 FIELD PERSPECTIVES

During the second day a specific working groups discussed field expectations and recommendations on IPC development and implementation. The following box presents a synthesis of issues raised:

(see picture in the next page)

Expectations from IPC Development and Implementation
<p>The practitioners involved in IPC country exercises expected that the IPC development and implementation will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - ensure consistency in the IPC approach between country, regional and global level, with clear definition of the functions at each level - allow for feedback and lesson learning from the field and guidance from the central level - improve capacity for food security analysis - ensure that minimum standards are reached in IPC implementation
Recommendations for Implementation at Country Level
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Promote greater awareness raising 2- Define an overall strategy based on the country context 3- Make a checklist of implementation steps including technical and institutional aspects 4- Organize training and identify trainers and resource people 5- Build capacity on livelihood / concepts / framework etc. 6- Create practical "how to" manual 7- Build a guidance / technical support group 8- Create a list of practitioners/ experts 9- Support funding requests / proposals 10-Ensure permanent regional support 11-Document lessons learned
Recommendations for Implementation at Global Level
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Ensure physical representation 2- Continue the technical development of IPC 3- Support institutional/process learning and sharing 4- Develop technical guidelines for country-level application 5- Contribute to budget / programme development
Recommendations for Implementation at Regional Level
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- Consolidate experience from lesson learned 2- Facilitate peer review / harmonization of process 3- Ensure capacity building of regional institutions

4.3 TECHNICAL AND INSTITUTIONAL WAY FORWARD

Additionally, separate working groups discussed key recommendations for moving forward on technical and institutional issues.

The following box presents a synthesis of the main recommendations.

<i>Recommendations on Technical Ways Forward</i>	<i>Recommendations on Institutional Ways Forward</i>
<p><u>Establish Technical Advisory Group and Core Technical Team:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Core Technical Team to act as interim technical advisory group, to advise on technical issues ▪ Advisory Group : Composed of agency and additional experts to facilitate peer review <p><u>Immediate Areas of Activity: Months 1-6</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Technical Guidance notes on a number of areas identified in working group synthesis discussions ▪ IPC Online Collaborative workspace developed to support lesson learning ▪ Lesson learning reporting aided for all meetings ▪ Translation of documents to French <p><u>Longer Term Areas of Activity : Months 1-18</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Regional consultations across the globe ▪ Systematic approach to lesson learning from pilots ▪ Establish Technical Help Desk/Clearing House ▪ Peer reviewing 	<p>By the end of June a multi agency plan incorporating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Iterative process of application, learning and technical development ▪ Institutional Structures at Global Level <p>Next Steps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FAO agreed to draft and share a more detailed information with group as soon as possible e.g. concept paper to develop implementation plan ▪ Working Group Meeting around May 21st ▪ Finalisation of implementation plan proposal by end June

Conclusions

→ *In the workshop wrap up and evaluation report there was a consensus amongst participants that the workshop objectives had been reached and that the workshop had been valuable in terms of action orientated discussions, technical clarifications and networking opportunities.*

Key observations emerging from workshop participants included :

- There is wide-spread commitment and active engagement amongst broad stakeholders to move forward on IPC development. It is recognised that a common approach can contribute to more appropriate response and lower transaction costs
- Successful IPC development will need to be demand driven at the country-level activities, supported by active learning. Greater effort is required to facilitate lesson learning at country and regional level and to ensure the field practitioners contribute more to the ongoing discussions.
- Specific attention should be given to support national and regional processes to ensure sustainable IPC approaches. Global support should be tailored to complement existing capacities and structures and national and

regional level consistency.

- The technical credibility of the IPC in its current form is appreciated, yet refinements and clarifications will be required in the imfinements and clarifications will be required in the immediate and longer term. This will involve the identification of mechanisms for technical review including allocation of technical staff, establishment of peer review mechanisms and leverage of online technology.
- The resolution of a number of technical and institutional issues is part of an ongoing process of deliberations between stakeholders.

Footnotes

¹And further confirmed in the workshop evaluation, available upon request.

Moving forward the following recommended steps emerged from the meeting:

March 23, 2007:

Feedback to donors including EC, USAID, DFID and CIDA on outcome of meeting.

April 2007:

Consultation process to be launched and facilitated by FAO on the modalities of multi-agency project proposal.

May 2007:

IPC side-event at Committee on World Food Security meeting

May 2007:

Interagency Meeting to develop programme proposal

June 2007:

Finalisation of programme proposal

In parallel, the following recommendations emerged to facilitate technical development :

May 2007:

Refine draft plan of action proposed at International Meeting to address immediate and more substantive technical priorities.

May 2007:

Identify institutional mechanisms for further technical development and peer review and agree on time-line for activities.

May – Oct. 2007:

Immediate Technical Activities including guidance notes, lesson learning templates, online forum continuation

May – Dec. 2008:

Longer term technical issues including initial regional consultations and systematic country lesson learning.

Appendix 1

[PARTICIPANTS LIST]

Full name	Organization	E-mail
Agnès Dhur	WFP	Agnes.Dhur@wfp.org
Alain Mourey	ICRC	amourey@icrc.org
Alexis Hoskins	WFP	alexis.hoskins@wfp.org
Calum Mc Lean	FAO	calum.mclean@fao.org
Carsten Völz	CARE	voelz@careinternational.org
Chris Leather	Oxfam GB	CLeather@oxfam.org.uk
Chuck Chopak	FEWS	cchopak@fews.net
Cindy Holleman	FAO	cf.holleman@fsau.or.ke
Colin Andrews	FAO	Colin.Andrews@fao.org
Daniel Maxwell	TUFTS	daniel.maxwell@tufts.edu
Daniele Donati	FAO	Daniele.Donati@fao.org
Darlene Tymo	WFP	darlene.tymo@wfp.org
Denise Melvin	FAO	Denise.Melvin@fao.org
Florence Egal	FAO	Floronce.Egal@fao.org
Francesco Del Re	FAO	Francesco.DelRe@fao.org
Gary Eilerts	USAID	geilerts@usaid.gov
Gina Kennedy	FAO	Gina.Kennedy@fao.org
Guenter Hemrich	FAO	Guenter.Hemrich@fao.org
Helen Young	TUFTS	Helen.Young@tufts.edu
James Tefft	FAO	James.Tefft@fao.org
Joyce Luma	WFP	joyce.luma@wfp.org
Kostas Stamoulis	FAO	Kostas.Stamoulis @fao.org
Laura Hammond	FEG	lchammond@btinternet.com
Laura Mattioli	FAO	Laura.Mattioli@fao.org
Luca Alinovi	FAO	Luca.Alinovi@fao.org
Luca Russo	FAO	Luca.Russo@fao.org
Marcela Villarreal	FAO	Marcela.Villarreal@fao.org
Margarita Flores	FAO	Margarita.Flores@fao.org
Mark Lawrence	FEG	ml657@tiscali.co.uk
Mark Smulders	FAO	Mark.Smulders@fao.org
Michael O'Donnell	Save the Children UK	m.o'donnell@savethechildren.org.uk
Mona Chaya	FAO	mona.chaya@fao.org
Neil Marsland	FAO	Neil Marsland@fao.org
Nicholas Haan	FAO	nhaan@t-ana.com
Paul Howe	WFP	Paul.Howe@wfp.org
Peter Walker	TUFTS	peter.walker@tufts.edu
Phumzile Mdladla	FEWSNET	pmdladla@fews.net
Prabhu Pingali	FAO	Prabhu.Pingali@fao.org
Richard Choularton	FEWSNET	rchoularton@fews.net

Full name	Organization	E-mail
Suzanne Jaspars	Independent Consultant	Sjaspars@aol.com
Thierry Antoine	EC	thantoine@yahoo.fr
Thierry Negre	EC	Thierry.NEGRE@ec.europa.eu
Tina Lloren	SC-US	tlloren@dc.savechildren.org
Tobias Flämig	WFP	Tobias.Flaemig@wfp.org
Wolfgang Herbinger	WFP	Wolfgang.Herbinger@wfp.org
Scott Ronchini	WFP	Scott.Ronchini@wfp.org
Norah Niland	OCHA	niland@un.org
Mark McGuire	FAO	Mark.McGuire@fao.org

Appendix 2

[MEETING AGENDA AND PREPARATION TEAM]

<i>IPC International Technical Meeting March 21-22nd, 2007 – Hotel Gianicolo Rome</i>		
IPC International Meeting - Agenda for Day 1		
Time	Session Title	Person
9.00 – 9.30	Introduction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Welcome and Opening Introduction of Participants Workshop Agenda, Objectives and Process Expected Output: Common Understanding of Objectives and Scope of the Workshop	Prabhu Pingali Guenter Hemrich/ Facilitation Team
9.30- 10.15	Scene Setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Key Note Address: Food Security Analysis / Response IPC in Context: Background and Strategic Direction Expected Output: Understanding of how IPC fits into bigger context; strategic direction	Dan Maxwell Flores/Alinovi
10.15-10.45	Coffee Break	
10.45-11.45	Key Technical Issues: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Joint Panel Presentation on key thematic issues arising from IPC Online Questions and Answers Expected Output: Key thematic issues distilled from IPC Online, broadly endorsed within plenary	N. Haan (Technical Expert & Chair) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2 Panel Discussants
11.45-13.00	Prioritizing and Moving Forward on Key Technical Issues (Part 1): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working Groups develop elements for broad problem statement based on IPC online debates and draft texts. 	5 Parallel Work Groups (based on IPC Online discussion categories) with technical facilitators and reporters.
13:00–14:15	Lunch	
14.15-15:30	Prioritizing and Moving Forward on Key Technical Issues (Part 2): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working groups chart opportunities to address key issues (i) in advance of IPC Technical Manual revision and (ii) beyond IPC Technical Manual deadline. Informed by IPC synthesis reports. Coffee Break Expected Output: Recommendations of broad opportunities to consider in technical review before and after Technical Manual revision.	5 Parallel Work Groups with technical facilitators and reporters.
16:00-17:30	Reporting back from working groups and plenary discussion	Facilitator/Reporter
17.30-17:45	Day's Closure and Wrap Up	Facilitator
18.00-20.00	Workshop Cocktail Reception	

IPC International Meeting – Agenda for Day 2		
Time	Session Title	Person
8.30-8.45	Recap of Day 1 Agenda for Day 2	Participant Facilitator
	Expected Output: Common Understanding of agenda and objectives for Day 2	
8.45-10.15	Key Institutional Issues & Implications: Global, Regional and Country Level <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Presentation of key issues from IPC Online ▪ Proposal of Multi-agency Way forward by FAO and WFP at Global Level ▪ Questions and Answers <p>* The session will include a quick synthesis report from the preparation team on technical ways forward arising from Day 1 deliberations.</p>	TBD FAO – WFP Multi-agency Strategy Presentation
	Expected Output: Understanding of key institutional implications at global, regional and national level.	
10.15-10.30	<i>Coffee Break</i>	
10.30-12.30	Institutional Issues: Break Out Groups (Part I)	<u>Parallel Work Groups</u> Technical Experts TBD
	Expected Output: Agreement on key issues and priority areas	
12.30-14.00	<i>Lunch</i>	
14.00-16.00	Institutional Issues: Break Out Groups (Part II)	<u>Parallel Work Groups</u> Technical Experts TBD
	Expected Output: Common understanding for multi-agency way forward under global consortium; guidelines on institutional mechanisms, requirements at different levels	
15.45-17.00	Plenary Wrap Up on Institutional Issues	
17.00-17.30	Formal Workshop Closure and Announcements Evaluation	Flores Facilitator
Workshop Close		

[PREPARATION TEAM]

Facilitator: Mr. Guenter Hemrich
Event Organiser: Mr. Colin Andrews
Technical Resource Person: Mr. Nick Haan
Logistics and Administration: Ms. Laura Mattioli
Additional Workshop Preparation: Ms. Denise Melvin,

Appendix 3

[WORKING GROUPS COMPOSITION]

Day 1

Group 1

Working Group Theme: Phase Classification and Early Warning

Working Group Members: Cindy Holleman, Agnès Dhur, Michael O'Donnell, Gary Eilerts, Luca Alinovi, Scott Ronchini, Wolfgang Herbinger, Thierry Antoine.

Group 2

Working Group Theme: Reference Outcome Indicators

Working Group Members: Chris Leather, Alexis Hoskins, Chuck Chopak, Margarita Flores, Gina Kennedy, Neil Marsland, Dan Maxwell.

Group 3

Working Group Theme: Response Analysis

Working Group Members: Calum McLean, Darlene Tymo, Danielle Donati, Thierry Negre, Susanne Jaspars, Peter Walker, Richard Choularton.

Group 4

Working Group Theme: Analysis Templates

Working Group Members: Helen Young, Tobias Flämig, WFP, Laura Hammond, Joyce Luma, Alain Mourey, Mark Lawrence, Florence Egal

Group 5

Working Group Theme: Maps and Population Protocols

Working Group Members: Paul Howe, Mark Smulders, Luca Russo, Tina Lloren, Francesco DelRe,

Day 2:

Working Group Theme: Institutional Issues

Working Group Members: Peter Walker, Chris Leather, Gary Eilerts, Michael O'Donnell, Joyce Luma, Carsten Völz, Darlene Tymo, Luca Alinovi, Margarita Flores.

Working Group Theme: Technical Issues

Working Group Members: Richard Choularton, Laura Hammond, Denise Melvin, Neil Marsland, Agnès Dhur, Suzanne Jaspars, Helen Young, Nicholas Haan, Colin Andrews.

Working Group Theme: Field Requirements

Working Group Members: Alain Mourey, Francesco Del Re, Daniel Maxwell, Gina Kennedy, Tina Lloren, Scott Ronchini, James Tefft, Cindy Holleman, Tobias Flämig, Alexis Hoskins.

Appendix 4

[SUMMARY OF KEY ISSUES FROM IPC ONLINE TECHNICAL FORUM]

Conclusions

Figure 1 highlights the key technical issues emerging from the IPC Online technical discussions:

Figure 1: Summary of Key Issues from IPC Online Technical Forum Discussions

Discussion 1: Overall Challenges

1. Clarifying focus of IPC – a humanitarian / food security tool, or both?
2. Combining current and future trends under one framework - Situation Analysis versus Early Warning; acute versus chronic
3. Prioritizing responses in terms of severity: The implications of a severity measurement?
4. Reducing subjectivity in process of analysis

Discussion 2: Phase Classifications and Early Warning Elements

5. The inclusion of Chronic Dimensions of Food Insecurity
6. The Phase Classification Labels and General Descriptors
7. Incorporation of future severity and its probability: early warning aspects

Discussion 3: Key Reference Outcomes

8. The adequacy and coverage of current reference outcome indicators:
9. Convergence in analysis of reference outcome indicators, not “among” indicators:
10. Baseline Information Requirements

Discussion 4: IPC Strategic Response Framework

11. Strengthening the IPC link between Situation Analysis and Response Analysis:
12. Development of Response Options Analysis Protocols

Discussion 5: IPC Analysis Templates

13. Reducing bias and subjective influences in analytical process
14. Convergence of evidence given data problems
15. Engaging different actors in analytical process

Discussion 6: IPC Analysis Templates

16. Estimating magnitude through IPC Population Tables
17. Improving presentation of IPC Cartographic Protocols
18. End use of the IPC Cartographic Protocol by decision makers

Note: Discussion 7 on Institutional Issues is not included in this preliminary technical report

Appendix 5

[WORKING GROUP REPORTS ON TECHNICAL ISSUES (DAY 1)]

Group 1: Phase Classifications and Early Warning Levels			
PART 1		Part 2	
Top Priority Issues (Suggestion Maximum 5)	Specific Problem Statements	Opportunities to address the problem	Expertise to draw from (institutions, people, articles, ideas, practice)
1. Labelling and definition of phases	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The current scope of IPC is somewhat unclear, due to the word "humanitarian". So which sectors are covered/ excluded, and who should participate in the IPC? ▪ Based on that, how should the phases be labelled/ do they need to be re-labelled? ▪ Is the number of phases adequate for capturing the range and diversity of situations we encounter? ▪ Depending on the scope of IPC, should we be categorising crises (e.g. food crisis, health crisis, etc.)? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small group with wide representation to develop proposals. Have a debate/ consultation with stakeholders and take a poll on various options. Consider how to include other users/ stakeholders, e.g. ntl govts, donors?). [3-6 months] ▪ (Ensure institutional debate on Thursday facilitates this.) ▪ Technical discussion of labels and number of phases linked to the above. ▪ Include feedback from country pilots ▪ Iterative learning during piloting – make IPC development an ongoing process, but with a coordinating body ensuring minimum standards/ quality control, and more "step by step" learning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Small technical group of representatives from different sectors ▪ IPC Online Forum members ▪ Field practitioners involved in pilots ▪ Users of IPC

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Try piloting in more diverse settings [ongoing process] 	
2. Consideration of Chronic issues/ multi-dimensional nature of problem	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ At present the distinction between the temporal and severity dimensions of food insecurity is blurred in IPC. Hence there is concern over the sequence of phases and how phase 2 in particular fits in. How can we clarify the distinction? ▪ The labels "chronic" and "acute" are unclear ▪ Should IPC capture the temporal dimension (and if so, how?), or should that be outside IPC? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Place the emphasis of the phases strictly on severity ▪ Remove "chronic" from the label for Phase 2, and replace with "borderline" or "vulnerable" or some other such term [do within 6 months] ▪ Work on how to capture the temporal dimension some other way ▪ Consider the implications for analytical framework and response framework ▪ Refine the terms ▪ Give guidelines/ principles [longer term process] 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Academics ▪ Practitioners ▪ Users
3. Coverage of early warning and projections	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ We need a projection of some sort, but how do we clarify the distinction between "early warning", "projection" and "imminent" and clarify the timeframes for IPC? ▪ What should the timeframe be for projections/ early warning? ▪ How do we get comparability within countries, regions and across regions with different seasonal patterns? ▪ How can we ensure greater transparency in the early warning classification? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Piloting in E&C Africa is a good opportunity to test and learn from experience, as they have also identified these problems and are working on addressing them. Try to formalise the learning more. ▪ Those revising manual need to articulate the early warning framework better: more concrete conceptual and methodological guidelines ▪ Possibly have a longer process with a working group to develop this further 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ FSNWG in Nairobi/ practitioners in the field ▪ Nick/ authors of the new Technical Manual

Group 2: Key Reference Outcomes			
PART 1		Part 2	
Top Priority Issues (Suggestion Maximum 5)	Specific Problem Statements	Opportunities to address the problem	Expertise to draw from (institutions, people, articles, ideas, practice)
To agree on the reference outcome indicators, it is imperative to identify the <u>focus</u> of the IPC: does it mainly focus on food security or broader humanitarian analysis	Food Security should be the main entry point, while recognizing links to other sectors (nutrition, health, etc). Food security should be one component of a holistic analysis to meet the needs for a truly "humanitarian" IPC.	Explain the focus of the IPC in the manual and associated policy documents	This focus recognizes that IPC practitioners are mainly food security experts who would not necessarily be qualified to analyze the entire range of humanitarian issues in other sectors.
<p>1. Adequacy/coverage of indicators:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Overall, agree that indicators are valid, some are more "objective" than others Missing indicator: access to income Questionable indicator: disease (epidemic, pandemic) 	<p>Given the focus on food security, need to emphasize <u>food access and coping strategies</u> consistently in all Phases: e.g. include coping strategies in Phases 1 and 5.</p> <p>This implies assigning greater weight to these two indicators (rather than malnutrition/mortality)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Include access to income as an indicator Possibly use a list of diseases with prevalence thresholds 	Rely on judgement & contextual knowledge of in-country, multidisciplinary experts, especially because we rely on proxies for food access

2. Availability & validity of data is often poor	There is no need for a "minimum" amount of data, as long as the IPC includes a confidence rating (low confidence when data are poor/spotty)	Develop standards for rating reliability of data and include in IPC Manual	Possibly use Sphere Guidelines' minimum standards for assessments
<p>3. Convergence of indicators:</p> <p>The IPC analysis should be primarily concerned with convergence in the analysis of reference outcome (indicators)</p>	Guidance is required on how to arrive at convergence of indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to explain linkages between indicators; Develop a decision tree Manual should include more guidance on the convergence process and identify the underlying analytical frameworks that guide the analysis 	Rely on in country and multi-sectoral experts, work in transparent, open manner
4. Need to collect baseline information	A baseline is needed to contextualize, help identify trends and guide responses but it is not realistic to expect that we can collect these data in all cases		

Group 3: Strategic Response Framework			
PART 1		Part 2	
Top Priority Issues (Suggestion Maximum 5)	Specific Problem Statements	Opportunities to address the problem	Expertise to draw from (institutions, people, articles, ideas, practice)
1. IPC includes response analysis. Response analysis and situation analysis need to be done together. But sequentially.	Situation and response analysis is often completely separate. Interface with programmers/ decision makers	Pilots in Kenya and Indonesia Meet with programmers during response planning Examine how IPC fits into existing planning processes.	WFP Indonesia, Cambodia and Kenya experience.
2. Local and global requirements are different Distinguish response analysis at national and global level. IPC to focus on response analysis at national/local level, which can then be fed into global system.	Needs of decision makers are different at local and national levels.		
3. Review what programme decision makers actually do with information provided through IPC			Places where IPC has been applied

4. Need for steps (conceptual framework) to guide interpretation and response analysis (prioritising underlying causes, provide options to address food insecurity, steps to guide appropriate response; e.g. food availability, markets, livelihood systems. Identify broad intervention areas which are then followed up by sector experts?			
5. Agreement/consensus about the right responses to a particular situation. Allow for minority views, which has to be justified with the same rigour as consensus view.		Ensure participation of all key technicians and programmers in response analysis to ensure that local context is taken into account.	

Group 4: IPC Analysis Templates			
PART 1		Part 2	
Top Priority Issues (Suggestion Maximum 5)	Specific Problem Statements	Opportunities to address the problem	Expertise to draw from (institutions, people, articles, ideas, practice)
1. Presentation/communication of conceptual understanding	<p>Templates need to follow <u>exactly</u> the logical flow and reflect the conceptual underpinnings of the IPC.</p> <p>Templates are not user-friendly in some aspects:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Missing Links - Logical flow of analysis does not always mirror conceptual framework outlined in manual text 	<p>Reorganise/review template so that it mirrors conceptual framework outlined in the manual text</p> <p>Dissemination processes of the framework</p> <p>Need more guidance in manual on how to link impacts on asset types to short term and medium- to long-term</p> <p>Include food consumption explicitly</p>	
2. Convergence (conceptual issues)	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Convergence of analysis vs. convergence of evidence – are these two different things? 2. Need consensus on a common conceptual framework even if it is derived from a range of methodological frameworks – this requires explicit statement of definitions, linkages of elements of the framework 3. Lack of data may limit ability to conduct analysis 4. Need guidance on defining and weighting direct/indirect evidence 5. Need to recognize that data may sometimes result in divergence 6. Should there be a minimum set of evidence/indicators for a phase classification to be made? 7. How should phases be defined from multiple evidence types? 8. Need to review reference 	<p>Typology of crisis types</p> <p>Guidance for different stakeholders:</p> <p>Technical:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - what is distinction between direct and indirect evidence? - Minimum set of evidence to ID phase <p>Decision-makers</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - clarify role of international technical support <p>Restructure list of outcomes to reflect causality</p> <p>Review reference outcomes – where does divergence occur and what does that tell us about causation, the development of severity, etc.</p>	

	<p>outcomes</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 9. Need to restructure list of outcomes to reflect causality 10. Need to include food consumption explicitly 		
3. Early Warning	<p>Unclear when EW is useful (not phase 5!)</p> <p>How does IPC capture trends and make projections?</p> <p>Need timeframe for phase and EW – maps are confusing as they cover next six months as well as 'EW status'</p>	<p>Guidance: how to derive early warning</p> <p>Consider how different indicators suggest different timeframes for EW projections</p> <p>Make calculations of projected trends/EW levels more transparent</p>	
4. Reliability	<p>Reliability score – how is it arrived at and used?</p> <p>Missing data, evidence reliability score: how does it work?</p>	<p>Need guidance on how to arrive at and use reliability score</p> <p>Guidance on how to use/evaluate data that may be outdated</p>	
5. Institutional consensus	Data & analysis requires inputs and engagement of broader group of institutions	Develop strategies to get institutions on board for analysis	
Cross-cutting action points:		<p>Action learning in pilot countries</p> <p>Develop TOR for IPC support teams (including at national level)</p> <p>Develop simple monitoring checklist for peer review</p> <p>Document evolution, lessons learned from the IPC approach – paper/journal</p> <p>NEED HOW TO DO IT MANUAL</p>	

Group 5: Maps and population			
PART 1		Part 2	
Top Priority Issues (Suggestion Maximum 5)	Specific Problem Statements	Opportunities to address the problem	Expertise to draw from (institutions, people, articles, ideas, practice)
Clients	A) Clients (different target audience and different utility of protocols .Move from donors and UN agencies to govts (at different levels . maps to complex for different users B) Packages – presentation of issues . basis for decision making: more than a map? . Packages weight of different elements of equal importance	Priority: a) Usability test b) Magnitude given equal weight Others a) same map but with different layers b) thinks in terms of packages	
Maps	A) Convey magnitude B) Confusion between different time projections Other minor points .pop maps in regional maps small countries tend to disappear .too much attention to red	. Visual presentation of magnitude in pie chart . comparing magnitude of maps (% , tot. pop in call out boxes) . Highlight importance of population in package . Working group to address ew/trends issues on maps	
Population tables	A) How to communicate prioritisation using magnitude (comparability between countries and within countries) B) Relation of populations (tot, affected, specific indicators) C) Pop estimates	. Guidance on comparing magnitude using population . Provide guidance on pop estimates (total, affected, different phases, etc) . clarify which level is important	

Appendix 6

[PROPOSALS FOR A MULTI AGENCY STRATEGY]

Introducing a Common Approach to Classifying Food Security in Developing Countries

*Proposal for a Multi-Agency Strategy
by FAO, WFP, Oxfam GB, FEWSNET,
Save the Children UK, Save the Children US, CARE International
and other partners forthcoming*

Background

- There is wide agreement on the need for a common approach to classify and communicate food insecurity to enable greater comparability, increased rigour, transparency, improved responses and decision making.
- The Integrated Food Security and Humanitarian Phase Classification (IPC) is currently regarded as the best approach available.
- FAO, WFP and other key agencies and donors are committed to introducing an IPC-type approach more widely.
- The IPC is increasingly being adapted beyond the initial Somalia context, both in the Horn of Africa and other regions. The growing interest and scope for country-level implementation requires technical support and coordination to ensure a consistent approach.
- The FAO Committee on World Food Security has endorsed the further development and application of an approach to the classification of food security using the IPC.
- Strong support and interest has also been expressed by a range of different actors including academic institutions, other INGOs and UN agencies and the SENAC advisory group.

Goal

To develop, implement and advocate a commonly accepted, standardized approach for classifying food insecurity to inform the allocation of resources according to need.

Added value

- A way of organisations working together to reach consensus on the food security and humanitarian situation and appropriate response
- Credible evidence-based country level analysis
- Enables global comparison of the severity and magnitude of food insecurity
- Links complex information to action

Strategy

Embark on a 5 year collaborative, two-pronged process of developing, refining and applying an IPC approach involving (i) regional and country-level implementation and development; and (ii) global development of the IPC and related tools.

To ensure broad buy-in for achieving this goal, the key players in the area of food security will be invited to be part of a collaborative process.

- ***Collaboration including:***

Global Level: UN, NGOs, donors, academia, others

Country and Regional: government and key agencies involved in food security sector

- ***Collaboration consisting of:***

oversight and support

implementation, learning and technical development

These collaborative arrangements will be pursued under both prongs of the global strategy:

A. Development:

The current IPC model will be developed through an iterative process based on field level application, learning and continuous development. The aim is to develop the tools and processes into a common classification system, which can be applied in all countries.

- ***Application and adaptation should follow common protocol***

Awareness-raising

Identifying or establishing technical groups

Training and technical support

Implementation

Learning

- ***Refinement and technical development***

Review of lessons learned and information/capacity gaps

Technical feedback to inform manual, training, guidance notes and adaptation process

B. Global application:

Time-bound process, guided by an expert advisory group and agency/donor management committee

Gradual expansion / wider adoption of IPC

Communication and awareness raising to inform decision-making and response

Strengthening protocols/information for analysis, assessment and response where gaps exist.

Structure

A. Preparatory phase:

In 2007, FAO and WFP are receiving support from the Netherlands and ECHO, respectively, to

Refine the IPC approach and the May 2006 version of the IPC technical manual based on input from regional and country pilots and technical experts, e.g. through an on-line forum.

Establish small operational task team to finalize a common strategy, develop implementation protocol,

develop proposals to donors, and explore possibilities for joint funding. The task team to be led by FAO and WFP.

B. Implementation phase:

To be defined based on an implementation plan developed by FAO and WFP, after consultation with key partners and donors in March 2007. Possible structures include:

Advisory body:

Provides technical and process guidance, possibly with two tiers: a core group of 5-6 technical experts, and a second, broader group of senior representatives from involved/interested partner agencies.

This group would meet 1-2 times per year.

Steering Committee:

Comprised of representatives of key stakeholders including donors, UN and NGOs.

Meets every six months to review work plans and progress.

Multi agency technical unit

To provide technical support to the field, coordinate learning and technical development