The IPC Governance Structure
• **Country Level**: At the country level, Technical Working Groups (TWGs) are the foundation of the IPC governance structure (figure below). These comprise technical experts representing key stakeholder institutions/organisations responsible for leading the country’s planning, coordination, and implementation of IPC activities. Where considered appropriate and feasible, IPC TWGs can be supported by other bodies, such as a senior management group, equivalent in composition and function to a steering committee at the country level, inclusive of all key partners involved in the IPC process.

• **Regional Level**: In most regions, regional IPC TWGs composed of representatives from key stakeholders are usually established to support the funding, implementation and institutionalisation of IPC at the country level and dissemination of IPC results and advocacy at the regional level. IPC regional coordinators and trainers, who are part of the IPC Global Support Unit (GSU), also play a key role in coordinating IPC activities within the region and provide direct support to regional and country stakeholders for IPC implementation.

• **Global Level**: At the global level, the IPC is governed by the IPC Global Steering Committee and is composed of senior officers representing the 15 partner organisations. The Steering Committee is responsible for strategically guiding and positioning the IPC globally. There is also a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) that is responsible for advising the Steering Committee on technical matters. This group is made up of high-level technical experts from the agencies represented on the IPC Global Steering Committee. If necessary, the TAG can invite experts from any relevant agencies to form working groups to work on specific topics. The IPC GSU is the operational arm of the IPC Global Steering Committee. Hosted at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN, the IPC GSU promotes the IPC within global decision-making structures and develops and updates IPC protocols and technical guidance based on inputs from the TAG. It also provides capacity development, technical and communication support to countries, as well as quality assurance oversight, among other things.
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Afghanistan’s protracted food crisis deepened and widened with a record high of nearly 19 million people experiencing high levels of acute food insecurity (IPC Phase 3 or above), between September and October 2021. The IPC has been working with Afghanistan since 2013.
The Role of the Global Famine Review Committee

When a country IPC analysis shows a potential or already identified situation of famine, a specific procedure is activated in order to confirm or disprove a Famine classification.

Once the process is triggered, the Famine Review Committee (FRC) is requested to conduct a review to ensure technical rigour and neutrality of the analysis before the results are confirmed and communicated. The FRC is a team of leading independent international food security and nutrition experts. The committee is tasked with reviewing and debating evidence available and IPC analysis results and reaching conclusions on whether a Famine/Famine likely classification is warranted.

From January to December 2020, close to 1.4 million children aged 6-59 months old in South Sudan were acutely malnourished and in need of treatment.

The IPC has been working with South Sudan since 2011.
Guiding Principles for IPC Technical Working Groups

**Scope:** There can be regional and national IPC Technical Working Groups (TWGs), depending on needs and context.

**Leadership:** The chairperson is a senior officer from a member organisation or the government where feasible. To facilitate inclusiveness and the overall buy-in of the IPC analysis at all levels, the IPC TWG must be co-chaired by a representative from another member organisation from the IPC Global Partnership, present at the country level.

**Membership:** The members of the IPC TWGs are technical officers with different sectoral expertise, typically from government branches, United Nations agencies, international and national NGOs, civil society groups, technical agencies and academic institutions.

**Terms of Reference:** The IPC TWGs should develop Terms of Reference which describe its purpose and membership; the roles and responsibilities of the chair, co-chair and members; its structure (including the broader IPC governance structure in the country, if applicable) and working modalities; and reflect the parameters described in these guiding principles.

**Training:** The IPC TWG ensures that all the individuals conducting an IPC analysis have adequate IPC training and, as much as possible, are IPC-certified analysts.

**Planning and Coordination:** The permanent members of the IPC TWG are designated by their organisation to plan, manage and coordinate IPC processes in the country, including IPC products.

**Technical Rigour:** Members of the IPC TWG and other analysts participating in the IPC analysis must commit to conducting evidence-based, unbiased analysis using the IPC protocols, concerned only with classifying and describing food security and malnutrition conditions as accurately as possible.

**Integration with Nutrition:** Whenever applicable and especially important in countries where food insecurity or acute malnutrition crises occur frequently, a combined IPC Food Security and Nutrition TWG should be formed.

**Communications:** The IPC TWGs should include communication experts from relevant institutions with the specific role of supporting IPC-related communications.

**Ownership:** To ensure commitment to the IPC partnership and promote ownership, formal agreement or signing of the IPC TWG Terms of Reference by the senior management of all member organisations is strongly encouraged. The TWGs also commit to communicating the analysis findings to all key stakeholders in-country and beyond to ensure that those affected by food insecurity and malnutrition receive much-needed assistance in a timely manner.
IPC Support to Technical Working Groups

The IPC GSU provides real-time support to the TWG according to the country’s needs, the analyses’ characteristics, the country context, and available resources within the IPC GSU / of IPC Global Partners. Building upon this approach, the IPC GSU explores means of extending pre-analysis support to TWGs to increase the availability and quality of the data collected and used for IPC analysis. This is achieved by collaborating with relevant stakeholders in the planning stages of data collection in order to ensure that survey and assessment protocols align with the indicators, thresholds and standards required for IPC analysis.

During the analysis, the IPC GSU, through its Quality Assurance function, uses tools and procedures to ensure that IPC products meet global standards and respond to the needs of decision-makers. Technical rigour, an effective multi-partner transparent process, and good governance, all contribute to producing quality IPC analyses that effectively inform plans, programmes and policies. Lastly, the IPC GSU’s Communications Unit, in coordination with global partners and country-based teams, designs and coordinates communications strategies to disseminate results at national, regional and global levels.
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From July to October 2021, about 2.1 million people in Kenya’s ASAL region were highly food insecure due to failed rains, low agricultural production and high food prices. From July to November 2021, over 650,000 children under 5 and over 96,000 pregnant or lactating women were acutely malnourished.

The IPC has been working with Kenya since 2012.