The IPC Governance Structure
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 IPC Governance Structure

Overview

The Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) is a multi-stakeholder initiative that aims to improve analysis and decision-making on food security and nutrition situations around the world. Nearly 20 years since its inception, the IPC initiative is now described as the ‘global standard’ for classifying acute food insecurity and malnutrition affecting millions globally – informing around $6 billion in food response decisions every year in approximately 30 countries. To register these and many more achievements, the IPC is founded on a strong governance structure that brings together governments, regional bodies and international agencies – and fosters rigorous processes, ownership and consensus-driven outcomes.

- **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, such as government institutions, UN agencies and NGOs. They are 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 are composed of representatives from key stakeholders and 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 providing direct support to regional and country stakeholders for IPC implementation.

- **Global Level:** At the global level, the IPC governance structure is comprised of a High Level Executive Committee (HLEC), a Steering Committee (GSC), a Technical Advisory Group (TAG), a Famine Review Committee (FRC) and the IPC Global Support Unit (GSU).
The IPC High Level Executive Committee (HLEC) is the highest-level entity within the overall IPC global governance structure. It comprises up to 17 high level representatives from IPC global partner organisations engaged in the IPC Global Steering Committee. The HLEC is responsible for positioning the IPC on the global agenda and assisting the IPC initiative to overcome challenges in countries facing (or vulnerable to) major food and nutrition crises and, in particular, sensitive contexts. In specific terms, the HLEC is charged with:

- Promoting and positioning the IPC on global agendas.
- Reinforcing institutional commitments to the IPC at all levels.
- Supporting the geographic expansion of the IPC.
- Highlighting other strategic considerations, as needed to ensure that IPC optimally responds to decision-maker needs.
- Protecting the integrity and neutrality of the IPC.

The IPC Global Steering Committee (GSC) is composed of senior officers representing the 19 partner organisations. The Steering Committee governs the IPC initiative globally and is responsible for strategically guiding and ensuring oversight and regular functioning of the initiative. The GSC defines the agenda for the HLEC regular (annual) meetings and can request ad-hoc HLEC meetings when the IPC faces critical issues in a country. The GSC also translates the strategic considerations shared by the HLEC into action.

The Technical Advisory Group (TAG) 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 Global Support Unit (GSU) is the operational arm of the IPC Global Steering Committee. Hosted at the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) 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 country support, quality assurance oversight, capacity development and communication support to countries.

The Famine Review Committee (FRC) is a team of leading independent international food security and nutrition experts. When a country’s IPC analysis shows a potential or already identified situation of famine, the FRC is requested to conduct a review to ensure technical rigour and neutrality of the analysis before the results are confirmed and communicated.
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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.
IPC Support to Technical Working Groups (TWG)

The IPC GSU provides real-time support to the TWG according to the countries needs, the analyses’ characteristics, the countries context, and available resources within the IPC GSU / of IPC Global Partners. Building upon this approach, the IPC GSU explores means of extending preanalysis 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 and standards required for an 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 team, in coordination with global partners and country-based teams, design and coordinate communications strategies to disseminate results at national, regional and global levels.

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.
Guiding Principles for IPC Technical Working Groups

**Scope:** There can be regional and national IPC TWGs, depending on countries needs and context.

**Leadership:** The chairperson is a senior officer from a member organisation – from the government where feasible. To facilitate inclusiveness and the overall buy-in of the IPC analysis at all levels, the IPC TWGs 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. They also must reflect the parameters described in these guiding principles.

**Training:** The IPC TWGs ensure 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 TWGs are designated by their organisations to plan, manage and coordinate IPC processes in the country, including IPC products.

**Technical Rigour:** Members of the IPC TWGs and other analysts participating in the IPC analysis must commit to conducting evidence-based, unbiased analyses 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 a 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.