



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the United
Nations

Office of Evaluation

IPC Regional Project, Phase II – Consolidation of the IPC in the Volatile Humanitarian Context of the Central and Eastern African Region - OSRO/RAF/907/EC

Management response to the evaluation report

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: <http://www.fao.org/evaluation>

Permission to make copy, download or print copies of part or all of this work for private study and limited classroom use is hereby granted, free of charge, provided that an accurate citation and suitable acknowledgement of FAO as the source and copyright owner is given. Where copyright holders other than FAO are indicated, please refer to the original copyright holder for terms and conditions of reuse. All requests for systematic copying and electronic distribution, including to list servers, translation rights and commercial reuse should be addressed to copyright@fao.org.

For further information, please contact:

Director, OED
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153
Rome, Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of FAO concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

January 2012

Prepared by the Regional IPC Steering Committee Secretariat based at FAO Sub-regional Emergency Office for Eastern & Central Africa (REOA)

Management Response Matrix

Evaluation of the IPC Regional Project, Phase II (January 2011), Rene Verduijn and Herma Majoor

Evaluation recommendation	Management Response	Management Plan			
		Action to be taken	Responsible Unit	Timeframe	Further Funding Required
A.1 Continue focus of IPC classifying severity of transitory food insecurity as part of the disaster cycle (proven demand and relevance). If relevant, countries should be allowed to experiment with classifying chronic food security in their respective settings.	<p>Accepted</p> <p>and ongoing.</p> <p>The focus of IPC at both country and regional level continues to be on the classification of the severity of acute food insecurity within a broader DRR/DRM framework. Protocols for the classification of chronic food insecurity have been made available and currently introduction in the countries is ongoing(IPC version 2.0). A pilot of the chronic food insecurity scale has been successfully carried out in Uganda.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Support countries in focusing on classifying severity of transitory food insecurity within a DRR/DRM framework. Monthly FSNWG analysis- Use of IPC products at regional level within a DRR/DRM framework Deliver specific protocols for chronic food insecurity classification Pilot of chronic scale of the IPC 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> IPC Reg SC IPC Reg SC - FSNWG GSU GSU 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Ongoing Ongoing December 2011 August 2011 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Yes Yes No No

<p>A.2 It is recommended that IPC remains a meta-analysis tool for situation analysis and is not confused with other FSIS functions such as baseline assessments, emergency needs assessment, M&E and early warning.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Accepted</p> <p style="text-align: center;">and ongoing</p> <p>With the new version of the IPC (vs. 2.0) clear distinction is made between situation analysis and projected food security outcomes (the latter having an early warning function).</p>	<p>1. Promote the IPC as a meta-analysis tool for situation analysis (or for projection of future food security outcomes) – through training / awareness raising events at country and regional level.</p>	<p>1. IPC Reg SC</p>	<p>1. Ongoing</p>	<p>1. No</p>
<p>B.1 The mission would recommend that the regional project team completes detailed histories for all 5 core countries – containing details as to context, institutional framework, progress made over time with the tool, assessment/ analysis, and use of the product to compliment the LL exercise.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Accepted</p> <p>Histories for the 5 countries (and for the other countries within the region) have been produced in December 2010 for the Regional IPC LL Workshop held in Nairobi. Those documents should be completed and updated.</p>	<p>1. Update and complete histories of countries</p>	<p>1. Consultant</p>	<p>1. By Nov 2012 (before the regional IPC workshop 2012)</p>	<p>1. Yes</p>
<p>C.1 IPC Eastern & Central Africa needs continued support from FAO-REOA, a fact that was confirmed by all stakeholders.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Accepted</p> <p style="text-align: center;">and done.</p> <p>Despite the lack of funding solely dedicated to IPC since the end of the regional IPC project in December 2010, FAO-REOA has stabilized two positions supporting IPC initiative in the region. This has guaranteed the continuity of minimal regional IPC functions (including technical support to countries) but this is somehow insufficient to adequately support all country TWGs, especially over the period of transition to the new version of IPC (2012).</p>	<p>1. Stabilize minimal technical personnel at REOA in order to support IPC initiatives in the region.</p> <p>2. Recruit an additional IPC/FS expert for IPC country support and regional analysis/ technical development.</p>	<p>1. FAO-REOA</p> <p>2. FAO-REOA</p>	<p>1. Since February 2011</p> <p>2. ASAP</p>	<p>1. No (till end of 2012)</p> <p>2. Yes</p>
<p>C.2 The mission feels there is a special obligation for FAO-TCE to sponsor IPC activities, because it misses</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Accepted</p>	<p>1. Maintain in place national FSIS/ IPC focal points</p>	<p>1. TCEO-FAO Representatives</p>	<p>1. Done and ongoing</p>	<p>1. Yes (to maintain</p>

<p>a dedicated information service to inform their significant and growing country programmes. In contrast, WFP programming is at least informed by their VAM- unit. Therefore, FAO is encouraged to keep national IPC/FSIS consultants in place, and incorporate them into the FAO country programmes.</p>	<p>FSIS/ IPC focal points have been maintained in FAO country offices in almost all countries. Nevertheless those positions have not been incorporated into FAO country programmes in all the countries and their sustainability is related to funds availability.</p>	<p>established over the implementation of the regional project.</p>			<p>the position in place sustainably)</p>
<p>D.1 Funding proposals for Burundi, CAR, DRC, Tanzania and Uganda should be developed as a matter of priority to prevent the breakdown of capacity built up over the past 2-4 years</p>	<p>Accepted and done-ongoing.</p> <p>Different proposals to maintain IPC activities in the mentioned countries have been developed (targeting regional and/or country donors). Regional proposals for direct country support have not been funded so far. Moreover CAR and Uganda were not successful in the fundraising causing breakdown in the activities. In CAR IPC project has been finally funded in January 2012.</p>	<p>1. Secure funding for IPC implementation at country level</p>	<p>1. FAO-REOA/ IPC Reg SC/ Country TWG/ FAO Country Offices/ GSU</p>	<p>1. Ongoing</p>	<p>2. Yes</p>
<p>D.2 All partners, at global, regional as well as country level, need to be reminded of their responsibility, if possible, to contribute in financial and technical terms. Pooling resources by all stakeholders is preferable.</p>	<p>Accepted and ongoing.</p> <p>This has been recognized since the beginning of the second phase as a priority . Technical contribution by all partners in a coordinated way is already happening in the region (technical support to countries coordinated between IPC Reg SC and GSU). Pool-funding by partners is still limited to a few countries (an overarching financial strategy, to maintain activities at global-regional-country is missing).</p>	<p>1. Advocate for financial and technical contribution at all level</p>	<p>1. IPC Reg SC/ SC/ GSU/ TWGs</p>	<p>1. Ongoing</p>	<p>1. No</p>

<p>D.3 It may be justified for ECHO and other donors to continue financial support to IPC in countries as Burundi, CAR and DR Congo on the “user pays” principal.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Accepted</p> <p>Since the end of the regional project phase II ECHO stopped funding IPC in the region. Being ECHO the main IPC donor, this created a financial gap that was just partially filled by other donors. The expectation at regional level was that the Directorate General Development and Cooperation of the European Commission would have taken over this “responsibility” from ECHO but it didn’t happen so far.</p>	<p>1. Continue advocating and fundraising with ECHO and other donors (DevCo <i>in primis</i>) for IPC support at country and regional level (also using a “user pays” principal)</p>	<p>1. IPC Reg SC/ TWGs</p>	<p>1. Ongoing</p>	<p>1. No</p>
<p>D.4 FAO and WFP may take it upon themselves to promote IPC as a standard tool in the Humanitarian Food Security Clusters with core funding from the two agencies.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Accepted</p> <p>Over the past year the IPC has been more and more strategically used by national FS clusters as programmatic and analytical tool. At the regional level, the FSNWG is somehow playing the role of regional FS cluster and within this regional umbrella, WFP and FAO (with the support of other organization as FEWS NET) financially and technically contributed to maintain regional IPC activities rolling (e.g. regional IPC technical workshop). Moreover, at the global level the global FS cluster has recently been included in the IPC SC.</p>	<p>1. Continue promoting IPC as standard tool for national FS clusters and for the regional FSNWG, through the co-leading agencies.</p>	<p>1. WFP/ FAO/ IPC Reg SC</p>	<p>1. Ongoing</p>	<p>1. No</p>

<p>E. Communication and advocacy are integral part of information management and need to be appropriately budgeted for in future. The mission feels that appropriate internal and external advocacy would go a long way into the successful application and use of the tool and products with global partners and active partners at the (sub-) national level.</p>	<p>Accepted and planned.</p> <p>Funds have been secured by FAO-REOA to develop a regional advocacy and communication strategy for IPC</p>	<p>1. Develop an actionable regional advocacy and communication strategy for IPC</p>	<p>1. IPC RC/ Reg IPC SC</p>	<p>1. By end middle 2012</p>	<p>1. Yes</p>
<p>F.1 To address a shortage of IPC practitioners and trainers like it has been faced in the past years, a capacity development strategy should be developed for concerned parties.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>This is recognized as a priority by the Reg IPC SC.</p> <p>A comprehensive capacity development strategy for regional and national analysts still need to be developed and additional funds are required. Nevertheless, the Reg IPC SC is reshaping its structure, including in the tasks the establishment of a support group (IPC trained and experienced FS analysts) that will build capacities at country and regional level.</p>	<p>1. Establish a regional IPC support group for country and regional capacity building.</p> <p>2. Develop a comprehensive regional and national capacity building strategy.</p>	<p>1. IPC RC/ Reg IPC SC</p> <p>2. IPC RC/ Reg IPC SC/ GSU/ PM</p>	<p>1. March 2012</p> <p>2. 2012</p>	<p>1. No</p> <p>2. Yes</p>
<p>F.2 The large need for FSIS expertise and training should be addressed collectively by all stakeholders in the FS sector, including governments, UN, NGOs, and institutions of higher learning. Separate capacity development programmes (outside IPC) would be appropriate and very much needed.</p>	<p>Accepted.</p> <p>GSU is currently working to develop an IPC certification system (that will include on-line courses in food security foundations). Moreover, the GSU is also working to include IPC in higher learning courses. In IPC trainings at regional and especially at country level, broader FS concepts are systematically included.</p>	<p>1. Advocate for inclusion in the IPC work –plans and technically support training in FS at country level .</p>	<p>1. IPC RC/ Reg IPC SC</p>	<p>1. Done/ Ongoing</p>	<p>1. No (required at country level for implementation)</p>
<p>F.3 Capacity development of IPC experts, and in particular providing technical backstopping to country teams and generation of normative</p>	<p>Accepted and ongoing.</p>	<p>1. Secure funds for core IPC regional position to support countries</p>	<p>1. FAO-REOA</p>	<p>1. Done</p>	<p>1. No (till end 2012)</p>

<p>guidance, should become a priority for FAO itself if it is serious about the promotion of IPC and its use. It is felt that the capacity within FAO (ESA in particular) has decreased significantly over the past 10-15 years, while TCE has not yet built up this function sufficiently.</p>	<p>FAO-REOA secured financial resources to fund two IPC technical positions to backstop the countries (currently in place: IPC RC and a regional FS analyst). In consideration of the large need for capacity building in particular at country level, and in more resources are needed. FAO, through the Reg IPC SC, advocates and coordinates regional partners in supporting the countries.</p>	<p>2. Promote and coordinate country support and technical backstopping from regional partners 3. Put in place additional technical resources at regional level</p>	<p>2. IPC RC/ Reg IPC SC 3. FAO REOA/ Reg IPC SC partners/ GSU</p>	<p>2. Ongoing 3. By April 2012</p>	<p>2. No 3. Yes</p>
<p>G.1 . The IPC initiative should develop a clear analytical framework to show the cohesion, the weighting between elements and the casual relationship between the different elements and indicators.</p>	<p>Accepted and done (included in the new version of the IPC).</p>	<p>1. Develop a clear analytical framework</p>	<p>1. PM/ GSU</p>	<p>1. Done</p>	<p>1. No</p>
<p>G.2 The IPC initiative should develop guidelines on the appropriateness and limitations with regard to the use of various proxy indicators by sector.</p>	<p>Accepted and done (included in the new version of the IPC).</p>	<p>1. Develop guidelines on the use of proxy indicators</p>	<p>1. PM/ GSU</p>	<p>1. Done</p>	<p>1. No</p>
<p>G.3 The IPC initiative should develop standards or minimum requirements for an IPC analysis to allow for comparability across borders.</p>	<p>Accepted and done (included in the new version of the IPC).</p>	<p>1. Develop standards and minimum requirements for an IPC analysis</p>	<p>1. PM/ GSU</p>	<p>1. Done</p>	<p>1. No</p>
<p>G.4 The IPC initiative should improve quality control and peer review mechanisms of processes and products, in part through the development of guidelines.</p>	<p>Accepted and done (included in the new version of the IPC).</p>	<p>1. Improve quality control and peer review mechanisms</p>	<p>1. PM/ GSU</p>	<p>1. Done</p>	<p>1. No</p>
<p>G.5 The IPC initiative should promote livelihood baselines (descriptions and profiles) to support the interpretation of reference indicators through an improved context.</p>	<p>Accepted and done (included in the new version of the IPC).</p>	<p>1. Promote livelihood baselines to support the interpretation of reference indicators</p>	<p>1. PM/ GSU</p>	<p>1. Done</p>	<p>1. No</p>

<p>G.6 The IPC initiative should address the underlying weaknesses in data together with all stakeholders (technical partners, government, donors and academic institutions) towards improved access to agreed key reference indicators that would improve the relevance and quality of output of the meta-analysis tool.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Accepted and ongoing.</p> <p>The IPC initiative has proven to be instrumental to inform data and information gaps in national FSIS. Based on the underlined gaps, some countries designed data collection tools based on key indicators</p>	<p>1. Advocate for improved data and information agreed on key reference indicators</p>	<p>1. Reg IPC SC/ TWGs</p>	<p>1. Ongoing</p>	<p>1. No</p>
<p>H.1 There is a strong need for global partners to step up their contribution to the IPC process at country-level, including better reporting on specific strategies in place that articulate their commitment and engagement to IPC with a geographic scope.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Accepted and ongoing</p> <p>At the regional level some IPC partners have substantially increased their level of engagement in IPC initiative, with both financial and technical contributions (e.g. co-funding and technical co-support of the regional IPC workshop and training for country analysts). Within the Reg IPC SC restructuring the partners will now be asked to engage more to direct support in country, technically and possibly financially.</p>	<p>1. Restructure the Reg IPC SC set-up, defining support and contribution commitments towards country support of each partner.</p>	<p>1. IPC RC</p>	<p>1. By March 2011</p>	<p>1. No</p>
<p>H.2 Cooperation with regional institutes like East Africa Community, IGAD and COMESA may add to the sustainability and impact of IPC. Stronger advocacy is needed in that regard at regional and global level.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Accepted and done/ ongoing</p> <p>FAO has recently signed a MOU with IGAD that subsequently started officially co-chairing the FSNWG. The Reg IPC SC committee, sitting under the FSNWG, is planning to restructure its set-up, taking into account IGAD involvement.</p>	<p>1. Institutionalize FSNWG: formalize the collaboration FSNWG and IGAD</p> <p>2. Restructure Reg IPC SC, taking into account IGAD formal involvement in FSNWG</p>	<p>1. FAO</p> <p>2. IPC RC</p>	<p>1. Done</p> <p>2. By March 2012</p>	<p>1. No</p> <p>2. No</p>

H.3 There is scope for the involvement of institutions of higher learning as full partners to contribute to technical assistance and training but also to incorporate FSIS methodologies/ tools and technical skills into their curricula.	Accepted <i>Please refer to recommendation F2</i>				

List of abbreviations:

IPC: Integrated Food Security Phase Classification; IPC Reg SC: IPC regional Steering Committee of the FSNWG; FSNWG: Food Security and Nutrition Working Group; IPC RC: IPC Regional Coordinator; ESA: Agricultural development Economics Division (FAO); GSU: Global Support Unit; PM: Programme Manager (global level); SC: Steering Committee (global level); DRR: Disaster Risk Reduction; DRM: Disaster Risk Management; TWG: Technical Working Group; LL: Lessons Learned; FS: Food Security; DevCo: Directorate General Development and Cooperation of the European Commission, European Union; IGAD: The Intergovernmental Authority on Development; MoU: Memorandum of Understanding