



MINUTES OF FSAC NATIONAL CLUSTER COORDINATION MEETING

Date: 30th May 2017
Venue: WFP Offices, Sana'a
Time: 11:00 AM

Attendance: WFP, ACF, DRC, NRC, NFDHR, LMMPO, EU Delegation, FSTS, YFCA, SCI, Sawaed Foundation, YWU, QC, ACTED, PU-AMI, YLDF, YWT, CHR-T, Human Appeal, YDN, RI, IYCY, VHI, SMEPS, ICAN, IOM, RDP, CSSW, HFY, War Child, SYDF, OCHA, ICRC, FHD, ITDC,

Agenda:

1. Introductions
2. Review of action points from the last meeting
3. FSAC/NUT high Priority Districts
4. WFP's EMOP priority districts
5. Revision of the FSAC Minimum Food Basket
6. Assessment quality/Coordination of all food security related assessments with FSAC
7. AOB

1. Introductions

- All FSAC partners present did a round of introduction

2. Review of last meeting minutes and action points

- There was a follow-up of main action points emanating from the last meeting, followed with an endorsement of the meeting minutes.

3. FSAC/NUT high Priority Districts

- A detailed explanation on the prioritization process was undertaken due to partners' request. This is due to the fact that averting the threat/risk of famine and saving lives requires working in partnership and across sectors in an integrated manner as a matter of paramount importance.
- The district prioritization process was guided by two main indicators;
 - GAM rates for Nutrition cluster and;



- % of severely Food Insecure (SFI) population for the FSAC cluster.
- There are a total of 95 joint FSAC - Nutrition Cluster priority districts
- The breakdown of districts under each category is as follows:-

Prioritization	Name of the category	Sub-categories	Threshold GAM	Threshold SFI	Number of districts	Filtering
1	Priority Districts - Convergence (95)	None	15% and above	20% and above	95	$\geq 15\%$ GAM & $\geq 20\%$ SFI
2	Priority Districts - Nutrition (62)	None	15% and above	below 20%	62	GAM $\geq 15\%$ & $< 20\%$ SFI
	Priority Districts - FSAC (89)	1st Priority	10 to 14.99%	20% and above	42	GAM is b/n 10% and 14.9% & $\geq 20\%$ SFI
		2nd Priority	below 10%	20% and above	47	GAM below 10% & $\geq 20\%$ SFI
3	Other Districts		below 10%	below 20%	87	GAM $< 15\%$ & $< 20\%$ SFI
TOTAL					333	

- The GAM rates and % of Severely Food Insecure (SFI) population in the joint Nutrition Cluster - FSAC priority districts have breached the emergency threshold levels for Nutrition and Food Security (i.e. $\geq 15\%$ GAM & $\geq 20\%$ SFI)
- The GAM prevalence was based on (SMART 2016, EFSNA 2016, CFSS 2014 data), while % of severely food insecure population was based on (IPC March 2017, EFSNA 2016 data).
- If only one threshold was reached (more than 15% GAM OR more than 20% of severely food insecure population), the districts were assigned as the respective cluster priorities only, i.e. “Nutrition Cluster priority” or “FSAC priority”.
- Please note that due to the lack of representative district level data, yet need to prioritize districts for Nutrition and Food Security interventions at a sub-governorate level, districts were clustered by livelihood zone/agro-ecological zone/ elevation with proportion of GAM cases within new cluster re-calculated.
- The percentages that have been used for the classification do not provide GAM prevalence rates for the clustered districts. They present the proportion of children with GAM from the total number of children measured in the clustered districts,



providing an indication of the severity of the situation in that area. It can only be used for district prioritization and should never be used for anything else!

- All the priority districts (“joint FSAC-NUT convergence”, “FSAC only”, “Nutrition cluster only”) are important considering the precarious and deteriorating food and nutrition situation. The priority joint FSAC-NUT convergence districts are crucial for integrated response.
- Nonetheless, other districts (“FSAC only” or “Nutrition cluster only” are equally important and should not be ignored! If no assistance is forthcoming to these districts, they will also fall into the joint priority FSAC-NUT convergence districts!

Action point: *The FSAC Coordinator to re-circulate the list of 95 joint FSAC and Nutrition Cluster priority districts*

4. WFP's EMOP Priority Districts

- WFP has launched a new Emergency Operation which is aimed at assisting 6.8 million people with General Food Assistance through in-kind food baskets and commodity vouchers. WFP is targeting only “severely food insecure” people, therefore focusing mainly on life-saving activities.
- WFP also recognizes that it may not be able to raise the necessary resources required to support the 6.8 million planned for assistance under the EMOP. Consequently, in the event that funding is not sufficient to meet all the life-saving objectives of the EMOP, WFP will have no other option than to prioritize within the most vulnerable with emphasis on those at risk of dying from starvation.
- In order to achieve this, a district level prioritization exercise was carried out which resulted in identification of 120 highest priority districts for both Nutrition and Food Security and Agriculture Clusters.
- The objective is to ensure that targeted beneficiaries in the highest priority districts receive full rations of food assistance and resources for this group is secured prior to assisting other priority groups.
- WFP will carefully monitor the situation of those “non-highest” priority groups, as they are also food insecure and lack of assistance may move them closer to famine.
- The selection of beneficiaries will be done using a robust targeting process described in the WFP EMOP document.
- “non-highest” priority groups, as they are also food insecure and lack of assistance may move them closer to famine.
- Geographic targeting
 - ✓ The results of the recent EFSNA and IPC analysis serve as a basis for the first level of geographic targeting.
 - ✓ District level prevalence of severe food insecurity and GAM rates have been applied and the districts requiring most urgently life-saving support were identified. Most of the targeted districts are from IPC 4 (Emergency) phase governorates.



- ✓ The selection of districts is guided by the standard thresholds of food insecurity using the IPC Phase Classification procedures and WHO's classification thresholds were applied on the GAM rates. Districts that have high levels of severe food insecurity and emergency levels of malnutrition were prioritized for "famine-prevention" emergency food assistance and categorized according to priorities.
 - ✓ District prioritization is mainly based on the percentage of severely food insecure population inside the district, the criteria put the 20% as threshold value, which means that any district with 20% or more severely food insecure population will be included in the food distribution.
 - ✓ Some districts with slightly below 20% of severely food insecure households were included in order to minimize the risk of exclusion
 - ✓ Moreover, within the targeted districts, there will be a second level sub-district geographic targeting which involves selection of villages/communities where assistance will be provided. Targeting at this level will be done by Cooperating Partners (who will be trained by WFP) in close consultation with local authorities, communities, key informants such as health workers, extension workers, teachers, etc. The targeting process at this level will also involve regular participation of affected populations, including the Food Assistance Committees with balanced representation of men and women.
- Household targeting
- ✓ Within the selected districts and sub-districts, eligible households for receiving emergency food assistance will be identified using the overall FSAC endorsed beneficiary targeting and selection criteria
 - ✓ The initial targeting criteria are based on directly observable and/or proxy indicators of vulnerability such as demographic characteristics, age, nutrition status, etc. residential status like IDPs/returnees, which have been developed by WFP using the generic profiles of food insecure households.
 - ✓ The Food Assistance Committees, with oversight by WFP/CPs, will apply the targeting criteria to identify beneficiaries to ensure impartiality (i.e. in accordance to need and without any barriers such as discrimination).
 - ✓ The principal eligibility criteria for household selection is the severity of food insecurity among the most vulnerable families. While households' status (such as being IDPs/returnees, headed by women, etc.) is an element of their vulnerability, the primary indicator of need is that they are severely food insecure and so are consequently eligible for emergency food assistance.
 - ✓ WFP's cooperating partners and targeted communities are important sources of information for refinement of household-level targeting criteria.
- **Action point:** *The FSAC Coordinator to circulate WFP's EMOP strategy and priority districts*



5. Revision of the FSAC Minimum Food Basket

- A revision of the current endorsed FSAC minimum food basket considering the changing market and country contextual analysis is of paramount importance.
- Cluster partners mandated a technical working group to revise the current food basket in terms of composition, quantities of various items (as per SPHERE standards and Nut Val calculations), and pricing (both USD and YER)
- The minimum food basket Technical Working Group (TWiG) will be co-led by WFP and NRC and composed of the following organizations/agencies:-
 - ✓ WFP
 - ✓ NRC
 - ✓ ACF
 - ✓ YFCA
 - ✓ YDN
 - ✓ NFDHR
 - ✓ ACTED
 - ✓ SCI
 - ✓ FSAC Coordinator
- The revision of food quantities would take into consideration the local context, preference by the beneficiaries and available packaging in the retail local markets.
- **Action point:** *The minimum food basket Technical Working Group (TWiG) to report the draft food basket revisions at the next cluster meeting (13th June 2017)*

6. Assessment quality/Coordination of all food security related assessments with FSAC

- There are concerns that some FSAC partners are currently undertaking assessments that do not meet the established FSAC rigorous assessment criteria using the endorsed minimum indicators/standards.
- Some partners are also conducting assessments without prior coordination with the relevant FSAC sub-cluster. This might result in overlaps of assessments and “beneficiary assessment fatigue”
- Subsequently, all FSAC partners are kindly requested to adhere to the FSAC minimum assessments standards, and coordinate prior to conducting any food security related assessment (whether “food security stand-alone” or “multi-sector” assessment)
- Partners are also encouraged to conduct a Secondary Data Review (SDR) before conducting any assessment to ascertain whether the sought data is already in existence (and thus no need for primary data collection)
- **FSAC will be sending a disclaimer to all stakeholders (donors, authorities, OCHA, UN agencies, INGOs, NNGOs and relevant government technical institutions e.g. FSTS) on food security related assessments that have not been coordinated and cleared by the cluster!**



- The Assessment Working Group will also not publish or circulate any food security related assessment that has not been cleared by FSAC.
- **Action point:** *FSAC to re-circulate the cluster's assessment indicators and minimum standards*

7. AOB

- There was no AOB for this meeting.