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## Agenda of the meeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Presenting Agency</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Review of the previous action points</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Presentation on climate outlook</td>
<td>FEWSNET</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>IPC 2021 analysis findings</td>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FSAC achievements and funding status in Q1 2021</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Findings of the Hard-to-Reach assessment</td>
<td>REACH</td>
<td>15 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Agriculture Working Group ToR</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>CCPM action plan</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>10 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>AoB; -</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>5 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- AHF 2(^{nd}) RA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Previous meeting action points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AP/N</th>
<th>ACTION POINTS</th>
<th>RESPONSIBLE PARTY</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>FSAC will share the Spring Disaster Contingency Plan with partners</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>FSAC will share the ToR of Agriculture Working Group with partners for their inputs and comments</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>FSAC/IPC will share IPC findings with all partners</td>
<td>FSAC/IPC</td>
<td>April</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>FSAC will send invitation email of CCPM workshop to partners</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>March</td>
<td>Achieved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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• Wet season progress
• Assumptions
• Short term forecast
Wet season progress
Afghanistan seasonal calendar

Source: FEWS NET
Widespread low precipitation October to mid-March
Average and above average precipitation mid-March to April in east

Source: UCSB Climate Hazards Center
Precipitation performance for entire wet season:
Below average southern Afghanistan
Average and above average northeastern Afghanistan

Source: UCSB Climate Hazards Center
Late season P has led to a SWE recovery in elevated and wetter areas, but not others because temperatures have been too warm or conditions too dry.

Source: USGS/USAID/FEWS NET
Below average precipitation effects on soil moisture and NDVI

Irrigation from groundwater and/or the Helmand River

Rootzone Soil Moisture Percentile: 20210420

Source: NASA LIS Framework

Map Produced by USGS/EROS
Below average precipitation effects on streamflow and water availability

Source: USGS/USAID/FEWS NET
Assumptions
According to ECMWF, NMME and WMO ensemble forecasts, precipitation during the remainder of the 2020/21 wet season in late April and May is expected to be below average across most of the northern half of the country and average across most of the southern half of the country. There is an increased risk for extended periods of dryness during critical vegetative and flowering stages of both irrigated wheat in lower elevation areas in late April and May.
Below average precipitation most likely late April and early May, especially in northern Afghanistan
Below average precipitation most likely in May, especially in northern Afghanistan
Assumption 2 of 8

Given cumulative precipitation to date and forecast precipitation through May, cumulative precipitation during the 2020/21 wet season from October 2020 to May 2021 is most likely to be below average across the country, except for central and northeastern provinces.
Observed analysis and forecast precipitation

Source: UCSB Climate Hazards Center
Assumption 3 of 8

According to NMME and C3S ensemble forecasts, above-average mean temperatures are anticipated throughout most of the country through September 2021. However, below-average minimum temperatures remain possible in localized areas.
Above average temperatures most likely
Assumption 4 of 8

Snow water volume levels are below average in most basins and at or near record minimum levels in many basins in the south and southwest. Given expectations for above-average temperatures and below-average precipitation, snowpack and snow water volumes are expected to continue to decline, as is typical in the spring, and remain below average in most areas. As a result of these factors, flooding risk is expected to be below-average in May 2021, though localized flooding events related to springtime storms are possible. However, continued snowmelt and early depletion of snow is likely to reduce water availability in downstream areas for the main season and will limit water availability for second season crops.
Late season P has led to a SWE recovery in elevated and wetter areas, but not others because temperatures have been too warm or conditions too dry.

Source: USGS/ USAID/ FEWS NET
Below average precipitation effects on streamflow and water availability
Assumption 5 of 8

Given current significantly below average NDVI values in much of the north, south, and southwest as of April 1-10, 2021, rangeland vegetative conditions are likely below average in lower elevation areas of the country. Given expectations for below-average cumulative precipitation in May and above-average temperatures through at least September, rangeland vegetative conditions in lower elevation areas are likely to remain below average during the rest of the spring season through May 2021 and throughout the summer dry season through at least September. In higher elevation areas where NDVI values are currently predominantly above average, below-average precipitation and early snowmelt are likely to contribute to below-average pasture conditions emerging during the summer dry season.
Below average precipitation effects on soil moisture and NDVI

Rootzone Soil Moisture Percentile: 20210420

Source: NASA LIS Framework

Irrigation from groundwater and/or the Helmand River
Based on evidence presented in assumptions 1-5 as well as 18-pentad SPI+forecast and current soil moisture conditions, meteorological and agricultural drought conditions are likely ongoing across the south and southwest and are likely to continue through September 2021.
Spatial patterns of wet season precipitation anomaly
Below average precipitation effects on soil moisture and NDVI

Rootzone Soil Moisture Percentile: 20210420

Irrigation from groundwater and/or the Helmand River

Source: NASA LIS Framework

Map Produced by USGS/EROS
Assumption 7 of 8

According to C3S, NMME, and WMO ensemble forecasts, precipitation during the dry season period from June to September 2021 is most likely to be average across most of the country. However, given the long lead time, a variety of outcomes are possible.
Dry season precipitation forecast
Wheat production is most likely to be below average across most of the country but near average in central and eastern parts of the country.
Short term forecast
Drier weather to prevail in most parts of Afghanistan

Week 1 forecast (week ending April 25)

Week 2 forecast (week ending May 02)

Source: NOAA CPC
Questions
Noor Habib Arwall
Deputy Country Representative – Afghanistan

narwall@fews.net
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IPC 2021 analysis findings
IPC Analysis Participants

- IPC Analysis Workshop was conducted from 7th to 18th March 2021.
- 45 Analysis Units including 34 provinces and 11 urban areas have been analyzed.
- Over 75 technical experts participated in the analysis workshop.
- Around 25 organizations were represented in the workshop.

1. MAIL
2. FSAC
3. FAO
4. WFP
5. FEWSNET
6. Nutrition Cluster
7. UNDP
8. AAH
9. Afghanaid
10. ANCC
11. Cordaid
12. AINHE
13. AKAH
14. GiHA
15. HRDA
16. REACH
17. SCI
18. SFL
19. WHH
20. WVI
21. ZOA
22. iMMAP
23. NCRO
24. NRC
25. OXFAM
Data Utilized in IPC Analysis

Data sources used for the analysis included:
1. The Pre-lean season Assessment (PLSA) 2021 – WFP/FSAC.
2. Seasonal Food Security Assessment (SFSA) 2020 – FSAC.
3. Food Production, Food Prices, Expected La Niña and Wheat Balance Sheet - MAIL.
4. Population Estimation – NSIA and UNFPA.
5. ALCS 2016-2917 – NSIA.
6. Precipitation pattern and the expected La Nina condition – NSIA.
7. Seasonal Calendar, field observation reports and Remote Sensing Data – FEWSNET.
8. Precipitation, Temperature, Snow, and Estimated Risk of Natural Disasters – iMMAP.
9. Food Prices data – WFP.
10. Refugees and Returnees from UNHCR.
11. Nutrition Data from Nutrition Cluster – UNICEF.
12. IDP Data - OCHA and IOM.
13. Agro-ecological Zoning - FAO.
15. Hard to Reach Assessment and Joint Marketing Monitoring Initiative from REACH, Informal Settlement’s Assessment.
IPC Analysis Findings
Current March – May 2021

10.9M
35% in IPC Phase 3 and above (NSIA)

14.1M
35% in IPC Phase 3 and above (FLM)
IPC Analysis Findings
Projection June – November 2021

9.5M
30% in IPC Phase 3 and above (NSIA)

12.2M
30% in IPC Phase 3 and above (FLM)
**Key Drivers**

**Conflict:** Ongoing conflict in many of the analyzed areas have resulted in population displacements and damage or loss of livelihoods. Between January and mid-March 2021, an estimated 62,200 new people were displaced internally due to conflict.

**High Food Prices:** High food prices further exacerbate food access of households and their purchasing power especially those already living below the poverty line. An estimated 10-20 percent price increase has been observed compared with 5 years average in the context of COVID-19 and economic downturn. Whereas, 5 – 10 percent reduction in food prices has been observed in compare to the peak of the COVID-19 pandemic in 2020.

**Reduced Income:** Households are facing an increased stress on their financial access due to reduced income and persistent unemployment causing increasing food insecurity.

**COVID-19 Impacts:** COVID-19 crisis imposed a burden on the economy and private Sector in 2020. Resulting in daily wage opportunities and small trader income to decrease and therefore limiting financial access of households.

**Dry Spell/Drought:** Cumulative precipitation has been below average during the wet season. As a result, snowpack development is also below average. This is likely to impact water available for irrigation of both first and second crops in 2021 limiting food availability in compare to normal years.
• Food Insecurity continues to be alarmingly high during current and projection periods due to conflict, high food prices, impacts of COVID-19 and the expected impacts of La Nina condition, in particular during the lean season 21-22.

• A reduction of 5% in IPC Phase 3 or above is estimated from the current to projection periods. However, only 1% reduction is estimated in IPC Phase 4 for the same periods.

• With harvest beginning in June food security will improve, however, the cumulative precipitation has been below average during the wet season which is expected to lead the country into a below average production. While simultaneously, this may trigger an early onset of the next lean season.

• It is expected the household may sustain their lives during the projection periods although with minimum harvest. However, they may face difficulties in terms of stocking food for the upcoming lean season.

• Provision of timely humanitarian food and livelihoods assistance to severely food insecure population may reduce the impacts of upcoming dry spell and avoid the people in need from slipping into higher IPC Phases.
Thank You!

Contact IPC Secretariat @:

abdul.rashidi@fao.org
FSAC achievements and funding status in Q1 2021
## FSAC Achievements in 1st Quarter 2021

### Total People Reached

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People Targeted</th>
<th>People Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.8 Million</td>
<td>2 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Food Assistance**

- **People Targeted:** 11.8 Million
- **People Reached:** 2 million

**Response**

- Partners: 16
- 51% In Kind (food)
- 48% Cash
- 1% Vouchers

### Funding Status

- **Requirement:** (US $)
  - 553 MILLION

  - **Received:** $16m (3%)
  - **Gap:** $537m (97%)

*Results were achieved with funding received in 2020*

### Livelihood Support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People Targeted</th>
<th>People Reached</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Million</td>
<td>0.4 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Response**

- Partners: 6
- 43% Agriculture Inputs
- 10% Animal Feed
- 47% Cash

**Partners reported to FSAC:**

- AAA, AAH, ACTED, AfghanAid, ANCC, AWRO, CARE, CoAR, CORDAID, CRDSA, CWW, HIA, NRC, OCHR, ORD, SHPOUL, WHH, WSTA, WVI, ZOA, FAO and WFP
Findings of the Hard-to-Reach assessment
Hard-to-Reach Monitoring
Round 4 – Food Security and Agriculture Findings
Presented to the FSAC Cluster
April 2021 | Kabul, Afghanistan
1. Introduction and Methodology
2. Key findings
3. Implications
4. Product links
Introduction and Methodology
The HTR assessment aims at providing evidence on the needs and vulnerabilities of the populations living in the most inaccessible areas of Afghanistan.

In line with the Humanitarian Access Group (HAG), HTR areas are defined as areas that humanitarian actors struggle to access whether due to physical constraints, the conflict intensity and spread, and the presence of multiple stakeholders on the ground.

Since July 2019, REACH conducted four rounds of the HTR assessment. The current findings relate to the last round of the assessment conducted in January 2021.
## Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Analysis</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sampling</th>
<th>Areas Covered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Key informant at settlement level</td>
<td>In-person, on the phone and AOK interviews</td>
<td>18% of a district’s settlements</td>
<td>25 provinces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data presented at national and district levels</td>
<td>A multi-sector KOBO tool including 119 questions</td>
<td>3763 KII</td>
<td>120 districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3533 settlements</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Assessed Districts
In partnership with:

Assessment conducted in the framework of:

Afghanistan Humanitarian Coordinated Assessment Working Group

Funded by:

USAID

UKaid

With the support of:

REACH

INTER-CLUSTER COORDINATION TEAM
Key Findings
Livelihoods

Top 3 reported main sources of income in assessed settlements:

In 89% of assessed settlements where farming was reported among the top three main sources of income, most residents owned their land for cultivation.

In 86% of assessed settlements where livestock was reported among the top three main sources of income, most residents owned at least 5 animals.
Livelihoods

Notable exceptions:

Districts where most residents were reportedly involved in livestock:
Gulistan (Farah), Reg (Kandahar), Deh-I Shu (Helmand), Dawlat Abad (Faryab).

Districts where most residents were reportedly involved in small business:
Paktika (Urgun, Wazakhwah), Kapisa (Tagab), Nangarhar (Muhmand Dara)

Districts where most residents were reportedly involved in formal / informal employment:
Paktika (Ziruk), Ghazni (Wali Muhammad Shahid), Kunar (Shigal), Nangarhar (Nazyan)

Remittances:
Sabari (Khost), Shindand (Herat), Badghis (Ghormach), Logar (Baraki Barak)
Event / Shock and Impact (conflict)

% of assessed settlements reportedly impacted by an event or shock:

Top 3 reported reasons for households experiencing a decrease in the volume of their production:

1. Active conflict or violence  54%
2. Drought / precipitation deficit  18%
3. COVID-19  13%

Top 3 reported reasons for households experiencing a decrease in the number of livestock owned:

1. Active conflict or violence  58%
2. Drought / precipitation deficit  18%
3. COVID-19  15%
Event / Shock and Impact (natural disasters)

Less HTR districts had been reportedly impacted by natural disasters in the fourth round than in the previous round. Consequently they had reportedly a fewer impact on populations living in HTR districts' livelihoods.

**Notable exceptions:**

Districts where flood / heavy rainfall reportedly impacted most residents' sources of income:
Chak-e Wardak and Daymirabad (Maidan Wardak), Wormamay (Paktika) and Kot (Nangarhar).

Districts where drought / low precipitation reportedly impacted most residents' sources of income:
Ab Band, Giro and Wali Muhammad Shahid (Ghazni), Nesh and Shorabak (Kandahar).
In 60% of assessed settlements, KIs reported that most residents were not able to access enough food to meet their daily needs.

% of assessed settlements by reported level of hunger for most residents:

- The worst it can be: 2%
- Bad: 43%
- Small: 44%
- Almost none: 11%

In 96% of assessed settlements, KIs reported that the price for staple food (flour, eggs, fruits, vegetables, etc.) increased in the three months prior to data collection.
**Food security**

**Districts of extra concern:**

Ab Band, Andar (Ghazni), Baghlan-e Jadid (Baghlan), Baghran (Helmand), Maiwand (Kandahar), Mohammad Agha (Logar), Shirin Tagab (Faryab)

In these districts an increase of 70% or more in the number of KIs reporting most residents from their settlements not being able to access enough food was observed in comparison to the previous round.

**Overall these districts were marked by:**

- A large majority of residents reportedly involved in farming
- A large reporting of flood / heavy rainfall (Ab Band, Baghran, Mohammad Agha, Shirin Tagab)
- A large reporting of drought / low precipitation (Andar, Maiwand)
% of assessed settlements in which KIs reported no, few, some, or many households were engaging in the following coping strategies when food or money to buy food was not available:

- **Borrowing / relying on help from friends / family** remained in all rounds the most used coping strategy used by populations living in HTR areas when food or money to buy food was not available.

- None 31% Reduced food for adults so children were able to eat
- Some 20% Few 41% Many 8%

- None 5% Borrowed/relied on help from friends/family
- Some 40% Few 45% Many 10%

- None 32% Sent a family member abroad to work
- Some 21% Few 37% Many 10%
Coping strategies

**Districts of concern:**

Most adults were reportedly reduced their food consumption so children were able to eat:
Andar (Ghazni), Logar (Charkh), Reg, Shorabak, Zheray (Kandahar), Andkhoy (Faryab), Garmser (Helmand), Jorm (Badakhshan).

**Borrowed / relied on help from friends / family:**
Andar (Ghazni), Andkhoy, Qaysar (Faryab), Reg, Zheray (Kandahar), Charsadra (Ghor), Deh Bala (Nangarhar), Khas Kunar (Kunar), Sheltan (Kunar) Jorm (Badakhshan).

**Had to sent a family member abroad to work:**
Andar (Ghazni), Charsadra (Ghor), Shindand (Hirat), Shorabak (Kandahar), Bala Murghab, Jawand (Badghis), Bilcheragh (Faryab), Sheltan (Kunar).
In 21 districts over the 120 assessed all KIs reported Food as one of the three main priority needs for most residents from their settlements.

In 2 districts all KIs reported Seeds and Agricultural products as one of the three main priority needs for most residents from their settlements: Eskamesh (Takhar) and Surobi (Paktika).
HTR outputs for operational programming
Hard-to-Reach R4 Nationwide level factsheet
Hard-to-Reach R4 District level factsheets
Hard-to-Reach R4 Dataset
CONTACTS:
Nicolas Stolypine
Hard-to-Reach Monitoring Focal Point
nicolas.stolypine@reach-initiative.org

Aubrey Bauck
REACH Inter-Sectoral Research Unit Manager
aubrey.bauck@reach-initiative.org
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Agriculture Working Group ToR
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CCPM Action Plan

2021
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. To support service delivery</th>
<th>Action to be Require</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Deadline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Composition of participants maintain comprehensive</td>
<td>Provide equal opportunity to male and female in the meeting. And motivate partners to give opportunities to their female male staff participating in the meeting. If there is capacity gap, FSAC will provide training opportunity to further build the capacity.</td>
<td>Partners/FSAC</td>
<td>Regular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quarterly dashboards make more easy use for all partners</td>
<td>Maintain dashboards more user friendly and share it regularly. Use simple terms and common vocabulary for easy understanding to all people and as finalized FSAC will share it.</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>Each Quarter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. To plan and develop strategy</td>
<td>Action to Be Require</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination further improvement of the partners on the development of response plan, such as HRP (including strategic objectives, activities and indicators)?</td>
<td>Coordination will be further improved on strategic plans. Keep coordination with all partners before starting plan, send email, share information, invite them for discussion and work together for finalization.</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>August, September, October, December</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. To monitor and evaluate performance</td>
<td>Action Require</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information product, updates, need analysis will increase support of partners' organization in response planning</td>
<td>Sensitize partners on information sharing and accessing to it. Cluster sharing information on time, Despite that, an orientation session will be conducting regarding accessing to all information, products and guidelines of FSAC to get the data and further orient them on the use of the data. It especially for new NGOs/Partners.</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>May and August</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. To build capacity in preparedness and contingency planning.</td>
<td>Action Require</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSAC facilitate and coordinate emergency/contingency plan to address potential need of Food Security as result of hazard or risk.</td>
<td>Keep the follow up with partners as going now,</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>Based on the need April, May, Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FSAC will further build the capacity of partners to develop comprehensive response plan.</td>
<td>Keep it as agenda point in cluster meeting for further discussion to identify the area of capacity building partners need, identify the gaps which need further improvement, which tools need further improvement, what is relevant to FSAC to provide assistance. Consequently, develop a plan based on the information for capacity building and improvement of tools.</td>
<td>FSAC/Partners</td>
<td>Based on the need April, May, Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Advocacy</td>
<td>Action Require</td>
<td>Responsible</td>
<td>Deadline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners will be further update on Advocacy messages adopted and activities undertaken</td>
<td>A presentation should present on advocacy undertaken by FSAC in Cluster meeting and share achievements with partners. Sensitize the partners on advocacy undertaken by FSAC and coordinate with other cluster.</td>
<td>FSAC</td>
<td>in Every Second Month, e.g., April, June</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Photo by World Bank
Thanks 😊

FSAC contact: [Javedkhan.Bazargkheil@fao.org](mailto:Javedkhan.Bazargkheil@fao.org)