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Problem Statement

The IPC is a useful tool that provides valuable information for decision makers, particularly those engaged in food security and livelihoods. In South Sudan however, the coverage of its audience is largely limited to Juba with very little field penetration, yet most interventions are implemented in the field.

We need to find innovative ways of engaging with partners’ staff members who operate in the field to ensure that they are part of the processes that feed into the IPC as well as the response analysis and strategic design of interventions.
What does IPC do?

• IPC answers:
  (a) How severe is it?
  (b) Where are they?
  (c) How many are they?
  (d) Who are they?
  (e) Why are they food insecure?

• The IPC contributes to answering questions on where to allocate resources, to whom and to how many people, when, and on what should be done.

• Final results communicated in the form of IPC Map(s) and Population Table(s)
IPC Phases and Response(s)

Even with any humanitarian assistance widespread death and starvation are occurring.

Trigger for urgent humanitarian action

System Failure

Minimal Phase 1

Stressed Phase 2

Crisis Phase 3

Emergency Phase 4

Famine Phase 5

Manageable Food Insecurity

Unmanageable Humanitarian Disaster

LIMA/CLR P – Making IPC more accessible to Humanitarian Actors
• **LIMA** stands for Local Livelihoods Information, Monitoring, and Analysis whereas **CLRP** stands for Coordinated Livelihood Response Plan.

• The primary function of **LIMA** is mobilization for, and technical support to, focused data collection of immediate programmatic relevance.

• The aim of **CLRP** is to serve as a platform for situation and response analysis and planning for FSL at a more local level using existing FSL coordination structures.
LIMA/CLRP – Making IPC more accessible to Humanitarian Actors
CLRP Approach

• Look at the map(s)
• Look at the numbers
• Look at the evidence used (*request from the SS IPC TWG*)
• Fill out the CLRP document
CLRP Document Sections

• **Section 1 – Situation Analysis**: This is a consensus based analysis of the current food security and nutrition situation using the most recently released IPC area classifications and severely food insecure population numbers.

• **Section 2 – Causal Analysis**: This is a consensus based understanding on how the current situation developed, including primary drivers of food insecurity as contextualized and specific as possible.

• **Section 3 – Scenario-Building**: This is a consensus based understanding of the most likely progression of the current food insecurity situation, given causal factors and risk analysis, over an agreed upon time period, such as 3 or 6 months; this is expressed as a series of assumptions that consider conflict, production, markets, climatic conditions etc.
• **Section 4 – Overall Response Objectives**: While response objectives are associated with each IPC phase within the IPC reference tables, CLRPs should use these as a starting point and customize them based on the local context and assumptions.

• **Section 5 – Gap Analysis**: This will clearly indicate recently concluded interventions, what is ongoing, and what needs to remain relative to the IPC area classification and food insecure populations while also considering the previous situation and causal analyses (and how accurate they were).
CLRP Document Sections contd.

• **Section 6 – Response Options**: This is a range of options for interventions, based on the IPC area classification and food insecure populations. This process also takes into consideration any previous CLRP documents, the previous situation and causal analyses and scenario development, and the benefits and costs of each option. Options should include immediate interventions and those anticipated as contingencies given the various scenarios that have been developed by the participants.

• **Section 7 – Response Plan**: This is a consensus view of the most effective and efficient methods of implementation given past experiences in the area and the scenario development undertaken. This section may include issues of targeting, logistics, and cross-cutting issues, among others.
Lessons Learnt from Maban and Akobo

• Majority of field level partner staff have not heard of IPC
• County level sub-clusters need to “attract” more agencies to increase quorum
• Need to provide more trainings on IPC – particularly interpretation of findings for response planning
• County level actors expressed interest to participate in IPC analyses – *Re-introduction of state level analysis?*
• Gaps between IPC data and information that partners on the ground have – *IPC TWG to consider FGDs for humanitarian partners*
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