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**Abbreviations and acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AFI</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMN</td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CFI</td>
<td>Chronic food insecurity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSP</td>
<td>Global Strategic Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSU</td>
<td>Global Support Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPC</td>
<td>Integrated Food Security Phase Classification</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OED</td>
<td>FAO Office of Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWG</td>
<td>Technical working group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. **Background and context**

1. These terms of reference (TORs) have been developed to guide the evaluation of the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) Global Strategic Programme (2019–2022).

2. The IPC is a global, multi-partner initiative to facilitate improved decision making through consensus-based food security analysis. It is founded on a complementary set of analytical tools and protocols for analyzing and classifying the severity and nature of food insecurity and nutrition to inform multi-agency response. The IPC analytical approach draws on a convergence of available evidence to classify the severity and causes of acute food insecurity and malnutrition with the view to enable clear communication for decision making.

3. The purpose of the IPC is to promote more appropriate and effective policies and responses to food insecurity and malnutrition by providing decision makers with timely, reliable and accessible information about the food security and nutrition situation based upon the consensus of multiple stakeholders at national, regional and global levels. It provides:

   i. a common technical approach to the analysis of pre-existing food security and nutrition information;
   
   ii. an institutional process for maximizing consensus between stakeholders about the current and likely food security and nutrition situation; and
   
   iii. the basis for response analysis and decision making about appropriate policies, programmes and resource allocation.

4. The IPC global initiative is led by an IPC Global Partnership including 15 major global agencies committed to eradicating food insecurity: Action Against Hunger International (ACF), Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere (CARE), Oxfam, the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS), the European Commission’s Joint Research Centre (JRC), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), the Global Food Security Cluster, the Global Nutrition Cluster, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development (IGAD), Save the Children, the Central American Integration System (SICA), the Southern African Development Community, the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the World Food Programme (WFP).

5. The IPC is managed by a Global Steering Committee, a governing body tasked with strategically guiding and positioning the IPC globally. The IPC Global Steering Committee, which currently consists of the 15 partner organizations listed above, has the following responsibilities: positioning the IPC in the broader international framework of food security and nutrition initiatives, promoting institutionalization within partner agencies, overseeing the IPC Global Strategic Programme Management, providing strategic guidance, ensuring global coherence and respect of IPC principles, and endorsing the IPC technical approaches, tools and guidelines.
2. **The IPC Global Strategic Programme**

6. The IPC Global Steering Committee gathered in October 2013 with the purpose of reaching consensus on an IPC Global Strategic Programme. Incorporating feedback from partner and donor consultations at the global, regional and country levels, the first IPC Global Strategic Programme was launched in early 2014, with the intention of supporting the adoption of the IPC as a global standard for integrated, multi-sectoral and consensus-based analysis of food insecurity and acute malnutrition. Initially conceived as a three-year programme (2014–2016), the GSP was extended to the end of 2018. The 2014–2018 GSP achieved a significant expansion of the IPC initiative, expanding the number of protocols as well as the number of countries in which IPC was applied while forging important new partnerships. A new 2019–2022 IPC GSP phase was developed following strategic reflections on the experience of the 2014–2018 GSP and taking into account the results of the 2016 mid-term review and the 2018 evaluation of the program.¹

7. The overall Strategic Objective of the 2019–2022 GSP has remained unchanged compared to the previous phase of the programme: “decision-makers at the global, regional and country level use the IPC for decision-making and this is providing the evidence and standards for better decisions that improve emergency and development policy and programming”. Based on findings from the review processes mentioned above, recommendations from IPC stakeholders, and lessons learned from application at the country level, the 2019–2022 GSP identified four outcomes, listed below and detailed in Figure 1:

   i. Outcome 1: Quality of IPC outputs is improved;
   
   ii. Outcome 2: IPC tools and procedures are responsive to evolving analytical developments and challenges;
   
   iii. Outcome 3: At global, regional and country level, IPC is supported by inclusive and sustainable processes and structures; and
   
   iv. Outcome 4: IPC information is efficiently communicated and accessible to all stakeholders for effective decision support.

¹ Results of prior evaluations are discussed in section 3.2 of this document.
8. The following are the key intended elements of the 2019–2022 GSP:\(^2\)

i. Focusing on food crises: reaffirming the IPC’s importance in food crises, the GSP will aim at improving IPC quality in key priority countries, with a special focus on those facing the worst food crises as identified by the Global Report on Food Crises. This will prioritize application of the acute food insecurity (AFI), targeted expansion of the acute malnutrition (AMN) and chronic food insecurity (CFI), and introduction of multi-scale analyses. This will also imply optimizing the early warning function of the IPC by improving the way IPC projections are developed and communicated.

ii. Needs-based technical development: the focus of technical development over the strategic period will be the rollout of the IPC Manual version 3.0, developing detailed technical guidance on specific topics (e.g. projection analysis) and refining the analytical tools to better identify the food insecure and malnourished populations. Further technical development will explore introducing IPC analysis for specific vulnerable populations, such as refugees/Internally displaced persons (IDPs) and food insecure urban populations and exploring possible adjustments to CFI protocols to better respond to the needs of decision makers. The IPC partnership will also look into how to make best use of the major advances in advanced Information technologies and artificial intelligence in support of the IPC.

iii. A commitment to quality: as a stepping-stone to quality assurance, capacity development efforts will be expanded following a continuous and flexible learning.

---

\(^2\) Source: IPC Global Strategic Programme (2019–2022): Towards improved evidence based decision making at global, regional, and country levels in response to food insecurity and malnutrition
approach, which will include a wider range of training modalities for global, regional and country IPC practitioners. Furthermore, across countries, real time quality assurance measures will be prioritised over post hoc quality reviews, and will consist in providing technical support as needed, from the planning stages of data collection through to final dissemination of results.

iv. Partnership, governance and institutionalization: the IPC is collaborative and consensus-driven in nature. This strategy will encourage IPC partner organizations to emulate their global-level commitments at regional and country levels, calling upon partners to strengthen the overall robustness of the IPC through their sector-specific expertise. Engagement at higher level and with IPC resource partners will also be sought to ensure that IPC is at the forefront of the global agenda on food security and nutrition. Where feasible, the governance of IPC at regional and country level will be strengthened to ensure improved integration of IPC into existing structures and systems for greater effectiveness, ownership and sustainability.

v. Stronger communication and information management: the quality and utility of IPC analyses is sometimes offset by limited uptake and application of IPC information (that is, information both from and about IPC). This strategy will include communication and outreach activities at global, regional and country level aimed at increasing stakeholders’ access to IPC information as well as awareness and understanding of IPC among decision-makers (thereby promoting the uptake of IPC findings). These efforts will be complemented by the introduction and coordination of a global network of communication specialists from IPC partner agencies as well as improved information management and increased support to countries for enhanced communication activities and dissemination of IPC findings.

2.1 IPC beneficiaries and target countries

9. Primary beneficiaries of the IPC GSP are food security experts and analysts in national government departments and regional institutions with a food security mandate, relevant United Nations (UN) offices, donor agencies and non-governmental organizations working on food security and nutrition. These stakeholder groups vary according to the country context and type of IPC scale. Indirect beneficiaries are the food insecure and malnourished populations of targeted countries and regions who will benefit from improved decision making and programmes with better food security impacts.

10. While in the 2014–2018 GSP countries were classified into three categories of IPC implementation (consolidation stage, introduction stage and potential countries), the 2019–2022 GSP has prioritized countries that are facing the largest food crises. Approximately 10 to 15 countries are identified every year based on the Global Report on Food Crises amongst other considerations.

11. A core principle of the IPC GSP is that support is driven by the demand. Indeed, IPC country activities are only implemented based on explicit request by the country/region.

12. Since 2019, the GSP programme has so far provided assistance to 50 countries from Asia, Africa, Central America and the Near East, on one or more types of analysis (acute, chronic, malnutrition).

---

3 As of January 2021.
2.2 IPC analyses and tools

13. Three IPC scales have been developed to address different needs and are presented in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPC definitions of food insecurity and malnutrition</th>
<th>Acute food insecurity</th>
<th>Chronic food insecurity</th>
<th>Acute malnutrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food insecurity found in a specified area at a specific point in time and of a severity that threatens lives or livelihoods, or both, regardless of the causes, context or duration.</td>
<td>Food insecurity that persists over time mainly due to structural causes, including intra-annual seasonal food insecurity.</td>
<td>Global acute malnutrition as expressed by thinness of individuals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guides interventions focus</td>
<td>Short-term objectives to prevent or decrease severe food insecurity that threatens lives or livelihoods.</td>
<td>Medium- and long-term improvement of the quality and quantity of food consumption for an active and healthy life.</td>
<td>Short- and long-term objectives to prevent or decrease high levels of acute malnutrition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical focus</td>
<td>Identify areas with large proportion of households with significant food energy gaps or livelihood change strategies that can endanger lives and livelihoods.</td>
<td>Identifying areas with large proportion of households with long-term inability to meet minimum food requirements both in terms of quality and quantity.</td>
<td>Identifying areas with large proportion of children acutely malnourished.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of countries using the scale</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the evaluation team.

2.2.1 New tools developed by the GSP 2019–2022

14. The IPC mapping tool,\(^4\) launched in October 2020, is an interactive interface that shows a map of all the countries the IPC works in and allows the download of population data. The IPC mapping tool features data from 2017 onwards for both AFI and CFI for 35 countries covered by the IPC. Links are made with countries covered by the Cadre Harmonisé (CH).

15. The IPC Population Tracking Tool,\(^5\) also launched in 2020, is an online platform that gives the public access to population data from more than 30 different countries and allows users to download resource data for offline IPC analyses since 2017.

16. The IPC Analysis Platform is a new initiative that aims at improving the frequency and coverage of IPC analyses by providing:

   i. Near real time analyses: current and forecasted status, including severity, magnitude and drivers provided with a consistent and adequate frequency to capture any significant changes in the food security and nutrition situation.

   ii. Coverage to any country of concern: expanding IPC further into all areas where information on food insecurity and acute malnutrition is a concern.

\(^4\) https://www.ipcinfo.org/#mapping-tool

\(^5\) https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis/population-tracking-tool/en/#:~:text=The%20IPC%20Population%20Tracking%20Tool%20is%20an%20online%20platform%20that,on%20official%20country%20population%20estimates.
iii. Unbiased and trustworthy analysis: findings are based on technical rigor and global standards built on multistakeholder evidence-based technical consensus, in line with IPC protocols and data quality standards.

17. The platform will rely on technological innovations to support and enhance human led analysis and will develop new processes and partnerships for data sharing, learning and communication. As of October 2021, a vision and strategy for the IPC Analysis Platform had been developed, endorsed and initial implementation begun.

18. IPC risk of famine reviews: In 2020, the IPC Global Support Unit (GSU) was approached by partners to develop standards for the assessment and communication of a risk of famine (ROF). Pilot analyses were conducted in Ethiopia, Madagascar and South Sudan following which a review process was conducted to learn from the experience of the pilots and provide recommendations for improving the IPC ROF analysis.

2.3 IPC governance structure

19. Country level: at the country level, technical working groups (TWGs) are the foundation of the IPC governance structure (Figure 2 below). These comprise technical experts representing key stakeholder institutions/organizations (e.g. governments, UN agencies, non-governmental organizations [NGOs]) 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.

20. Regional level: in most regions, regional IPC TWGs composed of representatives from key stakeholders are usually established to support the funding, implementation and institutionalization 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 GSU, also play a key role in coordinating IPC activities within the region and provide direct support to regional and country stakeholders for IPC implementation.

21. Global level: at the global level, the IPC is governed by the IPC Global Steering Committee and is composed of senior officers representing the 15 partner organizations. The Global Steering Committee is responsible for strategically guiding and positioning the IPC globally. There is also a technical advisory group (TAG) that is responsible for advising the Global 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 GSU is the operational arm of the IPC Global Steering Committee. Hosted at FAO, 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 capacity development, technical and communication support to countries, as well as quality assurance oversight, among other things.
2.4 Programme resources

While the GSP 2014–2018 was launched with a funding request of USD 17.25 million, the funding requirements for the GSP 2019–2022 were set at USD 34 million, an increase of almost 100 percent that illustrates the substantial growth of the programme.

The GSP is funded by three resource partners: the United Kingdom’s Foreign, Commonwealth & Development Office (FCDO), the European Union and the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) through different projects (see Table 2 below). Savings of about USD 6 million from projects that had contributed to the previous phase of the GSP (GCP/GLO/691/USA and GCP/INT/245/EC) were used, together with new grants received from FCDO, USAID bringing the current overall funding level at approximately USD 32 million
(corresponding to 94 percent of the initial funding request). The timeline of the projects that finance the IPC is indicated in Figure 4 below.

24. The new grants received from FCDO and USAID (GCP/GLO/1014/UK and GCP/GLO/1011/USA) are aligned with the objectives and structure of the GSP 2019–2022 and contribute to the achievement of the overall deliverables of the programme.

25. The EU contribution (GCP/GLO/596/EC) is part of a larger grant in support of the Global Network Against Food Crises Programme (GNAFC) partnership programme. The GNAFC programme was launched in July 2018 with the aim of building resilience in countries facing food crises with a EUR 77 million (USD 82 336 793) contribution from the European Union. The overall objective of the GNAFC partnership programme is to “substantially increase the resilience of vulnerable people’s livelihoods to food crises, through its contribution to the GNAFC, which will play a central role in translating evidence-based analysis into policy change at global and country level.” The programme is composed of three components:

   i. Component 1: analysis and Information: produce quality analyses and evidence that relevant national, regional and global stakeholders (i.e. Global Network against Food Crises, national policy makers) can use for programming and policymaking.
   
   ii. Component 2: country-level investment and learning: generate knowledge on a set of typologies of crisis and response options that national, regional and global stakeholders can adapt to their specific context and replicate for country level-investments.
   
   iii. Component 3: evidence-based joint/coordinated response to food crises: enhance dialogue in high-level policymaking and policy buy-in through the Global Network against Food Crises, joint coordination on country level, as well as knowledge management and learning.

26. Component 1, which is mapped to the GSP 2019–2022, serves as the analytical dimension, generating analyses to provide relevant national, regional and global stakeholders with evidence for programming and policymaking through information generated through IPC, Early Warning Early Action, and RIMA and supported by MEAL and KORE functions. Having run parallel to the GNAFC partnership programme in 2019, the components of INFORMED have since been gradually transferred into the GNAFC.

Table 2. Projects contributing to the IPC GSP (2019–2022)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Budget (USD)</th>
<th>OED-NTE</th>
<th>Expenditures as of 31/12/2021 (USD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Global Network Against Food Crises Partnership Programme – GCP/GLO/596/EC (component 1)</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>12 million</td>
<td>July 2018 December 2022</td>
<td>9.8 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards improved evidence-based decision-making at global, regional, and country levels in response to food insecurity and malnutrition – GCP/GLO/494/UK</td>
<td>FCDO</td>
<td>1.42 million</td>
<td>March 2021 September 2021</td>
<td>1.39 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards improved evidence-based decision-making at global, regional, and country levels in response to food insecurity and malnutrition - GCP/GLO/1014/UK</td>
<td>FCDO</td>
<td>4.13 million</td>
<td>September 2021 February 2024</td>
<td>0.93 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCP/GLO/1011/USA</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>9 million</td>
<td>August 2021 January 2024</td>
<td>0.44 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GCP/GLO/691/USA</td>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>3.12 million</td>
<td>October 2016 March 2021</td>
<td>3.12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EC-Informed GCP/INT/245/EC</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>2.9 million</td>
<td>May 2015 December 2019</td>
<td>2.9 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the evaluation team.
Figure 4. Timeline of IPC GSP projects

Update of IPC GSP Projects’ Timeline

Source: IPC GSU, March 2022.
3. Previous evaluations and monitoring and evaluation framework

3.1 Previous reviews and evaluations

27. There have been two evaluations of the GSP: a mid-term review in 2016/2017, and a final evaluation of the IPC GSP 2014–2018 published in 2019. A review of the IPC in South Sudan was also carried out in 2021.

3.1.1 Evaluation of the IPC Global Strategic Programme 2014–2018

28. The final evaluation of the GSP 2014–2018, while fulfilling an accountability purpose to the GSP’s three donor agencies, was focused on a strategic level and with a strong learning purpose in order to inform the design of the 2019–2022 phase of the programme. Recognizing that the significant expansion of the GSP, which more than doubled its annual budget between 2012 and 2017, entailed a new set of challenges and responsibility, the evaluation made the following eight recommendations:

i. The proposed strategic direction for the GSP should be adjusted as follows:
   • Giving the AFI’s early warning role greater emphasis and clarifying what kind of early warning role the AFI can and should play, alongside other systems for early warning.
   • Pausing roll-out of the CFI while exploring options for how it should be taken forward, and whether and how another organization would be better placed than the GSP to take over development and roll-out.

ii. More attention should be paid to monitoring use of the IPC AFI and AMN scales at country, regional and global levels.

iii. The GSP should focus on strengthening the quality and transparency of the IPC analysis process for the acute scales, as these are key factors affecting the utility and credibility of the IPC. The evaluation recommends a number of ways of doing this, ranging from data sources to consensus building, with implications for who participates in the IPC analysis process.

iv. A research funding facility for the GSP/GSU should be established, to build an evidence base to inform future technical development of the IPC acute scales. Such a facility will enable the GSP to commission independent research studies that deepen analysis and understanding of acute food insecurity, for example to strengthen the IPC in analysis and prediction of famine, and retrospectively to assess the accuracy of its early warning projections.

v. The GSP should develop and clarify its strategy on institutionalization, at country and regional levels.

vi. The growing influence, use and exposure of the IPC has implications for GSP global partners. This ranges from greater participation in capacity development at country and regional levels, contributing to the GSP according to their respective comparative advantage, stepping up their engagement beyond the technical domain, and stepping up institutionalization of the IPC within their own agencies.

---

vii. The GSP should continue to develop the IPC for better disaggregation. This includes by gender, displacement, supporting countries to disaggregate the analysis to smaller geographic units, and exploring how the IPC analysis can be adapted for urban contexts.

viii. Key issues beyond the scope of this evaluation should be explored in the mid-term review for the next phase of the GSP. These include the GSP’s approach to quality assurance, and the effectiveness and appropriateness of the GSP’s governance arrangements.

29. In its Management response, the IPC partnership accepted or partially accepted all recommendations and noted that most of the recommendations, and particularly those related to the enhanced focus on quality assurance, the change in the institutionalization strategy of IPC, and a greater role for the Global Food Security Cluster, reflected what was planned to be implemented in the GSP 2019–2022.

3.1.2 Independent review of the IPC South Sudan

30. In 2021, the three IPC resource partners – USAID, the United Kingdom’s FCDO and the European Union – commissioned ODI/HPG to carry out an independent review of the IPC in South Sudan, following a request from the Government of South Sudan, after the breakdown of the IPC analysis process in South Sudan in October/November 2020. The TWG had been unable to reach technical consensus on the severity of food insecurity in parts of the country. The review’s primary purpose was to support the restoration of the effective functioning and credibility of the IPC in South Sudan, by documenting what had happened, analyzing the reasons for the breakdown in consensus, and recommending the way forward. The findings revealed fundamental design flaws in the IPC model, the most critical being the breakdown of the model when the twin objectives of the GSP conflict: maintaining the integrity of an independent and objective IPC analysis with the global partnership as custodian, and institutionalizing the IPC as a locally owned, government-led process. The review made a number of recommendations to address this and other issues, with the aim of ensuring the effective functioning of the IPC in South Sudan in the future, and the continued credibility of the IPC as a global ‘gold standard’. Many of the findings and recommendations have relevance to this GSP evaluation.

31. Findings and recommendations of the evaluation of the 2014–2018 GSP, as well as lessons learned from implementation, led the IPC partnership to engage in a series of strategic reflections and to identify the following challenges that informed the development of the 2019–2022 GSP.

i. Implementation of IPC could be more effective if there was better dissemination at global, regional and country level of best practices drawn from country-level experience.

ii. IPC has maintained an extensive quality review process, the impact of which could have been more significant if more systematic follow-up on the findings and recommendations took place.

iii. Food security and nutrition crisis events are complex and multidimensional. Information demand from decision-makers requires that this complexity and multidimensionality is captured and presented well. This has fuelled interest in the thematic extension of IPC, to cover, for instance, food insecure populations in urban areas, refugees and IDPs. In addition, countries require a deeper understanding of the key drivers of CFI, gender-specific patterns and/or, in the case of heavily decentralised governments, information at

---

10 As well as findings and recommendations of the 2016 external Mid-Term Review of the IPC GSP and of the 2017 review of the FAO-EU Partnership Programmes FIRST and INFORMED, of which IPC is a major component
lower administrative level to inform economic investment decisions. At the same time, to be successful, the application of IPC at field level needs to remain simple and feasible.

iv. The acute food insecurity scale is not fulfilling its early warning function well compared with its ability to capture the current status of food insecurity. In fact, most users of the IPC rely upon the current situation analysis for their decisions about forthcoming resource allocations, and not the projections. Stepping up the early warning role of the IPC has both technical and communication implications.

v. The potential of the CFI scale in informing policies, programming and investment planning has not yet been realized. This results from various challenges including limited data availability and quality, lack of granularity of the analysis, political sensitivity of the results, the challenge of translating the findings into recommendations and GSU’s limited capacity to provide adequate support at country level, including for much needed engagement with potential users.

vi. Achieving the institutionalization of IPC by ensuring that IPC processes are embedded within regional and country structures and institutional mechanisms is a process that is context dependent. This requires a flexible approach that is specific to local context, with greater priority afforded to pluralistic, inclusive modes of partnership across all stakeholder organizations, not just a focus on government counterparts.

vii. Communications requirements have not always been proactively addressed, but were attended to more reactively, responding to requests for support as they were received. Support to country-level IPC TWGs has tended to focus on capacity building on technical topics to ensure the technical rigour of the analysis, giving less attention to the next step, i.e. communication. This has contributed to a context where there is limited communication at country level, which in turn impacts on suboptimal dissemination and uptake of IPC information.

viii. As IPC protocols and the number of IPC practitioners expanded, there has been an increase in usage of the Information Support System (ISS) and in the external and internal demand on ISS, certification database and other data and information systems, which need to be better addressed.

3.2 The IPC GSP 2019–2022 monitoring, evaluation and learning framework

32. The IPC monitoring and evaluation (M&E) framework was developed in 2014 and updated in 2019 to “guide the monitoring of programme performance, enable learning from ongoing implementation, and ensure accountability to stakeholders”. The framework recognizes that effectively monitoring the progress and evaluating the impact of the GSP requires an “approach capable of identifying shifts in the wider context, monitoring relationships between and actions of diverse stakeholders, synthesizing different sources of evidence, and accommodating unanticipated developments”.

33. The framework describes practical and technical issues involved in monitoring and evaluating the IPC as a complex, multi-partner, global approach to food security analysis and puts forward includes a logical model for monitoring and evaluating the outputs, outcomes and impact of the programme. The framework lists specific indicators as well as methods and tools (see Table 3 below) to ensure the collection and monitoring of progress against outputs and outcome indicators.
Table 3. IPC monitoring and evaluation tools and methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IPC scores</th>
<th>Progress towards key indicators at outcome and intermediate outcome level monitored by GSU through the use of four IPC scores (relevance, quality, capacity and institutionalization).</th>
<th>Baselines for the four scores measured in 2019 and progress monitored yearly.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IPC stakeholders’ perception survey</td>
<td>The survey has two objectives: i) monitor the progress of GSP II; and ii) provide information to the GSU of the IPC on users and practitioners’ perceptions of the IPC in order to support internal decision making aiming at better matching decision makers’ needs.</td>
<td>Baseline survey conducted in 2019. Follow-up surveys conducted in 2020. A follow-up survey is scheduled for April 2022.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key informant interview guidelines</td>
<td>Developed ad-hoc whenever feedback on specific thematic areas is needed (e.g. IPC CFI scale).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk review of use of IPC findings</td>
<td>The IPC desk review aims at providing information on decisionmakers’ use of IPC analysis findings to respond to food insecurity and malnutrition. In particular, the review is a source of information to monitor the progress indicator set at Outcome level in the logical framework of the IPC Global Strategic Programme 2019–2022: “% of countries where IPC is cited and/or reportedly used in food security and nutrition programming and policy documents”.</td>
<td>Results published in February 2020. A new IPC desk review will be conducted in April 2022.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the evaluation team.
4. **Evaluation purpose and intended users**

34. While this evaluation has an accountability element, it also has a strong learning element in order to provide findings and recommendations to inform the strategic direction and orientation of the GSP at a time where the next phase of the programme is being developed.

35. The primary intended users of the IPC evaluation are the Global Steering Committee and the IPC GSU. The secondary users are the three IPC resource partners, the 15 IPC partner organizations and all actors involved in IPC or food security analysis at global, regional and country levels.
5. **Evaluation scope**

36. The scope of this evaluation is the entire GSP, composed of the projects described above. All GSP activities at global, regional and country levels will be part of this evaluation. The timeframe is from January to April/May 2022,\(^\text{11}\) and the geographical scope includes all IPC countries, as well as global/headquarters level activities within the programme.

\(^{11}\) Although the current phase of the IPC GSP will finish at the end of 2022, data collection for this evaluation is expected to take place in April/May 2022.
6. Evaluation questions

37. The evaluation will be structured around four main lines of inquiry: Results on the use of the IPC; governance; adaptive capacity; and equity/gender. The main evaluation questions and sub-questions are outlined below. The questions relating to the results of the programme are structured around the four programme outcomes, in order to ensure clarity and coverage of all programme components. The final evaluation report will be structured around the evaluation questions.

38. An evaluation matrix will be prepared by the evaluation team during the evaluation inception phase and will include more sub-questions and information needs under each evaluation question, as well as data collection methods.

6.1 Use and utility of the IPC

EQ 1.1: To what extent is the IPC meeting decision-makers’ needs for evidence for improved decision-making?

1.1.1: Has the use of IPC in decision making increased during the current phase of the GSP? If it has, what have been the enabling factors and could be done to increase its use even further?

1.1.2: If decision-makers are using the IPC, how and for what purpose, with examples? What difference does it make to have the IPC?

EQ 1.2: To what extent is the support provided by the GSU to countries relevant, timely and useful, and how can it be improved, with the overall aim of facilitating utilization?

1.2.1: How has the role of GSU evolved compared to the GSP 2014–2018 and to what extent did this lead to an improvement at both country and global level?

6.2 Governance

EQ 2.1: How effective and appropriate are the current governance arrangements of IPC in view of the higher profile and increasing influence of the IPC?

2.1.1: How should IPC manage the tension between the objective of ‘ownership’ at country level, with the government playing a critical role, and the need to protect the independence and integrity of the IPC analysis as a global standard upheld by the GSP, while ensuring optimal use of IPC findings?

2.1.2: To what extent has IPC governance at regional and country level led to improved integration of IPC into existing structures and systems for greater effectiveness, ownership and sustainability?

6.3 Adaptive capacity

EQ 3.1: To what extent has the IPC GSP learned from implementation, from internal and external reviews, and from the changing external context and adapted its programme activities accordingly, with the overall objective of informing and influencing decision-making?

3.1.1: To what extent did formal and informal accountability and learning mechanisms (e.g. M&E system, case studies, quality reviews) enable the programme to adapt and improve?

3.1.2: Has the programme been using the most effective approach to quality assurance? What changes were introduced in the current phase and what impact did this have?
6.4 Equity/gender

EQ 4.1: To what extent has gender and other inter-sectional determinants of vulnerability been taken into account in the different IPC scales?

4.1.1: How has the GSP promoted disaggregation of different vulnerable groups (e.g. urban and displaced/ refugees; gender and generation) in the IPC analysis? To what extent is this meeting the needs of decision-makers?
7. **Methodology**

39. The key evaluation questions above will guide the overall assessment. In answering the evaluation questions, the evaluation will also assess the extent to which the recommendations of the evaluation of the 2014–2018 GSP were successfully implemented, as well as progress in implementing the recommendations of the mid-term review. The evaluation will also assess the extent to which the GSP has been able to address the challenges listed in section 3.1 above. Finally, the evaluation will make use of the IPC M&E framework to assess the performance of the programme.

40. An inception report will complement the TORs and contribute to guide the evaluation. It will provide parties involved in the evaluation with a mutual understanding of the organization of the work. It will encompass a draft theory of change (TOC), a stakeholder analysis, detailed information on the evaluation approach and methodology, the evaluation matrix, information and justifications for the country case studies selection, and an update of the limitations and risks, timeline and deliverables of the evaluation.

41. The evaluation will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the process. Triangulation of evidence will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.

42. In answering all evaluation questions, the evaluation will benefit from a desk review of existing documents and other secondary data. It will make use of primary data sources including semi-structured key informant interviews and focus group discussions with GSU and other staff of the 15 partner agencies, including FAO (at headquarters, regional and country-level), donor representatives, government officials, food security and nutrition stakeholders (IPC partners, practitioners and others, including technical experts and senior management in relevant UN agencies, NGOs, technical agencies, academia etc.) at global, regional and national levels, with a particular focus on users of the IPC.

43. The evaluation will also review the analyses and information collected as part of the programme’s monitoring and evaluation framework to assess progress against outputs and targets, such as the desk reviews of IPC use, the results of the IPC stakeholders’ perception surveys and the four IPC scores (see Section 3.2 above). The Evaluation Team will also contribute to the design of the 2022 user survey, scheduled to be administered in April 2022.

44. The evaluation will focus on a select number of IPC countries, to gather region and country-level evidence and provide an in-depth assessment of outcomes and achievements. These countries will be selected by the evaluation team in consultation with the GSU, with a potential long list proposed in Table 4 below. In these countries, the evaluation will review all IPC-related activities, independently of the source of funding. Country visits are expected to be planned in two countries, if the global context – including the COVID-19 situation – allows it, with other sample countries covered remotely.

45. In order to maximize the opportunities to learn and ensure this evaluation provides accountability to donors and partners, the following aspects will be taken into consideration to select focus countries for this evaluation:

   i. include countries where there have been challenges in achieving consensus and countries where consensus has been achieved more smoothly (as assessed through interviews and desk review during the inception phase);
ii. different contexts, e.g. ranging contexts of stable governance to conflict-affected/fragile states;

iii. countries where IPC analyses were carried out during the current phase of the GSP; and

iv. include some countries covered by the 2019 Evaluation of the IPC (2014–2018), and/or countries covered by the mid-term review.¹²

46. Accordingly, the following countries are being considered to be the subject of case studies by the evaluation team.

### Table 4. Long list of proposed country case studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>IPC scales implemented</th>
<th>Number and type of IPC analyses carried out as part of GSP 2019–2022 (until Jan 2022)</th>
<th>Included in the evaluation of IPC 2014–2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>9 (AFI and AMN)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>9 (AFI and AMN)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>11 (AFI and AMN)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>7 (AFI and AMN)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic</td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>11 (AFI and AMN)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>6 (AFI and AMN)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>5 (AFI)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>4 (AFI)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>3 (AFI)</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>4 (AFI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>2 (AFI)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>6 (AFI-CH and AMN)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(support to CH analysis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>Acute food insecurity</td>
<td>2 (AFI-CH and AMN)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(support to CH analysis)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the evaluation team.

47. Countries where FAO’s Office of Evaluation (OED) has conducted or is conducting concurrent country programme evaluations, such as Afghanistan and Madagascar, Nigeria, Somalia and South Sudan will feed into this evaluation, in order to create synergies and optimize the use of resources. The evaluation will also build synergies with the OED Evaluation of Component 2 of the Global Network against Food Crises partnership programme which is following a similar timeline.

48. In relation to the other IPC countries, desks reviews, skype interviews and/or online surveys will be conducted. The analysis of the survey results will add an additional layer for triangulation of the evaluation findings. In particular, it will enable the evaluation team to triangulate the primary data collected in countries where the IPC has proceeded more smoothly with information from

countries where less results have been achieved, and better understand the potentially contributing factors.

49. Particular attention will be devoted to ensuring that women and other under-privileged groups will be consulted in an adequate manner. The evaluation will adhere to United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG) Norms & Standards. The evaluation will draw specific conclusions and formulate recommendations for any necessary further action by FAO and/or other parties to refine the focus and strengthen the coordination of the programme and to ensure long term sustainability of the programme outcomes.

12 http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards
8. **Evaluation team composition and profile**

50. The evaluation team will consist of three external international consultants who will work under the guidance and with participation of the OED Evaluation Manager (EM).

51. The international consultants will have experience and expertise in two or more of the following areas: food security, information systems, policy development, early warning systems, nutrition, gender, monitoring and evaluation.

52. National consultants will support data collection as needed in countries selected as case studies or during the country missions carried out by the evaluation team. The national consultants will have some experience in evaluation, and a good knowledge of the policy and institutional framework related to the food security and nutrition analysis.

53. The evaluation team members and national consultants should be independent from any organizations that have been involved in designing, executing or advising any aspect of the IPC programme.
9. **Roles and responsibilities**

54. OED takes the lead in drafting the TORs, in the identification of the consultants and in the organization of the team’s work; it is responsible for the finalization of the TORs and of the team composition; it shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for quality assurance purposes in terms of presentation, compliance with the TORs and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations. OED is also responsible for following up with the budget holder (BH) for the timely preparation of the Management response and the follow-up report.

55. The OED EM guides and coordinates the evaluation team members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and coordinates the production of the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own. The EM is responsible for the finalization of the TORs and of the identification of the evaluation team members.

56. The IPC GSU is responsible for initiating the evaluation process, providing inputs to the TORs and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to participate in meetings with the evaluation team, make information and documentation available as necessary, and comment on the draft report. The GSU is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management response and the follow-up report. OED guidelines for the Management response and the follow-up report provide necessary details on this process.

57. The evaluation team is composed of an evaluation team leader, who leads the evaluation, and of two team members. The evaluation team is responsible for further developing and applying the evaluation methodology, for conducting the evaluation, for drafting an inception report including a revised version of the evaluation matrix and a stakeholder assessment and for producing the evaluation report. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided by OED. The evaluation team will also be free to expand the scope, criteria, questions and issues listed above, as well as develop its own evaluation tools and framework, within time and resources available and based on discussions with the EM, and in consultation with the GSU where necessary. The evaluation team is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the governments or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for quality assurance of all evaluation reports and takes the full responsibility of its publication on OED website.
10. Evaluation products (deliverables) and timeline

This section describes the key evaluation products the evaluation team will be accountable for producing. These products include:

i. These evaluation TORs.

ii. An inception report, including an evaluation matrix and a stakeholder analysis.

iii. The evaluation matrix will show how each evaluation question will be answered by way of: proposed methods, proposed sources of data and data collection procedures, and interview guides for relevant country-level stakeholders.

iv. Draft evaluation report: the project team and key stakeholders in the evaluation should review the draft evaluation report to ensure that the evaluation meets the required quality criteria. The draft report should illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation questions listed in the TORs.

v. Final evaluation report: the final evaluation report should include an executive summary. The report will be prepared in English with numbered paragraphs, following the OED template for report writing. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report. Translations in other languages of the Organization, if required, will be FAO’s responsibility.

vi. Evaluation brief and other knowledge products or participation in knowledge sharing events, if relevant.

Table 5. Indicative timeline of the evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TORs finalization</td>
<td>March 2022</td>
<td>EM with BH and GSU</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team identification and recruitment</td>
<td>February/March 2022</td>
<td>EM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inception report</td>
<td>April 2022</td>
<td>Evaluation team leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection</td>
<td>April – May 2022</td>
<td>EM and evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First draft for circulation</td>
<td>June 2022</td>
<td>EM and evaluation team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final draft for circulation</td>
<td>July 2022</td>
<td>EM and evaluation team</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Elaborated by the evaluation team.
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IPC technical classification tools

The acute food insecurity scale should remain the priority focus of the GSP, with the GSU continuing to provide technical support and capacity development on the acute scales, running quality review processes, continuing to roll out the acute malnutrition scale alongside the acute food insecurity scale, and taking action to increase the relevance of the acute food security tool. The mid-term review specifically recommends the following:

In the current phase of the GSP:

i. urgently addressing how phase 5 and famine guidance can be adapted so that it is possible to provide famine alerts when the convergence of evidence and judgement of the ERC experts indicate the likelihood of famine conditions;

ii. continuing to develop version 3.0 of the IPC manual, addressing how technical standards can be adapted to be less rigorous for contexts with limited access and data availability;

iii. scoping how the IPC can begin to analyze the food security of urban populations;

iv. monitoring the application and use of the acute malnutrition scale, and developing guidance on the contexts in which it should be used, based on evolving experience; and

v. at national level, promoting:
   - disaggregation of the IPC analysis by gender and socio-economic status, encouraging data collection methods to make this possible; and
   - trend analysis of IPC results to provide a more dynamic analysis of food security beyond the static snapshots.

In the next phase of the GSP:

i. adapting the IPC acute food insecurity scale to urban contexts.

The chronic scale should be a secondary priority for the GSU, consolidating work already underway, specifically:

In the current phase of the GSP, and into the next phase:

i. monitoring the development and use of the chronic scale at national level;

ii. thus clarifying the actual and potential uses of the chronic scale; and

iii. encouraging TWGs and other stakeholders of the chronic scale at national level to plan strategically and inclusively for institutionalization and ownership of the chronic scale, bringing partners from the development sector into the development and roll-out of the chronic scale.

Extending the geographical coverage of the chronic scale to new countries (and regions within countries) should be slowed down until the next phase of the GSP when the revised global governance system is put in place for the chronic scale.

Supporting IPC quality

Quality assurance must remain a high priority for the GSP, and there is likely to be growing demand for quality review processes as application of the IPC acute food insecurity scale expands geographically. Quality review processes for the IPC acute scales should be adapted to be more persuasive, more comprehensive, more inclusive, more accessible and more transparent. Specifically:
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In the current phase of the GSP:

1. to ensure greater transparency in the quality review process, a summary of the quality review findings should be made available to users of the IPC to ensure they are better informed about the quality of the analyses they are using; and
2. use of the IPC ‘brand’ should be dependent upon obligatory and periodic quality review processes: criteria should be drawn up to determine when a quality review process should be launched (e.g. with what frequency and/or when a certain number of global partners raise concerns about IPC quality).

In the next phase of the GSP:

1. the GSP should decentralize as much of the quality review function as possible to regional level with more face-to-face contact, backed up at the global level;
2. to support this decentralization of quality review, global partners should be more involved in quality review processes, e.g. the GSU should develop a roster of staff with the capacity to participate in quality review processes (from a technical and from an institutional perspective), per region, linked to IPC certification;
3. quality review processes should be extended to review aspects of the IPC analysis process beyond the worksheets, e.g. the inclusivity of the analysis, consensus-building processes, etc.; and
4. there should be in-built and obligatory feedback and follow-up mechanisms after a quality review process has been completed, actively supported by global partners at national level.

As the quality of IPC analyses can only be as good as the data on which they are based, where quality review processes show persistent evidence of poor data quality over time, the GSP should have adequate resources (e.g. to provide expert consultants) to:

In the next phase of the GSP:

1. carry out a strategic review of data feeding into the IPC analysis at national level, making recommendations to IPC stakeholders in-country about how data quality can be improved; and
2. provide technical advisory support to the TWG in-country to address specific data gaps and challenges.

This requires a longer-term perspective to be brought to quality review processes.

The GSP should explore how different categories and expectations of IPC quality, according to the context, can best be communicated to users of the IPC, to accompany the IPC analysis (and specifically the maps). This will ensure IPC users are better informed about the quality of the analysis they are using. For example, differentiating the quality of IPC analyses between:

1. contexts of conflict/reduced access where data availability and quality are known to be weak, thus affecting the reliability of the IPC analysis;
2. stable contexts where access is not constrained, but there are data gaps and the quality is known to be problematic; and
3. stable contexts with good quality data feeding into a strong IPC analysis.

This should commence in the current phase of the GSP and be completed in the next phase.
Institutionalization and sustainability

The GSP must review and revise its model and strategy for ‘institutionalization’ at national level:

i. differentiating between different contexts and thus having differentiated strategies and timescales for institutionalization:
   - for countries where government is party to the conflict and handing over the IPC to government is neither feasible nor desirable;
   - for countries where there is greater stability but weak institutional frameworks for food security, and government should be in the driving seat; and
   - for countries where there is greater stability and strong institutional frameworks and political commitment to addressing food security, and government should be in the driving seat.
   (When the IPC is newly introduced into a country context, an assessment should be made of which of the three scenarios it fits into).

ii. revising current targets for consolidation/institutionalization in the GSP, taking account of the three country scenarios indicated above, and recognizing that institutionalization of the IPC is a long-term process that is likely to take many years;

iii. reviewing its objective of ‘financial sustainability’ in terms of national government paying for the IPC, as long as international actors, including donors, are key users of the IPC; and

iv. with capacity development strategies that reflect the different models of institutionalization, emphasizing repeated IPC training and more in-depth training.

This should commence in the current phase of the GSP and be completed in the next phase.

The global partnership of the GSP should be more proactive at regional and national levels, working collaboratively to promote institutionalization of the IPC in terms of:

i. ensuring their own senior managers at regional and national levels are aware of the global partnership, of their agency’s corporate commitment to the IPC, and of the implications for their role and programming, e.g. reflected in job descriptions and in workplans;

ii. global partners should be held to account through obligatory self-reporting on the process of institutionalization within their respective agency;

iii. collectively promoting the IPC at both the technical and decision-making levels in-country, and regionally; and

iv. identifying other initiatives and networks that can proactively promote institutionalization of the IPC, e.g. the FIRST programme which is an opportunity for collaborative promotion of the IPC between FAO, the European Union and the respective national government.

To commence in the current phase of the GSP.

Strengthening governance and management of the IPC

Management of the GSU should be strengthened through:

i. a clearer distinction between functions required at global level, e.g.:
   - developing a strategy for institutionalization;
   - technical development;
   - oversight of quality assurance;
   - strategic planning and prioritization for capacity development;
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- communications and advocacy for global level analysis using the IPC; and
- functions that can be decentralized, e.g.:
  - implementing quality assurance processes;
  - carrying out capacity development;
  - technical support and support for roll-out of tools; and
  - supporting communications and advocacy at regional and national levels.

There should be a review of skillsets required at both levels against these functions. This should commence in the current phase of the GSP, to inform the next phase.

ii. expanding the capacity of the GSU by:

- in the current phase of the GSP:
  - urgently recruiting for the position of manager of the GSU, and filling all other vacant positions, supported by global partners providing staff secondments; where there are delays in recruitment, interim solutions should be sought, e.g. through short-term secondments (an increase in total staff numbers is not required);
  - ensuring contracts for senior staff are appropriate to, and provide adequate incentives for staff to stay with the GSU;
  - ensuring communications and advocacy skills and capacity are stepped up; and
  - rebalancing the current dominance of technical skills and expertise in the GSU with the need for strong strategic management and political/institutional skills.

Funding for the GSP should be simplified and streamlined, as far as possible with donors funding the overall programme rather than earmarked slices, with coordinated reporting requirements and the synchronized timing of grants.

In the next phase of the GSP:

Strengthening and elevating the governance of the GSP, to ensure it is commensurate with the higher profile and increasing influence of the IPC, specifically:

i. establishing a high-level Executive Committee for the GSP, to meet annually:
  - for strategic decision-making and prioritization within the GSP;
  - to reinforce the respective global partner’s corporate commitment to the GSP and to the IPC at all levels, ensuring senior managers are aware of what this means, and of their role at global, regional and national levels;
  - that includes donor agencies; and
  - that will recommend an appropriate governance structure for the chronic IPC scale, for the next phase of the GSP.

ii. elevating the TAG to be merged with the existing Steering Committee to become a ‘Technical Steering Committee’, focused on the IPC acute scales, with an additional one to two members who are technical experts independent of the global partners; and

iii. rethinking the governance arrangements for developing and rolling out the chronic scale, considering the establishment of a separate Technical Steering Committee for the IPC chronic scale.

This should commence in the current phase of the GSP, to inform the structure for the next phase of the GSP.