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Executive Brief: Lanao del Norte and Maguindanao Provinces, Mindanao, The Philippines
Integrated Food Security Phase Classification

Overview

Central Mindanao was selected as the focus for the IPC pilot exercise in The Philippines as the lives and livelihoods of the population have been undermined by nearly 30 years of violence and conflict. In that time there has been ongoing fighting between the Government of the Republic Philippines (GoRP) and the main separatist groups, the Moro National Liberation Front (MNLF) and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF). In 2008, around 700,000 were displaced on the island, making it the “biggest new displacement” in the world-(Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre). Although incidents of conflict still occur, the situation is steadily improving. Certain parts of the island are also prone to flooding which has destroyed crops and homes in the past. This has resulted in acute food security and livelihoods crisis. With gradual recovery, the current humanitarian activities will need to be adjusted.

How was the IPC conducted?

The Food Security Integrated Phase Classification (IPC) was carried out in a participatory manner involving a wide range of food security actors at the Mindanao and National levels. It was intended as a learning exercise to allow these stakeholders to try out the approach and see how it might add value to existing systems in The Philippines context. An awareness raising event was held in Manila to introduce the IPC approach and rationale for the pilot exercise. Further meetings were held in Mindanao with Provincial Government and Mindanao Development Agency (MinDA). All interested stakeholders were invited to send representatives to join the team who would carry out the analysis, called the Stakeholder Analysis Team. Information was collated from a wide range of sources in order support the analysis, and it was decided to focus on two provinces – Lanao del Norte and Maguindanao. Two workshops were organised in Mindanao (25th – 27th August, 21st-24th September) during which the data was subjected to a thorough reviews by the Analysis Team, and an IPC analysis was carried out. The two provinces provided an opportunity for participants to test how the IPC approach works in situations where there are different levels of information available. The IPC analysis itself and the classification of the provinces were done on the basis of technical consensus between the members of the

The IPC: classifying food security
The Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) is a standardized scale to describe the food security situation in a given country according to 5 Phases:
1A & 1B - generally food secure
2- moderate/borderline food insecure
3- acute food and livelihood crisis
4- humanitarian emergency
5- famine/humanitarian catastrophe
To date, the IPC has been piloted or being increasingly introduced in a total of 15 countries in the Horn of Africa, West and Southern Africa and Southern Asia. An additional 13 national governments have been introduced to the IPC through training events and workshops. The IPC is not an assessment method per se. It applies a convergence of evidence approach drawing from multiple data sources, methods and methodologies.
Analysis Team, and then peer reviewed by wider stakeholders during a short feedback workshop on 24th September in Davao. A further feedback workshop is being planned for National Stakeholders in Manila, in October 2010.

How were Lano del Norte and Maguindanao Provinces classified?

The IPC pilot was not designed to provide a rigorous situation analysis, and these results are not of a sufficient standard to support decision making or response planning. It was intended as a learning exercise to allow food security stakeholders at the National and Mindanao level an opportunity to try out the approach and see how it might add value to existing systems in The Philippines context.

For the period September 2010 – February 2011, Lanao del Norte was classified as being “moderate/borderline food insecure” (Phase 2) as a result of the long term effects of armed conflict on people’s livelihoods and investment in infrastructure. Nearly 15% of the population was displaced. In July 2010, the declaration of the GoRP Suspension of Military Operations (SOMO) and the Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MIILF) Suspension of Military Action (SOMA) has meant that all IDPs are returning to their communities. Civil security is now generally stable although there are still some minor disturbances in some interior areas caused by family feuds and a few remaining rebel groups. It will take time for people to re-establish their former livelihood systems, and improve production beyond subsistence. In general, IDPs have had better access to assistance than returnees do. Many are destitute as a result of the conflict and substantial degradation of the environment will slow the rate of agricultural development. Flooding and landslides are recurrent hazards in some areas. Populations affected by conflict and displacement are less resilient and so more vulnerable. However, there is positive progress in the areas of socio-political, physical and financial capital. The reinforcing effects of these assets when optimized to raise the levels of human and natural capital, will significantly improve the food security situation providing there is no further fighting.

For the same period, September 2010 – February 2011, Maguindanao was classified as being in an “acute food and livelihood crisis” (Phase 3). Maguindanao ranks as the third poorest province in Mindanao, with very limited financial resources per capita and low expenditures on social services. As with Lanao del Norte, it has also suffered significantly as a result of the conflict. Nearly 10% of the population have been displaced. Since July 2010, IDPs have gradually returned to their home communities but the majority are doing so without any assistance. As a result, the level of destitution is high. Returnees have less access to food options in comparison to IDPs and residents who were not displaced. and there is limited access to healthcare, water, education and agricultural inputs. The presence of unexploded ordinance (UXO) poses a risk in localised areas, and flash floods are also a hazard. The level of conflict is falling, but it still remains comparatively high. Achieving stability will depend on the outcome of the GoRP-MILF peace talks, and the impact of renewed conflict could result in a worsening situation.

The attached maps summarise the IPC analysis for both province. A second map is included for each province to show the areas of highest risk of flooding, landslide and conflict. These are not part of the IPC analysis, but would become the basis for a more detailed, municipal level analysis during the next phase of the IPC pilot.
The Food Security situation in the Provinces of Lanao del Norte and Maguindanao

The IPC pilot was not designed to provide a rigorous situation analysis, and these results are not of a sufficient standard to support decision making or response planning.

In general, Mindanao enjoys a reputation as being ‘the promised land’ and is well known for its abundant fruits and vegetables. The favourable climate and availability of land gives it the potential to be food secure. The topography in some areas makes cultivation more challenging but a culture of terracing has allowed communities to capitalise on the resources available to them. Along the coast, fishing is extremely important and cities like Davao, Cagayan de Oro and General Santos are attractive commercial centres for business.

While the effects of the conflict have been felt across Mindanao, the major impacts are localised in the Central provinces. As a result of the conflict, the level of investment in infrastructure and services such as education, healthcare and water supply has been low in both Maguindanao and Lanao del Norte Provinces. However this is especially marked in Maguindanao which, as the third poorest provinces in Mindanao, is able to spend only P9/capita on social services.

Displacement has resulted in destitution for many people, and increased their vulnerability to external shocks such as flooding and landslides. As IDPs, people had access to assistance from government and food security agencies but this is often lost when they return to their home communities. Where returnees have access to land\(^1\), their return often does not coincide with the growing season, so planting can be sub-optimal and many returnees do not have the means to reinstate their traditional livelihood activities in the first place. As a result, many resort to ‘daily labour’ and experience a significant reduction in their daily dietary diversity. The presence of returnees in communities also increases competition for limited resources and opportunities, many of which are exacerbating environmental degradation. One in every three households in Maguindanao was found to have either poor or borderline food consumption patterns. Stunting was found to affect 33.8% of children (above the national average of 27.9%) and 9.2% of 0-5yr olds suffer acute malnutrition. Communicable diseases make up 7 out of the top 10 diseases reporting to health facilities in Maguindanao, and the incidence of water borne diseases are increasing.

Projected evolution of the situation for 2011

The IPC pilot was not designed to provide a rigorous situation analysis, and these results are not of a sufficient standard to support decision making or response planning.

Evidence shows that there has been a gradual positive trend in many of the indicators within the two provinces over the last two years. This suggests the potential for an improvement in some of the underlying causes of food insecurity. However, this will be dependent on the success of the current peace talks, a marked reduction in the incidence of violence and the ongoing support of agencies in the area. Improving agricultural productivity, and addressing many of the issues that prevent secure access to land will be crucial to reducing the level of

---

\(^1\) In many areas, it is not clear who owns the land and as a result, many returnees have lost access to land they had previously cultivated.
conflict since poverty appears to be one of the key driving forces behind the ongoing insecurity.

**Response options**

*The IPC pilot was not designed to provide a rigorous situation analysis, and these results are not of a sufficient standard to support decision making or response planning.*

It was suggested to continue implementing projects that will meet the basic needs of IDPs in camps, and those staying with host families. The needs of returnees do not appear to be being addressed, and so new projects could be considered that address land access issues, asset re-stocking and more favourable loan arrangements. Where floods and landslides are prevalent, community capacity for Disaster Risk Reduction and Mitigation should be built and support given to the Provincial Recovery Programme. The peace process should be supported where ever possible, including strengthening the Peace & Order Council, the role of third parties in resolving family feuds and bringing Religious leaders into the peace negotiation process.

In terms of monitoring the situation, particular attentions should be given to indicators concerning access to food and the likelihood of recurrent conflict. Any deterioration in the stability of the provinces will have a severe impact on food security, especially recent returnees and those living within conflict zones, given the already stressed coping strategies of the most vulnerable households.

**Next Steps for IPC in the Philippines**

There was a great deal of enthusiasm amongst the stakeholders who participated in this pilot to carry out further analysis in Mindanao, unpacking provinces to municipal level. It was recognised that resources would be a key constraint for this activity taking place, and WFPs assistance was called on to help identify sources of funding.

At the national level, the future of IPC in The Philippines will depend on support from decision makers. Recommendations were made for DSWD to review IPC for possible inclusion to the Disaster Response Program/Plan of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Management Council (NDRRMC), and for NNC to present IPC concept to members of the Philippine Food and Nutrition Surveillance System (PFNSS) to determine complementarities of IPC in other related PFNSS subsystems/ activities and as an option for generating municipal level Food Insecurity data.
Defining Attributes of areas in phase 2 and 3

Hazards
a. Drought  
b. Floods  
c. Landslides  
d. Civil Security  
e. Price instability

Key Underlying Causes
A. Post-state Conflict  
B. Environmental Degradation  
C. Social Marginalization  
D. Others

Recurrence of Crisis in past 10 years
Low (1-2 years), Medium (3-4), High (>=5)

Confidence Level of Analysis
** Medium

Phase Classification
Early Warning (Oct ’10-March ’11)

Phase 3: Acute Food and Livelihood Crisis
Population Affected: 234,000

IV  
b, d, e  
A, B, C, D  
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** Medium

Phase 2: Moderate/Borderline Food Insecure
Population Affected: 538,283

IV  
b, d  
A, B, C, D  
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Integrated Food Security Phase Classification Pilot Exercise

- DRAFT REPORT -

Introduction

a) Background to the IPC Pilot in The Philippines
The IPC (Integrated Food Security Phase Classification – www.ipcinfo.org) is an innovative multi-agency approach and classification tool for improving food security analysis and decision-making. The IPC seeks to establish broad-based consensus among stakeholders (e.g. government, UN, NGO agencies, donors, etc) on the severity, underlying causes and expected trends in food security within a chosen geographical area. It is not an assessment method in itself, but it integrates information and analyses from diverse sources to classify food security according to reference outcomes that are drawn from recognized international standards.

Between July and September 2010, a two month pilot IPC exercise took place in The Philippines, lead by the World Food Programme (WFP) Country Office. Support for the pilot came from SIDA and the EU Food Facility Project. Under the Food Facility Project, WFP has been working closely with its partners in The Philippines to build capacity for food security and nutrition analysis. WFP is also the lead agency for the Philippines Food Cluster, which aims to support improved food security related analysis amongst its members.

Mindanao was selected as the focus for the pilot exercise as the lives and livelihoods of the population have been undermined by nearly 30 years of violence and conflict. In 2008, around 700,000 were displaced on the island, making it the "biggest new displacement" in the world- (Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre). Certain parts of the island are also prone to flooding and landslides. All together, this has resulted in acute food security and livelihoods crisis. Although incidents of conflict still occur, the situation is steadily improving. With gradual recovery, the current humanitarian activities will need to be adjusted. To design effective interventions, there is therefore a need for a comprehensive situation analysis. A wealth of information and data is available for Mindanao from a range of sources, and an IPC analysis is likely to add value for planners and decision makers.

b) Objectives of the Pilot Exercise
The pilot brought together key food security stakeholders from Government, the UN agencies and NGOs in order to carry out a situation analysis for conflict affected provinces in Central Mindanao, including a map of the IPC phases, and document the
learning from the process. Three guiding principles were used to inform the pilot exercise:

- That the process should be as participatory as possible, and include the full range of stakeholders to achieve sustainable results and approach.

- That the pilot exercise is a learning exercise and should be reviewed in light of existing analysis and reporting systems to provide lessons on its potential added value and capacity for replication in The Philippines.

- That the outcomes of the IPC pilot are intended to be shared with practitioners and decision makers at national, regional and global levels who are involved in improving food security decision making and response interventions through better analysis.

The following process was used as a framework for the pilot exercise:
# Implementation of the IPC in the Philippines

Using the framework outlined above as a guide, the following steps were taken as part of the pilot. Rather than taking each step separately, it was necessary to work on them concurrently.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Event/Activities</th>
<th>Outputs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1    | Raise awareness of IPC and the pilot activities amongst key stakeholders at national and Mindanao levels | Half-day Introductory Workshop in Manila on 22\(^{nd}\) July Consultant & WFP counterparts - Meetings with NNC, MINDA & Provincial Government | * Expressions of interest received from stakeholders wishing to join the Analysis Group  
* Concept Note for the IPC Pilot Exercise  
* Terms of Reference for the Analysis Group |
| 2    | Compile and review relevant data | WFP counterparts with inputs from participating Stakeholders | |
| 3    | Introduce IPC methodology and undertake preliminary analysis of data | 3-day workshop at The Paradise Island Garden and Resort, Samal Island from 25\(^{th}\) – 27\(^{th}\) August | * Proceedings of the preliminary analysis workshop  
* Agreement on the geographical scope of the pilot exercise  
* Completed evidence templates and initial phase classification for each District (partial template 1) |
| 4    | Organise evidence tables, and gather additional data where gaps identified | WFP counterparts inputs from participating Stakeholders | * Revised evidence templates for each District |
| 5    | Review preliminary analysis in light of new data, agree phase classification and complete analysis. Produce maps. | 3day workshop in Davao, Mindanao between 21\(^{st}\) – 23\(^{rd}\) September | * Proceedings of the second analysis workshop  
* Completed templates for each region (templates 1, 2 & 3) |
| 6    | Identify lessons learnt and next steps for IPC in The Philippines | 3day workshop in Davao, Mindanao between 21\(^{st}\) – 23\(^{rd}\) September | * Proceedings of the second analysis workshop |
This document follows the steps in the process, and reports on the activities themselves and the lessons learnt at each stage.

### Activities

#### a) Awareness Raising and Sensitisation

A one-day workshop was held in Manila on 22\(^{nd}\) July to introduce the IPC and proposed pilot exercise (see Annex 1). Participants were made up of key national level food security and livelihoods stakeholders (see Annex 2) in response to invitation letters which were sent out to NGOs, UN agencies and different Government Departments. This was followed up with additional background information downloaded from the IPC website – [www.ipcinfo.org](http://www.ipcinfo.org).

Prior to the event, meetings were held with the National Nutrition Council which was identified as the focal point for food security and nutrition surveillance in The Philippines\(^2\). Following the workshop, the consultant and WFP counterpart travelled to Mindanao to meet with representatives from the Mindanao Development Agency (MinDA), and five (5) Provincial Governments\(^3\) (see Annex 3).

---

\(^2\) The National Nutrition Council (NNC) is mandated as the highest policy-making and coordinating body in nutrition. Its function includes: (1) create a policy environment for nutrition planning, implementation, surveillance and monitoring and evaluation, (2) ensure a unified multisectoral and multilevel network to institutionalize the formulation and operationalization of policies and guidelines for efficient and effective program management; (3) strengthen the competence of stakeholders by providing technical and, capacity building and skills development and (4) generate and mobilize resources to support innovative nutrition interventions at all levels.

\(^3\) Cotabato Province, Sultan Kudarat, Lanao del Sur, Lanao del Norte and Maguindanao.
As a result of these activities, a number of stakeholders expressed interest in taking part in the pilot exercise. An informal working group was convened. Members were drawn from those stakeholders who had expressed an interest in taking part in the pilot exercise.

The key points raised during the workshop were:

- Participants expressed concern that the pilot needed a lead agency at national level, preferably Government. The temporary ‘clusters’ through which agencies operate during a food security situation were not considered appropriate. Amongst those suggested, NNC, Department of Agriculture and DSWD were identified but no agreement was reached. Instead, the decision was left for after the pilot when it would be clearer how (or if) IPC would move forward in The Philippines context.

- NNC are in the process of reviewing national information systems this August, so the outcomes of the IPC pilot exercise would be most timely and allow them to assess its value.

- The term ‘Technical Working Group’ was not considered appropriate for the pilot exercise, as it suggested a formal structure. It was decided that ‘Analysis Team’ was more acceptable and flexible.

- The political situation in Mindanao could make an assessment of the 5 provinces originally proposed for the pilot very difficult. They include very distinct governance systems that will have an impact on information availability. It was suggested that the pilot only focus on two provinces, instead. A final decision on the geographical focus was left to the Analysis Group.

- Participants expressed considerable interest in disaggregating the provinces to municipal level, although it was recognised that there was very limited municipal information available.

- Stakeholders asked for guidance on expectations of the pilot, who should take part and their roles and responsibilities.

- Participants were not sure if national level stakeholders should get involved in a Mindanao level analysis.

- There was a call for more flexibility in the timeline for the pilot, taking into consideration barangay elections in October and new officials recently in post.

As a result of the workshop, a Concept Note for the IPC pilot was drafted and circulated to the workshop participants (see Annex 4). A draft Terms of Reference for the Analysis Team was also drawn up (see Annex 5), plus a work plan outlining the tasks for the rest of the pilot exercise (see Annex 6).
**Recommendations:**

- Sensitisation and awareness raising should start well in advance of the pilot exercise. They are crucial to its success, and will help identify the most appropriate partners and timeframe for implementation.

- Where possible, an institutional home should be identified and ownership developed prior to the start of a pilot exercise, so that the process can be planned and implemented as a partnership between the country host and the institutional home.

- Flexibility needs to be built into the timeline/funding for a pilot exercise, in order to respond to important events and the constraints that stakeholders face in participating.

- The terminology used for the IPC is not always suitable or acceptable in all countries. Providing it does not affect the validity of the analysis or devalue the process, it should be possible for stakeholders to adapt the terminology to suit the context.

- The country host (in this case, WFP) should be given a thorough briefing and clear guidance on their role and responsibilities as part of the pilot process.

**b) Compile and review data**

Between the 3rd week of July to 4th week of August, WFP Country Office scanned official government sources, assessments from local and international non-government organizations, and local government data collection mechanisms for relevant data. National government agencies who have statistical data with national, regional and provincial disaggregation include the National Statistics Office (NSO) and National Statistical Coordination Board (NSCB). These agencies produce relevant information on economic, demographic, and health indicators. The Department of Social Welfare and Development (DSWD) has also established the National Household Targeting System (NHTS), which is a data bank and information management system which targets who and where the poor people are. NHTS contain census-type of information gathered among local government units even down up to the barangay level.

Information regarding displacements linked with both natural and man-made disasters can also be extracted from the NHTS. Data on natural hazards are readily available from the Mines and Geosciences Bureau (MGB), a unit under the Department of Environment and Natural Resources (DENR). The MGB has developed maps for selected provinces and regions which are more predisposed to landslides, drought, floods and earthquakes. The PAGASA (Philippine Atmospheric, Geophysical and Astronomical Services Administration) is the official weather bureau that contains historical data, current and future forecasts on typhoons in the country. On the food production side, the Bureau of Agricultural Statistics (BAS), an attached agency to the
Department of Agriculture (DA) generates data on food production, trade, food consumption, prices, among others which all relates to agriculture activities.

WFP met with these agencies as part of the IPC awareness-raising activities, in order to gain permission to utilize their data for the pilot study. All of the agencies gave their support and requested that data sources were cited in the final report.

During the Awareness-Raising meetings with the Provincial Planning and Development Officers (PPDO) in the five (5) conflict-affected provinces of Mindanao, questions were raised regarding the locally produced data in their provincial Socio-Economic Profile (SEP) and the Provincial Development and Physical Framework Plan (PDPFP). The provinces of Lanao del Norte, Cotabato and Sultan Kudarat have updated their SEP and PDPFP for 2010 while Maguindanao have drafts document dated 2008. Lanao del Sur have their drafts from the previous year. These documents contain socio-economic, demographic and health information linked to the province’s development plan. Information is gathered from the different government agencies through their respective public service delivery mechanisms and functions. It was suggested that participants to the preliminary IPC analysis workshop should bring along the most recent version of their SEP and PDPFP from their respective provinces to be utilized for the analysis workshop.

The Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA) of WFP and the Joint Nutrition and Food Security Assessment (JNFSA) of UNICEF and WFP provided data related to food security and nutrition among the Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) in the conflict affected provinces.

During the data review process, the following issues were identified:

- The bulk of data gathering was carried out by WFP for this pilot. The national government agencies and other international organizations should play a more active role in mining data for specific key reference outcomes.

- Most of the official government statistics are representative only at the regional level and gathered every three or five years.

- The indicators gathered in the Philippines do not exactly match the indicators listed in the IPC reference outcomes. In effect, rendering most of the data available as Indirect Evidence.

- While the reference period for the analysis covers September 2010 – February 2011, it was necessary to use national data from 2007 and 2008. Most of the provincial level data came from 2009.
• National and local water access indicators are more of qualitative than quantitative. Water availability is generally not considered in terms of quantity per person per day.

• Some provinces have piloted the Community-Based Monitoring System (CBMS), either from a selection of municipalities or as an aggregate for the province in general.

• Consistent and extensive coordination with the international and local NGOs should also be in place to obtain their confidence and accountability in sharing their project documents such as assessments, project reports, and baseline surveys.

**Recommendations:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Data gathering is a key stage in the process and should be allocated sufficient time. Where possible, an opportunity should be provided for each agency to discuss the Key Reference Outcome so that the most appropriate evidence can be identified.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Guidelines on information needs should be supplied to stakeholders, so that they can be actively involved in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• An IPC Focal Point is needed with the mandate and time to develop relationships with key stakeholders, such as NGOs, in order for information to be shared openly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where possible, a preliminary review of data could be carried out by the Analysis Group in order to assess the relevance of existing data as well as the gaps and challenges.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

c) **Preliminary Analysis Workshop**

A three day workshop was held in The Paradise Island Garden and Resort, Samal Island, Davao Province from 25th – 27th August 2010. This was the first meeting of the Analysis Group. The workshop was attended by representatives from a range of national, regional and provincial stakeholders (see Annex 2). Some the participants had attended the Stakeholders Meeting in Manila in July, and were targeted during the awareness raising activities. However, for most of the participants this was their first opportunity to experience IPC at first hand.

---

4 CBMS was project of the Department of Interior and Local Government (DILG) aimed to enhance effectiveness in development planning and decision-making. The data generated from this surveillance system is a promising input to IPC analysis.
The programme for the workshop is given in Annex 1. The primary objective was to introduce participants to the IPC approach, review available data and complete, as far as possible, Table 1 of the Analysis Template. To begin with, an overview of food security concepts was provided followed by the definitions and related concepts on IPC. Participants then discussed and agreed the geographical focus of the analysis. On the second day, participants were divided into two groups, one for each province. They then spent that day filling in the evidence template, and assigning a phase classification for each Outcome Reference. The third day was spent presentation of the results, reviewing the lessons learned and planning on the future activities for the pilot.

The initial plan of the IPC pilot in the Philippines is to conduct the analysis covering the five (5) conflict-affected provinces in Mindanao. During the Stakeholders Forum in Manila, which was attended by the national agencies, a concern was raised regarding the practicability of this. It was then suggested to reduce the number of provinces and so the geographical focus. The analysis process was explained to the participants. By looking at the schedule and the weight of the analysis, it was then discussed if the team would like to retain the five provinces or maybe reduce the number so as to accommodate the completion of the analysis templates. Upon discussions with the participants, it was agreed that the number of provinces that the pilot would focus on would be reduced to two (2), for the following reasons:

a) There were a very limited number of participants coming from each provinces who could conduct the situational analysis;
b) The duration of the pilot was short, which reduced the time available to build the evidence base;
c) It was decided that the participants could be split into no more than two groups, in order to retain sufficient skills and expertise to conduct the analysis and this would not be enough to carry out an analysis for all five (5) provinces.

The group also arrived at a consensus to use the opportunity to do a comparison of two provinces: one that had sufficient and relatively good data (data-rich) and a province in which the data collection methods and results are challenging (data-poor). With this, the participants selected Lanao del Norte as an example of a data-rich province while Maguindanao represented a data-poor or data-challenged province.
The key points from the workshop were:

**On indicators and information**

- Many of the IPC Reference Outcome Indicators were new to members of the Analysis Group, and there was a scarcity of direct evidence available. As a result, participants relied on indirect evidence. Interpretation required a good technical understanding of the relationship between the indirect evidence and the outcome indicator thresholds. Not all the necessary expertise was available in the groups during this workshop so interpretation was sometimes difficult.

- There was a discrepancy between the values identified in data from provincial level and that from the National Statistics Office. This was often due to differences in methodology, and the national analysis being based on regions rather than provinces.

- The group working on Lanao del Norte Province found it useful to analyse food availability and food access separately. They gave them an individual phase - access (identified as Phase 3) and availability (identified as Phase 1A). This did not affect the overall phase classification for the province, but helped to link the outcome of the analysis with the underlying causes of food insecurity.

**On the process**

- The participants felt they needed more time, and examples from other countries, in order to gain a good understanding of the concepts.

- Data gathering prior to the workshop needed to be more effective and focused, with clear guidance being given to the participants on what information would be required.

**On geographic focus**

- Participants decided to focus on two provinces, rather than all of those represented at the workshop, in order to compare how an IPC analysis works in both a ‘data rich’ and ‘data poor’ context. Those whose provinces were not chosen for the analysis were naturally disappointed but it was decided that to include more was not possible. However, this demonstrated a considerable enthusiasm amongst participants to carry out an analysis in their area in future.

**On the contribution to Response and Decision-Making**

- Participants felt that the multi-stakeholder composition of the Analysis Team, and focus on building consensus provided a very robust process for the analysis and building consensus. They suggested that a similar process could be adopted during response planning, in order to take advantage of the transparency and rigor it afforded.

- Participants felt confident that they could replicate the IPC in their own provinces, and that it would add value to their current project and programme design.
processes. However, ultimate responsibility for decisions on programme and project focus would rest with local government officials who have priorities beyond simply food security. In order for them to accept the analysis as part of their planning process, it may be necessary to place greater emphasis on response options linked to the underlying causes (e.g. governance or structural issues).

- There is an established bias towards focusing food security analysis on conflict affected areas. However, conflict/violence is not the only hazard in Mindanao and its impacts are felt more widely. Therefore, there is value in conducting a Mindanao level analysis at a later date in order to allow a comparative assessment of food security across the whole island.
- That in future, a province level analysis taken down to municipal level would be extremely helpful in planning and decision making.

**Recommendations:**

- Extra time should be spent in analysis or training workshops to ensure a good understanding is reached on the relationship between information, its interpretation and the phase classification.

- In the User Guide or via the IPC website, provide more practical examples and guidance on how the proxy indicators / indirect evidence should be interpreted, and their relationship with the outcome indicators and thresholds. This is most applicable where the technical expertise is not available within the TWG to interpret all the information being considered. i.e. an “IPC for Dummies”

- Provide guidance to stakeholders early in the pilot process on the type of information needed for the analysis, so that they can contribute the most appropriate and up to date information.

- The Global IPC Technical Working Group might want to consider what value there might be in allowing the ‘unpacking’ some of the more complex outcome indicators, such as livelihoods or food availability/access, in terms of achieving a better understanding the underlying causes of food security.

- Care should be taken during the initial stages of the IPC process to be clear on the scope of the pilot process, so as not to raise stakeholders expectations.

**d) Second Analysis Workshop and Peer Review**

The final analysis workshop was organised for 21\textsuperscript{st} – 24\textsuperscript{rd} September 2010 in Davao, Mindanao (see Annex 1). It was attended by 23 participants, of whom 48% were new to the IPC process as they had not been present at the first analysis workshop in August (see Annex 2). They comprised of 7 completely new stakeholders, and 4 alternative staff members from existing stakeholders attending on behalf of colleagues. The mix of experience levels at this event brought benefits as well as challenges. It meant time was taken up re-introducing some of the concepts and methodology from the first
workshop, so that everyone could contribute more equitably to the discussions. Many questions were raised by the less experienced participants, which provided an ideal opportunity to ensure the rest of the Analysis Group had understood the issues in the first instance. The new members also brought a fresh perspective on the original analysis, and also new evidence, which was much appreciated by everyone.

The objectives of the workshop were to:

1. Review, validate and improve the output generated by the teams who conducted the Preliminary IPC Analysis
2. Proceed to completion of Risk Analysis (Table 1), and introduce the other components of Tables 2 & 3 including the map.
3. To gather other stakeholders from the five provinces and in the regions to critique the output and process of the Preliminary and Final Analysis Workshop.

As with the first workshop, participants worked in two groups. There was one group for each of the two focal provinces. The first task was to critically review the original evidence templates and phase classification. Some evidence was discarded on review, and additional evidence was added. A strong wireless internet signal at the venue allowed participants to search for information and maps as they went along. Over the next 3 days, participants were introduced to the Risk Analysis, Impact Analysis and Population Estimate component of the IPC analysis.

After this, the two groups were given an opportunity to develop a map of the two provinces in order to get first hand experience of the cartographic protocols. Since the analysis was only carried out at province level, it was not possible for any detail to be included. However, as there had been a great deal of interest in carrying out IPC at municipal level, each group put together a second map showing their interpretation of the distribution of hazards within each province. In this way it was possible for them to get a better understanding of how a future IPC might be organised.

The third day of the workshop concluded with two sessions on 'lessons learned' from the IPC pilot overall, and then participants put forward their suggestions for the 'next steps' for IPC in The Philippines. Despite having worked extremely hard over the previous two days the discussions were lively and creative, demonstrating the enthusiasm participants felt for the approach. Once these sessions were concluded, representatives of the Analysis Group spent time preparing presentations for the peer review workshop the next day. The quality of the discussions, and level of commitment shown by the two groups throughout the analysis workshop was impressive, and they are to be commended for their contribution to the pilot exercise.

The fourth day of the workshop was organised as a half-day peer review session where the results of the pilot analysis were presented to wider stakeholders. Invitations were distributed to stakeholders in Mindanao and the Regions. Unfortunately, the workshop was not as well attended as envisaged due to a clash with the ongoing budget hearings.
among the regional government agencies across the country. However, new participants joined from Strengthening Response to Internal Displacement in Mindanao (StrIDe-Mindanao) and the Act for Peace (A4P) of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and participants from the regional bureaus of the Department of Agriculture from Region 10 and Region 12. During the half day workshop, a brief introduction of IPC was made, followed by a presentation of the phase classification by each of the two province analysis teams. The lessons learnt and suggested next steps were then presented and discussed in plenary.

The key points from this stage of the pilot (see next sections for more detail on lesson learning):

- The pilot IPC exercise represented the first time such a broad range of stakeholders had come together to carry out a situation analysis before.
- During the first analysis workshop, there had been a tendency to score Government data sources as ‘most reliable’. However, on reflection the groups found that differences in sampling methodology between Provincial, Regional and National level, amongst other issues, meant there were discrepancies between the levels of certain proxy indicators coming from the National Statistics Office and from Provincial Government. This caused difficulties with interpretation, which were resolved as a result of the broader range of information being used in the IPC analysis. They validated or reinforced the analysis.
- Participants felt that there was a wealth of information available that would have added value to the IPC analysis, if they could have access to it. This was mainly due to participants not being aware of what information they needed to provide. However, they were also amazed at the amount of information that had been brought together for the workshop, some of which they were unaware of.
- Some stakeholders had found it difficult to commit the same members of staff to both workshops, while others who had not been involved at the beginning were keen to get involved in the process. While this might make facilitating workshops more challenging, in a pilot exercise it also provides an opportunity to raise awareness so should be viewed as a positive outcome. Should the IPC progress beyond the pilot exercise, the issue of continuity will need to be addressed. This was clearly set out in the Concept Note and Terms of Reference developed at the start of the pilot process although circumstances reduced their effectiveness.
- The potential for provincial IPC analysis to focus on municipal level came up several times during the workshop, and was seen as a valuable next step for IPC which would help organisations like MinDA in planning activities and complement ongoing activities such as the Community Based Monitoring System (CBMS).
- Participants felt it would make more sense to conduct a provincial analysis in the province in question, in order to have direct access to the most up to date information and technical expertise. However, they highlighted the potential need
to ‘translate’ the language of IPC when dealing with officials from municipal level as they are using a different profile of indicators which do not include ‘coping mechanisms’, ‘consumption patterns’ and ‘access to food’.

- It was observed that the high cost of healthcare on Mindanao meant many households went into debt in order to meet their healthcare needs or committed a large proportion of their disposable income. However, it was not clear how well an issue like this was reflected in the analysis templates.

- Some of the new participants questioned whether there was a political motivation behind the selection of the two provinces, since one was under the governance of ARMM while the other was not. This would also explain why there were differences in the data available. These types of sensitive issues would need to be taken into consideration during the next phase of the IPC, although it was felt that carrying out an analysis in each province would not prove an issue.

- Participants found it difficult to identify a timeline for their analysis, as food security in Mindanao is not constrained by the seasons or agricultural calendar. It is conflict driven, with underlying governance and structural issues.

The consolidated results of the lesson learning session are presented below:

On indicators

- There is a need to ensure the appropriate “experts” in each given sector are available in the analysis group to provide the technical details on the terminologies and indicators.

- The lack of data (at barangay/municipal level, no data bank or standard method of collection) forced the groups to look for the nearest available proxy indicators where these were available.

- It was possible to group some of the information about proxy indicators together, rather than taking each piece of information separately.

- There is clearly a need for a meta-analysis of Mindanao

- There is a need to look into the timeliness, reliability, soundness, standardization and validity of the data

On participants

- It is crucial to involve those key agencies that (i) have the data, and (ii) have the expertise, in the analysis

- There is a need to ensure the continuity of participation from stakeholders

- Even though there was a lack of expertise in some areas amongst the participants of the pilot exercise, each was able to contribute meaningfully.
However, the ‘reliability’ aspect of the data gathered can sometimes be compromised in the process when technical expertise is not present.

On geographical focus

- A municipal level analysis would have given much more specific and detailed analysis. However, provincial level IPC analysis has the added value of being able to look into the bigger picture in addition to having more complete data available.
- Doing a Livelihood Zone approach is possible but may not be the most effective method as compared to municipal level analysis, as it is not clear at this stage how strong the link is between food security and livelihoods. Also, it would depend on the data available and which agency was responsible for collecting and analysing the data to carry out a livelihood zonation.

On the Manual and Templates

- There is a need to put IPC terminology into layman’s terms (“IPC for Dummies”).
- The layout of the templates was not always very helpful – squeezing a large amount of data into a column took up a lot of room, and some of the issues were repeated.

On Use of IPC

- IPC is an important tool which could help in the decision making process as it provides a comprehensive situation analysis.
- Adopting IPC would strengthen M&E systems and force agencies to have complete and up to date information.
- The holistic approach was much appreciated.
- Being multi-agency strengthens partnerships and builds networks amongst agencies who may not have another opportunity to work together.

On Workshop Process

- It takes time to fully understand the IPC process. For some participants who were involved in previous workshops, this final workshop helped them fully grasp the concepts.
- The IPC analysis workshop provided a useful venue for different stakeholders to come together for the first time.
The consultative, participative and open minded nature of the workshop was much appreciated

More time should be allowed for the groups to validate and get feedback on their work

**Recommendations:**

- It is recommended in future to develop a clear Memorandum of Understanding or Partnership Agreement with the agencies/Local Government Units in order to fully mainstream and institutionalise the IPC process in future. This will help ensure continuity of participation, and clarify expectations, roles and responsibilities.

- To undertaken a municipal level analysis, it would be better to conduct the analysis workshop in the province concerned so as to have direct access to information and ensure that municipal representatives are able to participate in the process.

**Information Sources**

The final IPC workshop aimed to review the output of both Lanao del Norte and Maguindanao groups from the preliminary analysis on the current and imminent phase. The groups also had the opportunity to begin working on the two remaining templates, the Template 2 (Analysis of Immediate Hazards, Effects on Livelihood Strategies – Template 2 (Implications for Immediate Response) and Template 3 (Analysis of Underlying structures, Effects on Livelihood Assets, and Opportunities in the Medium and Long Term).

For Template 2, each group obtained data from their SEPs and PPDPFs as well as from the members knowledge on the security levels of their respective provinces. The dominant risk among these two provinces is primarily civil security with a focus on armed conflict, inter-ethnic tensions and conflict generated from land disputes. Template 3, on the other hand, extracts data straight from each province’s SEP, their knowledge of the ongoing peace negotiations, their knowledge of current local development paradigm shifts from previous and present local administrations, and data from the Mines and Geosciences Bureau of the Department of Environment and Natural Resources for the risks on floods and landslides.
IPC Analysis of Lanao del Norte and Maguindanao

For the period September 2010 – February 2011, Lanao del Norte was classified as being “moderate/borderline food insecure” (Phase 2) as a result of the long term effects of armed conflict on peoples livelihoods and investment in infrastructure. Nearly 15% of the population was displaced. In July 2010, the declaration of the Government of the Philippines (GRP)—Moro Islamic Liberation Front (MILF) Suspension of Military Operation (SOMO) and Suspension of Military Action (SOMA) has meant that all IDPs are returning to their communities. Civil security is now generally stable although there are still some minor disturbances in some interior areas caused by family feuds and a few remaining rebel groups. It will take time for people to re-establish their former livelihood systems, and improve production beyond subsistence. In general, IDPs have had better access to assistance than returnees do. Many are destitute as a result of the conflict and substantial degradation of the environment will slow the rate of agricultural development. Flooding and landslides are recurrent hazards in some areas. Populations affected by conflict and displacement are less resilient and so more vulnerable. However, there is positive progress in the areas of socio-political, physical and financial capital. The reinforcing effects of these assets when optimized to raise the levels of human and natural capital, will significantly improve the food security situation providing there is no further fighting.

Lanao del Norte

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food access /availability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary diversity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water access/availability</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destitution/displacement</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Synthesis                   | 1          | 2              |

For the same period, September 2010 – February 2011, Maguindanao was classified as being in an “acute food and livelihood crisis” (Phase 3). Maguindanao ranks as the third poorest province in Mindanao, with very limited financial resouces per capita and low expenditures on social services. As with Lano del Norte, it has also suffered significantly as a result of the conflict. Nearly 10% of the population have been displaced. Since July 2010, IDPs have gradually returned to their home communities but the majority are doing so without any assistance. As a result, the level of destitution is high. Returnees have less access to food options in comparison to IDPs and residents who were not
displaced and there is limited access to healthcare, water, education and agricultural inputs. The presence of unexploded ordinance (UXO) poses a risk in localised areas, and flash floods are also a hazard. The level of conflict is falling, but it still remains comparatively high. Achieving stability will depend on the outcome of the CRP-MILF peace talks, and the impact of renewed conflict could result in a worsening situation.

Maguindanao

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Outcome Indicators</th>
<th>Confidence</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CMR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute malnutrition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stunting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disease</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food access/availability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietary diversity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water access/availability</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destitution/displacement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihood assets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Synthesis</strong></td>
<td><strong>2</strong></td>
<td><strong>3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The completed IPC templates for both provinces can be found in Annex 7, and the map can be found in Annex 8. It had been assumed that there was a difference in data availability between the two districts, and that this would affect the IPC analysis. In the end, it was clear that while there might have been some differences in the amount of information that was available to support an analysis, and some variation in the reliability of this information, it did not prevent a robust analysis being carried out. Also, the results were directly comparable so that the situation in Maguindanao and Lano del Norte could be compared.
Next Steps
On the last day of the final analysis workshop participants suggested a number of activities that would enable IPC to move forward in The Philippines context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Who</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Present IPC to national agencies and disseminate results of pilot testing</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generate resources for pilot testing of municipal level IPC</td>
<td>WFP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re echo/give feedback to line managers and colleagues</td>
<td>NNC &amp; DSWD participants</td>
<td>Within 2 weeks from today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review IPC for possible inclusion to the Disaster Response Program/Plan of the National Disaster Risk Reduction Management Council (NDRRMC)</td>
<td>DSWD</td>
<td>Within 1 month from today</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present IPC concept to members of the Philippine Food and Nutrition Surveillance System (PFNSS) to determine complementarities of IPC in other related PFNSS subsystems/activities and as an option for generating municipal level Food Insecurity data.</td>
<td>NNC</td>
<td>Within the next 6 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a great deal of enthusiasm amongst participants for a further ‘pilot’ exercise in Mindanao, unpacking additional provinces to municipal level. It was recognised that resources would be a key constraint for this activity taking place, and WFP’s assistance was called on to identify sources of funding.

Over the longer-term, and at a national level, the future of IPC in the Philippines will depend on the support of decision makers in NNC and DSWD, for example, in taking ownership of the process. Suggestions were made to both organisations, which should be followed up by WFP.
### Consolidated Recommendations

In addition to the next steps outlined in the above section, a number of recommendations have been identified that are of relevance to the Global IPC Initiative, and partners in The Philippines.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitisation and awareness-raising should start well in advance of the pilot exercise. They are crucial to its success, and will help identify the most appropriate partners and timeframe for implementation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where possible, an institutional home should be identified and ownership developed prior to the start of a pilot exercise, so that the process can be planned and implemented as a partnership between the country host and the institutional home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility needs to be built into the timeline/funding for a pilot exercise, in order to respond to important events and the constraints that stakeholders face in participating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The terminology used for the IPC is not always suitable or acceptable in all countries. Providing it does not affect the validity of the analysis or devalue the process, it should be possible for stakeholders to adapt the terminology to suit the context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The country host (in this case, WFP) should be given a thorough briefing and clear guidance on their role and responsibilities as part of the pilot process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra time should be spent in analysis or training workshops to ensure a good understanding is reached on the relationship between information, its interpretation and the phase classification.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the User Guide or via the IPC website, provide more practical examples and guidance on how the proxy indicators / indirect evidence should be interpreted, and their relationship with the outcome indicators and thresholds. This is most applicable where the technical expertise is not available within the TWG to interpret all the information being considered. i.e. an “IPC for Dummies”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide guidance to stakeholders early in the pilot process on the type of information needed for the analysis, so that they can contribute the most appropriate and up to date information.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Global IPC Technical Working Group might want to consider what value there might be in allowing the ‘unpacking’ some of the more complex outcome indicators, such as livelihoods or food availability/access, in terms of achieving a better understanding the underlying causes of food security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care should be taken during the initial stages of the IPC process to be clear on the scope of the pilot process, so as not to raise stakeholders expectations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• It is recommended in future to develop a clear Memorandum of Understanding or Partnership Agreement with the agencies/Local Government Units in order to fully mainstream and institutionalise the IPC process in future. This will help ensure continuity of participation, and clarify expectations, roles and responsibilities.

• To undertake a municipal level analysis, it would be better to conduct the analysis workshop in the province concerned so as to have direct access to information and ensure that municipal representatives are able to participate in the process.

In addition to the above, the consultant would like to add the following:

• That WFP feedback the results of this pilot to Mindanao stakeholders through a half day workshop in Cotabato, and face-to-face meetings with each individual province in the Central Mindanao region during October and early November.

• That every support should be given by WFP and the Global IPC Initiative to the municipal level analysis suggested by the participants. There is considerable interest in IPC amongst stakeholders, and this is currently where stakeholders see IPC adding value.

• The current absence of a clear national level institutional home for IPC is likely to prove the main constraint to the adoption of the approach. It is therefore important that every effort is made to continue advocacy and awareness raising activities, and support the key agencies to ensure they have all the relevant information to make an informed decision on the future role of IPC.

• There is a potential weakness inherent in the separation of decision makers from technical experts in a pilot exercise, particularly when the timescale is short. The eventual adoption of the approach is dependent on decision makers buying into the process, but they may be excluded from it if the advice on composition of the Technical Working Group is followed rigidly. However, the analysis can suffer when there is insufficient technical expertise in the group. The Global IPC Initiative may want to consider developing separate guidelines for an expanded TWG when piloting the approach so that decision makers are able to see the process in action.

• The Global IPC Initiative should consider developing guidelines for conducting a pilot exercise, based on the learning from this and other exercises covering issues such as the role of good preparation before the pilot starts, pro-forma invitation letters, guidelines on data requirements, etc.

• The IPC needs to be more explicit about the importance of partnerships/relationships and communication. The IPC is not just a technical methodology. There needs to be greater acknowledgement that these skills are required to play the role of country focal point. It is also a vital part of preparing
the way for a pilot exercise and fostering ownership amongst national stakeholders.

- In future it would be beneficial to the process if the country host was encouraged to ensure that staff involved in IPC was released from their normal duties to focus on the IPC and reflect this in their job description and activity plan. Additional support or incentive could be given as financial support in the budget to cover a proportion of the salary, if necessary.

Conclusions
All those participating in this pilot exercise should be congratulated for their hard work and efforts in such a short period of time. The majority of the participants grasped the concepts and methodology very quickly and while the subsequent analysis is not to a standard that could support decision making, the process was sufficiently rigorous to enable them to identify its potential in The Philippines context.

Feedback to stakeholders will take place in October, through the distribution of the final outputs from this pilot (report, executive brief and map). A national stakeholder’s workshop is planned towards the end of October, and additional meetings are recommended. It will be important to follow up on the recommendations and next steps identified by participants in the pilot process.

In the short-term, there is sufficient interest for a further ‘pilot’ to be possible at the Mindanao level; focusing on 2-3 more provinces but unpacking them to the municipal level. The Community Based Monitoring System offers an opportunity to input considerable information at this level. In the long-term, there seems to be considerable potential for IPC to add value to existing systems and support decision making and response planning. Suggestions have been made to review its potential in association with The Philippine Food and Nutrition Surveillance System (PFNSS).

It is vital that advocacy and awareness raising efforts by WFP and continue amongst key food security stakeholders at national and Mindanao level at least the next 6months in order to maintain the interest and momentum that has built up during this exercise. Support from the Global IPC Initiative will be essential during this period.