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# ICA Overview and Introduction

The aim of the ICA is to help in the identification of where to position broad long-term programmatic strategies that support food insecure and vulnerable populations in ways that will complement and protect the underlying long-term development trajectory that is present in every country. It does this by informing where to focus ‘geographically’ different combinations of selected programmatic themes whose aim is to lift the most vulnerable out of food insecurity and reduce the risks they face from climate-related natural shocks, thereby protecting their development gains and enabling further progress in highly food insecure and risk-prone areas. The ICA advocates for tailoring support linking humanitarian and development efforts in ways that make the most sense according to unique geographical contexts.

To do this, the ICA provides a broad depiction of context resulting from the analysis, interpretation and overlaying of recurrence in statements on food security (taken from existing food security analyses), with information on where risk and/or exposure to climate-related natural shocks occurs (taken from existing data or modelled in their absence) to identify and categorise areas of overlap between them. The ICA visually overlays additional information, such as nutrition data, climate change risk or land degradation, onto these categories as ‘lenses’ to deepen geographical understanding of context, and available information on livelihoods, seasonality, and population distributions to further support programming discussions and strategy development.

The ICA uses a consultative process with partners, firstly to validate the technical findings followed by discussions to identify the most appropriate, broad programmatic strategies in specific geographical areas, including where to position safety nets, disaster risk reduction (DRR), early warning and preparedness. These ICAs involve local partner consultation and participation in the analytical and interpretative phases so findings reflect collective knowledge and experience. As part of the Three-Pronged Approach (3PA), which strengthens the design, planning and implementation of longer-term and emergency programmes, an ICA also indicates where to conduct Seasonal Livelihood Programming (SLP) consultations to populate the broad ICA programmatic strategies with specific activities, and which inform Community-based Participatory Planning (CBPP) processes.

This report summarises results of the ICA consultation in Country that discussed the programmatic implications of the findings of the ICA analysis as described in the ICA Technical Paper for Country. The ICA Technical Paper is available as a separate document, and includes maps and data for all factors included in the ICA categorisation, maps and data for additional ‘lenses’ of analysis, and methodological descriptions.

# Programmatic Themes Relevant to the ICA

## Safety Nets

A safety net is a programme approach that provides predictable, reliable, and consistent assistance over time to people in need, allowing them to factor this assistance in their own planning and risk-taking decisions as they move toward self-reliance. Safety nets can take different forms and tackle different objectives depending on the context, e.g. protective-only, shock-responsive or productive.

## Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR)

Disaster risk reduction is a theme that includes all efforts to reduce disaster risk, typically focusing on either exposure or vulnerability. In the setting of the ICA disaster risk refers to the risk posed by climate-related natural shocks, but of course there are other causes of disasters. DRR efforts may be long or short term.

The nexus between recurrent shocks, persistent high levels of food insecurity, malnutrition and land degradation may guide a combination of climate adaptation, DRR and safety nets to support resilience.

## Early Warning

Early warning may target a variety of audiences, from policy makers to individual households. In the ICA early warning refers to warning of impending climate-related natural shocks. The key elements are that warning precedes a shock, and is intended to trigger some form of immediate action to reduce shock risk. Thus early warning is often closely tied to preparedness, and is a component of DRR.

## Preparedness

Preparedness is a DRR theme that refers to plans and actions that precede a climate-related natural shock event and reduce the risk and/or impact it poses. Preparedness can be implemented nationally, regionally, within organisations or at the community or household level; all aspects are important. Because preparedness exists in the period before a shock event, preparedness systems are often linked to early warning.

# Using the ICA Layers to Focus Programmatic Themes

This page overviews how to think about and use the various ICA data layers to identify programme themes relevant to particular geographic areas. Each layer is included for a specific purpose. The ICA Areas and Categories, explained in more depth on the following page, combine the core layers of food security and natural shocks to visualise the intersection of the main programmatic themes. Lenses and Additional Contextual Information layers are used to refine strategies identified via the Categories.

## ICA Categories and Areas

#### ICA Categories

* Assists with broadly identifying where to place the thematic programme building blocks of safety nets, DRR and early warning/preparedness systems.

#### ICA Areas

* Adds detail to the process above, by showing the intersection of food insecurity and natural shock risk

## ICA Core

#### Food Security Layer

* Helps to identify where food security safety nets (to provide predictable, consistent assistance) are needed by highlighting areas where food insecurity consistently recurs over the defined threshold.

#### Natural Shock Risk Layer

* Highlights areas where natural climate-related hazard risk are highest and thus DRR efforts are appropriate. These can be built into safety net efforts in areas with consistently high food insecurity.
* Contributes to defining regions where early warning and preparedness should be emphasised

## Lenses

#### Land Degradation Lens

* Land degradation can heighten the impact of natural shocks, and is a major contributor to food insecurity. This lens shows where efforts to halt and reverse land degradation are required, either as part of safety nets, DRR or stand-alone programmes, and through policy.

#### Landslide Risk Lens

* Enables focus on specific areas where landslide risk is high, helping to refine DRR activities and where additional land stabilization/rehabilitation is required.

#### Nutrition Lens

* Shows where nutrition strategies may be required in both food insecure and food secure areas

## Additional Contextual Information

#### Intra-Annual Food Insecurity Variability

* Adds detail on when in the year food insecurity challenges peak, informing the yearly timing and duration of safety nets and/or other food security programmes

#### Inter-Annual Food Insecurity Variability

* Shows seasonal or shock-influenced patterns in food insecurity values, for programme refinement

#### Seasonality of Natural Shocks

* Assists with refinement of early warning and preparedness strategies by noting when risk is highest

#### Livelihoods

* Provides insight into how programme themes can be adjusted to local livelihood systems

#### Population Distribution

* Shows the geographic concentration of where people live

#### Numbers of Affected

* Estimates how many people are in need of long term assistance, and how many may need assistance if a shock occurs, by looking at the relative levels of food insecurity over the past five years.

# Using ICA Areas and Categories to Focus Programmatic Themes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Exposure to  **Natural Shocks** | **Recurrence of Food Insecurity above Threshold** | | |
| **LOW** | **MEDIUM** | **HIGH** |
| **LOW** | **Area 5** | **Area 3B** | **Area 3A** |
| **MEDIUM** | **Area 4 B** | **Area 2 B** | **Area 1 B** |
| **HIGH** | **Area 4 A** | **Area 2 A** | **Area 1 A** |

The ICA categorises the country’s Administrative levels/boundary into Categories 1 to 5 – derived from nine related areas – based on their levels of recurring food insecurity and exposure to natural climate-related shocks, as described below. Findings for Country name are mapped on the next page. The ICA Categories and Areas provide evidence to inform the discussions and selection of broad programmatic strategies using the thematic building blocks of safety nets, DRR and early warning/preparedness systems. Details on Category and Area implications for Country name are provided in following sections of this report.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **CATEGORY 1** | Persistent food insecurity suggests that safety nets providing predictable support to vulnerable populations may be appropriate, whilst high shock risk justifies including DRR, including early warning and preparedness themes. |
| **CATEGORY 2** | Intermittent food insecurity patterns may be related to either shocks (natural or man-made) or seasonal factors. If seasonal, safety nets can reduce predictable food insecurity; if shocks are a cause, a recovery focus may be suitable. At the same time, high shock risk argues for DRR including early warning and preparedness. |
| **CATEGORY 3** | Locations identified as Area 3A show persistent food insecurity that can justify safety nets; Area 3B locations are more likely linked to seasonal factors where safety nets may also be applicable, or shocks where recovery is more of a focus. Whilst natural shock risk is lower, local contexts may benefit from early warning/ preparedness to reduce risk from possible events. |
| **CATEGORY 4** | In the absence of a clear long term food insecurity entry point (noting that pockets of food insecurity may exist), DRR including early warning / preparedness is a priority. Further, attention should be paid to land degradation given that this could worsen future shocks, potentially impacting food security. |
| **CATEGORY 5** | In the absence of a clear long term food insecurity entry point (noting that pockets of food insecurity may exist) programme themes should concentrate on DRR to a level justified by the risk. This can include ensuring appropriate early warning/preparedness relative to risk, as well as mitigating land degradation and other risk reduction measures. |

# ICA Areas Map

<insert ICA Areas map here: Full page landscape view, size 500kb. Use PNG format, not JPEG>

# Category 1: Combining Food Security Safety Nets and DRR

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| <insert map of Category 1 areas (areas 1A and 1B). 10cm wide, PNG format > | Category 1 areas have seen high recurrence of food insecurityamong threshold level or more of the population over the past reference period andface high or medium levels of natural shock risk.  Persistent food insecurity suggests that safety nets providing predictable support to vulnerable populations may be appropriate, whilst high shock risk justifies including DRR, including early warning and preparedness themes. | | | |
| **Level Natural shock** | **Recurrence of Food Insecurity** | | |
| LOW | MEDIUM | **HIGH** |
| LOW | Area 5 | Area 3B | Area 3A |
| **MEDIUM** | Area 4B | Area 2B | **Area 1B** |
| **HIGH** | Area 4A | Area 2A | **Area 1A** |

1. **For broad food security programme positioning:**

* Which areas does the group feel there is a need for food security safety nets?
* Are there any areas where food security safety nets are not felt to be relevant – why, and what should be done instead?

1. **For broad DRR (including early warning and preparedness) positioning:**

* In which areas does the group feel there is a need for DRR efforts to natural climate-related shocks (including early warning and preparedness)?
* **Note:** Consider the differences between ICA Areas 1A and 1B.

1. Looking at the ICA lenses (nutrition, land degradation, and landslide risk):

* Are there any key components to be included in or added as a complement to the safety nets, and DRR (including early warning and preparedness), identified above – and if yes, what components should we add where to enhance resilience?
* What additional investigations may be needed?

1. Considering the Additional Factors (livelihoods, seasonality and population distribution):

* What further detail can be used to position (geographically and in time), include in, or complement safety nets, DRR (including early warning/preparedness) and other programmatic aspects noted above?
* How do different livelihood systems affect how we prioritise actions?

1. Looking at the population data tables for Category 1 areas, are programmes likely to be able to scale up to absorb vulnerable people in case of a shock, or will emergency operations be needed?

# Category 2: Combining Seasonal Food Security Safety Nets/Recovery and DRR

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| <insert map of Category 2 areas (2A and 2B). Dimensions 10cm width x 7.06cm height> | Locations in Category 2 Areas show moderate levels of recurrence of food insecurity (as opposed to persistent recurrence as seen in Category 1 areas) coupled with high or medium natural shock risk.  Intermittent food insecurity patterns may be related to either shocks (natural or man-made) or seasonal factors. If seasonal, safety nets can reduce predictable food insecurity; if shocks are a cause, a recovery focus may be suitable. At the same time, high shock risk argues for DRR including early warning and preparedness. | | | |
| **Level Natural shock** | **Recurrence of Food Insecurity** | | |
| LOW | MEDIUM | **HIGH** |
| LOW | Area 5 | Area 3B | Area 3A |
| **MEDIUM** | Area 4B | **Area 2B** | Area 1B |
| **HIGH** | Area 4A | **Area 2A** | Area 1A |

1. **For food security programme positioning:**

What do we know about food insecurity patterns in the different areas? Consider the following:

* Is food insecurity seasonal? If yes, is there a need for a seasonal food security safety net?
* Is food insecurity the likely result of a shock or critical event in the last five years? If yes, is there a need for a food security programme that will help people to recover from this shock/event?

1. **For broad DRR (including early warning and preparedness) positioning:**

* In which areas does the group feel there is a need for DRR efforts related to natural climate-related shocks (including early warning and preparedness)?
* **Note:** Consider the differences between ICA Areas 1A and 1B.

1. Looking at the ICA lenses (nutrition, land degradation, and landslide risk):

* Are there any key components to be included or to complement the safety nets and DRR (including early warning and preparedness) identified above – and if yes, what components should we add where?
* Which potential resilience building focus may be required? What are some of the key areas needed to address the concomitance of short, medium and longer-term actions? What additional investigations may be needed

1. Considering the Additional Factors (livelihoods, seasonality and population distribution):

* What further detail can be used to position (geographically and in time), include in, or complement safety nets and DRR (including early warning and preparedness) noted above?

1. Looking at the population data tables for Category 2 areas, are programmes likely to be able to scale up to absorb vulnerable people in case of a shock, or will emergency operations be needed?

# Category 3: Focus on Seasonal Food Security Safety Nets or Recovery

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| <insert map of Category 3 areas (3A and 3B). Dimensions 10cm width x 7.06cm height> | Locations in Category 3 have seen high or moderate levels of recurrence of food insecurity among threshold level or more of the population over the past reference period, coupled with relatively low natural shock risk.  Locations identified as Area 3A show persistent food insecurity that can justify safety nets; Area 3B locations are more likely linked to seasonal factors where safety nets may also be applicable, or shocks where recovery is more of a focus. Whilst natural shock risk is lower, local contexts may benefit from early warning/ preparedness to reduce risk from possible events. | | | |
| **Level Natural shock** | **Recurrence of Food Insecurity** | | |
| LOW | MEDIUM | **HIGH** |
| LOW | Area 5 | **Area 3B** | **Area 3A** |
| **MEDIUM** | Area 4B | Area 2B | Area 1B |
| **HIGH** | Area 4A | Area 2A | Area 1A |

1. **For food security programme positioning:**

In Area 3A:

* Does the group feel there is a need for food security safety nets, and if yes, in which ones?
* For those where food security safety nets are not felt to be relevant – why, and what should be done instead?

In Area 3B:

* Is food insecurity seasonal? If yes, is there a need for a seasonal food security safety net?
* Is food insecurity the likely result of a shock or critical event in the last five years? If yes, is there a need for a food security programme that will help people to recover from this shock/event?

1. **For broad DRR (including early warning and preparedness) positioning:**

* To what extent, where, are preparedness and early warning systems justified to reduce the risk of possible (albeit less likely) natural climate-related shocks?

1. Looking at the ICA lenses (nutrition, land degradation, and landslide risk):

* Are there any key components to be included or to complement the safety nets and DRR (including early warning and preparedness) identified above – and if yes, what components should we add where?
* Which potential resilience building focus may be required that is not necessarily linked to recurrent shocks? What additional investigations may be needed?

1. Considering the Additional Factors (livelihoods, seasonality and population distribution):

* What further detail can be used to position (geographically and in time), include in, or complement safety nets and DRR (including early warning and preparedness) noted above?

1. Looking at the population data tables for Category 3 areas, are programmes likely to be able to scale up to absorb vulnerable people in case of a shock, or will emergency operations be needed?

# Category 4: Focus on Disaster Risk Reduction

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| <insert map of Category 4 areas. Dimensions 10cm width x 7.06cm height> | Category 4 Areas have seen low recurrence of food insecurity among threshold level or more of the population over the last reference period and exhibit high or medium risk of natural shocks.  Whilst evidence does not support food security focused interventions, DRR (including infrastructure improvement as well as early warning / preparedness) is a priority. Further, attention should be paid to land degradation given that this could worsen future shocks, potentially impacting food security. | | | |
| **Level Natural shock** | **Recurrence of Food Insecurity** | | |
| LOW | MEDIUM | **HIGH** |
| LOW | Area 5 | Area 3B | Area 3A |
| **MEDIUM** | **Area 4B** | Area 2B | Area 1B |
| **HIGH** | **Area 4A** | Area 2A | Area 1A |

1. **For food security programme positioning:**

There are likely to be pockets of food insecurity in these areas (although their recurrence above the threshold are low) that should not be overlooked. Depending on the group’s understanding of the context (and a follow-up review of assessments), are there areas known to have:

* Long-term year-round food insecurity? If yes, is there a need for a long-term food security safety net or programme? Seasonal food insecurity?
* If yes, is there a need for a seasonal food security safety net?

1. **For broad DRR (including early warning and preparedness) positioning:**

* Which areas does the group feel there is a need for DRR efforts to natural climate-related shocks (including early warning and preparedness)?

**Note:** Consider the differences between ICA Areas 1A and 1B.

1. Looking at the ICA lenses (nutrition, land degradation, and landslide risk):

* Are there any key components to be included or to complement any safety nets and DRR (including early warning and preparedness) identified above – and if yes, what components should we add where?
* Is there a need to advocate for a nutrition programme?
* Is there a need to advocate for policy on land degradation (as a risk to future food insecurity?)

1. Considering the Additional Factors (livelihoods, seasonality and population distribution):

* What further detail can be used to position (geographically and in time), include in, or complement DRR (including early warning and preparedness) – or any food security programme - noted above?

1. Looking at the population data tables for Category 4 areas, are programmes likely to be able to scale up to absorb vulnerable people in case of a shock, or will emergency operations be needed?

# Category 5: Focus on Enhanced Early Warning and Preparedness

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| <insert map of Category 5 areas. Dimensions 10cm width x 7.06cm height> | Locations in Category 5 have seen a low recurrence of food insecurity among threshold level or more of the population over the reference period and face low natural shock risk.  In the absence of a clear food security entry point (noting that pockets of food insecurity may exist) programme themes should concentrate on DRR to a level justified by the risk. This can include ensuring appropriate early warning/preparedness relative to risk, as well as mitigating land degradation. | | | |
| **Level Natural shock** | **Recurrence of Food Insecurity** | | |
| LOW | MEDIUM | **HIGH** |
| LOW | **Area 5** | Area 3B | Area 3A |
| **MEDIUM** | Area 4B | Area 2B | Area 1B |
| **HIGH** | Area 4A | Area 2A | Area 1A |

1. **For food security programme positioning:**

There are likely to be pockets of food insecurity in these areas (although their recurrence above the threshold are low) and should not be overlooked. Depending on the groups understanding of the context (and a follow-up review of assessments), are there areas known to have:

* Long-term year-round food insecurity? If yes, is there a need for a long-term food security safety net or programme? Seasonal food insecurity?
* If yes, is there a need for a seasonal food security safety net?

1. **For broad DRR (including early warning and preparedness) positioning:**

* How can early warning/preparedness strategies best address the risks faced in Category 5 areas? Consider the individual shock layers, seasonality and population distribution
* Are there areas where land degradation justifies a stronger DRR approach beyond early warning and preparedness?

1. Looking at the ICA lenses (nutrition, land degradation, and landslide risk):

* Are there any key components to be included or to complement any safety nets and DRR (including early warning and preparedness) identified above – and if yes, what components should we add where?
* Is there a need to advocate for a nutrition programme?
* Is there a need to advocate for policy on land degradation (as a risk to future food insecurity?)

1. Considering the Additional Factors (livelihoods, seasonality and population distribution):

* What further detail can be used to position (geographically and in time), include in, or complement DRR (including early warning and preparedness) – or any food security programme - noted above?

1. Looking at the population data tables for Category 1 areas, are programmes likely to be able to scale up to absorb vulnerable people in case of a shock, or will emergency operations be needed?

# Minutes of the ICA Programmatic Consultations

## Location and Date

* Add meeting logistics information

## Participants

1. List participants, including name, title and agency/organisation affiliation

## Meeting Headings

* Add headings in this format, and content as appropriate