Assessment Working Group face-to-face meeting
23 October 2012
Draft Report

The purpose of the face-to-face meeting was to review the work of group throughout 2012 and to identify / reaffirm priority areas for 2013 and further develop the work plan as appropriate.

The main objectives of the meeting were to:

1. Revise and endorse the gFSC Situation Indicators
2. Discuss gFSC Performance Indicators
3. Agree on a work methodology for the coming months, including timeframes and focal points for target outputs, rotation of co-chairs
   (see Annex 1-2 for meeting Agenda and list of participants).

The meeting begun with an introduction and welcome to new members of the group then moved to focus on finalising the gFSC situation indicators.

Toward the end of 2011, gFSC partners recognised a need to create a technical Assessment Working Group (AWG) for the food security cluster in order to provide technical direction to the gFSC on key areas of assessment needs in humanitarian food security responses. This group was established in January 2012 and the two co-chairs – WFP and ACTED, were face-to-face meeting in April, Geneva Switzerland. During this meeting, the terms of reference and work plan for 2012 were also developed. The AWG consist of 25 experts from 17 different organizations (please see attached TORs).

The first task of the AWG was to define the core set of Food Security Indicators for use in humanitarian response by:

- defining the various phases of emergency and corresponding information needs.
- defining appropriate core indicators for the various phases, then tools to be used.

Situation Indicators

An initial list of 30 indicators was derived from existing IASC, SPHERE, WFP, FAO, NGO indicators for food security responses in emergencies. This initial draft was circulated to all AWG members as well as the food security cluster country coordinators and information managers. Building on comments received, the list of situation indicators was refined with an attempt to ensure that they are relevant and SMART (Annex 3: Situation Indicators).

Participants decided to go through each of the indicators to see if there was agreement on the current the wording of the indicators; disaggregation; IASC Phase; IPC link; Outcome /contributing tools/frequency; and if a baseline is needed for each of the indicators. However, following in-depth discussions on the first two indicators, it was decided to focus purely on the wording at this stage and to continue the rest via email. The results of this discussion are summarized in **Annex 4: Comments on Situation Indicators.**

It was decided that this list should be finalised by the end November 2012. By the end January 2012, it is planned to have completed the gFSC situation indicator matrix specifying:

- Theme (access, availability, utilization)

- Indicator (as per agreed by 6 November)
- Disaggregation
- Outcome / contributing factors (IPC link)
- Tools
- Frequency / Baseline needed.
- IASC Phase

The next task of the AWG will be to look at the various IASC phases of an emergency as defined in the Operational Guidance for Coordinated Assessments in Humanitarian Crises, look at what could be appropriate indicators at each phase, where this information will come from and what decisions this information can help formulate. (Phases are attached FYI and the entire guidance can be found at: http://assessments.humanitarianresponse.info/sites/assessments.humanitarianresponse.info/files/ops_guidance_finalversion2012.pdf)

A guidance note to explain the purpose, process of the core indicators will be devloped by January 2013 to be circualted with the core list and matrix of the gFSC indicators.

A first draft of a FAQ /summary of existing tools highlighingting the pros, cons, pitfalls of selected common tools will be devleoped.

Performance indicators

It as recognised that there was a need for further discussion needed aroudn the suggeted performance indicators. The recently established Sahel indicator will be used to stimulate discussion among AWG members. It si planned to have the final list endorsed by January 2013.

Way forward

Members of the AWG thanked the current co-chairs for their work throughout 2012 and hoped that they would continue to co-chair until April 2013. Both of the co-chairs agreed to this motiohn.

It is important that the group continures to keep regular communication and discussion. It was suggested to hold longer teleconferences, less frequently.

Action points

Situation Indicators

Vincent Annoni Co-chair AWG, based on discussions and feedback received will circulated an updated version of the situation indicators for no objection approval by end November 2012.

A guidance note to explain the purpose, process of the core indicators will be devloped by January 2013 to be circualted with the core list and matrix of the gFSC indicators.

A first draft of a FAQ /summary of existing tools highlighingting the pros, cons, pitfalls of selected common tools will be devleoped Jodi Blackham, Samaritans Purse.

A call for nominations April 2013, will be circualted in Jnauary 2013 will be circulated the continued committement of the current co-chairs to remain until April 2013.

The next AWG teleconferences will be held in January 2013 for a time period of at least 2 hours.

Performance

Take Sahel to stimulate discussion among the AWG to decide – done by April – with the aim to have finalised before then.

Less conference calls – longer 1st one in January 2013.

Annex 1

Assessment Working Group face-to-face meeting
23 October 2012
Agenda

4. Opening remarks and welcome
   Introduction of the meeting participants
5. Overview from the chair as to group progress to date
6. Revision and Final Endorsement of Situation Indicators
   Endorsement of all indicators as mapped out for the different emergency phases
7. Discussion on Performance Indicators
   Revision and final endorsement of performance indicators.
8. Agree on a work methodology for the coming months,
   Timeframes and focal points for target outputs
   Rotation of co-chairs
9. Summary of the meeting / key points to report back to the gFSC

Annex 2
List of participants

Agency	Surname:	First Name:	Email:
1. ACF	Deret	Helene	hderet@actioncontrelafaim.org
2. ACTED	Annoni	Vincent	vincent.annoni@impact-initiatives.org
3. CTS	Ockwell	Ron	ron01@orange.fr
4. FAO	Mollet	Matthias	Matthias.mollet@fao.org
5. ICRC	Dhur	Agnes	adhur@icrc.org
6. NRC	Legallo	Quentin	quentin.legallo@nrc.no
7. Oxfam	Young	Philippa	PYoung@oxfam.org.uk
8. Samaritans Purse	Blackham	Jodi	JBlackham@samaritan.org
9. Save the Children	Saulle	Jessica	J.Saulle@savethechildren.org.uk
10. Solidarité	Pascal	Peggy	ppascal@solidarites.org
11. UNHCR	Mattinen	Hanna	mattinen@unhcr.org
12. WFP	Ogden	Kathryn	Kathryn.ogden@wfp.org
13. WVI	Van Zutphen	Ton	ton_van_zutphen@wvi.org

Annex 4: Comments on Situation Indicators

It is important to note that geographic and population sub-groups depending on context disaggregation should be linked to IASC phases

#	Do we agree with wording	Disaggregate	IASC Phase	IPC link Outcome contributing	Tools	Frequency/ Baseline needed
1	NO- but want to keep					
2	YES - Delete HDDS	Yes according to phases	All in various level of detail	Outcome (HDDS FCS, HHS HEA)	Focus / HH/ community group discussion	No with focus group discussion
3	Yes – need to provide explanation against phases and refer to 10,11,12 (that will be deleted as they are sub- indicators)					
4	No – keep outbreaks remove destocking (compare to LEGS)					
5	Change from HH to community perception Change suitable to adequate					
6	YES - but info from WASH					
7	YES – (add fuel)					
8	Yes – split into 2 indicated one with physical access and one with safe access (disaggregate by gender)					
9	Yes- add guidance, include remittances in definition Need to add purchasing power indicator					
10	Delete (sub-indictor of #3)					
11	Delete (sub indictor of #3)					
12	Delete (sub indictor of #3)					
13	Yes (list a few including water in definition)					
14	(delete) Need 1-2 market indicators that includes *alarm bell* ACTED to propose new and circulate					
15	NEW AGREED: % of communities and / or HH unable to pursue normal livelihood activities at this time of the year					
16	(link to #1) Yes but - re-word – in-line with a CSI indicator?					
17	YES - change **yield** change to **production**					
18	Duration of key food stocks for HH own food consumption (link to MAHFP)					
19	NO do not agree – need to revise					
20	Change in number of meals per day (need guidance on what is meant by meals etc)					

21	No – want to keep but it needs to be re-worded. HFIAS – can help to capture 21					
22	Yes keep					
23	Refer to Nutrition cluster					
24	Refer to Nutrition cluster					
25	Refer to Nutrition cluster					