Appendix C  IPC Analysis Templates

Part 1: Analysis of Current or Imminent Phase and Early Warning

| Area of Analysis (Region, District, or Livelihood Zone): Agro-pastoral livelihoods |
| Region: Gede region, |
| Districts: Dolo, Luq, Beledhawa, Garbaharey and Bardera |
| Reference period: January-June 2010 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference Outcomes</th>
<th>Direct and Indirect Evidence For Phase in Given Time Period</th>
<th>Projected Phase for Time Period</th>
<th>Evidence of Risk for Worsening Phase or Magnitude</th>
<th>Risk Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(As defined by IPC Reference Table)</td>
<td>• List direct and indirect (e.g., process or proxy indicators) evidence of outcomes (note direct evidence in bold)</td>
<td>(Circle or Bold appropriate Phase)</td>
<td>(list hazard and process indicators)</td>
<td>(Circle or Bold appropriate Risk Level and expected Severity, if warranted)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude Mortality Rate: Data not available</td>
<td>Note source of evidence</td>
<td>Generally Food Secure 1A</td>
<td>Generally Food Secure 1A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crude mortality rate: 1-2/10,000/day, &gt;2 reference rate, stable U5MR &gt; 2/10,000/day</td>
<td>Note evidence Reliability Score (1=very reliable, 2= somewhat reliable 3=unconfirmed)</td>
<td>Generally Food Secure 1B</td>
<td>Generally Food Secure 1B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify indicative Phase for each piece of evidence</td>
<td>Borderline Food Insecure</td>
<td>Borderline Food Insecure</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Note ‘Not Applicable’ or ‘Not Available’ if necessary</td>
<td>Acute Food &amp; Livelihood Crisis</td>
<td>Acute Food &amp; Livelihood Crisis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Acute malnutrition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Acute Malnutrition &gt; 15% (W/H&lt;-two_scores), &gt; usual, increasing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Statement: Nutritional Status is Critical with no change from Gu’09. (Source: FSNAU/Partners Nutrition Assessment, Dec. ’09; R=1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition Assessment: December ’09 GAM rate of &gt;18.2 % (CDC pro. 90%) and SAM rate of &gt;2.6 % (CDC pro.91%). Results indicate Critical nutrition situation with no change from Gu’09. (Source: FSNAU/Partners Nutrition Assessment, Dec. ’09; R=1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIS nutrition trend: Data indicates high numbers and stable trend of acutely malnourished children (Source: FSNAU/SRCS, GHC, AMA, HIRDA, MCH Data, July-Dec 09, R=3).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Disease | Endemic diseases within seasonal norms. |

Disease: Endemic diseases within seasonal norms.
| No disease epidemic reported. | High reported morbidity level of 27.3%, with diarrhoea at 11.6%, ARI at 15.2% febrile at 20.2%, (Source: FSNAU/Partners Nutrition Assessment, Dec ’09, R=1) |

**Food Access:**

**Overall statement:** The majority of poor agropastoralists have experienced significantly below average cereal production and crop failure during the last 3 seasons in the northern part of the region. In the south of Gedo, access to food has improved in the current Deyr season among all wealth groups of Bay-Bakool Agropastoral areas.

**Food sources:**

**Overall cereal production:** Overall cereal production in Gedo region is estimated at 3,890 Mt, which is 166% of Deyr ’08, 54% of the PWA and 51% of the five-year average, respectively; 75% of the total production in the region is sorghum, while 25% is maize. About 93% of all cereal production is from Bardera, while the rest is distributed among other parts of the region. The north of the region is more affected by low production than the south due to successive crop failures. (Source: FSNAU crop assessment and analysis, Dec. ’09; R=1/2)

**Own milk production:** Milk production in the agropastoral zones is normal because of medium conception for sheep/goats and medium calving rates of camel during this season. (Source: FSNAU Deyr ’09/10 pastoral analysis, Dec. ’09; R=2)

**Market purchase (Staple food cereal):** Sorghum prices in Bardera (southern Gedo) show a reduction of 17% and 27% since June ’09 and Dec ’08, respectively. However, the prices are 207% above the five-year average (SoSh 1,791/kg) and the Dec.’09 (SoSh 5,500/kg) price. DAMAS

Luq (southern Gedo), sorghum prices show a reduction of 27% and 20% since June ‘09 and Dec ’08, respectively but the prices Dec.’09 (SoSh 2,333/kg) are 243% above the five-year average (SoSh 8,000/kg).

(Source: FSNAU Market Data/Analysis, Dec.’09; R=1)

**SLIMS data:** Red sorghum prices (Burdhubo in the south) in Dec.’09 (SoSh 8500/kg) declined by 26% from June ‘09 (11,500/kg) and 61% since Dec ‘08 (SoSh 14,000) whereas they are 89% of 5-year average (2003-2007). This indicates that currently the poor and middle wealth groups have better access to cereals. (Source: SLIM Data Analysis data, Dec.’09; R=1)
Market Purchase
Imported commodity (sugar and vegetable oil) purchase:

Sugar prices: In Bardera Dec.’09 sugar prices have not changed much since June ’09 (21% increase) and Dec ’08 (14% increase), but are almost double the Dec. 5-year average (170% increase). In Luq market, in Dec.’09, sugar prices are about 25% higher than the Dec.’08 and June ‘09 prices and increased by 161% from the five-year average price. (Source: FSNAU Market Data/Analysis, Jan.’09; R=1)

Vegetable oil prices: The average price is 27% below the Dec.’08 price in Bardera; however, it is 8% and 117% higher than June ’09 and the five-year average. In Luq, although vegetable oil price reduced by 10% compared to June ’09 and Dec’08, the price is still 59% higher than five-year average. (Source: FSNAU Market Data/Analysis, Jan.’09; R=1)

Purchasing power (terms of trade): In Bardera (southern Gedo), the ToT between local quality goat and cereal is 68% higher, increasing from 88kg/goat in June ’09 to148kg/goat in Dec ‘09, but the current terms are 8% below (160kg/goat) the five-year average. The current ToT in Luq (northern Gedo) as of Dec. ’09 is 58kg/goat, which is 18% and 35% higher compared to Dec ‘08 and June ’09 respectively and is 20% of the five-year average. (FSNAU market update and analysis, Dec. ’09; R=1)

Other Food Sources This Deyr 09/10 cereal production was poor entir the region. Although since July ’09 approximately 7,000 MT of food aid has been distributed in Gedo, with 75% distributed in southern Gedo and the remainder distributed since (July’09) in the north. (Source: FSNAU Market Update, Jan.’09 and Food Aid data,
Income sources

Overall statement: Overall income levels of the poor agro-pastoral households, both in the north and south of the region has slightly improved due to medium calving for camel and medium consumption rates of sheep and goats. Holdings are below baseline for shoats and cattle where camel is around the baseline.

Own production sales (milk): Milk production among pastoralists and agro-pastoralists is normal for camel. The average camel milk price reduced by 10% between June and Dec.'09 in Bardera. And also price reduced by 10% between June and Dec.'09 in Luq. However, due to low milk production, as a result of several successive seasons of dry conditions, income from milk sales presently is low but is improved; (Source: FSNAU Post Pastoral Assessment/Analysis, Dec.'09; R=1)

Own production sales (livestock): In Bardera market the average local quality goat price in Dec.'09 (SoSh 816,667) is higher by 45% compared to June '09 (SoSh562,500), and 23% higher compared to Dec.'08 (SoSh 662,500), while they are 187% above the five-year average (SoSh 285,000); In Luq market, the average local goat price in Dec.'09 (SoSh 462,500) reduced by 3% and 5% compared to June’09 (SoSh 475,000) and Dec. '08 (SoSh487,500) and is 16% above the five-year average (SoSh 400,000); (FSNAU market update and analysis, Jan. ‘2010; R=1)

SLIMS data: The (787,500 SoSh) Dec ‘09 local goat price in Burdhubu of southern Gedo is 33%, 9% and 2% higher compared to June '09 (592,500 SoSh), Dec. '08 (725,000 ) and 5-year average (768,750 SoSh), respectively. Similarly, in Gedweyne, in northern Gedo, the price increased 13%, 50% and 36% compared to June '09, Dec. '08 and 5-year average respectively. (Source: SLIMS data analysis Jan.’09; R=1)

Labour opportunities and wage rates: Although availability of labour was poor in Deyr ‘09/10 in most of the region, except in pockets of Bardera market, wages are only 6% and 4% lower than in June ‘09 and Dec.’08 respectively and 189% higher than the five-year average due to hyperinflation.

Labour wages are the same in Luq since June’09, but are higher by 150% and 567% compared to Dec. ‘08 and the five-year averages, respectively; (Source: FSNAU Market Data/Analysis, Dec.’09;
**Self-employment opportunities:** The current prices of charcoal in the region are 94%, 100% and 282% of June ‘09, Dec ‘08 and five-year average respectively compared to Dec ‘09 prices. Although the average firewood price is 71%, 75% and 163% of June ‘09, Dec ‘08 and five-year average respectively compared to Dec ‘09 prices. (Source: FSNAU Market Data/Analysis, Dec.’09; R=1)

**Food Availability:**
According to FSNAU market supply data, cereal availability is average to above average, with the majority being supplied from Bay region. About 3,697 MT of cereals from Deyr ‘09/10 production are expected from agropastoral and riverine areas in the region particularly Bardera and pockets of Garbaharey and Luq districts. (Source: FSNAU Deyr ‘09/10 Assessment, Dec.’09; R=1/2)

**Cereal balance sheets:** According to FSNAU cereal stock analysis, current production could cover regional per capita cereal requirements for three months. (Source: FSNAU Stock Data and Analysis, Dec.’09; R=1)

| Dietary diversity | Overall Statement: Dietary diversity is improving due average milk (from camel) and crop production but child feeding and care practices are sub-optimal
|-------------------|--------------------------------------------------
| Chronic dietary diversity deficit. | Milk consumption is increasing following improved milk production mainly from camel and decreasing milk prices. (Source: FSNAU/Partners Nutrition Assessment, Dec ’09; R=1) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water access/availability.</th>
<th>Overall Statement: Water availability is not currently a concern but water quality is a concern for agro-pastoral community.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adequate but of poor quality.</td>
<td>Source of Water: More than 92.8% of households are accessing water from unprotected sources. (Source: FSNAU/Partners Nutrition Assessment, Dec ’09; R=1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sanitation: Sanitation situation remains poor with 80.4% of the households using the bush or a designated area. (Source: FSNAU/Partner Nutrition Assessment, Dec. ’09; R=1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Destitution/Displacement Concentrated</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Civil Security**  
Limited/Widespread Conflict, low intensity conflict, increasing.

**Civil Insecurity**  
Insecurity in Gedo region has stabled in the last six months. Though the magnitude is limited, the intensity of conflict is low. Commodity and population movement is not restricted. (Source: Civil Insecurity Monitoring and UNHCR Population Tracking Table, Jan.’10; R=1)

**Coping strategies**  
Food and non-food purchase through credit is the main coping strategy employed by poor pastoral households; this is followed by seeking remittances from relatives and friends in main urban areas. (Source: FSNAU/Partner assessment and SLIM data analysis, Dec. ‘09-Jan.’10; R=1)

**Structural Issues**  
Lack of proper governance and institutional structures.

**Hazards**  
Recurrent with high livelihood vulnerability

**Livelihood Assets**  
(5 capitals) Accelerated and critical depletion or loss of access

**Natural capital**  
Seasonal Rainfall: Although the start of Deyr ‘09/10 rainfall was average to near average, rainfall amount, distribution and frequency in the agropastoral zone are average with a long dry spell in Nov. and Dec. '09 (Source: FSNAU/FEWS climate analysis/satellite images and field ground truth observations, Dec.’09; R=1)

Rangeland Conditions: Both browse and grazing conditions are significantly improved in the region and expected to sustain in the next 6 months. (Source: FSNAU/Partner assessment, NDVI images, Dec 2009; R=1)

**Physical capital:** Road networks are poor, negatively affecting commodity and transportation movement and diminishing food access and availability by increasing transport costs and commodity prices and reducing levels of trade. (Source FSNAU Deyr ’09/10 Assessment; Dec.’09; R=1)

**Social Capital:** Crop zakat is low in most parts of the region. Other social support mechanisms, such as cash gifts and credit have remained normal in the region. (Source: FSNAU pastoral assessment and herd dynamics analysis, Dec.’09; R=1)

**Human Capital:**  
Limited health facilities in most rural agropastoral areas. (Source: FSNAU/Partners Assessment, Dec. ’09; R=1)
**Nutrition Assessment:** December ’09 GAM rate of >18.2 % (CDC pro. 90%) and SAM rate of >2.6% (CDC pro. 91%). Results indicate *Critical* nutrition situation with no change from Gu’09. (Source: FSNAU/Partners Nutrition Assessment, Dec. ’09; R=1)

Improved immunization and vaccination status attributed to child health day: Reported Vitamin A supplementation and measles vaccination of >80% (Source: FSNAU/Partners Nutrition Assessment, Dec. ’09; R=1)

**Financial Capital**

**Remittance and Debt Levels – SLIM Data**

REMITTANCE: The number of people receiving remittance in El Adde (South) is 76% higher than same period last year and 20% lower since June’09. (Source: SLIM data analysis, Dec.’09; R=1),

DEBT: The number of people receiving loans in El Adde reduced by 37% and 51% compared to June ’09 and Dec.’08 respectively (Source: SLIM data analysis, Dec.’09; R=1)
## Part 2: Analysis of Immediate Hazards, Effects on Livelihood Strategies, and Implications for Immediate Response

### Area of Analysis (Region, districts, and livelihood): Dolow, Luuq, Beledhawa, Garbohaarey and Baardheere – Agro-pastoral Livelihood

**Jan.-June 2010**

### Time Period of Analysis:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current or Imminent Phase (Circle or Bold Phase from Part 1)</th>
<th>Immediate Hazards (Driving Forces)</th>
<th>Direct Food Security Problem (Access, Availability, and/or Utilization)</th>
<th>Effect on Livelihood Strategies (Summary Statement)</th>
<th>Population Affected (Characteristics, percent, and total estimate)</th>
<th>Projected Trend (Improving, No change, Worsening, Mixed Signals)</th>
<th>Risk Factors to Monitor</th>
<th>Opportunities for Response (to Immediately improve food access)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Generally Food Secure 1A                                    | Drought, Environmental degradation, Hyperinflation, Insecurity | Limited access to own food production | Crop failure and high cereal prices limiting access to food income from livestock severely affected by low productivity, loss of animals and little herd growth | Southern Agro-pastoral Population-North Gedo:  
  - HE - 75% of poor in north Gedo  
  - AFLC - 25%P and 25% of middle Bay-Bakool Agropastoral:  
  - AFLC - 75% of poor Total of 15,000 people  
  Southern Agro-pastoral South Gedo:  
  - AFLC - 25% of poor | Good improvement (South)  
  Slight improvement (North) | Gu’10 rains and cereal production  
  Livestock movements  
  Water availability and access  
  Terms of trade: livestock to cereal and labour to cereal  
  Market access and food supply | Food Aid  
  Food for Work  
  Rehabilitation of water sources.  
  Income generation activities |
| Generally Food Secure 1B                                     |                                     |                                                                         |                                                     |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                  |                        |                                                             |
| Borderline Food Insecure                                     |                                     |                                                                         |                                                     |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                  |                        |                                                             |
| Acute Food and Livelihood Crisis                            |                                     |                                                                         |                                                     |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                  |                        |                                                             |
| Humanitarian Emergency                                       |                                     |                                                                         |                                                     |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                  |                        |                                                             |
| Famine/Humanitarian Catastrophe                              |                                     |                                                                         |                                                     |                                                                                                                                   |                                                                  |                        |                                                             |
### Part 3: Analysis of Underlying Structures, Effects on Livelihood Assets, and Opportunities in the Medium and Long Term

**Area of Analysis (Region, districts, and livelihood):** Dolow, Luuq, Beledhawa, Garbohaarey and Baardheere – Agro-pastoral Livelihood  
**Time Period of Analysis:** Jan.-June 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANALYSIS</th>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Current or Imminent Phase</strong></td>
<td><strong>Underlying Causes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Circle or Bold Phase from Part 1)</td>
<td>(Environmental Degradation, Social, Poor Governance, Marginalization, etc.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| ▪ Generally Food Secure 1A | • Environmental degradation via charcoal burning and tree cutting as the means of coping.  
▪ Recurrent drought  
▪ Weak social and governance structures | Physical capital:  
• Roads accessible but in poor condition and require rehabilitations  
• Continuous environmental degradation | No change | Rehabilitation of roads to improve market accessibility |
| ▪ Generally Food Secure 1B | | Social capital:  
• Loss or weak social networks among agro-pastoralists  
• Access to humanitarian support through food aid | | Provision of Income generation programmes among the pastoral communities |
| ▪ Borderline Food Insecure | | Financial capital:  
• Further decline of livestock herd sizes via high off-take and retarded growth  
• Limited income from milk and livestock sales | Worsening (north Gedo)  
Slight improvement (South Gedo) | • Restocking especially cattle and sheep/goat to cover the loss of livestock through off-take.  
• Introduction of veterinary services and animal husbandry  
• Agro-extension services |
| ▪ Acute Food and Livelihood Crisis | | Natural capital:  
• General improvement in pasture and rangeland conditions, but conditions poor in certain pockets of agro-pastoral zones | No change | • Water development projects to improve livelihoods |
| ▪ Humanitarian Emergency | | Human capital:  
• Limited to no access to health and education services.  
• High malnutrition rates among children | No change or deterioration | • Provision of education and human health services |
| ▪ Famine/ Humanitarian Catastrophe | | | | |

**Note on Estimation of Affected Population Numbers**
1. Define geographic area that spatially delineates the affected population.

2. Identify the most current population estimates for this geographic area, interpolating from admin boundaries where necessary.

3. Adjust total population estimates to account for any known recent migration in or out of the affected area.

4. Estimate the percent of the population estimated in each Phase within the affected geographic area. The most appropriate method could be by livelihood zone, wealth group, but in some instances may be more accurate to estimate by clan, gender, etc. Note, the IPC does not provide a method for the population estimates.