TECHNICAL NOTES

GRFC AS A PUBLIC GOOD – CONSULTATION, PARTNERSHIP AND CONSENSUS

1 | PRELIMINARY WORK

Data gathering

FSIN and Food Security Technical Working Groups

- Identify and share relevant data and analyses pertaining to the year 2023 for those countries qualifying for the GRFC 2023 according to the criteria for inclusion and guidelines set and agreed in the technical consultations in December 2022

- Engage with regional and country-level food security and nutrition specialists to try and fill data gaps

2 | RESEARCH, ANALYSIS AND PRODUCTION

Data endorsement

FSIN and Technical Working Groups

- Agree to the same criteria for endorsement of data/analysis used in the GRFC 2023

- Identify and endorse peak acute food insecurity estimates for 2023 and assess and validate the reliability of the data source

- Identify and endorse nutrition data

- Identify and endorse displacement data

- Identify and endorse key drivers of acute food insecurity

Drafting

FSIN and Technical Working Groups

- Initial drafting based on data endorsed by the Technical Working Groups

- Complement data and figures with qualitative literature reviews

- Produce relevant infographic, maps, graphics, and other visuals

Quality control

FSIN and Technical Working Groups

- Review and comment on drafts

- Discuss until consensus is reached on draft report

3 | REVIEW AND CLEARANCE

Review

Senior Committee

- Review and comment on the report

- Provide guidance on addressing gaps or lack of consensus

- Troubleshoot on technical challenges

- Discuss until consensus is reached

Finalise production

FSIN

- Implement Senior Committee recommendations

- Refine draft

FSIN

- Final proof-read

Institutional clearance

Senior Committee

- Each partner organisation authority validates the report

4 | RELEASE AND DISSEMINATION

Publication of the 2023 Global Report on Food Crises Mid-Year Update

FSIN and GNAFC

- Digital and physical publication of the full report and related products, including In Briefs (translated into Spanish and French), spotlights, and stand-alone assets (regional overviews, technical notes, data)

- Coordinated communications campaign (including web, social media, and media), to maximize the visibility and outreach

- Tracking of numbers of downloads and visits and usage of the report

All partners are in agreement with the approximate degree of magnitude and severity of acute food insecurity indicated for the countries included in this report except where a disclaimer is present. The differences stem from the varying interpretations of the data related to the factors which contribute to or indicate acute food insecurity.

DATA SELECTION

Country selection process

Step 1 The Senior Committee endorsed the list of countries/territories with the selection rationale that the FSIN and the Food Security Technical Working Group (TWG) used for the GRFC 2023.

Steps for selection included:

1. Pre-select all countries/territories that requested external assistance for food and/or faced shocks as assessed by FAO-GIEWS:

   a. in 2022, or

   b. at least once in the past 3 years, or

   c. at least 3 years in the past 10 years

   External assistance for logistical support, for capacity building, for longer-term poverty reduction or development purposes is not considered as a qualifying factor for a food crisis.

   Countries that did not request external humanitarian food assistance, but which had acute food insecurity analyses available that indicate high levels of food insecurity, are not included in the GRFC. However, the TWG can still consider such analyses for the regional overviews in consultation with the Senior Committee.

2. Exclude high-income countries from the global country list, as these countries are expected to manage their food crises with internal resources.

3. Assess the following among the low or middle-income countries/territories, that are not identified by FAO-GIEWS assessments, but requested external food assistance because of:

   a. hosting refugee populations who were assisted by UNHCR and WFP. If this criterion is met, only the refugee populations in that country are included, while the host country is only pre-selected if its resident population needed external food assistance.

   b. having over 1 million or at least 20 percent of its population forcibly displaced.

   c. having populations affected by conflict and insecurity, weather extremes and/or economic shocks.

As a result of the above process, **73 countries/ territories** were considered for inclusion in the GRFC 2023.

Step 2 FSIN facilitates discussions with the Food Security TWG on the available acute food insecurity data for the countries/territories selected for the GRFC 2023.

The core rules on the data endorsement for the Mid-Year Update were the same as per GRFC 2023, including:

1. Assessment/analysis methodology is among those endorsed by the TWG (see data endorsement)

2. The 2023 peak analysis covers at least one month of 2023, and if several analyses are available, the one describing the highest magnitude of acute food insecurity is selected.

Out of the 73 countries/territories considered for inclusion, **58 had data available** that met the requirements to be included as food crises in the GRFC 2023.

Of these 73, there are **48 countries with data available for the Mid-Year Update, of which 26 are new analyses**, 14 are existing projections and eight are analyses straddling 2022 and 2023.

Out of the 73 countries/territories considered for inclusion, 16 do not have data for both the GRFC 2023 and the Mid-Year Update, 10 only have data for the GRFC 2023 and there were none with data only for the Mid-Year Update.

Data endorsement: sources and methodologies

The data presented in the GRFC and its suite of products follow the data source priority ranking listed below. Exceptions can be made based on the Food Security TWG discussion and agreement on the data that appear to best reflect a particular country's food security situation. This is primarily due to different analysis coverage, timings or when a country/territory has information from several sources.

1. IPC/CH Acute Food Insecurity Analysis

2. FEWS NET IPC-compatible analysis

3. WFP's CARI methodology

4. Humanitarian Needs Overview, or similar country team source

Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC)

The IPC results from a partnership of various organizations at the global, regional and country levels and is widely accepted by the international community as a global reference for the classification of acute food insecurity. There are around 30 countries currently implementing the IPC.

It provides the 'big picture' evidence base of food crises by assessing the following: how severe, how many, when, where, why, who, as well as the key characteristics. It provides data for two time periods – the current situation and future projection. This information helps governments, humanitarian actors and other decision-makers quickly understand a crisis (or potential crisis) and informs appropriate action.

The IPC makes the best use of the evidence available through a transparent, traceable and rigorous process. Evidence requirements to complete classification have been developed, considering the range of circumstances in which evidence quality and quantity may be limited

while ensuring adherence to minimum standards. To ensure the application of the IPC in settings where access for collecting evidence is limited, specialized parameters have been developed. The IPC provides a structured process for making the best assessment of the situation based on what is known and shows the limitations of its classifications as part of the process.

IPC analysis teams consolidate and analyse complex evidence from different methods and sources (e.g., food prices, seasonal calendars, rainfall, food-security assessments, etc.), but the IPC allows them to describe their conclusions using the same, consistent language and standards and in a simple and accessible form. This harmonized approach is particularly useful in comparing situations across countries and regions, and over time.

The IPC technical manual version 3.1 provides information to understand and critically utilize IPC products and the protocols, including tools and procedures, to conduct the classification itself.

See https://www.ipcinfo.org/ipcinfo-website/resources/ipc-manual/en/

Classifying Famine (IPC/CH Phase 5)

Famine is classified at area level in the IPC according to an internationally accepted standard based on the following three criteria:

- At least one in five households face an extreme lack of food

- At least 30 percent of children suffer from wasting

- Two people for every 10 000 dying each day due to outright starvation or to the interaction of malnutrition and disease.

Given the severity and implications of this classification, all regular IPC protocols and special Famine protocols must be met before an area is classified in Famine (IPC/CH Phase 5). *See IPC version 3.1.*

Areas can be classified in Famine Likely if minimally adequate evidence available indicates that a Famine

IPC 3.1 acute food insecurity reference table

		Phase 1 None/Minimal	Phase 2 Stressed	Phase 3 Crisis	Phase 4 Emergency	Phase 5 Catastrophe/Famine
	Phase name and description	Households are able to meet essential food and non-food needs without engaging in atypical and unsustainable strategies to access food and income.	Households have minimally adequate food consumption but are unable to afford some essential non-food expenditures without engaging in stress-coping strategies.	Households either have food consumption gaps that are reflected by high or above-usual acute malnutrition; or are marginally able to meet minimum food needs but only by depleting essential livelihood assets or through crisis-coping strategies.	Households either have large food consumption gaps which are reflected in very high acute malnutrition and excess mortality; or are able to mitigate large food consumption gaps but only by employing emergency livelihood strategies and asset liquidation.	Households have an extreme lack of food and/or other basic needs even after full employment of coping strategies. Starvation, death, destitution and extremely critical acute malnutrition levels are evident. (For Famine Classification, area needs to have extreme critical levels of acute malnutrition and mortality.)
	Priority response objectives	Action required to build resilience and for disaster risk reduction	Action required for disaster risk reduction and to protect livelihoods	**Urgent action required to ⟶** Protect livelihoods and reduce food consumption gaps	Save lives and livelihoods	Revert/prevent widespread death and total collapse of livelihoods

Food security first-level outcomes

First-level outcomes refer to characteristics of food consumption and livelihood change. Thresholds that correspond as closely as possible to the Phase descriptions are included for each indicator. Although cut-offs are based on applied research and presented as global reference, correlation between indicators is often somewhat limited and findings need to be contextualized. The area is classified in the most severe Phase that affects at least 20% of the population.

Food consumption (focus on energy intake)	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5
	Quantity: Adequate energy intake **Dietary energy intake:** Adequate (avg. 2 350 kcal pp/day) and stable **Household Dietary Diversity Score:** 5–12 food groups and stable **Food Consumption Score:** Acceptable and stable **Household Hunger Scale:** 0 (none) **Reduced Coping Strategies Index:** 0–3 **Household Economy Analysis:** No livelihood protection deficit **Food Insecurity Experience Scale:** (FIES 30 days recall):<-0.58	**Quantity: Minimally Adequate** **Dietary energy intake:** Minimally adequate (avg. 2 100 kcal pp/day) **Household Dietary Diversity Score:** 5-FG but deterioration ≥1 FG from typical **Food Consumption Score:** Acceptable but deterioration from typical **Household Hunger Scale:** 1 (slight) **Reduced Coping Strategies Index:** 4–18 **Household Economy Analysis:** Small or moderate livelihood protection deficit <80% **FIES:** Between -0.58 and 0.36	**Quantity: Moderately Inadequate** – Moderate deficits **Dietary energy intake:** Food gap (below avg. 2 100 kcal pp/day) **Household Dietary Diversity Score:** 3–4 FG **Food Consumption Score:** Borderline **Household Hunger Scale:** 2–3 (moderate) **Reduced Coping Strategies Index:** ≥19 (non-defining characteristics (NDC) to differentiate P3, 4 and 5) **Household Economy Analysis:** Livelihood protection deficit ≥80%; or survival deficit <20% **FIES:** > 0.36 (NDC to differentiate between Phases 3, 4 and 5)	**Quantity: Very Inadequate** – Large deficits **Dietary energy intake:** Large food gap; well below 2 100 kcal pp/day **Household Dietary Diversity Score:** 0–2 FG (NDC to differentiate P4 and 5) **Food Consumption Score:** Poor (NDC to differentiate P4 and 5) **Household Hunger Scale:** 4 (severe) **Reduced Coping Strategies Index:** ≥19 (NDC to differentiate P3, 4 and 5) **Household Economy Analysis:** Survival deficit ≥20% but <50% **FIES:** > 0.36 (NDC to differentiate between Phases 3, 4 and 5)	**Quantity: Extremely Inadequate** – Very large deficits **Dietary energy intake:** Extreme food gap **Household Dietary Diversity Score:** 0–2 FG **Food Consumption Score:** Poor (NDC to differentiate P4 and 5) **Household Hunger Scale:** 5–6 (severe) **Reduced Coping Strategies Index:** ≥19 (NDC to differentiate P3, 4 and 5) **Household Economy Analysis:** Survival deficit ≥50% **FIES:** > 0.36 (NDC to differentiate between Phases 3, 4 and 5)
Livelihood change (assets and strategies)	**Livelihood change:** Sustainable livelihood strategies and assets **Livelihood coping strategies:** No stress, crisis or emergency coping observed	**Livelihood change:** Stressed strategies and/or assets; reduced ability to invest in livelihoods **Livelihood coping strategies:** Stress strategies are the most severe strategies used by the household in the past 30 days	**Livelihood change:** Accelerated depletion/erosion of strategies and/or assets **Livelihood coping strategies:** Crisis strategies are the most severe strategies used by the household in the past 30 days	**Livelihood change:** Extreme depletion/liquidation of strategies and assets **Livelihood coping strategies:** Emergency strategies are the most severe strategies used by the household in the past 30 days	**Livelihood change:** Near complete collapse of strategies and assets **Livelihood coping strategies:** Near exhaustion of coping capacity

Food security second-level outcomes

Second-level outcomes refer to area-level estimations of nutritional status and mortality that are especially useful for identification of more severe phases when food gaps are expected to impact malnutrition and mortality. For both nutrition and mortality area outcomes, household food consumption deficits should be an explanatory factor in order for that evidence to be used in support of the classification.

Nutritional status*	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5
Global Acute Malnutrition based on Weight-for-Height Z-score	Acceptable <5%	Alert 5–9.9%	Serious 10–14.9% or > than usual	Critical 15–29.9% or > much greater than average	Extremely Critical ≥30%
Global Acute Malnutrition based on Mid-Upper Arm Circumference	<5%	5–9.9%	10–14.9%		≥15%
Body Mass Index <18.5	<5%	5–9.9%	10–19.9%, 1.5 x greater than baseline	20–39.9%	≥40%
Mortality*	**Crude Death Rate** <0.5/10,000/day **Under-five Death Rate** <1/10,000/day	**Crude Death Rate** <0.5/10,000/day **Under-five Death Rate** <1/10,000/day	**Crude Death Rate** 0.5–0.99/10,000/day **Under-five Death Rate** 1–2/10 000/day	**Crude Death Rate** 1–1.99/10,000/day or <2x reference **Under-five Death Rate** 2–3.99/10,000/day	**Crude Death Rate** ≥2/10,000/day **Under-five Death Rate** ≥4/10,000/day

Food security contributing factors

For contributing factors, specific indicators and thresholds for different phases need to be determined and analysed according to the livelihood context; nevertheless, general descriptions for contributing factors are provided below.

	Phase 1	Phase 2	Phase 3	Phase 4	Phase 5
Food availability, access, utilization, and stability	Adequate to meet short-term food consumption requirements **Safe water** ≥15 litres pp/day	Borderline adequate to meet food consumption requirements **Safe water** marginally ≥15 litres pp/day	Inadequate to meet food consumption requirements **Safe water** >7.5 to 15 litres pp/day	Very inadequate to meet food consumption requirements **Safe water** >3 to <7.5 litres pp/day	Extremely inadequate to meet food consumption requirements **Safe water** ≤3 litres pp/day
Hazards and vulnerability	None or minimal effects of hazards and vulnerability on livelihoods and food consumption	Effects of hazards and vulnerability stress livelihoods and food consumption	Effects of hazards and vulnerability result in loss of assets and/or significant food consumption deficits	Effects of hazards and vulnerability result in large loss of livelihood assets and/or extreme food consumption deficits	Effects of hazards and vulnerability result in near complete collapse of livelihood assets and/or near complete food consumption deficits

DATA SELECTION

may be occurring or will occur. This classification should trigger prompt action by decision-makers to address the situation while calling for urgent efforts to collect more evidence. Famine and Famine Likely are equally severe, the only difference is the amount of reliable evidence available to support the statement.

The IPC supports Famine prevention by highlighting the following:

- IPC Phase 4 Emergency is an extremely severe situation where urgent action is needed to save lives and livelihoods.

- Households can be in Catastrophe (IPC/CH Phase 5) even if areas are not classified in Famine (IPC/CH Phase 5). This is the case when less than 20 percent of the population is experiencing Famine conditions and/or when malnutrition and/or mortality levels have not (or not yet) reached Famine thresholds. These households experience the same severity of conditions even if the area is not yet classified in Famine. This can occur due to the time lag between food insecurity, malnutrition and mortality, or in the case of a localized situation.

- Projections of Famine can be made even if the areas are not currently classified in Famine, thus allowing early warning.

Risk of Famine is an IPC statement that highlights the potential deterioration of the situation compared with the most-likely scenario expected during the projection period. Although it is not an IPC classification, it indicates a worst-case scenario that has a reasonable probability of occurring.

Cadre Harmonisé (CH)

The Cadre Harmonisé is the multi-dimensional analytical framework used by CILSS for the analysis and identification of areas and groups at risk of acute food insecurity in the Sahel, West Africa and Cameroon. It aims to inform national and regional food crisis prevention and management systems. It considers various indicators of food and nutrition security outcomes and contributing factors.

The CH relies on existing food security and nutrition information systems that have been in place in most Sahelian countries since 1985, and more recently in other coastal countries of West Africa. There are 18 countries currently implementing the CH: Burkina Faso, Benin, Cameroon, Cabo Verde, Chad, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, the Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo.

The CH version 2.0 clarifies the specific functions and protocols for carrying out an integrated and consensual analysis of acute food and nutrition insecurity.

See http://www.cilss.int/index.php/2019/10/04/cadre-harmonise-manuel-version-2-0/

IPC/CH five-phase classification

As a result of technical developments of the CH tools and processes and harmonization efforts over the last decade, IPC and CH acute food insecurity approaches are very close to each other and give comparable figures of acute food insecurity. The five-phase classification is the same though there are a few differences pertaining to the use of certain indicators, classification of famine and estimation of humanitarian assistance.

Classification into five phases: 1. None/Minimal, 2. Stressed, 3. Crisis, 4. Emergency and 5. Catastrophe/Famine is based on a convergence of available evidence, including indicators related to food consumption, livelihoods, malnutrition and mortality. Each phase has important and distinct implications for where and how best to intervene and thus influences priority response objectives. Populations in IPC/CH Phases 3–5 (Crisis, Emergency and Catastrophe) are deemed to be those in need of urgent food, livelihood and nutrition assistance. Populations in IPC/CH Phase 2 (Stressed) require a distinct set of actions – ideally disaster risk reduction and livelihood protection interventions. Classifying IPC/CH Phase 5 (Famine) requires analytical conclusions that meet three specific criteria.

FEWS NET

Funded and managed by USAID's Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA), the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET) provides early warning and evidence-based analysis of acute food insecurity to inform humanitarian and development response. FEWS NET is monitoring 29 countries where it analyses the dynamics of food, nutrition and livelihood security so policymakers can design programmes that address the root causes of persistent or recurrent acute food insecurity, undernutrition and vulnerability.

FEWS NET classification is IPC-compatible, which means it follows key IPC protocols but is not built on multi-partner technical consensus, so it does not necessarily reflect the consensus of national food security partners.

See https://fews.net/fews-data/333

CARI

WFP has developed, and uses, the Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI) methodology. This methodology is also commonly used by other food security partners in their assessments. CARI is a widespread practice for Multi-Sector Needs Assessments, used in calculating the People in Need figure for countries/territories not covered by IPC/CH analyses.

Before any intervention, WFP analyses the food security situation with partners to perform effective targeting, determines the most appropriate type and scale of intervention and ensures the most efficient use of humanitarian resources.

The CARI addresses the multiple dimensions of food security through five indicators – Food Consumption Score, reduced Coping Strategies Index, Economic Capacity to Meet Essential Needs (ECMEN) OR Food Expenditure Share, and Livelihood Coping Strategies.

Example of a completed CARI console

DOMAIN		INDICATOR	FOOD SECURE (1)	MARGINALLY FOOD SECURE (2)	MODERATELY FOOD INSECURE (3)	SEVERELY FOOD INSECURE (4)
CURRENT STATUS	Food Consumption	Food consumption groups FCG and reduced Coping Strategies Index	Acceptable consumption and reduced Coping Index below 4 21.1%	Acceptable consumption and reduced Coping Index 4 or above 30.3%	Borderline consumption 36.2%	Poor consumption 13.4%
COPING CAPACITY	Economic Capacity	ECMEN (or Food expenditure share when ECMEN is not available)	Total expenditure > MEB Food Expenditure Share <50%	Food Expenditure Share 50-65%	SMEB > Total Exp < MEB Food Expenditure Share 65–75% 18.4%	Total Exp < SMEB Food Expenditure Share >75% 71.5%
	Livelihood Coping Strategies	Livelihood Coping Strategies – Food Security	No coping 10.1%	Stress 19%	Crisis 3.6%	Emergency 11.4%
Food Security Index (CARI)			30.1%	27.0%	25.3%	17.6%

DATA SELECTION

Each surveyed household is classified into one of four food security categories –food secure, marginally food secure, moderately food insecure and severely food insecure. The results are presented within the CARI food security console, which provides the prevalence of each available CARI food security indicator. The aggregate results provide the population's overall food security outcome or Food Security Index (FSI).

Populations that are classified as 'moderately acute food insecure' and 'severely acute food insecure' as per WFP's CARI methodology are reported as an approximation to populations facing IPC/CH Phase 3 or above.

Indicators used by the CARI may be used within IPC/CH analyses, but there are differences between the two methods. The fundamental one is that the CARI analyses primary data from a single-household survey, while the IPC/CH uses a 'convergence-of-evidence' approach, incorporating and analysing a variety of secondary information. The CARI assesses the situation at a fixed point in time with no projection, the IPC/CH provides the current snapshot and a projection based on the most likely scenario for a period in the future.

Change in CARI methodology

The third edition was launched in December 2021, and it introduced two changes: firstly, the food consumption domain now includes Reduced Coping Strategies Index in addition to Food Consumption Group; and secondly, Economic Capacity to Meet Essential Needs (ECMEN) is now the preferred measure for economic vulnerability instead of food expenditure share, which is better for assistance targeting purposes. The main implication for the GRFC is comparison with prior surveys.

The ECMEN indicator identifies the percentage of households whose expenditures exceed the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB). A MEB is defined as what a household requires in order to meet their essential needs, on a regular or seasonal basis, and its cost. The MEB covers those needs that households meet fully or partially through the market. It serves as a monetary threshold that can be used to assess a household's economic capacity to meet their needs. To compute the ECMEN, household expenditures are used as a proxy for household economic capacity.

Link to CARI methodology https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000134704/download/

Humanitarian Needs Overview (HNO) and other estimates

OCHA HNOs provide the People in Need (PiN) figure for the Food Security and Livelihoods cluster, based on data collected during the year and it is endorsed by the Humanitarian Country Team in each country/territory. Similarly, food insecurity estimates are provided by OCHA in the Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) and Joint Response Plan (JRP). When no other sources for acute food insecurity estimates are available, the GRFC food security TWG assesses the methodology of the PiN to ensure it is based on acute food insecurity indicators and equivalent to IPC/CH Phase 3 or above.

Data lacking partnership consensus, and data gaps

All information in the GRFC is carefully assessed prior to use in the report, particularly on the methods and indicators used in the analysis. Because of this rigorous process, there are countries where food security information is available, but the source does not use the methods endorsed by the GRFC food security TWG. The information is acknowledged and the decision not to utilize it in the report is primarily because it lacks consensus among all partners. Until a neutral comparability study on indicators is available, such countries are listed as 'data not meeting GRFC requirements'. This refers to publicly available information in which partners identified limitations and therefore did not deem it appropriate for use in the report, whereas a "data gap" refers to absence of any public analysis for the year in question.

Citing the data source

All data sources are referenced according to the month and year of its publication.

Acute food insecurity peak for 2023

The peak estimate is based on the highest number of acutely food-insecure people in the year in question as reported by endorsed data sources. It does not reflect the latest analysis available but purely the observed peak.[1] The peak can be either an analysis made for the current period in 2023 or a projections made in 2022 or 2023 and referring to a period of the year 2023.

Number of countries with data sources for the 2022 peak estimates and 2023 projection estimates

Data sources	2022	2023
IPC	27	23
CH	15	15
FEWS NET	3	7
WFP CARI	6	2
HNO	7	-

A projection update or a new analysis that covers at least part of the previous projection period overrides the original projection findings since the latest analysis is based on more up-to-date information, hence providing more accurate findings.

Data from non-IPC/CH (FEWS NET, CARI and HNO analyses) sources are presented in the country narratives according to the terminology and categorization used in the original data source.

The wording 'high levels of acute food insecurity' or 'IPC/CH Phase 3 or above, or equivalent' are used to include both IPC/CH estimates and any food security estimates that are based on non-IPC/CH data sources reflecting an approximation of IPC Phase 3 and above.

Information is presented in summary tables as IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent without further breakdown to more specific IPC/CH Phases.

Graphs

To better contextualize acute food insecurity levels, the graphs show numbers of acutely food-insecure people, disaggregated by phase where possible, along with numbers of people in IPC/CH Phases 1 and 2 and the total country population.

Maps

Boundaries and names shown and designations used on the maps in this document do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations.A dotted line represents approximately the Line of Control in Jammu and Kashmir agreed upon by India and Pakistan. The final status of Jammu and Kashmir has not yet been agreed upon by the parties. The final boundary between the Republic of the Sudan and the Republic of South Sudan has not yet been determined. The final status of the Abyei area is not yet determined. A dispute exists between the Governments of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland over sovereignty of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas).

---

1 AFI estimates are rounded in this document.

DRIVERS OF FOOD INSECURITY

The drivers of food crises are often interlinked and mutually reinforcing, making it difficult to pinpoint the specific trigger or driver of each food crisis.

Also, it is acknowledged that food insecurity is not driven solely by the occurrence of a hazard, but rather by the interaction between hazards and people specific vulnerabilities. Although not listing each specific vulnerability factor for each country, the GRFC 2023 takes a practical approach by estimating which are the most salient drivers for each country/territory out of the broad categories explained below. The Food Security TWG analyses each selected country and identifies which of the drivers could be considered as the primary driver. For countries with two or more drivers affecting various parts of the country, the primary driver was selected based on analysis of how many people were affected by each of the drivers. The GRFC presents the number of countries by primary driver in global and regional narratives and aggregates the corresponding numbers of acutely food insecure people.

For countries where the analysis is purely focused on the displaced populations, the primary driver reflects the reason those populations are displaced from their country of origin.

Conflict/insecurity

This includes interstate and intra-state conflicts, internal violence, banditry and criminality, civil unrest or political crises often leading to population displacements and/or disruption of livelihoods and food systems.

It is a key driver of acute food insecurity because in conflict situations civilians are frequently deprived of their income sources and or have difficulties in accessing food as food systems and markets are disrupted, pushing up food prices and sometimes leading to scarcities of water and fuel, or of food itself.

Landmines, explosive remnants of war and improvised explosive devices often destroy agricultural land, mills, storage facilities, machinery etc.

Conflict prevents businesses from operating and weakens the national economy, reducing employment opportunities, increasing poverty levels and diverting government spending towards the war effort.

Health systems are usually damaged or destroyed, leaving people reliant on humanitarian support – yet increasingly, insecurity and roadblocks prevent humanitarian convoys from reaching the most vulnerable, or aid agencies face lengthy delays, restrictions on personnel or the type or quantity of aid supplies, or insufficient security guarantees. Parties to conflict can deny people access to food as a weapon of war, especially in areas under blockade/embargo. Food insecurity itself can become a trigger for violence and instability, particularly in contexts marked by pervasive inequalities and fragile institutions. Sudden spikes in food prices tend to exacerbate the risk of political unrest and conflict (FAO et al., 2017).

For countries with conflict/insecurity as the primary driver during the past year, change to another primary driver needs serious consideration as recovery from conflict/insecurity takes a long time and may remain as the underlying cause of food insecurity. In cases where conflict/insecurity has reduced and/or localized, with other drivers showing a predominant effect, the change in the primary driver from the previous year is considered.

Weather extremes

These include droughts, floods, dry spells, storms, cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons and the untimely start of rainy seasons.

Weather extremes drive food insecurity by directly affecting crops and/or livestock, cutting off roads and preventing markets from being stocked. Poor harvests push up food prices and diminish agricultural employment opportunities and pastoralists' terms-of-trade, lowering purchasing power and access to food, and triggering an early lean season when households are more market-reliant because of reduced food stocks.

Adverse weather events are particularly grave for smallholder farmers and pastoralists who rely on agriculture and livestock-rearing to access food and often lack the resilience capacities to withstand and recover from the impacts of such shocks. People's vulnerability to weather shock events rests on their capacity to adapt and bounce back after their livelihood has been affected, as well as the scale and frequency of shocks. Repeated events further erode capacity to withstand future shocks.

Weather events and changes in climate can lead to an intensification of conflict, for instance, between pastoralist herders and farmers over access to water and grazing. There is ample evidence suggesting that natural disasters – particularly droughts – contribute to aggravating existing civil conflicts.

Economic shocks

Economic shocks at country level can affect the food insecurity of households or individuals through various channels. Macroeconomic shocks may lead to increases in acute food insecurity through for instance, a contraction in GDP leading to high unemployment rates and consequent loss of income for those affected households, or a significant contraction in exports and/or a critical decrease in investments and other capital inflows, bringing a significant currency depreciation and high inflation, increasing production costs and food prices and worsening terms of trade which may lead to increases in acute food insecurity. High debt and limited fiscal space constrain economic growth, increase vulnerability to economic shocks and detract from development spending.

Increases in world market prices of staple grains, oil and agricultural inputs can affect food availability, push up domestic food prices for consumers and reduce their purchasing power. Economic shocks can also occur at a more localized level or hit only a particular socioeconomic category of households. For instance, pastoralists' facing lack of animal feed, veterinary

services, subsequent deteriorating livestock body conditions and depressed livestock prices are likely to be affected by a reduction in purchasing power and face a constrained access to food as a result.

Disease outbreaks

Disease outbreaks (occurrence of disease cases in excess of normal expectancy) are usually caused by an infection, transmitted through person-to-person contact, animal-to-person contact, or from the environment or other media. Water, sanitation, food and air quality are vital elements in the transmission of communicable diseases and in the spread of diseases prone to cause epidemics.

Displaced populations – particularly in overcrowded camps – are more susceptible to disease outbreaks which strained health systems cannot prevent or control (WHO). Epidemics and pandemics can also affect the ability of people to carry on their activities and livelihoods and, in the worst cases when widespread, may also affect markets and supply chains.

Crop pests and animal diseases

Transboundary plant pests and diseases can easily spread to several countries and reach epidemic proportions. Outbreaks and upsurges can cause huge losses to crops and pastures, threatening the livelihoods of vulnerable farmers and the food and nutrition security of millions at a time.

All animal diseases have the potential to adversely affect human populations by reducing the quantity and quality of food, other livestock products (hides, skins, fibres) and animal power (traction, transport) that can be obtained from a given quantity of resources and by reducing people's assets. Transboundary Animal Diseases (TADs) may be defined as those epidemic diseases that are highly contagious or transmissible and have the potential for very rapid spread, irrespective of national borders, causing serious socioeconomic and possibly public health consequences.

NUTRITION AND HEALTH

Key indicators and categorization

Wasting

Moderate wasting using the weight for height indicator is identified by weight for height z scores (WHZ) between -2 and -3 of the reference population, and severe wasting by WHZ below -3. Wasting reflects both moderate and severe wasting in a population. Wasting can also be defined by Mid-Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) measurements ≤12.5 cm, with severe wasting defined with a measurement of ≤11.5 cm.

Severity index for prevalence of wasting in children aged 6–59 months

Prevalence ranges	Label
< 2.5%	Very low
2.5–< 5%	Low
5–< 10%	Medium
10–< 15%	High
≥ 15%	Very high

Source: De Onis et al. Public Health Nutrition, 2018. Available at: https://www.who.int/nutrition/team/prevalence-thresholds-wasting-overweight-stunting-children-paper.pdf

Minimum Dietary Diversity

This indicator refers to the percentage of children aged 6–23 months who receive foods from five or more out of eight food groups a day.

The eight food groups are: i. breastmilk; ii. grains, roots and tubers; iii. legumes and nuts; iv. dairy products (infant formula, milk, yogurt, cheese); v. flesh foods (meat, fish, poultry and liver/organ meats); vi. eggs; vii. vitamin-A rich fruits and vegetables; viii. other fruits and vegetables. In some surveys, minimum dietary diversity is calculated based on seven food groups, excluding breastmilk. In these cases, the indicator refers to the percentage of children aged 6–23 months who receive foods from four or more out of seven food groups a day.

Minimum Meal Frequency

The indicator refers to the proportion of children aged 6–23 months who receive solid, semi-solid or soft foods at least the minimum number of recommended times a day depending on their age and whether they are breastfed.

Minimum Acceptable Diet

This composite indicator combines meal frequency and dietary diversity to assess the proportion of children aged 6–23 months consuming a diet that meets the minimum requirements for growth and development.

Prevalence ranges	Label
> 70%	Phase 1 – Acceptable/minimal
40–70%	Phase 2 – Alert/stress
20–39.9%	Phase 3 – Serious/severe
10–19.9%	Phase 4 – Critical/extreme
< 10%	Phase 5 – Extremely critical/catastrophic

Source: Preliminary thresholds suggested by IFE Core Group.

Percentage of households not consuming micronutrient-rich food (analysed in refugee populations)

This refers to the proportion of households with no member consuming any vegetables, fruits, meat, eggs, fish/seafood, and milk/milk products over a reference period of 24 hours. The food group of vegetables, fruits, meat, eggs, fish/seafood, and milk/milk products are the same as the 12 food groups defined by FAO (2011).

Access to basic drinking water services

Improved drinking water sources are those which, by nature of their design and construction, have the potential to deliver safe water. The WHO and UNICEF Joint Monitoring Program for Water Supply Sanitation and Hygiene (JMP) subdivides the population using improved sources into three groups (safely managed, basic and limited) according to the level of service provided. In order to meet the criteria for a safely managed drinking water service, people must use an improved source meeting three criteria: accessible on premises; available when needed; free from contamination. If the improved source does not meet any one of these criteria but a round trip to collect water takes 30 minutes or less, then it is classified as a basic drinking water service. If water collection from an improved source exceeds 30 minutes, it is categorized as a limited service (WHO and UNICEF).

LIMITATIONS AND COMPARABILITY

Limitations and data challenges, 2023

There is no breakdown by phase due to the use of non-IPC/CH data sources in nine countries: Angola, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Jordan (refugees), Nicaragua, Sri Lanka, Uganda, Yemen and Zimbabwe. The only potential distinction would be between moderately and severely acutely food-insecure populations in Jordan and Sri Lanka.

Lack of/low data availability for refugee food security

Refugee food security is measured in various ways across refugee populations and data are not systematically collected, disaggregated, consolidated or shared.

WFP ENA assessment is available for refugee populations in Rwanda and IFRC vulnerability assessment for Syrian refugees in Türkiye but not accepted by the GRFC 2023 for inclusion.

Comparability of acute food insecurity estimates in food crises, 2022–2023

This section briefly summarizes the countries for which comparing figures for 2022 and 2023 needs a careful understanding of the differences in methodology, the representativeness and coverage.

Angola

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Angola are not comparable due to a change in data source and coverage. In 2022, the peak was derived from an IPC analysis, covering only 58 percent of the country. In contrast, the 2023 estimate is based on a FEWS NET analysis with full coverage, making the two periods not directly comparable.

Bangladesh

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Bangladesh are not comparable due to changes in methodology. In 2022, the peak was derived from the Joint Response Plan on the Rohingya Humanitarian Crisis, analyzing Forcibly Displaced Myanmar Nationals (FDMNs) and host communities in Cox's Bazar. However, in 2023, the estimate is based on a new IPC analysis covering 15 districts across Bangladesh, including FDMNs in camps. This substantial increase in the analysed population from 1.4 million to 38.2 million, along with the change in methodology, makes the two periods incomparable.

El Salvador

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in El Salvador are not comparable due to the change in data source. The 2022 peak was derived from IPC analysis, while the 2023 estimate is based on a FEWS NET analysis.

Ethiopia

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Ethiopia are not comparable due to the change in data source. The 2022 peak was derived from HRP, whereas the 2023 estimate is based on a FEWS NET analysis.

Ghana

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Ghana are not directly comparable, even though both are based on the CH methodology, since the population analysed increased from 44 percent to 100 percent.

Jordan (refugee population)

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Jordan's refugee population are not comparable, although both are based on WFP's CARI methodology. The analysed population increased by 11 percent between the two years.

Kenya

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Kenya are not comparable, despite both being based on the IPC methodology. The analysed population increased by 12 percent.

Mauritania

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Mauritania are not comparable, even though both are based on the CH methodology. The population analysed declined by 19 percent.

Nigeria

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Nigeria are not comparable due an significant expansion to changes in the coverage of the CH analysis. The population analysed increased by 22 percent, covering 26 states and the FCT in 2023 up from 21 states and the FCT in 2022 from 159.1 million people to 193.6 million.

Pakistan

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Pakistan are not comparable, even though both are based on the IPC methodology, due to the increase in geographical coverage from 28 to 43 districts, representing an increase from 19.8 million to 36.7 million people analysed.

Sierra Leone

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Sierra Leone are not comparable, even though both are based on the CH methodology. This lack of comparability is mainly due to an official revision of the country's population estimate based on a recent census conducted by the government, which found a 12 percent decline in the population.

Yemen

The peak estimates for 2022 and 2023 in Yemen are not comparable due to changes in the data source. The 2022 peak was derived from IPC analysis, while the 2023 estimate is based on a FEWS NET analysis.

FEWS NET analyses with range estimates

For those countries where ranges are provided (Angola, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Nicaragua, Uganda, Yemen, Zimbabwe) the regional aggregate comparison is computed considering the upper bound. When this is the case, no year-on-year comparison is provided at country level.

HISTORICAL INCLUSION

Historical inclusion of countries/territories in the GRFC, 2017–23

Over the seven years of the GRFC's existence, 38 countries have systematically appeared as food crises each year following the rigorous selection process.

Thirteen countries have regularly been selected for inclusion but subsequently excluded because of recurrent data gaps. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela have had estimates available only once and qualified as major food crises. The other countries regularly excluded are: Cuba, the Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Nepal, Papua New Guinea, Peru (migrants), Philippines, Tajikistan, Timor-Leste and Vanuatu. On the other hand, the Kyrgyz Republic – a regularly excluded country, was no longer identified as a food crisis.

Economic shocks drove new countries – Colombia, Ecuador and Peru – to be identified as food crises in 2022.

Over the seven years, several regional crises have featured, allowing for coverage of countries that would otherwise not have qualified for inclusion as a major food crises. The Lake Chad Basin region, encompassing the Extrême Nord region of Cameroon, western Chad, northeastern Nigeria and eastern Niger, was included in 2017, 2018 and 2019 editions. The Central Sahel region, covering Burkina Faso, Mali and western Tillabéri and Tahoua regions in the Niger, was in the GRFC 2020. The Central American Dry Corridor region (El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras) was in the 2018–2020 editions. As many of these food crises have grown in severity and magnitude, the countries have qualified for inclusion in their own right.

See Appendix 2: Country selection criteria and coverage for the GRFC 2023.

Numbers of food crises considered and identified for years 2016–2023

	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023*
Number of potential food crises considered	65	61	66	71	79	77	73	73
Number of food crises identified (with endorsed data)	48	51	53	55	55	53	58	48

* GRFC 2023 Mid-Year Update.

Frequency of inclusion of food crises countries/territories with data meeting the GRFC requirements, 2017–2023

Number of years	Number of countries/ territories	Countries/territories
7	38	Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Honduras, Iraq, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe
6	8	Angola, Djibouti, El Salvador, Guinea Bissau, Namibia, Pakistan, Palestine*, United Republic of Tanzania, Ukraine
5	4	Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Lebanon (refugees), Myanmar
4	1	Jordan (refugees)
3	3	Colombia (migrants), Ecuador (migrants), Türkiye (refugees)
2	6	Egypt (refugees), Nepal, Rwanda (refugees), South Africa, Sri Lanka, Togo
1	7	Algeria (refugees), Congo (national or refugees), Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Lebanon, Peru (migrants), Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

* The occupied Palestinian territories are referred to as Palestine in the GRFC 2023.

GLOSSARY

Acute food insecurity

Acute food insecurity is any manifestation of food insecurity at a specific point in time that is of a severity that threatens lives, livelihoods or both, regardless of the causes, context or duration.

These acute states are highly susceptible to change and can manifest in a population within a short amount of time, as a result of sudden changes or shocks that negatively impact on the determinants of food insecurity and malnutrition (IPC, 2019). Transitory food insecurity is a short-term or temporary inability to meet food consumption requirements related to sporadic crises, indicating a capacity to recover.

Asylum-seekers

An asylum-seeker is a person seeking sanctuary in a country other than their own and waiting for a decision about their status. The legal processes related to asylum are complex and variable, which is a challenge when it comes to counting, measuring and understanding the asylum-seeking population. When an asylum application is successful, the person is awarded refugee status.

Chronic food insecurity

Chronic food insecurity refers to food insecurity that persists over time, largely due to structural causes. The definition includes seasonal food insecurity that occurs during periods with non-exceptional conditions.

Chronic food insecurity has relevance in providing strategic guidance to actions that focus on the medium- and long-term improvement of the quality and quantity of food consumption for an active and healthy life (FAO *et al.*, 2021). FAO defines this as 'undernourishment' and it is the basis for the SDG indicator 2.1.1 published in the SOFI report.

Moderate food insecurity refers to the level of severity of food insecurity, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), in which people face uncertainties about their ability to obtain food and have been forced to reduce, at times during the year, the quality and/or quantity of food they consume due to lack of money or other resources. It thus refers to a lack of consistent access to food, which diminishes dietary quality, disrupts normal eating patterns, and can have negative consequences for nutrition, health and well-being.

Severe food insecurity refers to the level of severity of food insecurity in which people have likely run out of food, experienced hunger and, at the most extreme, gone for days without eating, putting their health and well-being at grave risk, based on the FIES (FAO *et al.*, 2021).

According to the *SOFI Report 2023,* between 690 million and 783 million people in the world faced hunger in 2022 – an increase by about 122 million since before the COVID-19 pandemic. Around 11.3 percent of the global population was severely food insecure in 2022, representing 900 million people. Around 2.4 billion people in the world were moderately or severely food insecure (FAO *et al.,* July 2023).

Coping strategies

Coping strategies are measures to which people resort in order to obtain food, income and/or other essential goods or services when their normal means of livelihood have been disrupted or other shocks/hazards affect their access to basic needs.

Export prohibitions and restrictions

Export prohibitions and restrictions are export measures that have a limiting effect on the quantity or amount of a product being exported. They can take the form of a tax or a quantitative restriction. The latter is generally prohibited with some exceptions, notably those applied to prevent or relieve critical shortage of foodstuffs.

Food access

Food access refers to access by households/individuals to adequate resources for acquiring appropriate foods for a nutritious diet.

Food availability

Food availability refers to the availability of sufficient quantities of food of appropriate quality, supplied through domestic production or imports.

Food crisis

A food crisis occurs when rates of acute food insecurity and malnutrition rise sharply at local or national levels, raising the need for emergency food assistance.

Food crises are far more likely among populations already suffering from prolonged food insecurity and malnutrition. A food crisis is usually set off by a shock or combination of shocks that affect one or more of the pillars of food security: food availability, food access, food utilization or food stability.

Food crises can also occur in countries that have important economic activities and are major food exporters, such as Ukraine.

Forced displacement

Forced displacement is an involuntary or coerced movement of a person or people away from their home or home region as as a result of persecution, conflict, generalized violence or human rights violations. Displacement is often a side-effect of conflict, food insecurity and weather shocks.

Displaced people are often more vulnerable to food insecurity and malnutrition, having had to abandon their livelihoods and assets, undertake arduous journeys, and settle in areas or camps with limited access to basic services or former social networks. Their rights are often restricted due to host country legal frameworks, resulting in a lack of access to land, employment and freedom of movement. They are often dependent on humanitarian assistance to meet their food needs.

Displaced populations often face severely compromised access to safe water and improved sanitation and are at increased risk of frequent outbreaks of infectious disease, which weakened health systems cannot treat, prevent or control. In crises, children are often not able to access other preventive services such as micronutrient supplementation and immunization, further increasing the risk of malnutrition. Displacement can also result in the breakdown of familial and community networks that provide the necessary support and guidance for looking after young children.

Food insecurity

Food insecurity refers to the lack of secure access to sufficient amounts of safe and nutritious food for normal human growth and development and an active and healthy life. For people to be food secure, food must be both consistently available and accessible in sufficient quantities and diversity, and households must be able to utilize (store, cook, prepare and share) the food in a way that has a positive nutritional impact.

GLOSSARY

GIEWS assessment (used in country selection for GRFC)

The FAO Global Information and Early Warning System (GIEWS) classifies and regularly updates the list of countries requiring external assistance for food, dividing them into three categories according to the predominant driver: countries with (1) an exceptional shortfall in aggregate food production and supplies; (2) widespread lack of access to food; and (3) severe localized food insecurity.

Internally displaced people

IDPs are those people forced to flee their homes as a result of or in order to avoid the effects of armed conflict, situations of generalized violence, violations of human rights, or natural or human-made disasters, and who have not crossed an international border.

Livelihoods

People's capabilities, assets (both material and social) and activities required for a means of living linked to survival and future well-being, and the policies and institutions that shape or constrain access to assets and choices about activities.

Major food crisis

A food crisis is defined as 'major' if more than 1 million people or more than 20 percent of a total area, region or country population is estimated to be facing IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent, or if at least one area is classified in Emergency (IPC/CH Phase 4) or worse, or if the country is included in the IASC humanitarian system-wide emergency response-level 3.

Malnutrition

Malnutrition is an umbrella term that covers undernutrition and overweight, obesity and diet-related non-communicable diseases (NCDs) such as heart disease, stroke, diabetes and cancer. *See https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/malnutrition.*

Undernutrition is a consequence of inadequate nutrient intake and/or absorption, and/or illness or disease. Acute malnutrition (wasting, thinness and/or bilateral pitting oedema), stunting, underweight (a composite of stunting and wasting) and micronutrient deficiencies (e.g. deficiencies in vitamin A, iron) are all forms of undernutrition.

While overweight, obesity and NCDs are not a focus of this report, they often coexist with undernutrition within the same country, community and even individual. Stunted children, for example, face a greater risk of becoming overweight as adults (UNICEF).

Malnutrition has immediate and long-reaching consequences, including stunting children's growth, increasing susceptibility to disease and infections, and contributing to 45 percent of deaths among children aged under 5 (WHO). The determinants of malnutrition also include inadequate access to healthcare, poor water and sanitation services, and inappropriate child-feeding and care practices, as described in the UNICEF framework.

Migrants

According to IOM, migrant is an umbrella term, not defined under international law, reflecting the common lay understanding of a person who moves away from his or her place of usual residence, whether within a country or across an international border, temporarily or permanently, and for a variety of reasons. The term includes a number of well-defined legal categories of people, such as migrant workers; persons whose particular types of movements are legally defined, such as smuggled migrants and those whose status or means of movement are not specifically defined under international law, such as international students.

A migrant with the intention to settle is someone who has reached the final destination country, where the person wishes to remain permanently.

- Transit migrant is someone who is temporarily staying in one or more countries with the objective of reaching a further and final destination country.

- Pendular migrant: Temporary and usually repeated population movements, which may represent a movement pattern within a country and between neighbouring countries.

Minimum Expenditure Basket

A Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) is defined as what a household requires in order to meet basic needs, on a regular or seasonal basis, and its average cost. The MEB is a monetary threshold – the cost of these goods, utilities, services and resources – and is conceptually equivalent to a poverty line. It typically describes the cost of meeting one month's worth of essential needs. Since the MEB sets a monetary threshold for what is needed to cover essential needs, the households whose expenditures fall below the MEB are defined as being unable to meet their essential needs. More information is available: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000074198/download/

Nutritional status

Nutritional status refers to the physiological state of an individual that results from the relationship between nutrient intake and requirements and the body's ability to digest, absorb and use these nutrients.

Nutritious foods

Nutritious foods are referred to as safe foods that contribute essential nutrients such as vitamins and minerals (micronutrients), fibre and other components to healthy diets that are beneficial for growth, and health and development, guarding against malnutrition. In nutritious foods, the presence of nutrients of public health concern (including saturated fats, free sugars and salt/sodium) is minimized, industrially produced transfats are eliminated, and salt is iodized.

People facing high levels of acute food insecurity

People who are referred to as 'facing high levels of acute food insecurity' are in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above. However, this does not necessarily reflect the full population in need of urgent action to decrease food gaps and protect and save lives and livelihoods. This is because some households may only be classified in IPC/CH Phase 1 or 2 because they receive assistance, and are in fact in need of continued action. In many countries, the number in Crisis or worse (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above) refers to populations in need of action further to that already taken.

People in Need (PiN) vs gap

PiN estimates, used in HNOs, are based on analysis that does not take into consideration humanitarian assistance. This is purely a figure for the number of people who would need assistance. The gap, however, takes into consideration all existing and likely happening assistance, and bases the needs according to unmet needs. In summary, the gap figure is smaller, and should only reflect those who need assistance on top of the assistance already being provided.

GLOSSARY

Prevalence

The proportion of a population who have a specific characteristic in a given time period.

Primary driver of acute food insecurity

Although acknowledging that drivers are often interlinked and mutually reinforcing, the GRFC identifies as primary driver the most prominent trigger of acute food insecurity for each country/territory in terms of number of people affected on a yearly basis.

Refugees

A refugee is someone who has been forced to flee his or her country because of persecution, war or violence. Refugees are recognized under various international agreements. Some are recognized as a group or on a 'prima facie' basis while others undergo an individual investigation before being given refugee status. The 1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees provide the full legal definition of a refugee.

Stateless people

A stateless person is someone who does not have a nationality of any country. Some people are born stateless, but others become stateless due to a variety of reasons, including sovereign, legal, technical or administrative decisions or oversights. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights underlines that 'Everyone has the right to a nationality' (UNGA, 1948, article 15).

Stunting

Stunting is associated with physical and cognitive damage which can affect learning and school performance, and lead to lost potential and lower earnings later in life. It can also affect the next generation. Efforts to prevent stunting are most effective in the 1 000 days between conception and a child's second birthday. Stunted children aged under 5 years are identified by a height-for-age z score (HAZ) below -2 of the reference population. Severe stunting is defined as HAZ below -3.

Survival Minimum Expenditure Basket

While the MEB is defined as what a household requires in order to meet their essential needs, on a regular or seasonal basis, and its average cost, the SMEB is the absolute minimum amount required to maintain existence and cover life-saving needs, which could involve the deprivation of certain human rights. However, the concepts of SMEB and MEB have not always been used consistently by the humanitarian community and are sometimes used interchangeably. It is therefore important to be clear from the outset of the analysis whether a MEB or SMEB is the goal. More information is available: https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000074198/download/

Undernourishment

Undernourishment is defined as the condition in which an individual's habitual food consumption is insufficient to provide the amount of dietary energy required to maintain a normal, active, healthy life. For the purposes of this report, hunger is defined as being synonymous with chronic undernourishment. The PoU is used to measure hunger.

Undernutrition

Undernutrition is a consequence of insufficient nutrient intake and/or absorption, and/or illness or disease. Acute malnutrition (wasting and/or bilateral pitting oedema), stunting, underweight (a composite of stunting and wasting) and micronutrient deficiencies (e.g. deficiencies in vitamin A, iron) are all forms of undernutrition.

Vulnerability

Vulnerability refers to the conditions determined by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes that increase the susceptibility of an individual, community, assets or systems to the impacts of hazards. Vulnerability to food insecurity is the range of conditions that increases the susceptibility of a household to the impact on food security in case of a shock or hazard.

Wasting

A child who is too thin for his or her height as a result of rapid weight loss or the failure to gain weight is a sign of wasting which, although treatable, can lead to illness, disability or death. Moderate wasting is identified by weight-for-height z scores (WHZ) between -2 and -3 of the reference population, and severe wasting by WHZ below -3. Global Acute Malnutrition reflects both moderate and severe wasting in a population as well as presence of bilateral pitting oedema. Wasting can also be defined by Mid-Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC) measurements ≤12.5 cm, with severe wasting defined with a measurement of ≤11.5 cm. Wasting is used in this report to describe all forms of acute malnutrition including those diagnosed with oedema. Affected children require urgent feeding, treatment and care to survive. Wasting prevalence depicts the nutrition situation in the general population at a specific time: it can show marked seasonal patterns and can change quickly over time.

The immediate cause of wasting is a severe nutritional restriction as a result of inadequate food intake or recent illness, such as diarrhoea, that hinders appropriate intake and absorption of nutrients.