

CARI & IPC Factsheet: Technical Annex

This technical annex accompanies the Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI) guidance note. The annex summarizes the CARI and how it is related to IPC and provides technical details on the differences between the CARI and the IPC. It explains how food security indicators are used within each method for food security classification.

CARI & IPC: Inputs, Analysis and Results

The CARI analyses primary data from a single household survey, while the IPC uses a “convergence-of-evidence” approach, incorporating and analysing a variety of secondary information. This is a fundamental difference between the two methods, though many other differences exist. Table 1 outlines the main differences between the CARI and the IPC, related to inputs, analysis and results.

Table 1: CARI & IPC Technical Comparison

Aspects	CARI ¹	IPC ²
Input		
Sources of Information	The CARI analyses a set of primary data from a single household survey.	The IPC meta-analysis consolidates a variety of methods and secondary data.
Types of Data Incorporated	<p>Five indicators can be used within the CARI:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Food Consumption Score (FCS) 2. reduced Coping Strategies index (rCSI) 3. Economic Capacity to Meet Essential Needs (ECMEN) 4. Food Expenditure Share (FES) 5. Livelihood Coping strategies - Food Security (LCS-FS) <p>Additional information can be used to develop the analytical narrative which underpins the CARI results.</p>	<p>The IPC considers a wide range of evidence related to food security, nutrition, and livelihoods analysis.</p> <p>The entire body of food security evidence is divided into food security outcomes and food security contributing factors.</p>
Minimum Data Requirements	<p><i>To construct the CARI console, the survey tool must generate an acceptable minimum combination of the five food security indicators listed above.</i></p> <p><i>The CARI Technical Guidance shows the two possible combinations of food security indicators which will facilitate construction of the console.</i></p>	<p><i>The minimum evidence base for classification of the current situation is:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least one piece of R1 + direct evidence for either food consumption or livelihood change outcome 2. Four other pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence, with at least two of those from the season of analysis <p><i>The minimum evidence base for classification of the projected situation is:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. IPC Current adhering to Evidence Level 1 2. Evidence used for current classification at most 12 months old at the end of projection period² 3. Four pieces of R1 (+ or -) evidence presented with clear assumptions on forecasted trends <p><i>The minimum evidence base enables analysts to classify an area, but not to estimate populations. For population estimates at least a medium evidence level is required, necessitating more evidence on outcomes and contributing factors.</i></p>

¹ For more detail on the CARI, refer to the [Technical Guidance](#)

² For more detail on the IPC, refer to the Technical Manual [Version 3.1](#)

Unit of Analysis	The household is the unit of analysis in the CARI; each individual household is categorised into a food security group.	For Acute Food Insecurity, the IPC has two units of classification: (1) Area-based; and (2) Household Group-based, which are relatively homogenous groups of households with regard to food security outcomes. As a minimum standard, an IPC classification must be Area-based.
Temporal Analysis	CARI is based on cross-sectional data; it assesses the situation at a fixed point in time with no forecasting.	The IPC has two different time periods for situation analysis: (1) the current snapshot (i.e., at the time the analysis is conducted); and (2) a future projected snapshot. Multiple projections can also be prepared. The future projection is based on the most likely scenario for any period in the future.
Analytical Method	The outcomes of each indicator included in the CARI analysis are converted into a standard 4-point classification scale. An algorithm (provided in the CARI Technical Guidance) is used to assign each surveyed household into one of the four food security groups.	The food security outcome indicators are classified into five categories based on standard thresholds. However, rather than mathematical algorithm, the IPC uses a “convergence-of-evidence” approach. This requires the analysts to critically evaluate the body of evidence, and, all things, considered, make their best estimation of the severity of the situation based on the IPC Reference Table.
Analysts	A food security analyst(s), skilled in data analysis, can produce the CARI results.	The IPC enables technical consensus by forming a multi-stakeholder Technical Working Group (TWG) to conduct the analysis. The consensus-based process involves bringing together experts from different disciplines and perspectives to evaluate and debate the evidence, leading to the big-picture conclusions for the IPC.
Results		
Classification: Groups/Phases	The CARI uses four food security groups: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Food secure2. Marginally food secure3. Moderately food insecure4. Severely food insecure	IPC is based on five food insecurity phases: <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Minimal/None2. Stressed3. Crisis4. Emergency5. Famine/Catastrophe
Classification: Area	The CARI classification provides a representative estimate of food insecurity within the target population. The food security console can be prepared for all geographic levels (i.e., national; urban/rural; district; livelihoods; etc) and other strata (e.g., livelihood activities, sex of household head). Area classification is based on the food security situation of the worst 25% of the population.	A key criterion for the Area classification is that 20% of the population must be in that Phase or worse. It is up to the IPC analysts to determine the spatial extent of the Analysis Area. The IPC is adaptable and applicable to any spatial size.
Classification: Population	The CARI analyses statistically representative survey data, thus can reliably estimate the number of food insecure households in a target population.	The IPC estimates the number people in the five phases of food security based on secondary data and consensus.

<p>Response Analysis</p>	<p>The CARI Technical Guidance does not attempt to instruct analysts on how to recommend specific program responses based on a particular set of console results. However, CARI results can be used to conduct profiling of the food insecure household to guide targeting and prioritization decisions.</p> <p>For further information see Targeting and Prioritization operational guidance note.</p>	<p>The IPC focuses on answering questions related to the situation analysis and stops short of determining recommendations for specific action. This intentional limitation aims to ensure that the IPC analysis is neutral and minimally influenced by a wide range of potential biases associated with preferred types of food security response by any institution or agency.</p> <p>The Situation Analysis of the IPC provides a solid foundation for subsequent Response Analysis.</p>
<p>Reporting and Communication</p>	<p>The CARI reporting console will form one component of a broader food security analysis report.</p> <p>Food security assessments present additional sources of data which develop a richer context-based narrative, underpinning the CARI key findings.</p>	<p>The IPC enables Communicating for Action by using maps, charts, tables and text in a standardized Communication Template to present and describe core aspects of situation analysis.</p> <p>The IPC Communication Template includes four parts:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the first page of graphics (including a map); 2. a second page of summary text; 3. population tables; and 4. Sections A, B, and C from the Analysis Worksheets for all areas included in the analysis

CARI & IPC: Indicators and Classification

As explained in the CARI-IPC Fact Sheet, all component indicators of the CARI can be used within IPC analysis. Table 2 shows where each CARI component indicator fits into the IPC Analysis framework.

Table 2: CARI Component Indicators within the IPC Analytical Framework

CARI Component Indicator	IPC Analytical Framework	
1. Food Consumption Score	Food security first level outcome	Food Consumption Score
2. reduced Coping strategies Index		reduced Coping strategies Index
3. Livelihood coping strategies food security		Livelihood coping strategies
4. Economic Capacity to Meet essential Needs	Indirect Evidence	Hazards and Vulnerability: Percentage of population under the national poverty line
5. Food Expenditure Share		Access: Percentage of income spent on food

The manner in which CARI is utilized during IPC analyses may vary, depending on the wider body of evidence available. If the CARI console, i.e., the aggregated results, is included within the IPC analysis, WFP VAM recommends that the food security groups translate to the IPC phases as illustrated in Table 3 below.

Table 3: CARI Classifications and IPC Phases

CARI Classifications		IPC Area Phases	IPC Household Phases	IPC Group Phases
1 = Food secure	→	1 = Minimal	1 = None	
2 = Marginally food secure	→	2 = Stressed	2 = Stressed	
3 = Moderately food insecure	→	3 = Crisis	3 = Crisis	
4 = Severely food insecure	→	4 = Emergency	4 = Emergency	
		5 = Famine	5 = Catastrophe	

If the IPC analysts choose to separately consider each of the CARI component indicators, IPC reference table provides the details of how each food security indicator is classified into the five IPC phases.