

**EU Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note**

1. Indicator name
<b>Number of food insecure people receiving assistance through interventions supported by the EU</b>
2. Associated EU Results Framework statement and primary SDG
SDG 2 – Zero Hunger EU RF statement - Pursue an end to hunger and undernutrition and systematically integrate resilience in all actions
3. Technical Definition
<p>For the purpose of this indicator, individuals are included if they benefit directly from EU-funded interventions that target areas and regions affected by chronic and/or acute malnutrition and food insecurity. Areas and regions are considered as food insecure if they are classified as phase 2 and/or above on the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC).</p> <p>Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>The internationally recognised pillars of food security<sup>2</sup> include availability, access, nutrition and prevention. Examples of EU assistance in regions by pillar include the following:</p> <p><u>Availability of food</u> - support to improve subsistence farming practices, e.g. provision of drought resistance seeds; support that aims to increase the production and productivity of smallholders, e.g. change to production of crops that are in demand at markets</p> <p><u>Improving access to food</u> - provision of social transfers (in cash or in kind, cash or assets) to poor or vulnerable individuals aimed at reducing their deficits in food consumption; support to farmers to introduce cash crops as a supplements rather than substitutes for food crops; support to off-farm employment (to reduce dependency on agriculture) through for example, identification of opportunities, introducing or improving post-harvest processes; support to improve small infrastructure (e.g. bridges); improving market information accessible to farmers (including ICT innovations); strengthening integration of smallholders into food supply chains; support farmers on rehabilitation of productive infrastructures e.g. irrigation.</p> <p>In a fortified food intervention, if the food is distributed to beneficiaries, the counting will be done as above. In contrast, if the intervention supports food processing and such food is later</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> Definition of the Food Security Committee 1996

<sup>2</sup> agreed at the 1996 World Food Summit

on distributed, the recipients should be considered as indirect beneficiaries and thus not be counted.

Improving nutritional adequacy of food intake - interventions that promote and provide advice, training and support to adopt/utilise: kitchen gardens especially legumes (rich in energy, protein and iron); homestead production of animals (poultry, rabbits, goats, sheep and cattle); fish farming; dairy production; intercropping (complementary cereal-legume production) or bio-fortified crops (micro-nutrient or protein-rich foods)<sup>3</sup>; indigenous foods (forest products, wild fruits, insects, herbs).

Mass publicity campaigns e.g. only distributing information leaflets are excluded.

Enhancing crisis prevention and management: direct beneficiaries of household or community level disaster risk reduction management (e.g. early warning systems) and food reserves.

Only individuals supported by the EU in areas or regions of food insecurity (e.g. IPC phase 2 and above) may be included for this indicator. Please note, related EU RF indicators on nutrition (EU RF 2.2) and smallholder (EU RF 2.3) are required to report the number of beneficiaries targeted in regions with IPC phase 2 and above.

Individuals receiving vocational training, or provided access to credit through EU support should be counted under the VET/skills development indicator (EU RF 2.15) or the access to financial services indicator (EU RF 2.13) respectively.

#### 4. Rationale (including which policy priorities and links to this indicator)

Ensuring food security is a main priority identified in the New European Consensus on Development (2017) - “to make coordinated, accelerated and cross-sectoral efforts to end hunger, increase the capacity for diversified local and regional food production, ensure food security and nutrition and enhance the resilience of the most vulnerable, particularly in countries facing protracted or recurrent crises”.

#### 5. Level of disaggregation and other reporting requirements

Main categories for disaggregation include, in order of importance:

- Age bracket (0 to 4, 5 to 14, 15 to 19, 20+)
- Sex (only where data on individuals rather than households is available)
- Geographical location for example rural/urban; marginal/productive areas

#### 6. Data Sources (including issues on different definitions by source and level of availability of the data)

<sup>3</sup> The practice of bio-fortification through genetically modified crops is not supported by all EU Member States.

Information on IPC phase categories for an area can be found at <http://www.ipcinfo.org/ipc-country-analysis> or found in the Global Report on Food Crisis (GRFC) <http://www.fsincop.net/global-network/global-report/en/>

EU intervention monitoring systems: annual and final reports from implementing organisations (e.g. governments, international organisations, non-state actors, etc.), ROM reviews, and evaluations.

#### 7. Data calculation (including any assumptions made)

The unit of measurement for this indicator is the (chronically and/or acutely) food insecure individual<sup>4</sup> receiving assistance.

Where only household data is available, the number of individuals can be computed by using the average composition of the household. Such data should be preferably retrieved from – in order of preference – intervention surveys, surveys realised in the same area of the intervention, department/regional statistics, and ultimately national statistics.

Only unique number of individual should be reported for this indicator. If the same person benefits from more than one form of support during the same reporting period, that individual should only be counted once. To avoid double counting of the beneficiaries between years (or another relevant time period, e.g. months, quarters, etc), you should take a peak year (or relevant time period) result. Alternatively, multi-year results can be included where EU Delegations can reliably estimate the number of individuals benefitting in year 1, then in year 2 they should aim to identify new individuals benefitting (i.e. not supported in year 1) and add this to the total from year 1.

#### 8. Worked examples

**Example 1** – An intervention is targeting villages in a food insecure region (categorised as IPC phase 2) It supported women to increase the production of traditional grains, small livestock and vegetables for home consumption and sale in local markets for the benefit of the women and their families. In total 4,000 women from different households in 30 villages were reached between 2015 and 2017.

The number of food insecure people receiving assistance through interventions supported by the EU reported for this intervention is 4,000

**Example 2** - An intervention aims to reduce deficit in food consumption by providing social transfers to people living in several food insecure counties (IPC phase 3). The reporting from the implementing partners include following beneficiary information for 2014:

**Table: Number of unique individuals reached split by counties and type of support**

<sup>4</sup> However, the focus of the action might be at different level, i.e. household, community, state.

County	No. of villages	Group 1 - cash only	Group 2 - food only	Group 3 - cash & food	Total
X	31	30,000	22,000	900,000	<b>952,000</b>
Y	64	1,000,000	20,000	300,000	<b>1,320,000</b>
Z	79	400,000	500,000	200,000	<b>1,100,000</b>
<b>Total</b>	<b>174</b>	<b>1,700,00</b>	<b>542,000</b>	<b>1,400,000</b>	<b>1,942,000</b>

The total number of beneficiaries to be reported is therefore 1,942,000 in 2014.

9. Is it used by another organisation or in the framework of international initiatives, conventions, etc? If so, which?

Other institutions include related indicators though not specifically focused on food insecure people, e.g. African Development Bank People benefiting from improvements in agriculture (millions).

The Special Court of Auditor report on food security 1/2012 recommends the Commission to better support the financial sustainability of agriculture and social transfer interventions in order to provide adequate support to the development of income-earning capacities of the beneficiaries.

10. Other issues

Country owned, EU supported, contingency plans on food insecurity that include IPC analyses is very important, and should be reported and monitored at intervention level. Approaches to measuring and reporting direct beneficiaries should be explored further.