Global Europe Results Framework Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator name
GERF 2.32: Number of food insecure people receiving EU assistance
2. Technical details

Please use the information provided in OPSYS or the SWD.

Results Dashboard code(s): *65248.*

Unit of measure: *Number of (#).*

Type of indicator: *Quantitative (not qualitative) – Numeric (not percentage); Actual ex-post (not estimated or ex-ante); Cumulative (not annual); Direct (not indirect); Flow (not stock).*

Level of measurement: *Specific Objective – Outcome; Direct Output; Output.*

Disaggregations: Sex (*Female; Male; Intersex*); Gender (*Woman/girl; Man/boy; Non-binary; Prefer not to say*); Age group - Results framework for Food Insecurity and Contraception (*0-4; 5-14; 15-19; 20+*); Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) (*Phase 1 - Minimal; Phase 2 - Stressed; Phase 3 – Crisis; Phase 4 – Emergency; Phase 5 - Famine*).

DAC sector codes: *12240 - Basic nutrition; 31110 - Agricultural policy and administrative management; 31120 – Agricultural development; 43071 – Food security policy and administrative management; 43072 – Household food security programmes; 52010 – Food assistance; 72040 – Emergency food assistance.*

Main associated SDG: *2.1 By 2030, end hunger and ensure access by all people, in particular the poor and people in vulnerable situations, including infants, to safe, nutritious and sufficient food all year round.*

Other associated SDGs: *1.1 extreme poverty; 1.2 multidimensional poverty; 1.3 social protection; 1.5 resilience to shocks and disasters; 2.2 malnutrition; 3.2 death of newborns and small children; 4.1 primary and secondary education; 4.2 pre-primary education; 10.1 income growth of the bottom 40 percent.*

Associated GERF Level 1 indicator: *1.24 Prevalence of undernourishment (SDG 2.1.1).*

Associated GERF Level 3 indicators:

3.10 Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance directed towards supporting social inclusion and human development

3.11 Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance directed towards nutrition

3.13 Number and share of EU- external interventions promoting gender equality and women's empowerment

3.14 Number and share of EU-funded external interventions promoting disability inclusion

3.15 Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance directed towards reducing inequalities

3.16 Amount and share of EU-funded external assistance qualifying as ODA.

3. Policy context and Rationale

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".

Achieving this objective requires an expanded understanding of food security and nutrition (FSN), as articulated by the HLPE Report 18: Reducing inequalities for Food Security and Nutrition (2023): "*Since the first FAO widely-accepted definition of food security in 1974, which focused on food supply, the concept of food security has continued to evolve. Most recently, the four previously identified dimensions of food security – availability, access, utilization and stability – have been extended to include agency and sustainability; and the right to food has been acknowledged as central to food security. Previous definitions of food security had not adequately engaged with the conditions within which food was produced or distributed, nor with who was hungry or malnourished and why. Framing food systems through a lens of agency signals the need for policy and programmatic responses that place power in the hands of those most affected by poor FSN and marginalized in the systems that produce our food; and that people are supported to demand accountability from those with the duty to support them. The incorporation of the sustainability dimension explicitly links food security outcomes to the nature of food systems and calls for radically transformed systems that are "empowering, equitable, regenerative, productive, prosperous" and that "boldly reshape the underlying principles from production to consumption". Both agency and sustainability require that policies and practices address systemic unfairness, injustice and exclusion in food systems.*"

4. Logframe inclusion

If an intervention generates the result measured by this indicator, then it must be reported in OPSYS. Corporate targets have been set for the indicators used to monitor the Strategic Plan and the Multiannual Financial Framework (see Section 9). Progress towards these targets is reported annually in the Annual Activity Plan (for the Strategic Plan) and the Programme Performance Statements (for the Multiannual Financial Framework). These values are calculated by aggregating the results reported in OPSYS. These reports ultimately contribute to the Annual Management Performance Report submitted by the European Commission to the Council and Parliament during the annual budgetary discharge procedure. If targets are not met, explanations must be provided. Therefore, it is crucial that all results are recorded in OPSYS.

There are two ways of doing this:

1. Include the indicator directly in the logframe (recommended approach);
2. Match the indicator to the closest logframe indicator (only if the indicator was not originally included in the logframe and modification is not possible).

Why? The matching functionality in OPSYS only accommodates reporting current values and does not yet support encoding baselines and targets. This is a significant drawback because targets are a valuable piece of information, especially at the beginning of a Multiannual Financial Framework. Indeed, results take time to materialise as they are the last step in the chain, appearing only after

programming, commitments, contracting, and spending have occurred. Targets allow to see what results are expected long before they materialise, which is reassuring to the different stakeholders concerned with accountability. **Therefore, include all corporate indicators directly in the logframe whenever possible, and reserve the matching functionality only for cases when this is not feasible**.

5. Values to report

The following values must be determined in line with the definitions provided in Section 6.

Baseline value: the value measured for the indicator in the baseline year. The baseline value is the value against which progress will be assessed. For GERF indicators, this value is usually zero**.** This is because the results being measured must be directly attributable to EU support; prior to the start of implementation, the specific intervention has not yet occurred and therefore cannot have generated a result. A non-zero baseline may only occur if the intervention is following up on work achieved by another intervention financed by the same instrument.

Current value: the most recent value for the indicator at the time of reporting. Current values will be collected at least once a year and reported cumulatively throughout the implementation period.

Final target value: the expected value for the indicator in the target year.

Intermediate target values (milestones). A tool has been developed in OPSYS to generate intermediate targets automatically[1].

- **For outputs**: the intermediate targets are generated using a linear interpolation between the baseline and target values because it is assumed that outputs materialise sooner and more progressively over implementation (than outcomes).

For outcomes: the expected progression over the course of implementation will vary across interventions. During the creation of a logframe, the expected outcome profile must be selected (OPSYS offers four options[2]) and this selection triggers the generation of intermediate targets for all 30 June and 31 December dates between the baseline and target dates for all output and outcome quantitative indicators. All automatically generated intermediate targets values and dates can be

---

[1] This has been done in the context of the Primary Intervention Questionnaire (PIQ) for the EAMR. Three new KPIs provide an overall assessment of ongoing interventions (current performance and future performance) and completed interventions (final performance). Scores will be calculated for all INTPA and NEAR interventions participating in the annual results data collection exercise.
- *KPI 10* reflects the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of ongoing interventions. The information on relevance is provided by the Operational Manager's response to a question in a survey. The information on efficiency and effectiveness is provided either by the logframe data, if sufficient data is available, or the response to a question in a survey, if not.
- *KPI 11* reflects expectations regarding the most probable levels of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness and sustainability that can be achieved by ongoing interventions in the future. In this case, all the information is provided by the Operational Manager's responses to questions in a survey.
- *KPI 12* reflects the relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of completed interventions. The information on relevance is provided by the Operational Manager's response to a question in a survey. The information on efficiency and effectiveness is provided by the logframe data if sufficient data is available, or the response to a question in a survey, if not.

[2] a. *steady progress*: The outcomes are achieved continuously throughout implementation; b. *accelerating progress*: The outcomes are achieved towards the end of implementation; c. *no progress until end*: The outcomes are mostly achieved at the end of implementation; d. *none of the above*.

subsequently modified by the Operational Manager or the Implementing Partner with the approval of the Operational Manager.

6. Calculation of values

Specify all assumptions made, list definitions for all technical terms, provide any relevant guidance on (double) counting, and include checklist for quality control.

The value for this indicator is calculated by counting the number of food insecure people receiving EU assistance, using the Technical Definitions and Counting Guidance provided below. Please double check your calculations using the Quality Control Checklist below.

Technical Definitions

Food security exists when all people, at all times, have physical, social and economic access to sufficient, safe, nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for a healthy and active life. The key dimensions of food security are availability, access, sustainability, agency, utilization and stability[3].

- **Availability** Having a quantity and quality of food sufficient to satisfy the dietary needs of individuals, free from adverse substances and acceptable within a given culture, supplied through domestic production or imports.
- **Access** (economic, social and physical) Having personal or household financial means to acquire food for an adequate diet at a level to ensure that satisfaction of other basic needs are not threatened or compromised; and that adequate food is accessible to everyone, including vulnerable individuals and groups.
- **Utilization** Having an adequate diet, clean water, sanitation and health care to reach a state of nutritional well-being where all physiological needs are met.
- Stability Having the ability to ensure food security in the event of sudden shocks (e.g. an economic, health, conflict or climatic crisis) or cyclical events (e.g. seasonal food insecurity).
- **Agency** Individuals or groups having the capacity to act independently to make choices about what they eat, the foods they produce, how that food is produced, processed, and distributed, and to engage in policy processes that shape food systems. The protection of agency requires socio-political systems that uphold governance structures that enable the achievement of FSN for all.
- **Sustainability** Food system practices that contribute to long-term regeneration of natural, social and economic systems, ensuring the food needs of the present generations are met without compromising the food needs of future generations.

The following tools can help identify the interventions that aim to address the immediate or underlying determinants of food insecurity, but since their findings might not be exhaustive, other interventions might also be relevant.

1. OECD DAC nutrition policy marker: all interventions where nutrition is a significant objective (score 1) or is the principal objective (score 2) may be considered: see The OECD-DAC policy marker on nutrition Handbook for data reporters and users for further information;

---

[3] Food security and nutrition: building a global narrative towards 2030 HLPE 15

2. OECD DAC CRS purpose code: all interventions marked with one of the following purpose codes may be considered: 12240 for basic nutrition, 43072 for household food security programmes, 52010 for food assistance, or 72040 for emergency food assistance;

3. Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC): all interventions operating in areas and regions that are classified as phase 2 and/or above may be considered: see the IPC Mapping Tool for further information.

Counting Guidance

1. People receiving vocational training or provided access to credit through EU support should be counted under the VET/skills development indicator (GERF 2.14) or the access to financial services indicator (GERF 2.17) respectively, and NOT under GERF 2.32.

2. People are eligible for counting if they are food insecure and the intervention addresses some aspect of their food insecurity. This is most often the case when one of the following three conditions hold:

a. The intervention has a score of 1 or 2 for the OECD DAC nutrition policy marker;

b. The intervention has one of the following DAC codes: 12240, 43072, 52010 or 72040;

c. The intervention is supporting people in areas and regions classified as phase 2 and/or above according to the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC).

3. In a fortified food intervention, the people can only be counted if the food is distributed directly to them. Consequently, if the intervention supports food processing and such food is distributed later on, the recipients should be considered as indirect beneficiaries and should not be counted.

4. If only household data is available, the number of people can be computed by using the average composition of the household. Such data should be retrieved from – in order of preference – intervention surveys, surveys realised in the same area of the intervention, department/regional statistics, and ultimately national statistics. If these sources are not available, use the data on the following website: https://www.un.org/development/desa/pd/data/household-size-and-composition. Round the output of the calculation to the nearest whole number. Record the calculations in the calculation method field to facilitate quality control.

5. The Gender Action Plan III (GAP III) requires the reporting of gender-disaggregated values if possible and sex-disaggregated values if not. Use intervention data to provide the disaggregation.

6. Double counting is not allowed: a person can be counted only once in the same reporting period. This means that if the same person benefits from one or more forms of support over one or more years in the same reporting period, from the same intervention or different interventions, this person should be counted only once. To avoid the double counting of people over time, two approaches are possible. If it is possible to reliably estimate the number of people supported in the first year, and the number of new people supported in the following years (i.e. not yet supported during the reporting period in question), these numbers can be added up without the risk of double counting. However, if this information is not available, the maximum result of the reporting period should be used instead. Record the calculations in the calculation method field to facilitate quality control of the values reported. Report the geographic location of the people in the comment field to facilitate quality control of double counting.

7. However, there are exceptions to the double counting rule: people counted under GERF 2.32 can also be counted under the following GERF indicators if the relevant conditions are met:

- GERF 2.1 *Number of smallholders reached with EU-supported interventions aimed to increase their sustainable production, access to markets and/or security of land;*

- GERF 2.20 *Number of migrants, refugees, and internally displaced people or individuals from host communities protected or assisted with EU support;*
- GERF 2.33 *Number of women of reproductive age, adolescent girls and children under 5 reached by nutrition-related interventions supported by the EU;*
- GERF 2.39 *Number of people directly benefiting from EU supported interventions that aim to reduce social and economic inequality.*

Quality Control Checklist

1. Has the indicator been included directly in the logframe? Reserve the OPSYS matching functionality only for cases when this is not feasible.
2. If the indicator has been included directly in the logframe, does the current value *include* the baseline value? If the indicator has been matched to a logframe indicator, does the current value exclude the baseline value?
3. Has the intervention been attributed the nutrition marker score of 1 or 2? Has the intervention been attributed the basic nutrition DAC code 12240? Are the beneficiaries of the intervention located in an area classified as IPC ≥ 2 for most of the duration of the intervention? If the answer to any of these questions is "yes", then the support might be aimed at restoring food security and is eligible for reporting under GERF 2.32. If the assistance has other aims such as primary/secondary education, VET/skills or access to finance, then count these individuals under the corresponding GERF and NOT under GERF 2.32.
4. Are the beneficiaries supported directly? Good! This means that there are no intermediaries who receive the aid and then redistribute it to the final beneficiaries.
5. Does the GERF value exclude individuals reached solely through mass publicity campaigns, e.g. general distribution of health nutrition leaflets? Good!
6. Does the GERF value count people? If only the number of households is available, then convert to the number of people using average household size.
7. Is the GERF value a whole number? The number of people cannot be a decimal number.
8. Have gender (or sex) disaggregated values been reported? Gender (or sex) disaggregation is mandatory.
9. Does the GERF value include the people counted under GERF 2.1 *Number of smallholders reached with EU-supported interventions aimed to increase their sustainable production, access to markets and/or security of land*, if they also qualify for this indicator? This type of double counting is exceptionally permitted in this case.
10. Does the GERF value include the people counted under GERF 2.33 *Number of women of reproductive age, adolescent girls and children under 5 reached by nutrition-related interventions supported by the EU*, if they also qualify for this indicator? This type of double counting is exceptionally permitted in this case.
11. Does the intervention focus on migration? If so, this result should also be reported under GERF 2.20 *Number of migrants, refugees, and internally displaced people or individuals from host communities protected or assisted with EU support*, if all conditions are verified. Double counting with GERF 2.20 is allowed.
12. Does the intervention focus on inequalities? If so, this result should also be reported under GERF 2.39 *Number of people directly benefiting from EU supported interventions that aim to reduce social and economic inequality*, if all conditions are verified. Double counting with GERF 2.39 is allowed.

13. Has any other double counting been avoided? People should be counted only once, except for the cases mentioned above.

14. Have all calculations been recorded in the calculation method field? Has all relevant information, including the geographic location of results, been reported in the comment field?

7. Examples of calculations

Example 1

An intervention is targeting villages in a food insecure region (categorised as IPC phase 2). It supports 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, 4000 women from different households in 30 villages were reached between 2022 and 2024.

The number of food insecure people receiving assistance through interventions supported by the EU reported for this intervention is 4000.

Example 2

An intervention aims to reduce deficit in food consumption by providing social transfers to people living in three counties where food insecurity is a problem. The intervention has a score of 2 for the nutrition policy marker. The reporting from the implementing partners includes the following information for 2023:

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

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	952,000
Y	64	1,000,000	20,000	300,000	1,320,000
Z	79	400,000	500,000	200,000	1,100,000
Total	174	1,700,00	542,000	1,400,000	3,642,000

The total number of beneficiaries to be reported is therefore 3,642,000 in 2023.

8. Data sources and issues

Please use the data source categories specified in OPSYS.

EU intervention monitoring and reporting systems: *Progress and final reports for the EU-funded intervention; ROM reviews; EU-funded feasibility or appraisal reports*.

International organisation data portals and reports: *WFP Global Report on Food Crisis (GRFC), https://www.wfp.org/publications*.

Other international reports: *Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC), http://www.ipcinfo.org/ipccountry-analysis*.

Include any issues relating to the availability and quality of the data.

The data collected on this indicator will be reported in OPSYS by the Implementing Partner. The values encoded in OPSYS will be verified, possibly modified and ultimately validated by the Operational

Manager. Once a year the results reported will be frozen for corporate reporting. Unit D4 will perform quality control on the frozen data and aggregate as needed to meet the different corporate reporting requirements: see below.

9. Reporting process & Corporate reporting

The data collected on this indicator will be reported in OPSYS by the Implementing Partner. The values entered in OPSYS will be verified, amended if necessary and ultimately validated by the Operational Manager. Once a year the results reported will be frozen for corporate reporting. The methodological departments in HQ responsible for GERF corporate reporting will perform quality control on the frozen data and aggregate as needed to meet the different corporate reporting requirements.

Please replace ○ with ● for the relevant items below.

This indicator will be reported upon in the following contexts:

> ○ *NDICI via the Annual Report*
> ○ *NDICI via the 2021-27 Programme Performance Statements*
> ○ *INTPA Strategic Plan 2020-24 via the Annual Activity Report*
> ○ *INTPA Strategic Plan 2025-29 via the Annual Activity Report*
> ○ *NEAR Strategic Plan 2020-24 via the Annual Activity Report*
> ○ *ENEST Strategic Plan 2025-29 via the Annual Activity Report*
> ○ *MENA Strategic Plan 2025-29 via the Annual Activity Report*
> ○ *FPI Strategic Plan 2020-24 via the Annual Activity Report*
> ○ *FPI Strategic Plan 2025-29 via the Annual Activity Report*

This indicator has been included in the following other results measurement frameworks:

> ● *EFSD+*
> ● *GAP III*
> ○ *IPA III*
> ● *TEI-MORE*

10. Baseline alignment & Annualisation

Corporate reports most often cover different timeframes. Only rarely does the 7-year Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF) start in the same year as the 5-year Strategic Plans. Because the MFF drives the funding for these interventions, it serves as the primary baseline for data collection. To report against other cycles with different start dates, results must first be annualised and then re-cumulated starting from the required baseline year.

The annualisation method depends on the type of indicator, which can be found in Section 2:

- **Flow Indicators** (discrete achievements): These measure "one-off" events or new beneficiaries reached within a specific timeframe (e.g., Number of people trained). To find the annual result, we calculate the variation (the difference between the cumulative total at the end of the year and the beginning of the year).

    Example: If a project reached 500 total people by 2024 and 800 by 2025, the 2025 annual result is 300 (the new results generated that year).

- **Stock Indicators** (continuous support): These measure an ongoing state or sustained support (e.g., Number of countries supported). To find the annual result, we take the total cumulative value at the end of the year, as this represents the full extent of the EU's active footprint.

  Example: If the EU supports 10 countries in 2024 and continues supporting those same 10 in 2025, the 2025 annual result remains 10 (the total "stock" of support active that year).

  In this case, the result is often achieved at the onset of the intervention and remains ongoing throughout implementation. When re-baselining for a new corporate cycle, these results are maintained rather than recalculated as variations. The annual value is the total number of entities under active support at the end of the reporting year, regardless of whether that support commenced before or after the new baseline year.

11. Other uses

GERF 2.32 can be found in the following thematic results chains:

- [Resilience, Conflict sensitivity and Peace](#)

GERF 2.32 can be found in the following groups of EU predefined indicators available in OPSYS, along with other related indicators:

- Nutrition
- Resilience, Conflict Sensitivity and Peace
- Sustainable Aquatic and Agri-Food Systems

For more information, see: [Core indicators for design and monitoring of EU-funded interventions | Capacity4dev (europa.eu)](#)

Include references to external bodies using the same or similar indicator.

12. Other issues