

# Indicators on the nexus of food systems and (in)stability

*Mapping report*

**THE**   
**BROKER**

Rojan Bolling & Jacqueline Vrancken

May 2018

*Realised with the support of*



## Introduction

The realization of SDG 2 is inextricably linked with the promotion of peace and stability and the prevention of (violent) conflict. It is estimated that out of 815 million malnourished people 489 million live in countries affected by conflict. Given this reality the efforts of Dutch policy for development cooperation in the domains of food and nutrition security (FNS) will increasingly take place in such fragile settings, especially when more developed partner countries transition towards a trade-based relationship. However, current results-frameworks on FNS used by the Inclusive Green Growth department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (MFA) do not include indicators that can clearly show results on interventions that link food security to stability.

This mapping therefore aims to quickly provide an overview of current indicator use by relevant international actors to monitor results in food systems and peacebuilding interventions. Specifically the mapping would aim to identify food systems indicators that are relevant in fragile settings (e.g. capturing progress towards resilience or around use of negative coping strategies). The results of this initial mapping can then be used as input for more in-depth discussion. Three questions have guided this mapping exercise:

- What indicators are currently used in the result frameworks of the directorates DSH, IGG and DDE at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs?
- What (quantifiable) indicators are currently available or used by (relevant) international donors to measure results on: 1) interventions for conflict transformation, peacebuilding and promotion of stability; 2) food systems interventions?
- Are there frameworks available in which (quantifiable) indicators on conflict and stability are linked to indicators for food systems interventions?

## Methods

An initial meeting was held at the MFA to discuss the current use of result frameworks and provide input on the direction and outputs of the study. It was decided to contact a limited number of NGOs, embassies and other relevant organizations to inquire after their use of indicators and indicator frameworks. Unfortunately this resulted in limited response, perhaps due to the limited timeframe of the study. The main outcomes of the mapping study were therefore found via publicly available online sources. Please see the annex for the mapping document.<sup>1</sup>

Searches were performed via Google and key organizational websites. Finding results frameworks used by the EU, DFID, SIDA, USAID, FAO, WFP, and GIZ were prioritized. Apart from frameworks used by these institutions a limited number of relevant other frameworks were included in the mapping that could provide input where gaps remained. Search terms used included (variations of): Indicator, Indicator Compendium, Standardized Indicator, Indicator Guidelines, Results framework, Impact Evaluation, Output, Outcome. Used in combination with organization acronyms (e.g. GIZ, USAID, etc.), or thematic areas (e.g. peacebuilding, food systems, etc.). When standardized indicator lists on organizational outcome level were not available for organizations indicators used in thematically relevant programmes or projects were used, when available.

---

<sup>1</sup> The format of the mapping document builds upon a GSDRC report 'Indicators for conflict, stability, security, justice and peacebuilding: <http://gsdrc.org/publications/indicators-for-conflict-stability-security-justice-and-peacebuilding/>

## Key outcomes and observations

In the initial phase of the mapping it became clear that indicator frameworks explicitly linking food systems to (in)stability were not readily available, which was confirmed during the course of the study. It was therefore decided to focus on providing an overview of frameworks in four thematically related areas: food systems, peacebuilding and conflict transformation, stability and resilience and humanitarian aid. Here we present some of our further observations on the use of various indicator frameworks.

Key actors (FAO, WFP, EU) use standardised frameworks and indicator lists in order to facilitate standardised reporting, not only to allow for comparison of results and to translate project/programme results to country level, but also to simplify the evaluation process. Most indicator lists are contained in a results framework that lists several impact areas/strategic objectives with corresponding outcomes and outputs. The lists of indicators are mostly proposed only as starting point - in correspondence with multi-annual strategic plans - and many of the indicators may have to be adapted to fit the specificities of different projects and contexts. Therefore most indicator lists are at country, community or programme level and not at household (project) level.

Several key actors have produced standardised frameworks per thematic area, which however often overlap, or make use of sector wide standardised frameworks (such as the SDGs) other other overarching frameworks developed in cooperation with other organisations (such as GAFSP). E.g. FAO provides [Food Security Indicators](#) (classified along the four dimension of food security - availability, access, utilization and stability) but also a [Resilience Tool](#) (with indicators for Income and Food Access, Access to Basic Services, Social Safety Nets, Assets, Adaptive Capacity, Stability) a newly developed [Food Insecurity Experience Scale](#) and lists [Targets and Indicators](#) for the Post-2015 Development Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals. Moreover, FAO has introduced the [Emergency Livelihood Response Programme](#) to provide direct assistance as well as guard against further declines in food security among “vulnerable but viable” households in South Sudan. Furthermore, FAO is a key stakeholder in the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP) that developed a [Monitoring and Evaluation Framework](#). Because of the parallel existence of several frameworks within organisations, it is unclear which ones and how these are used in a standardised manner. A similar conclusion came forth from email correspondence with WFP; there are dozens of different methodologies, each with their own indicators and it is unclear which once are used as standard.

Often, potentially relevant organisations do not provide clear indicator lists on their websites, such as the IFRC and GIZ (which require login to access an intranet environment) or e.g. PAX and SNV (that only provide a limited number of result indications in their yearly report). It may be interesting to acquire indicator lists (particularly at project level) from these organisations, but for this it may be necessary to contact them directly.

Looking at indicators for stability, it became clear that most organisations integrate these with indicators for peacebuilding, security, governance and justice systems. For example, the [Instrument contributing to Stability and Peace](#) (IcSP) of the European Foreign Policy Instrument formulates “Security, Stability and Peace” as one macro-sector and USAID categorises it under “Conflict Mitigation and Stabilization”. The IcSP has specific peace and stability objectives and IcSP activities are often implemented in parallel to humanitarian assistance with a view to ensuring the linkages between relief, rehabilitation and development (LRRD), and contribute to stabilisation, where other Instruments cannot or are unable to provide a rapid and flexible response. The links to food security are very limited, but with more general links to socio-economic opportunities/recovery and

livelihood/capacity building in relation to ex-combatants and individuals that are vulnerable for violent extremism propaganda.

Interestingly, FAO is developing a [Corporate Framework to support sustainable peace in the context of Agenda 2030](#) following the April 2016 Security Council and General Assembly resolutions on peacebuilding that put the concept “sustaining peace” central stage. This concept encompasses activities aimed at preventing the outbreak, escalation, continuation and recurrence of conflict, including addressing root causes and moving towards recovery, reconstruction and development. The objective of the corporate Framework is to guide FAO in carrying out its mandate in its areas of competence and comparative advantage, i.e. food security, nutrition and sustainable agriculture, towards a more deliberate and transformative impact on sustaining peace. One of the deliverables for this framework is a list of indicators in relation to sustainable peace (reflecting the central importance of gender and age). The output indicators brought forward so far for this Framework are selected examples from relevant areas of FAO’s work.

## Selection of relevant indicators

Within the scope of the current exercise it is not possible to provide an indicator framework that definitively captures the effects of interventions on the food security - stability nexus. However based on the outcomes of preceding studies and recent literature a selection of indicators from this mapping is presented that could be seen as a first step in this direction.<sup>2</sup> Indicators that captured effects of increased resilience of food systems were given preference where available. Due to the limited effects that individual food and nutrition security interventions can have on various forms of stability (e.g. economic, social) many indicators also capture outcomes at household or community level. Peacebuilding, conflict transformation and stability related indicators were selected based on their relevance to show increased or decreased risk of instability in relation to governance of resources, livelihoods and community cohesion.

### *Food systems*

FAO	Average dietary energy supply adequacy
FAO	Prevalence of undernourishment
FAO	Percent of arable land equipped for irrigation
IFAD	Number of kilometres of roads constructed, rehabilitated or upgraded
IFAD	Number of market, processing or storage facilities constructed or rehabilitated
IFAD	(Number) Percentage of persons/households reporting improved physical access to markets, processing and storage facilities
ZOA	Decreased prevalence and duration of acute malnutrition among children 6- 59

<sup>2</sup> F&BKP (2016) ‘From food security towards a resilient society’, [knowledge4food.net/wp-content/.../05/160518\\_fbkp-article\\_fs-resilientsociety.pdf](http://knowledge4food.net/wp-content/.../05/160518_fbkp-article_fs-resilientsociety.pdf); The Broker (2018) ‘Food security programming and stability: Exploring conflict sensitivity in Dutch FNS programming’, [www.thebrokeronline.eu/content/download/81708/815549/version/1/file/Project+Report+FNS+programming+and+stability.pdf](http://www.thebrokeronline.eu/content/download/81708/815549/version/1/file/Project+Report+FNS+programming+and+stability.pdf); FAO (2018) ‘The State of Food Insecurity in the World 2017’, <http://www.fao.org/state-of-food-security-nutrition/en/>

	months
ZOA	Increased average food production per household
ZOA	Increased index of household assets per household
UNOCHA	Change in food consumption patterns
UNOCHA	Change in food source
UNOCHA	% change in key food & non-food commodity prices
UNOCHA	Change in availability of key commodities in markets
UNOCHA	Percentage of Households/ communities unable to plant for next season
UNOCHA	Percentage of Households with suitable daily water and fodder consumption for livestock

*Peacebuilding and conflict transformation*

European Commission - IcSP	Degree of use of conflict management mechanisms
European Commission - IcSP	Degree of community participation in conflict management and dialogue initiatives
ZOA	Increased positive perception on trust and interaction across conflict lines
ZOA	Decreased no. and % of violent conflicts over land and water
ZOA	Decreased no. and % of population with personal grievances regarding access to/use of land and water
ZOA	Increased no. and % of population who feels more secure in the area where they live

*Stability*

European Commission - IcSP	% of ex-combatants who see a viable future for themselves in civilian life
European Commission - IcSP	Percentage of demobilised combatants able to meet their and their dependents' basic needs
European Commission - IcSP	% of community members who feel that the ex-combatants and their families are "very well" or "well" integrated and do not feel threatened by their presence
European Commission - IcSP	% of targeted individuals who feel less marginalised

*Resilience*

UNOCHA	Frequency of food/cash assistance to beneficiary HH (months)
UNOCHA	Number and Percentage of non-functioning markets
UNOCHA	Number and Percentage of households with no livelihood assets
UNOCHA	Number and Percentage of affected areas with local government-led response planning capacity, with the ability to meet the needs of the entire community in its diversity
FAO - Resilience tool	Available coping strategies (count, 0 to 18)
FAO - Resilience tool	Food consumption ratio (Share of food expenditure divided by total expenditure)
FAO - Resilience tool	Capacity to maintain stability in the future (ordinal, 1 to 5)
WFP - Senegal programme	Quantity of agricultural inputs (seeds, fertilizer) distributed
WFP - Senegal programme	Quantity of agricultural tools distributed
International Dialogue on Peacebuilding and Statebuilding	% change in food prices over last three months
UNDP (2014-2017)	Number of women and men benefitting from emergency jobs and other diversified livelihoods opportunities within six to eighteen months after a crisis, disaggregated by vulnerability groups
UNDP (2018-2021)	Number of forcibly displaced people (millions), disaggregated by type (refugees, asylum seekers, internally-displaced persons) and by sex and age to the extent possible
UNDP (2018-2021)	Conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population, by sex, age and cause
UNDP (2018-2021)	Number of victims of intentional homicide per 100,000 population, by sex and age
UNDP (2018-2021)	Number of people benefitting from jobs and improved livelihoods in crisis or post-crisis settings, disaggregated by sex and other characteristics
RABIT	Ability of community members to diversity their income sources (e.g. selling different products)
RABIT	Ability to access support from family, friends and neighbours in times of emergency