WBG SCORECARD FY24-FY30 METHODOLOGY NOTE

WBG Results Indicator

The purpose of this note is to ensure the rigor, transparency, and reproducibility of the WBG results indicators included in the new WBG Scorecard FY24-FY30, as well as their alignment with the WBG’s vision. Technical teams were asked to provide a sufficiently detailed methodology so that anyone who reads this note can understand its rationale, theory of change, data sources, and method of calculation.

Definitions included in this template are aligned to the WBG Scorecard paper endorsed by the Board on Dec 19, 2023. The methods notes are living documents and will be subject to updating and revision pending operational inputs and implementation lessons over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATOR NAME</th>
<th>Millions of people with strengthened food and nutrition security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SUB-INDICATORS | • People fed as a result of improved access to food through in-kind and food transfers, productive inclusion, cash-based interventions and/or food emergency programs
| | • People fed as a result of increased agricultural/food market linkages or trade
| | • People fed as a result of improved access to food from increased non-farming income |
| OUTCOME AREA | ☐ Protection for the Poorest
| | ☐ Green and blue planet and resilient populations
| | ☐ Sustainable food systems
| | ☐ Affordable, reliable, and sustainable energy for all
| | ☐ Digital services
| | ☐ More and Better Jobs
| | ☐ No Learning Poverty
| | ☐ Effective Macroeconomics and Fiscal Management
| | ☐ Inclusive and equitable water and sanitation services
| | ☐ Connected Communities
| | ☐ Digital connectivity
| | ☐ Gender equality and youth inclusion
| | ☐ Better Lives for People in Fragility, Conflict, and Violence
| | ☐ More private investments |
| SDG ALIGNMENT | See https://sdgs.un.org/ for further details on SDGs: |
| | □ 1. No Poverty
| | □ 2. Zero Hunger
| | □ 3. Good Health and Well-being
| | □ 4. Quality Education
| | □ 5. Gender Equality
| | □ 6. Clean Water and Sanitation
| | □ 7. Affordable and Clean Energy
| | □ 8. Decent Work and Economic Growth
| | □ 9. Industry Innovation and Infrastructure
| | □ 10. Reduced Inequalities
| | □ 11. Sustainable Cities and Communities
| | □ 12. Responsible Consumption and Production
| | □ 13. Climate Action
| | □ 14. Life Below Water
| | □ 15. Life on Land
| | □ 16. Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions
| | □ 17. Partnerships for the Goals |
| List of specific UN targets (if applicable): |
| | • SDG 2: End hunger, achieve food security and improved nutrition and promote sustainable agriculture. |
| DISAGGREGATION | ☒ Youth ☒ Sex ☐ Disability-inclusive ☒ FCS ☒ SSS, SIDS and LDCs ☐ IDA, IBRD, IFC and MIGA
| | ☒ Country income groups ☒ Regions ☒ WBG Joint Programming |

1 This includes from reduced food loss and waste (sub-categories: staples, fruit & vegetables, livestock & fisheries/sustainable animal protein; fortified foods or special nutritious foods) (number) and from increased non-farming income; sub-indicator: People/beneficiaries reached as a result of increased production of fortified foods or special nutritious foods.

2 Includes (food-related exports/imports; sub-categories: staples, fruit & vegetables, livestock & fisheries/sustainable animal protein) (number).

3 Also relates to Beneficiaries of in-kind and food transfers, productive inclusion, cash-based interventions and/or food emergency programs (based on SSN CSC sub-indicator). In addition, the subindicator “Increased agricultural and/or food production (metric tons)” could serve as a complementary FNS intermediate outcome subindicator, if projects are unable to report on the higher-level outcome subindicators listed above (sub-categories: staples, fruit & vegetables, livestock & fisheries/sustainable animal protein; fortified foods or special nutritious foods). It can be used as an input to convert to people fed as be the method of calculation.

4 Includes targets 2.1.1 (prevalence of undernourishment) and 2.1.2 (prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)).
The number of people benefiting from interventions by IBRD, IDA, IFC, and MIGA across multiple sectors that strengthen food and nutrition security. These interventions may span the universally accepted dimensions of food and nutrition security, including the availability of food, access to food, utilization of food and stability of food systems. Examples of such interventions could include:

- Operations from a diverse set of thematic areas, such as climate resilient agriculture and food systems
- Social protection/social safety nets
- Nutrition services
- Supply chains
- Financial and trade finance operations that support food inputs, imports, and distribution of food
- Improved irrigation and drainage services
- Agricultural services
- Improved practices and technologies to enhance agricultural production
- Integration of farmers to markets

Results achieved can be based on actuals at the project level or can use model-based estimations at the portfolio level relying always on available project level data inputs.

Expected results is based on the latest available estimations of future results, including model-based or other informed estimations.
The world is off-track to meet the Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) of Zero Hunger (SDG 2) targets driven by climate-related shocks, locusts, conflicts, economic shocks, and the COVID-19 pandemic. Global food and nutrition insecurity has been increasing and is at a record high, with 281.6 million people across 59 countries classified as acutely food insecure in 2023 (GRFC 2024), while nearly 30 percent of the world’s population faces moderate to severe food insecurity (SOFI, 2023). Hunger and starvation are the most critical manifestations of extreme poverty, and unless we radically transform our food system through strategic investments and targeted policy reforms, SDG 2 will not be met by 2030.

Food security is defined as all people, at all times, having physical and economic access to sufficient safe and nutritious food that meets their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life (1996 World Food Summit). The four main dimensions of food security are:

1. **Physical availability** of food: Food availability addresses the “supply side” of food security and is determined by the level of food production, stock levels and net trade.

2. **Economic and physical access** to food: An adequate supply of food at the national or international level does not in itself guarantee household level food security. Concerns about insufficient food access have resulted in a greater policy focus on incomes, expenditure, markets and prices in achieving food security objectives.

3. **Food utilization**: Utilization is commonly understood as the way the body makes the most of various nutrients in the food. Sufficient energy and nutrient intake by individuals are the result of good care and feeding practices, food preparation, diversity of the diet and intra-household distribution of food. Combined with good biological utilization of food consumed, this determines the nutritional status of individuals.

4. **Stability** of the other three dimensions over time: Even if your food intake is adequate today, you are still considered to be food insecure if you have inadequate access to food on a periodic basis, risking a deterioration of your nutritional status. Adverse weather conditions, political instability, or economic factors (unemployment, rising food prices) may have an impact on your food security status.

For food security objectives to be realized, all four dimensions must be fulfilled simultaneously. The World Bank Group (WBG) has included food and nutrition security (FNS) among the eight global challenges to address at scale in its Evolution Roadmap. WBG’s multisectoral investments to strengthen people’s FNS combine both immediate actions to address FNS crises and long-term regeneration of natural, social, and economic systems, ensuring the food needs of the present generations are met without compromising the needs of future generations. See HLPE (2020). *Food security and nutrition: building a global narrative towards 2030*: https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/8357b6eb-8010-4254-814a-1493fa4a93/content

---

14 New WBG Scorecard paper (Annex I, Technical Criteria): it refers to outcomes with sufficient causal proximity to WBG interventions to allow for attribution of results.

15 New WBG Scorecard paper (Annex I, Technical Criteria): it refers to outcomes where attribution is located further down the causal chain, relative to WBG interventions, and may be contingent on other exogenous factors.

16 https://www.fao.org/3/a936e/a936e00.pdf, Ongoing discussions in food security and food systems circles, including the High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition (HLPE), are considering the inclusion of two additional dimensions: agency, which seeks to understand how households make choices about what they eat, how they produce food, and their capacity to engage in policy processes that shape food systems; and sustainability, which aims to capture food systems 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. See HLPE (2020). *Food security and nutrition: building a global narrative towards 2030*: https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/8357b6eb-8010-4254-814a-1493fa4a93/content
emergencies as well as long-term investments to build improved longer-run resilience and support the transformation of agri-food systems for better FNS outcomes. WBG efforts typically focus on adapted responses across four areas:

1. **Support production and producers**: Invest in actions to enhance agricultural production and productivity by focusing on more efficient use of fertilizers and other inputs, increasing access to new/rehabilitated climate resilient irrigation, improving agricultural/food market linkages, repurposing public policies and expenditures to better support farmers and output, and taking advantage of major advances and reduced costs in the use of digital technology.

2. **Facilitate increased trade in food and agricultural inputs**: Build international consensus and commitment to avoid export restrictions that increase global food prices and import restrictions on agricultural inputs such as fertilizer that discourage production in developing countries. Ensure that client requests to use project funds for financing food imports as an emergency measure are justified and that the modalities employed meet specific WBG guidelines.

3. **Support vulnerable households**: Expand social protection programs, including targeted cash transfer interventions with a focus on building FNS, and enhancing productivity and income generating opportunities through social assistance. Build quickly on existing social protection investments and delivery systems, to promote adaptive country responses.

4. **Invest in resilient and sustainable food systems**: Strengthen food systems to make them resilient to rising risks (conflict, climate change, pests, diseases), trade disruptions, and economic shocks to balance immediate, short-term needs with long-term investments.

Annex 1 visualizes the theory of change with the following indicative, typical activities, outputs and intermediate outcomes included in WBG projects aiming to contribute towards the higher-level outcome of strengthened FNS:

**Activities:**

- Agricultural input production and distribution, including fertilizer/seeds/feed, machinery/mechanization.
- Extension services and technical assistance (AgTech) in (post-)production practices, crop-diversification, climate-smart agriculture, diversification, producer organization, business development, digital technologies, information systems, etc.
- Improving existing and/or new irrigation and drainage services.
- Improving access to financial services and products, including loans, credits (matching), trade finance; digital payments, including making digital wave/supplier payments, receiving digital payments for products sold.
- Investments in market, transport and trade infrastructure for production, storage, cold chain, processing, and trading of food crops and sustainable animal protein including food fortification.
- Food-related logistics and warehousing, management of food stocks.
- Agri-finance products including trade finance.
- Strategic trade facilitation and policy dialogue, regional coordination, and global partnerships.
- Technical assistance, analytics and lab services on food trade restrictions, trade policies, food safety and sanitary and phytosanitary standards for imports(exports), traceability, etc.
- In-kind and food transfers, including school meals and emergency food production inputs.
- Basic nutrition services, in particular for pregnant women and children.
- Nutrition- and gender-sensitive technical assistance, such as promotion of home/kitchen gardens/crop diversification.
- Digital food information systems.
• Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) services for safe food production and consumption.  
  
• Technical assistance and analytics on safety net systems efficiency and effectiveness. 
• Investments in climate-smart agriculture technologies, including improved data and measurements systems (e.g., MRV). 
• Technical assistance to build the institutional capacity to design and implement food system reforms and infrastructure investment programs. 
• Technical assistance to strengthen early warning and risk management systems, strategic reserves. 
• Investments in increased and/or improved processing of food products that contribute to FNS, including during crises. 
• Interventions that complement / diversify farm incomes, such as growing non-food crops or rural non-farming activities (e.g., eco-tourism, arts and crafts) that increase farmers’ ability to buy food.

**Outputs:**

- Farmers and/or agri value chain actors reached with improved access to agricultural assets or services, including advisory services, access to inputs such as fertilizers and other agri inputs. 
- Farmers/areas provided with improved irrigation and drainage services. 
- Agricultural input providers provided with assets or services. 
- Farmers and/or agri value chain actors provided with improved access/using improved financial services, including access to loans and trade finance provided to farmers, producer organizations, and companies in agri value chains or digital payments, including making digital wage/supplier payments, receiving digital payments for products sold. 
- Farmers and/or agri value chain actors that benefit from improved access to sustainable transport infrastructure, new or improved market transportation and logistics services, in particular rural all-season roads in agricultural production areas. 
- Farmers and/or agri value chain actors provided with new or improved electricity services that enhance agricultural production, logistics and market connectivity. 
- People served with in-kind and food transfers from social safety net programs, productive inclusion, cash-based interventions and food emergency programs. 
- People provided with nutrition services, especially women and children. 
- Technical support and investments provided for food systems reforms.

**Intermediate Outcomes:**

- Farmers and/or agri value chain actors adopting improved agricultural technology, Good Agricultural Practices (GAP), including climate-smart agriculture technology. 
- Farmers and/or agri value chain actors using improved logistics and infrastructure with demonstrated effects on improving food availability (such as grain storage, cold chain logistics, and irrigation). 
- Increased agricultural production, including quality improved. 
- Increased agricultural productivity. 
- Farmers and/or agri value chain actors having increased market access/linkages. 
- Farmers and agri value chain actors adopting practices to improve resilience to selected risks along the agri value chain, including the impacts of climate change. 
- People with improved access to in-kind and food transfers from social safety net programs, productive inclusion, cash-based interventions and food emergency programs. 
- People with improved access to nutrition services, especially women and children.

**Higher-Level Outcomes:**

---

7 While the theory of change acknowledges that WASH activities contribute towards FNS, WASH results in terms of number of people would be counted under the WASH CSC results indicator. 
8 In crisis scenarios, increased food production might not be achieved and sustained food production can be considered a positive outcome.
- People fed as a result of increased agricultural/food production (including from reduced food loss and waste and improved and/or new irrigation and drainage services).
- People fed as a result of increased agricultural/food market linkages or trade (food-related exports/imports)
- People fed as a result/beneficiaries of in-kind and food transfers, productive inclusion, cash-based interventions and/or food emergency programs (based on SSN CSC sub-indicator).

Outcome type/subtypes from the IEG taxonomies developed in Results and Performance of the World Bank Group Annual Review (RAP) 2021 mapped to the outcome(s) measured by the FNS indicator are:

**WORLD BANK**
A. Access to services expanded
B. Human capital increased
C. Enterprise or sectoral performance improved
D. Quality of services improved
E. Capacity of institutions to perform institutional functions enhanced
F. Productive sector expanded
G. Use of services or assets increased
H. Legal or regulatory context improved
I. Public assets improved
J. Temporary relief to individuals provided
L. Natural capital sustained
M. Individual employability or livelihood improved
N. Citizen engagement of community participation enhanced
O. Awareness, attitudes, or behaviors changed
P. Equity or inclusion enhanced

**IFC**
**Project-level outcomes:**
1.1. Access to goods and services
1.2. Quality/affordability of goods and services
1.3. Enhanced capacity of final beneficiaries
2.1. Suppliers/distributors reached
3.1. Increased employment
4.1. Increased transfers to the government
5.1. Increased money spent/transfers to the communities
6.1. Enhanced E&S standards of the client
6.2. GHG reduction
7.1. Gross value added
7.3. Export sales

**Market-level outcomes:**
9. Competitiveness in the market
10. Resilience in the market
12. Inclusiveness in the market
13. Sustainability in the market

**MIGA**
**Project-level outcomes:**
1.1. Access to goods and services
1.2. Quality/affordability of goods and services
1.3. Enhanced capacity of final beneficiaries

---

20 Although relevant for the FNS results indicator, IEG’s outcome types do not include (i) GHG reduction for the World Bank and (ii) climate adaption/resilience.
2.1. Suppliers/distributors reached
3.1. Increased employment
4.1. Increased transfers to the government
5.1. Increased money spent/transfers to the communities
6.1. Enhanced E&S standards of the client
6.2. GHG reduction
7.1. Gross value added
7.3. Export sales

**Foreign investment outcomes:**
9. Business and sector practice
10. Market development
12. Sustainability
13. Signaling effects

WBG operations strengthen people’s FNS typically across the four dimensions by (1) Support to production and producers, (2) Facilitating increased trade in food and agricultural inputs, (3) Support to vulnerable households, and (4) Investing in resilient and sustainable food systems. The following list of activities is indicative of typical interventions:

**Support to production and producers:**
- Agricultural input production and distribution, including fertilizers, seeds, feed or machinery/mechanization to support primary production and primary processing, including for basic processed foods (e.g., noodles, bread) or specialized nutritious food (e.g., for chronic or acute malnutrition).
- Extension services and technical assistance (AgTech) in (post-)production practices, crop-diversification, climate-smart agriculture, producer organization, diversification, business development, digital technologies, information systems, rural non-farming income opportunities, etc.
- Improving existing and/or new irrigation and drainage services
- Use agri-finance financial services and products, including loans, credits, trade finance, short term finance that involve staple food items, including making digital payments

**Facilitating increased trade in food and agricultural inputs:**
- Market and trade infrastructure for production, storage, cold chain, processing, and trading of animal protein, food crops and commodities including food fortification
- Food-related logistics and warehousing, management of food stocks
- Enhancing farmers’ and other agri value chain actors’ market access or linkages to agricultural and food value chains, including technical assistance, productive and entrepreneurial investments, facilitating strengthened linkages to existing or new buyers/markets, etc.
- Trading of key food crops
- Strategic trade facilitation and policy dialogue, regional coordination, global partnerships
- Technical assistance and analytics on food trade restrictions, trade policies, food safety and sanitary and phytosanitary standards for imports/exports, traceability, etc.

**Support to vulnerable households:**
- In-kind and food transfers, including school meals; productive inclusion, cash-based interventions and food emergency programs, including emergency food production inputs
- Basic nutrition services, in particular for pregnant women and children,
- Nutrition- and gender-sensitive technical assistance, such as promotion of home/kitchen gardens or crop diversification
- Digital food information systems
**Limitations**

- Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH) services for safe food production and consumption
- Technical assistance and analytics on safety net systems efficiency and effectiveness

**Advantages**

- Investments in climate-smart agriculture technologies, including climate resilient irrigation and improved data and measurements systems (e.g., MRV)
- Technical assistance and analytics to inform the development of policies/strategies/regulatory frameworks
- Technical assistance to build the institutional capacity to design and implement food system reforms and infrastructure investment programs
- Food-related logistics and warehousing, management of food stocks
- Technical assistance and investment to strengthen early warning and risk management systems and strategic reserves
- Investments in food processing

---

**Investing in resilient and sustainable food systems:**

- The indicator contributes to SDG2 on ending hunger, achieving food security and improved nutrition, and promoting sustainable agriculture. It also supports the WBG’s mission of ending extreme poverty and boosting prosperity on a livable planet. The FNS indicator is critical to the World Bank Group’s new vision and mission under the Evolution Roadmap because it is closely associated with poverty. Climate change also has negative impacts on food production and can thus harm food security. Additionally, this new indicator requires monitoring changes in agricultural production (and/or productivity), which was previously not always explicitly reported in operations’ results frameworks but constitutes a significant part of WBG interventions. By including this, the indicator provides a more holistic view of the progress made in improving food production and productivity.

  This results indicator aims to capture a more comprehensive scope of FNS programming. This is deliberate as FNS cannot be achieved by only short-term measures in response to FNS crises but requires a balance with longer-term measures to make the global food system more resilient and sustainable. The indicator provides a holistic view of the progress made in addressing the FNS global challenge, particularly in the context of recurrent crises and shocks. The indicator will allow WBG to report on the effects across multiple sectors to achieve greater FNS, as multiple underlying sub-indicators can be linked to the scorecard indicator.

**Limitations**

- The main limitation pertains to challenges related to measuring FNS, as there is no universal measure. There are different methodologies used by different organizations for estimating varying aspects of acute food security, chronic food security and nutrition outcomes, each with its advantages and disadvantages and varying availability in terms of country coverage and data collection frequency. Examples include the FAO’s Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES), Dietary Diversity Score (DDS), WFP’s Food Consumption Score (FCS), IPC’s Food Security Phase Classification, among others. Most of these measures require conducting rigorously designed household surveys, which can be time-consuming and costly, and therefore are generally not used for regular/annual reporting. WBG operations typically do not collect data using these methodologies for their direct beneficiaries but use proxy indicators related to agricultural production, food trade or in-kind food transfers.

  In some sectors, the WBG will be able to estimate or calculate the number of people fed as a result of (i) increased agricultural production, (ii) increased agricultural market linkages or trade, or (iii) in-kind food transfers, productive inclusion, cash-based interventions or food emergency programs (based on SSN CSC sub-indicator). In other cases, depending on the sector, proxy indicators such as the volume of agricultural production as a result of interventions may be the best available information. Moreover, some of the sub-indicators track progress at the household level and do not take into account indirect beneficiaries who may benefit from the significant multiplier
effects within the community (e.g., through spillover of adoption of good practices, local market stimulation, etc.)\textsuperscript{21}

DATA AND CALCULATION

INTERNAL DATA SOURCE(S)

☒ World Bank’s Operations Portal (PADs, PDs, ISRs, and ICRs)
☒ World Bank’s Operations Portal (Lending and Portfolio)
☒ IFC Operational Portal (iDesk/iPortal)
☒ IFC AIMM System
☒ MIGA Results Measurement System
☒ MIGA Portfolio Records
☒ Other

The overall approach taken for WBG corporate scorecard reporting on FNS is similar across IBRD/IDA, IFC and MIGA, with the aim to improve FNS across the four dimensions of food availability, access, utilization and stability.

Step 1: Data collection and aggregation (Client/Implementing Agency)

The raw information on FNS is typically obtained from government agencies or departments responsible for the project/program implementation, such as the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development, the Ministry of Health, or private sector clients of IFC and MIGA. This information is either directly received from the clients or derived from operation-specific monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, drawing on farmer registries, or beneficiary information systems unique to each operation, built on inputs such as censuses, field surveys, economic and financial analyses, etc. Data collected are entered into the respective WBG systems, or if needed, are aggregated across different intervention areas and across different type of activities, which is typically undertaken by the operation’s implementing unit M&E staff (for IBRD/IDA projects). Ensuring the accuracy of this raw data is crucial, especially in aligning it with the actual beneficiaries receiving support.

Step 2: Reporting into the ISR/ICR or IFC/MIGA results measurement systems (WBG Operational team/Task team)

IBRD/IDA operational task teams obtain and analyze the aggregated data from the client through the operation’s/program’s M&E system to monitor actual progress. The operational team and the equivalent team for MIGA will include the progress data in next ISR/ICR (IBRD/IDA) and results measurement systems (IFC/MIGA), depending on the project’s status. Progress data will also be disaggregated according to youth, gender and type of agricultural production supported (i.e., staple crop, fruits and vegetables, livestock and fisheries or sustainable animal protein). These reports are submitted for review and approval via the system after projects are approved.

Step 3: Reporting for the WBG Corporate Scorecard FNS Results Indicator (WBG Operational team)

The new FNS corporate scorecard results indicator requires reporting by task teams on the volume of agricultural products produced, processed or traded within the scope and duration of the operation. This information should ideally distinguish between the types of agricultural production supported by operations (i.e., staple crop, fruits and vegetables, sustainable animal protein). Such information is typically available in operations’ results frameworks, economic and financial analyses, or other operational documents. The following conversion methodology is used to convert outputs reported as volume in metric tons (m\textsuperscript{3}) to number of people fed. The conversion methodology is expressed by the formula below:

\[
\text{Number of People Fed} = \frac{\sum \text{Food}_i \text{ Calorie}_i}{365 \times R}
\]

\textsuperscript{21} Furthermore, defining the indicator based on beneficiaries excludes capturing area-based impacts of WBG interventions, such as areas under the improved practices. This is problematic, as operations could have large numbers of direct beneficiaries but only a limited area benefiting from upgraded technology.
Operational documents typically also contain information on proxy intermediate outcome/output results indicators, such as (i) Increased agricultural productivity (e.g., tons/hectare), (ii) Farmers adopting improved agricultural technology, (iii) Farmers having increased market access/linkages, (iv) Farmers adopting practices to improve resilience risks, (v) Farmers reached with agricultural assets or services, (vi) Farmers provided with new/improved irrigation or drainage services, (vii) Farmers reached with improved access to inputs, and (viii) Farmers reached with improved access to finance, or proxy custom results indicators that capture the same type of measures. These indicators are recommended to be considered in operations’ results frameworks (in particular for IBRD/IDA).

**Step 4: Aggregation for the CSC WBG Results Indicator (AGF Global Team; IFC CDI; MIGA MIGES)**

For IBRD/IDA, the Agriculture and Food (AGF) Global Practice Global Engagement Unit is responsible for validating and aggregating data from all operations that are relevant for the FNS CSC reporting. The aggregation of data is based on operations’ results reporting (based on Steps 1-3), including on the new corporate results (sub-)indicators listed in this method note: (i) People fed as a result of increased agricultural/food production (sub-categories: staples, fruit & vegetables, livestock & fisheries); (ii) People fed as a result of increased agricultural/food market linkages or trade (food-related exports/imports; sub-categories: staples, fruit & vegetables, livestock & fisheries); and (iii) People fed as a result of improved access to food from/Beneficiaries of in-kind and food transfers, productive inclusion, cash-based interventions and/or food emergency programs (based on SSN CSC sub-indicator). For IFC and MIGA, the Development Impact Department of IFC and the Economics and Sustainability Department (MIGES) of MIGA are responsible for aggregating the data for FNS CSC reporting following the steps 1-3 above.

In line with the Theory of Change (Annex 1), beneficiary numbers of other CSC indicators will be considered for reporting given the multi-sectoral nature of FNS (e.g., food-related social safety net measures, nutrition services for women and children, improved access to water, sanitation and hygiene services, sustainable transport infrastructure services, electricity services, financial services). For some of those sub-indicators, results reporting will be based on FNS operations as identified by relevant World Bank sector and theme codes. In addition, some WBG operations provide beneficiaries of FNS estimates in their results frameworks, such as the FIES or FCS, which will also be considered on a case-by-case basis for the aggregate reporting. Results tracking is done through either the Implementation Status Report (ISR) or the Implementation Completion Report (ICR), depending on the operation’s status. For IFC and MIGA, results tracking is done through their respective results measurement systems.

**Unit of analysis**

The reporting of the FNS indicator should be expressed in individual terms (people fed). In case this is not feasible, for IBRD/IDA financed operations, there are usually three types of reporting units used: number of people, number of (farm) households, hectares (e.g., area targeted by interventions), and percentage (e.g., of beneficiaries, or of produce sold to markets). When

---

22 This sub-indicator can be used to calculate a proxy indicator of people fed as a result of improved and/or new irrigation and drainage services (number), based on information such as operations’ economic analysis or other documentation. In cases the number of farmers is not available, this sub-indicator will be based on the ‘Area with improved with improved irrigation and drainage services.’

23 As per OPCS guidance, these are 11 sector codes (Agricultural Extension, Research, and Other Support Activities; Agricultural markets, commercialization and agribusiness; Crops; Fisheries; Forestry; Irrigation and Drainage; Livestock; Other Agriculture, Fishing and Forestry; Public Administration - Agriculture, Fishing & Forestry; Social Protection; and Public Administration - Social Protection) and 3 theme codes: Food Insecurity, Nutrition and Locust Outbreak.
beneficiary-level information is not provided in the project documentation, a conversion factor is used to convert results reported as units of households to number of people. If available, the conversion factor used is the one provided in project documentation. When this factor is not available, then the conversion factor used is based on the most recent information available from the United Nations Population Division Database on Household Size and Composition.

**METHOD OF CALCULATION (DISAGGREGATION)**

- **Youth**: The standardized approach specified in the Corporate Scorecard Disaggregation Methodology is followed, based on the UN definition of youth (ages 15-24).
- **Sex**: Several FNS projects actively disaggregate their progress by gender. Where available, data included in the FNS relevant results indicator are reported. For projects that do not enumerate the number of female beneficiaries, the standardized approach specified in the Corporate Scorecard Disaggregation Methodology is followed.
- **FCS**: Results are aggregated according to the most recent FCS list.
- **Small States (SS), Small Island Developing States (SIDS), and Least Developed Countries (LDCs)**: Results are aggregated according to the most recent list of SS, SIDS, and LDCs.
- **IDA/IBRD/IFC/MIGA**: Project data are used to aggregate results by institution.
- **Region**: Project data are used to aggregate results by WBG region.
- **Country income group**: Results are aggregated according to the income level list.
- **WBG joint programming**: The standardized approach specified in the Corporate Scorecard Disaggregation Methodology is followed.

For more information, please refer to the Common Principles to Limit Double Counting.

The WBG Corporate Scorecard Annex on Common Principles to Limit Double Counting provides details related to double counting. All decisions take a conservative approach, erring on the side of undercounting when possible. Preferably, each operation should contribute only one indicator to the WBG Results indicator it is reporting on. In cases where multiple indicators are included from one operation, a conservative approach will be taken to avoid double counting the same beneficiaries by considering only the highest progress value of the two reported.

The proposed indicators and results measurement strategies are agreed upon between the project team and the client during project design. These agreements are part of the monitoring and evaluation system design, which includes the results frameworks that are reviewed at various instances during quality review and decision meeting stages. In addition, for some projects, separate monitoring and evaluation firms are hired to provide additional capacity and assistance to the client when needed. Finally, for projects using disbursement linked indicators (IPF with DLIs or P4Rs), there is a third-party that verifies the reported results.

With the roll-out of the new corporate scorecard indicator, efforts will need to be made to strengthen both staff and client capacity to effectively capture results in line with the definition included in this note. Trainings, guidance notes and additional technical support will be needed to enhance the design of results frameworks and measurement and reporting of the new indicator during project implementation.

To ensure accuracy, values recorded in the relevant results indicators in the FNS operations for the current reporting period are cross-checked against those from the previous reporting period. If the reported values are cumulative, any instance of the current report showing varying values from the previous report is flagged as a potential reporting error. In such cases, project

---

24 If female beneficiary values are reported as a percentage of total, the total number of beneficiaries is multiplied to convert the unit of analysis.
25 WB: Classification of Fragile and Conflict-Affected Situations.
27 UN List of SIDS: List of SIDS.
28 UN List of LDCs: List of LDCs.
29 WBG regions are Africa West, Africa East, East Asia & Pacific, Europe & Central Asia, Latin America & the Caribbean, Middle East & North Africa, and South Asia.
30 WB Data: WB Country and Lending Groups.
documents such as ISRs or ICRs are carefully examined, and task teams contacted to conduct any required corrections. Sample quality control checks and peer reviews are conducted on individual project values and calculations done at the portfolio level to confirm the accuracy of reported figures.
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