



FOOD SECURITY AND NUTRITION

 OVERVIEW OF FINDINGS



PROGRAM

The Overview of Findings (OoF) provides guidance on how to determine the level of performance of each key area. This allows the government or partners to assign a level—latent, emergent, moderate and advanced or full implementation—on the four-point scale, that may or may not be used to support the process (see Module 5—Implementation Guidelines).

Once the information and data collection are finalized, they will represent the basis for the completion of the Performance Journal (PJ). The PJ is a tool that helps to prioritize the areas of the social assistance programme that need strengthening. The PJ is complemented by the OoF.

Table 1 Overview of Findings (OoF)

Latent	Emerging	Moderate	Advanced
As defined in CODI			
Attention is needed to include FSN	Elements are present in the design; however, they are not yet reflected in practice	Programme design/ implementation is satisfactory, but the performance is in need of strengthening	Programme design/ implementation is highly satisfactory with broad-based success in implementation and results
General definition for the FSN tool			
There is a lack of or some awareness/ knowledge of concepts. No FSN outcomes are achieved.	FSN considerations are integrated in the design. There is a degree of institutionalization (e.g. laws exist). No FSN outcomes are observed.	FSN considerations are institutionalized and implemented with initial results.	FSN considerations are institutionalized and enforced with observable outcomes.
A. FSN objectives			
There is a lack of consideration for FSN objectives within the programme. FSN objectives might be mentioned but not as a specific output of the programme.	Design documents incorporate FSN, at least partially. Piloting exercises might be underway.	Programme design and implementation arrangements directly address FSN objectives. Some limitations to fully achieving the targets remain. ¹	The programme is designed with specific FSN objectives. The operations/ budget/ implementation/M&E of the programme reflect these goals. The outcomes show full achievement.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was an analysis of the FSN situation conducted for the design of the programme? • Are FSN objectives clearly stated in the design of the programme? • Does the programme have specific FSN indicators? 			
None of the sub-criteria are met.	At least the implementation of one sub-criterion is under planning.	At least one sub-criterion is implemented and the remaining criteria are under planning.	All three sub-criteria are fully implemented.

Latent	Emerging	Moderate	Advanced
B. Inclusiveness			
<p>No direct targeting or consideration is given to the food insecure and nutritionally vulnerable.</p> <p>Coverage of the food insecure and nutritionally vulnerable is low.</p>	<p>The design includes targeting the food insecure and nutritionally vulnerable groups through diverse modalities.</p> <p>However, the targeting is not yet effective.</p> <p>The design includes mechanisms to enable programmes to access the most vulnerable.</p> <p>Piloting may be underway with FSN-sensitive targeting.</p>	<p>The programme includes targeting the food insecure and vulnerable, but with challenges.</p> <p>Coverage is still limited.</p> <p>Efforts are being made to be more inclusive of the food insecure and nutritionally vulnerable.</p>	<p>The food insecure and nutritionally vulnerable are intentionally targeted and reached.</p> <p>Specific challenges of this target group are integrated into both programme design and implementation.</p> <p>M&E includes the baseline for targeting food insecure/ nutritionally vulnerable participants and measures over time.</p> <p>Outcomes show progress in reaching the malnourished.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the nutritionally vulnerable and food insecure families prioritized in the targeting and eligibility mechanisms? • Is there specific consideration for the needs of first 1 000 days between conception and the child's second year, and pregnant and lactating women? • Are the constraints and needs of the nutritionally vulnerable and food insecure taken into account in the targeting and eligibility key area? • Are the specific constraints faced by women being considered? 			
None of the sub-criteria are met.	At least the implementation of one sub-criterion is under planning.	At least two sub-criteria are implemented and the remaining criteria are under planning.	All four sub-criteria are fully implemented.
C. Adequacy			
<p>Programme benefits, duration and timing do not reflect the FSN necessities of those most in need.²</p>	<p>Benefits, duration and timing are taken into account in the design of the programme to meet the needs of the most vulnerable.</p> <p>Some efforts are underway to align the benefits, duration, and timing of those most in need, but are not yet fully implemented.</p>	<p>The design of the programme includes benefits, duration and timing, adequately addressing FSN needs.</p> <p>In practice, benefit levels broadly meet the requirements of the most nutritionally vulnerable, but benefits are often irregular and do not always reflect the duration required.</p>	<p>Benefits are sufficient to meet FSN needs, are predictable and regular, and reflect the timing (seasonality) and the duration required by the most vulnerable.</p> <p>Positive programme impacts on FSN outcomes are observed.</p>

Latent	Emerging	Moderate	Advanced
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the benefit design adequate for good nutrition and food security at family level and at individual level? Please assess for each: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – level; – regularity; – duration; and – timing. • Does the delivery of the programme consider FSN constraints and needs, with particular attention to women’s needs and empowerment? • Does the programme integrate well-designed nutrition education and/or BCC? 			
None of the sub-criteria are met.	At least the implementation of one sub-criterion is under planning.	At least one sub-criterion is implemented and the remaining criteria are under planning.	All three sub-criteria are fully implemented.
D. Responsiveness			
<p>There is no recognition to address responsiveness to changes and shocks.</p> <p>There is no link to early warning, disaster risk reduction systems or humanitarian interventions.</p> <p>The M&E system lacks FSN indicators or FSN tracking.</p>	<p>FSN responsiveness during shocks or transitions has been integrated into the design.</p> <p>However, resources and mechanisms are not yet in place.</p> <p>The programme is not yet able to respond effectively to shocks.</p> <p>The M&E system is not yet effective to inform adjustments to respond to changes in the FSN context.</p>	<p>The issue of FSN during shocks or transitions has been integrated into the design.</p> <p>In the implementation there are still bottlenecks that do not allow for adequate response times, funds available, etc.</p>	<p>The programme includes flexibility, incorporating features for timely responses to shocks and stresses.</p> <p>The M&E system includes FSN indicators enabling for results to be fed back into operations.</p> <p>Impacts are observed through improved coping mechanisms, resilience and expanded coverage, as needed.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a M&E system designed to capture adjustments due to changes, shocks or other socioeconomic, demographic, natural or political developments, or results that might impact FSN outcomes? • Is the programme flexible to scale up, adapt and evolve according to • adjustments due to changes, shocks or other socioeconomic, demographic, natural or political developments, or results from M&E processes? 			
None of the sub-criteria are met.	At least the implementation of one sub-criterion is under planning.	At least one sub-criterion is implemented and the remaining criteria are under planning.	All two sub-criteria are fully implemented.

Latent	Emerging	Moderate	Advanced
E. Coherence, integration and governance			
<p>Policy frameworks for FSN and social protection incorporate no cross-sectoral reference.³</p> <p>No institutional mechanisms and coordination exist for and between FSN and social protection.</p> <p>There is no capacity within the programme to address FSN issues.</p> <p>No explicit linkages or coordination are in place to support FSN in the programme.</p>	<p>FSN-social protection policies exist with linkages.</p> <p>Cross-sectoral institutional bodies are being established and are initiating work.</p> <p>Information systems are being created to reflect FSN-social protection linkage.</p> <p>The capacity to effectively operationalize the structure is limited.</p> <p>Training has not yet been provided for programme staff on FSN issues.</p>	<p>Social protection programmes implemented cross-sectoral linkages. In practice, strengthening of the coherence is required.⁴</p> <p>The design of the programme has articulated roles and responsibilities, coordination mechanisms and the capacity needed for multisectoral approach.</p> <p>However, from a practical point of view, understanding and participation in the coordination of the bodies are limited.</p>	<p>FSN-social protection policies exist with explicit cross-sectoral reference.</p> <p>Multi-sectoral institutional bodies are operating effectively.</p> <p>Programmes are implemented with full cross-sectoral linkages.</p> <p>Accordingly, information systems reflect the cross-sectoral dimensions of the programme.</p> <p>Outcomes indicate benefits of the FSN-social protection linkages.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the programme actively promote access to good quality complementary services as sanitation, health, nutrition, education, agriculture, labour market and insurance programmes? • Are there operational modalities in place to ensure functional intersectoral linkages? • Are there mechanisms in place that allow for the sharing of information systems among programmes? • Is there a multi-stakeholder governance mechanism to promote coordination/cooperation facilitating social protection and FSN linkages among programmes and interventions, at national and decentralized levels? • Are the roles and responsibilities defined for both the social protection, and FSN bodies and actors involved in the programme? • Is there a social protection strategy/policy with explicit FSN objectives? • Is there a FSN strategy/policy that includes social protection as a pathway to FSN? 			
None of the sub-criteria are met.	At least the implementation of three sub-criteria is under planning.	At least three sub-criteria are implemented and the remaining criteria are under planning.	All six sub-criteria are fully implemented.

Latent	Emerging	Moderate	Advanced
F. Sustainability			
The sustainability of FSN is not reflected in the design.	Sustainability is recognized and concrete measures are included in the programme. However, the promoted practices are limited and national commitment is uncertain.	Sustainability is incorporated in the design and implementation. However, the environmental, social, economic, and financial attributes of sustainability are not implemented with equal results.	The programme includes explicit measures to address all four dimensions of sustainability. Evaluations show continued good practice. There is national commitment to continue resource allocation.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental sustainability: are sustainable natural resources management approaches considered to promote FSN? • Social sustainability: are there incentives for households/communities to develop practices/structures that promote social cohesion for FSN in the long run? • Economic sustainability: does the programme adequately address its contribution to build the resilience of households and strengthen the local economy? • Financial sustainability: is there adequate financial support for the sustainability of programme objectives, and intended coverage? 			
None of the sub-criteria are met.	At least the implementation of two sub-criteria is under planning.	At least two sub-criteria are implemented and the remaining criteria are under planning.	All four sub-criteria are fully implemented.
G. Rights and dignity			
Rights and dignity considerations are absent in the programme. Entitlements are absent from national legal or strategic policies and frameworks.	The design of the programme includes principles of rights concerning FSN with some degree of programme operational features. There is minimal implementation of a rights-based approach (e.g. awareness, grievance mechanisms).	The design of the programme comprises a rights-based approach and the implementation of this is ongoing (e.g. public communication for awareness of the programme), notably among the food insecure and nutritionally vulnerable. A complaint and appeal/recourse mechanism that is accessible, responsive, transparent and fair is marginally communicated and underused.	Rights-based approaches to FSN and social protection are prescribed by law and policies, and integrated explicitly into the programme. The design and implementation of the programme ensure that rights and responsibilities of all parties are known and protected, and effective grievance mechanisms are in place. Complaints have been fed back into operations.

Latent	Emerging	Moderate	Advanced
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there commitment for the progressive realization of the right to food (e.g. legal, national policy/strategies, other) in the country, including social protection as a mechanism for that realization? • Are the entitlements of social assistance programmes prescribed by law and embedded in national policy and strategic frameworks (e.g. benefits, eligibility and levels of assistance)? • Are there mechanisms for appeals/recourse and complaints, that are accessible, responsive, transparent and fair? • Do the design and implementation of the programme overall ensure the respect for the right and dignity of the recipients, in particular as regards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • non-discrimination; • gender-equality; and • responsiveness to special needs? 			
None of the sub-criteria are met.	At least the implementation of two sub-criteria is under planning.	At least two sub-criteria are implemented and the remaining criteria are under planning.	All four sub-criteria are fully implemented.

Note: This OoF is an indicative instrument to guide the pre-filling of the PJ. The matrix cells describe what needs to be considered for each key area to reach a certain performance level. Each level considers the extent to which FSN has been taken into account within the design and implementation.

¹For example, when and if benefit levels are determined without linkages to FSN issues.

²For example, the benefits might be too reduced to ensure an adequate diet for the whole family or the timing might not respect the seasonal requirements for agricultural labour force.

³Such as references to WASH, health services, nutrition education and promotion, agricultural extension and credit–livelihood support, labour market programmes, etc.

⁴Such as a coordinated distribution of benefits and the possibility for beneficiaries to access multiple services.

Table 2 Performance Journal (PJ)

Key area	Status ¹	Arguments/ explanation provided by participants	Ways forward
A. FSN objectives and indicators			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was an analysis of the FSN situation conducted for the design of the programme? • Are FSN objectives clearly stated in the design of the programme? • Does the programme have specific FSN indicators? 			
B. Inclusiveness			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the nutritionally vulnerable and food insecure families prioritized in the targeting and eligibility mechanisms? • Is there specific consideration of the needs of the first 1 000 days between conception and a child's second year, and pregnant and lactating women? • Are the constraints and needs of the food and nutritionally insecure taken into account in the targeting and eligibility key area? • Are the specific constraints faced by women being considered? 			
C. Adequacy			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the benefit design adequate for good nutrition and FSN at family level and at individual level? Please assess for each level: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – regularity; – duration; and – timing. • Does the delivery of the programme consider FSN constraints and needs, with particular attention to women's needs and empowerment? • Does the programme integrate well-designed nutrition education and/or BCC? 			

Key area	Status ¹	Arguments/ explanation provided by participants	Ways forward
D. Responsiveness			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there a M&E system designed to capture alterations due to changes, shocks or other socioeconomic, demographic, natural or political developments or results that might impact the FSN outcomes? • Is the programme flexible to scale up, adapt and evolve according to adjustments due to changes, shocks or other socioeconomic, demographic, natural or political developments or results from M&E processes? 			
E. Coherence, integration and governance			
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does the programme actively promote access to good quality complementary services as sanitation, health, nutrition, education, agriculture, labour market and insurance programmes? • Are there operational modalities in place to ensure functional intersectoral linkages? • Are there mechanisms in place that allow for the sharing of information systems among programmes? • Is there a multi-stakeholder governance mechanism to promote coordination/ cooperation facilitating social protection and FSN linkages among programmes and interventions—at national and decentralized levels? • Are the roles and responsibilities defined for both the social protection, and FSN bodies and actors involved with the programme? • Is there a social protection strategy/policy with explicit FSN objectives? Is there a FSN strategy/policy that includes social protection as a pathway to FSN? 			

Key area	Status ¹	Arguments/ explanation provided by participants	Ways forward
<p>F. Sustainability</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Environmental sustainability: are sustainable natural resources management approaches considered to promote FSN? • Social sustainability: are there incentives for households/communities to develop practices/structures that promote social cohesion for FSN in the long run? • Economic sustainability: does the programme adequately address its contribution to building the resilience of households and strengthening the local economy? • Financial Sustainability: is there adequate financial support for the sustainability of programme objectives, and intended coverage? 			
<p>G. Rights and dignity</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is there commitment for the progressive realization of the right to food (comprising legal, national policy/strategies, other) in the country, including social protection as a mechanism for that realization? • Are the entitlements of social assistance programmes prescribed by law and embedded in national policy and strategic frameworks (including benefits, eligibility and levels of assistance)? • Are there mechanisms for appeals/recourse and complaints, that are accessible, responsive, transparent and fair? • Do the design and implementation of the programme overall ensure respect for the rights and dignity of recipients, in particular as regards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – non-discrimination; – gender-equality; and – responsiveness to special needs? 			

¹Please refer to the OoF to determine the level of progress of each key area.

