

Gender & CRF Indicators

General information and guidance about the WFP Corporate Results Framework:

[CRF \(Executive Board approved\) document](#)
[CRF Indicator Compendium](#)
[CRF Logframe Business Rules](#)

WHAT

In the Corporate Results Framework (CRF), there are two gender-specific requirements:

- (i) disaggregate person-related data by sex and age (Strategic Results 1-4)
- (ii) report against the indicators that measure the cross-cutting result “C.3 Improved gender equality and women’s empowerment among WFP-assisted population” (as applicable to a Country Offices strategic plan)

The corporate age group categories are:

0-23 months	6-11 years	18-59 years
24-59 months	12-17 years	60+ years

See the [Gender Analysis](#), [Monitoring](#) and [Reporting](#) sections of the Gender Toolkit for information as to the importance and use of sex- and age-disaggregated data and gender equality indicators.

HOW

This section highlights the data disaggregation and gender elements of the CRF Outcome Indicators; and provides guidance on their interpretation.

Note: Households recorded as being headed by a woman may be single-headed households, while households recorded as being headed by a man may consist of two or more adults (e.g. father, mother, grandparents, aunt). When analysing and reporting household data it is thus important to be clear as to what types of households are being described and compared. This is because the needs, resources, priorities, vulnerabilities and coping strategies of households will probably be different if there is more than one adult generating income and/or undertaking the household domestic and caring work.

WFP Strategic Outcomes 1 to 4

Strategic Result 1: Everyone has access to food

Strategic Outcome 1.1 Maintained/enhanced individual and household access to adequate food

1.1.1: Food Consumption Score (FCS), disaggregated by sex of household head

Disaggregation: Disaggregate the household FCS by the sex of the household head.

Analysis: Compare the FCSs of the different household types; such as those headed by a woman and those by a man, and single and multi-adult households. Make sure to compare single-headed households with single-

WFP Gender Office
Gender & CRF Indicators

headed households; and, similarly, households with multiple adults with households with multiple adults.

Interpretation: With reference to additional (including qualitative) information, explain any difference in consumption between households headed by a woman and households headed by a man; noting variation by single and multi-adult households. If there are two adults in the household, there might be more assets available or there might be more strategies to revert to, than in a single headed household. This indicator can also show if there are any differences between types of households in terms of types of food consumed; such as mostly cereals or little protein-rich food. If you compare women-headed households with men-headed households, and you do not know if you are referring to single or multiple adult households, make this limitation to the validity of the comparison clear.

Limitations: As this indicator is disaggregated at the household level, it does not provide information about the food consumption of individual women, men, girls and/or boys within a household.

1.1.2: Coping
Strategy Index
(food)

Disaggregation: Disaggregate the food CSI (level of stress a household is facing when exposed to food shortage) by the sex of the household head.

Analysis: Compare the food-based coping strategies of households headed by a woman and households headed by a man. Make sure to compare single-headed households with single-headed households; and, similarly, households with multiple adults with households with multiple adults.

Interpretation: In the CSI, a higher score indicates a higher level of stress. Compare the CSI scores of different types of households. Explore the reasons for any differences in CSI scores. If CSI scores do not decrease after a food assistance intervention, the reasons why should be investigated; noting any similarities and/or differences by type of household. If you compare women-headed households with men-headed households, and you do not know if you are referring to single or multiple adult households, make this limitation to the validity of the comparison clear.

Limitations: As this indicator is disaggregated at the household level, it does not provide information about the coping strategies that might be adopted by the different members of a household; for example, women may restrict consumption of nutritious food in favour of their children when food is scarce.

1.1.2 Coping
Strategy Index
(Livelihoods)

Disaggregation: Disaggregate the livelihood CSI by the sex of the household head.

Analysis: Compare the livelihood-based coping strategies of different household heads; single woman, single man, woman in a household of multiple adults, man in a household of multiple adults etc. Make sure to compare single-headed households with single-headed households; and, similarly, multiple-adult households with multiple-adult households. If you compare women-headed households with men-headed, and you do not know if you are referring to single or multiple adult households, make this limitation to the validity of the comparison clear.

Interpretation: Drawing upon other data (including qualitative information), explore reasons for differences in livelihood CSI groups (neutral/none, stress, crisis, emergency).

WFP Gender Office
Gender & CRF Indicators

If a particular household type (e.g. single man-headed) is overly represented in a particular CSI group (e.g. crisis), possible reasons should be identified (such as through qualitative research) and food assistance tailored accordingly.

Related to discrimination in ownership of assets, like land, or cultural restrictions on their movements, women-headed households might have recourse to fewer coping strategies than men-headed households.

Limitations: As this indicator is disaggregated at the household level, it does not provide information about the coping strategies of the individual members of the household. For example, boys may beg for assistance in public spaces (road, market etc.), while men may borrow money.

1.1.3: Food expenditure share (FES)

Disaggregation: Disaggregate the FES by the sex of the household head.

Analysis: Compare the FES by types of households. Make sure to compare single-headed households with single-headed households; and, similarly, households with multiple adults with households with multiple adults. For example, compare the average food expenditure share for women-headed households with that of men-headed household.

Interpretation: This indicator measures the proportion of a household's available budget (estimated through an expenditure module) that is spent on food. Differences in the FES by household type should be investigated (such as through qualitative research) and explained, with WFP assistance tailored accordingly.

Limitations: As this indicator is disaggregated at the household level, it does not provide information as to expenditures by individuals within households; and thus the existence of intra-household inequalities. Additionally, identifying reasons for any indicated differences in FES by type of household requires the collection and analysis of qualitative information.

1.1.4: Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced asset base

Disaggregation: Disaggregate the reporting population by sex (female/male) and age group (12-17, 18-59, 60+ years).

Analysis: Identify differences and similarities in the reporting of benefits by women, men, girls and boys. Quantitative data should be complemented and contextualized by qualitative information obtained from the beneficiaries themselves, as well as from the community planning team and direct observations.

Interpretation: Differences in reported benefits by sex and/or age group, should be analysed in relation to the planned direct beneficiaries. Where the planned beneficiaries were equally women and men aged 18 to 59 years, women and men from that age group should equally report benefits. If, however, the planned direct beneficiaries were young women, young women should be reporting benefits more than another population group within the targeted community.

Limitations: What is understood as a 'benefit' is subjective; limiting valid comparisons of the types of benefits reported by different population groups. Also, if an intervention targeted a particular population group (e.g. young women), other members of the community may report not-benefitting (where their self-reports are not-applicable and may skew the data).

1.1.5: Minimum Dietary Diversity

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by age group (12-17 & 18-59 years).

WFP Gender Office
Gender & CRF Indicators

for Women of reproductive age (MDD-W)

Analysis: Calculate the percentage of women aged 12-17 and 18-59 years in a specific population or target group who reached minimum diet diversity. Minimum diet diversity is defined as consumption of five or more food groups out of ten in the last 24 hours.

Interpretation: MDD-W indicates the likelihood of micronutrient adequacy for (girls and) women of reproductive age. Women with minimum diet diversity are more likely to have higher micronutrient intakes than women who do not achieve minimum dietary diversity. Where the percentage of women achieving minimum dietary diversity is low, direct (e.g. access to variety of food) and indirect (e.g. gender inequalities) reasons should be explored.

If only a small percentage of women show a minimum diversity score, it might be a sign of unequal (intra-household or other) allocation of food and/or access to resources that enable purchase of food. WFP programmes should be adjusted to ensure that assistance equitably benefits all members of targeted households.

Limitations: MDD-W is not an indicator of an individual's nutritional status, particularly with respect to micro-nutrients. Accordingly, this indicator should not be used for screening or targeting women.

1.1.7: Proportion of children 6–23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by the sex and by age category (6-11 months, 12-17 months, 18-23 months)

Analysis: Compare (a) the proportion of girls and boys, by age group, who receive a minimum acceptable diet; (b) the proportion of girls and boys, by age group, who do not receive a minimum acceptable diet; (c) the proportion of girls who receive a minimum acceptable diet, with the girls who do not; and (d) the proportion of boys who receive a minimum acceptable diet with those who do not.

Interpretation: Any differences in receipt of acceptable diet, by sex and age group, should be reported; along with the known and suspected reasons. MAD can indicate if targeted assistance – such as supplementary food or education of caregivers – is needed for girls and/or boys of particular ages.

Limitations: Being quantitative, this indicator does not reveal the (direct and indirect) reasons for the existence or lack of MAD in infants. Qualitative information should be used to interpret the figures.

Strategic Result 2: No-one suffers from malnutrition

Strategic Outcome 2.1: Improved consumption of high-quality, nutrient-dense foods among targeted individuals.

2.1.1: Proportion of eligible population that participates in programme (coverage)

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by sex and age group of eligible persons.

Analysis: Compare the proportion of participants who are women, men, girls and/or boys; relative to the purpose of the programme. For example, if the programme targets women (18-59 years), then women (aged 18-59 years) should be the participants. If, however, a programme targets women and men in equal numbers, then equal numbers of women and men should be participants.

Interpretation: As applicable to the programme purpose, differences in coverage by sex and age should be reported; and the (direct and indirect) reasons identified. In some societies, girls and boys might not equally participate in a MAM treatment programme because, for example, their caregivers might not be able to take them to the distribution sites for reasons related to gender inequality and/or protection concerns. This may be the case where the mobility of women is restricted; the times of distribution are incompatible with household responsibilities, or the travel to a distribution site is unsafe.

Limitations: Quantitative data indicate similarities and differences in who the beneficiaries / participants are in terms of numbers; but not the reasons for the similarities and differences. Qualitative information should be obtained to understand the reasons for differences in coverage; by sex, age and other factors, such as disability.

2.1.2: Proportion of target population that participates in an adequate number of distributions (adherence)

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by sex and age group.

Analysis: Compare the proportion of women, men, girls and/or boys who participated in an adequate number of distributions; relative to the planned target population. For example, if the programme targets girls aged 3 to 5 years, then girls aged 3 to 5 years should be the participants. If, however, a programme targets girls and boys (aged 3 to 5 years) in equal numbers, then equal numbers of girls and boys (aged 3 to 5 years) should be participants.

Interpretation: As applicable to the target population, differences in coverage by sex and age of distribution participants should be reported; and the (direct and indirect) reasons identified. In some societies, girls and boys might not equally participate in a MAM treatment programme because, for example, their caregivers might not be able to take them to the distribution sites for reasons related to gender inequality and/or protection concerns. This may be the case where the mobility of women is restricted; the times of distribution are incompatible with household responsibilities, or the travel to a distribution site is unsafe.

Limitations: Quantitative data indicate similarities and differences in who the beneficiaries / participants are in terms of numbers; but not the reasons for the similarities and differences. Qualitative information should be obtained to understand the reasons for differences in coverage; by sex, age and other factors, such as disability.

2.1.3: MAD

See Outcome Indicator 1.1.7

2.1.4: Moderate acute malnutrition (MAM) treatment

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by sex and age.

WFP Gender Office
Gender & CRF Indicators

performance:
recovery,
mortality, default
and non-response
rate

Analysis: Compare the treatment performance rate of beneficiaries by sex and age group; separately for recovery, mortality, default and non-response.

Interpretation: As applicable to the beneficiary population, differences in coverage by sex and age should be reported; and the (direct and indirect) reasons identified. In some societies, girls and boys might not equally participate in a MAM treatment programme because, for example, their caregivers might not be able to take them to the distribution sites for reasons related to gender inequality and/or protection concerns. This may be the case where the mobility of women is restricted; the times of distribution are incompatible with household responsibilities, or the travel to a distribution site is unsafe.

Limitations: Quantitative data indicate similarities and differences in who the beneficiaries / participants are in terms of numbers; but not the reasons for the similarities and differences. Qualitative information should be obtained to understand the reasons for differences in coverage; by sex, age and other factors, such as disability.

2.1.5: MDD-W

See outcome indicator 1.1.5

Strategic Result 3: Smallholders have improved food security and nutrition through improved productivity and incomes

Strategic Outcome 3.1: Increased smallholder production and sales

3.1.1: Percentage
of male/female
smallholder
farmers selling
through WFP-
supported farmer
aggregation
systems

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by sex of smallholder farmer (and age group, if coverage is of persons 18-59 years and 60+ years).

Analysis: Compare the percentage of women smallholder farmers with the percentage of men smallholder farmers, selling through WFP-support systems. For example, of the total smallholder farmers, 60 percent are men and 40 percent are women.

Interpretation: Relative to the target beneficiaries (which may not be equally women and men), differences in the percentage of women and that of men selling through WFP-supported systems should be reported and the (direct and indirect) reasons described. Gender inequalities – such as in land ownership, access to financial and extension services, domestic responsibilities, social norms about leadership – should be explored as possible reasons for differences between women and men smallholder farmers.

Limitations: The indicator provides numerical information about smallholder farmers only; not other categories / scales of farmers who may be benefiting from WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems. Further data collection and analysis – such as relating to size of landholding, status of membership in a cooperative, commodities being sold etc., by sex – would yield a deeper understanding of the factors related to farmer aggregation systems and livelihoods, for women and men.

3.1.3: Value and
volume of pro-
smallholder sales
through WFP-
supported
aggregation
systems

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by sex of smallholder farmer (and age group, if coverage is of persons 18-59 years and 60+ years) – individual farmers or cooperatives (as applicable).

Analysis: Compare the value and volume of sales of women smallholder farmers with those of men smallholder farmers.

WFP Gender Office
Gender & CRF Indicators

	<p>Interpretation: Differences in the value and/or volume of sales by women smallholder farmers, relative to men smallholder farmers, should be reported and the (direct and indirect) reasons described. Gender inequalities – such as in access to resources and extension services that influence commodity type and productivity – should be explored, as possible reasons for any differences identified in the value and/or volume of sales by women and men smallholders.</p> <p>Limitations: The indicator does not provide information as to the reasons for differences between women and men smallholder farmers in the value or volume of sales. Neither does the indicator provide information as to why some smallholder farmers do not sell through (WFP-supported) aggregation systems. Further qualitative information is needed to adequately understand the reasons for differences in value and volume, and means of sale, by women and men.</p>
<p>3.1.4: Percentage of WFP food procured from pro-smallholder farmer aggregation systems, disaggregated by sex of smallholder farmer and type of programmes</p>	<p>Disaggregation: Disaggregate by sex (and age group) of smallholder farmer.</p> <p>Analysis: For a given programme, compare the percentage of food procured from women smallholder farmers with the percentage procured from men smallholder farmers.</p> <p>Interpretation: In relation to the intended beneficiaries, differences in the percentage of food procured from women smallholder farmers with that procured from men smallholder farmers should be reported and explained. Gender inequalities – such as in ownership of land, membership of aggregation systems and access to information and technologies – should be explored, as possible reasons for any differences identified in the procurement of food from women and men smallholders.</p> <p>Limitations: The indicator does not provide information as to the reasons for any differences in the procurement of food from women smallholder farmers and men smallholder farmers; necessitating collection of additional information from the diversity of stakeholders so as to strengthen existing, and inform new, programmes.</p>
<p>3.1.5: FCS</p>	<p>See Outcome Indicator 1.1.1</p>
<p>3.1.6: CSI</p>	<p>See Outcome Indicator 1.1.2</p>
<p>3.1.7: FES</p>	<p>See Outcome Indicator 1.1.3</p>
<p>3.1.8: ABI</p>	<p>See Outcome Indicator 1.1.4</p>
<p>3.1.9: Percentage of targeted smallholder farmers reporting increased production of nutritious crops, disaggregated by sex of smallholder farmer</p>	<p>Disaggregation: Disaggregate by sex (and age group) of smallholder farmer.</p> <p>Analysis: Compare the production increases (or not) of nutritious crops of women smallholder farmers with those of men smallholder farmers.</p> <p>Interpretation: Differences in the production of nutritious crops by women smallholder farmers, relative to men smallholder farmers, should be reported and the (direct and indirect) reasons described. Gender inequalities – such as in access to resources (like land), extension services and market information that influence productivity – should be explored, as possible reasons for any differences in the production by women and men smallholders.</p> <p>Limitations: The indicator does not provide information as to the reasons for differences between women and men smallholder farmers in the production of</p>

WFP Gender Office
Gender & CRF Indicators

	nutritious crops. Further quantitative and qualitative information is needed to adequately understand the reasons for gender-related differences.
3.1.10: MDD – W	See Outcome Indicator 1.1.5
3.1.11: MAD	See Outcome Indicator 1.1.7
3.1.12: FCS – N	See Outcome Indicator 1.1.1

Strategic Result 4: Food systems are sustainable

Strategic Outcome 4.1: Improved household adaptation and resilience to climate and other shocks

4.1.1: FCS	See Outcome Indicator 1.1.1
4.1.2: CSI	See Outcome Indicator 1.1.2
4.1.3: FES	See Outcome Indicator 1.1.3
4.1.4: ABI	See Outcome Indicator 1.1.4
4.1.7: FCS – N	See Outcome Indicator 1.1.1
4.1.8: MAD	See Outcome Indicator 1.1.7

WFP Cross-cutting Results: Gender Equality & Protection

Cross-cutting Result C.1: Affected populations are able to hold WFP and partners accountable for meeting their hunger needs in a manner that reflects their views and preferences

Indicator C.1.1: Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme (who is included, what people will receive, length of assistance)	Disaggregation: Disaggregate by sex and age group of “assisted people”.
	Analysis: Compare the proportions (%) of females and males, by age group (12-17, 18-59, 60+ years), informed about the programme.
	Interpretation: Differences in the proportions of assisted females and males, by age group, informed about the programme should be reported and the (direct and indirect) reasons described. Gender inequalities – such as in access to ICT, distribution of unpaid care and domestic work, and decision-making authority – should be explored, as possible reasons for any indicated differences.
	Limitations: The indicator does not provide information as to the reasons for differences between women, men, girls and boys. Further quantitative and qualitative information is needed to adequately understand the reasons for gender-related differences in receipt of information; while also noting type and understanding of information received.

Cross-cutting Result C.2: Affected populations are able to benefit from WFP programmes in a manner that ensures and promotes their safety, dignity and integrity

Indicator C.2.1:
Proportion of
targeted people
accessing
assistance without
protection
challenges

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by sex and age group of “targeted people”.

Analysis: Compare the proportions (%) of targeted females and males, by age group (6-11, 12-17, 18-59, 60+ years), who accessed assistance without protection challenges.

Interpretation: Differences in the proportions of targeted females and males, by age group, who access assistance without protection challenges should be reported and the (direct and indirect) reasons described. Gender inequalities – such as in access to ICT, distribution of unpaid care and domestic work, and leadership – should be explored, as possible reasons for any indicated differences.

Limitations: The indicator does not provide information as to the reasons for differences between women, men, girls and boys accessing assistance without protection challenges; or the protection challenges that women, men, girls and/or boys may encounter when accessing assistance. Further quantitative and qualitative information is needed to adequately understand the reasons for gender-related differences in accessing assistance without protection challenges; as well as, for example, the nature, frequency and responses to protection challenges by women, men, girls and/or boys.

Cross-cutting Result C.3: Improved gender equality and women’s empowerment among WFP-assisted population

Indicator C.3.1:
Proportion of
households where
women, men, or
both women and
men make
decisions on the
use of
food/cash/vouch
ers,
disaggregated by
transfer modality

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by:

- decision-maker – woman, man, woman and man (i.e. joint decision making)
- transfer type – food, cash, voucher; and
- household type – single-headed households, households with several adults who are all female or all male, households with several adults who are both female and male.

Recording household type is required so as to remove single-headed households, households with only one adult and households where adults are all of one sex from the calculations.

Analysis: Compare the proportion of households where (i) women, (ii) men, and (iii) women and men jointly make decisions on the use of food; of cash; and of vouchers. Gender inequalities – such as in decision-making authority, access to financial services and distribution of domestic responsibilities – should be explored as possible reasons for any indicated differences.

All C.3.1-related analyses should be of comparisons of households with multiple adults, who are both women and men. Where the adults in a household are all women, or all men, measuring the sharing of decision-making by women and men is not valid.

Interpretation: Decision-making on the use of household resources – food, cash, vouchers – is an indicator of the:

- a) power than women and men exercise within their households;

WFP Gender Office
Gender & CRF Indicators

- b) extent to which women and men in a household are able to make decisions that impact upon their lives and the lives of other persons; and
- c) prospects of the particular food security and nutrition needs, interests and priorities of women and men, within a household, being addressed.

Interpretation of Indicator C.3.1 data should be made taking into consideration other quantitative data and qualitative information, related to household functioning and gender roles, relations and responsibilities; including examples of household decision-making processes and outcomes. Interpretation should also consider the views and opinions of the beneficiary women and men as to what they consider as being beneficial and empowering in terms of intra-household decision-making.

Longitudinal data that indicate increasingly shared decision-making by women and men, in a household, on the use of a particular transfer (food, cash, voucher) should be interpreted positively. Conversely, data that indicate a reduction in the proportion of households where women and men both make decisions about the use of the transfer may be interpreted as reflective of increasing inequality (at the household level).

Limitations: As this indicator applies to households with women and men, it does not provide information on decision-making on the use of transfers in (i) other familial / relational structures; and (ii) households where the decision-makers are legal minors (less than 18 years of age). This indicator also does not provide information as to the nature of the power dynamics between the different adults within a household; where adults may differ in age, disability, literacy, sexuality etc. Collection and analysis of qualitative information is needed to understand the reasons for any gender-related differences (and so inform and strengthen programming).

Disaggregation: Disaggregate decision-making entity members by sex and age group (18-59 and 60+ years at a minimum); and, as possible, disaggregate by disability.

Analysis: Compare the proportion of decision-making entity members who are women, with those who are men; while also noting differences or similarities by age (and disability). Gender inequalities – such as in the distribution of domestic responsibilities and mobility – should be explored as possible reasons for any indicated differences.

Interpretation: The proportional representation of women and men in decision-making entities indicates the respective: (i) value attributed to women and men and the contributions they can, and should be able to, make; (ii) opportunities that women and men have to make decisions that impact upon their lives and the lives of other persons; and (iii) prospects of the particular food security and nutrition needs, interests and priorities of women and men being identified and addressed. Equitable representation should not be misinterpreted as the existence of equality.

Limitations: This indicator provides information as to the presence of women and men, but not their influence, in decision-making entities. As the equal exercise of power is the fundamental indicator of gender equality, it is important that the quantitative data provided by this indicator be complemented by qualitative information about the nature and extent of the influence of women and men, of different ages, in the decision-making entities.

Indicator C.3.2:
Proportion of food assistance decision-making entity – committees, boards, teams, etc. – members who are women

WFP Gender Office
Gender & CRF Indicators

Indicator C.3.3:
Type of transfer
(food, cash,
voucher, no
compensation)
received by
participants in
WFP activities,
disaggregated by
sex and type of
activity

Disaggregation: Disaggregate by:

- a) sex of participant – female, male;
- b) type of transfer – food, cash, voucher, none;
- c) age group, with minimum age disaggregation being 12-17, 18-59, 60+ years;
- d) type of activity – caretaking, counselling, cooking, training, awareness-raising, educating / training, campaigning, monitoring, food processing, gardening, transporting, farming etc.

Analysis: Compare the:

- i) proportion of women to men who receive a transfer – food, cash, voucher or none – for a particular activity;
- ii) types of transfers received by women and those by men (e.g. if men are more likely to receive cash than food), overall (all activities grouped together) and in relation to the types of activities undertaken; and
- iii) types of activities undertaken by women and men (e.g. women are voluntary nutrition counsellors, men are cooks for which they receive a voucher).

Interpretation: Receipt of a transfer, or not, for contributing to the implementation of a WFP activity, as well as the nature of the transfer relative to the type of contribution, is indicative of the value that is attributed to the knowledge, skills and time of women and of men (and girls and boys, for applicable WFP activities); whether they are equally valued (or not) and if they have equal opportunity to participate and be compensated.

Where participants in a particular WFP activity are equally women and men, and receive equivalent transfer, WFP is supporting gender equality and women's empowerment. Where the transfer received by women and men participating in a WFP activity differs in type and/or quantity, information needs to be gathered to determine whether gender discrimination and inequalities are being perpetuated. Where substantially more women than men, or men than women, perform a particular activity, additional data and information are needed to determine if stereotyped and limiting gender roles are being reinforced.

Limitations: This indicator does not apply to WFP interventions that (i) involve unconditional food, cash or voucher transfers; and (ii) do not engage women and men (or girls and boys) from the target/beneficiary community in implementation of an activity. Receipt of a transfer (or not) for a contribution to a WFP initiative does not provide information about an individual's control over the transfer received. Qualitative information should be gathered from women and men to determine the value that they attribute to the (i) transfer received (and views of not receiving a transfer, as applicable); and (ii) nature and extent of their participation in a WFP activity.