SAVING LIVES
CHANGING LIVES

Guidance on Data Quality

Prepared by RAM
October 2020

WFP
World Food Programme

Content

I. Introduction

This document provides guidance on how to ensure WFP monitoring systems produce high quality data that measures the outputs, outcomes, cross-cutting priorities and processes of WFP's programmes worldwide. Country Offices (CO) need accurate data to make the right decisions concerning programme design and implementation, and advocate for more resources to meet beneficiaries' needs. The generation of sound evidence is also crucial for ensuring the credibility of monitoring results, and upholding WFP's reputation and accountability to affected populations, governments, donors, partners and other UN agencies.

High quality data meets the following five dimensions[1]:

1) **Completeness:** The information system captures all that should be measured, including required disaggregation.
2) **Timeliness:** How up-to-date data is at the time of its release. There might be a gap between when the data was collected and when it becomes available.
3) **Reliability:** Data is always collected in the same way based on standard protocols and procedures that do not change according to the user. The data are reliable because they are collected consistently.
4) **Validity:** the degree to which data correctly reflects the real-world object or event being described.
5) **Integrity:** data generated by the information system at all analysis levels is protected from deliberate manipulation or bias for political or personal reasons.

There are two approaches for ensuring high quality data.

- Preventive measures: The first, setting up systems, processes and tools mainly prior to data collection, ensures that quality is an inherent characteristic of the data produced. This is an *ex ante* method for guaranteeing data quality through the design of robust monitoring systems, anticipative action and management of staff resources.

- Detective controls: The second method occurs after data collection and consists of *ex-post* checks on the data generated and reported to identify possible shortcomings in the five dimensions of data quality. These checks are known as 'detective controls' and apply at different stages of data collection, aggregation and reporting.

Both approaches, (1) strengthened systems through 'preventive measures', and (2) verifications on data quality by employing 'detective controls', are needed to ensure data quality.

While 'preventive measures' are system-wide and implemented irrespective of the type of indicators, 'detective controls' are indicator-specific. Indeed, each indicator has a first point of recording, referred

[1] WFP's five principles of personal data protection and privacy (Lawful and Fair Collection and Processing, Specified and Legitimate Purpose, Data Quality, Participation and Accountability and Data Security) should also be mainstreamed in monitoring processes. For further guidance please refer to the WFP Guide to Personal Data Protection.

to as the primary data source, and multiple points of aggregation and reporting across geographic and temporal levels. This sequence of multiple points of aggregation from the first point of recording to final entry in data systems is referred to as a data flow. This data flow varies according to the indicator type and data collection methods; it can also differ depending on the Country or Field Office set up or capacity.

Through indicator sheets, this guidance outlines the data flow and specific points where 'detective controls' should be applied to ensure high quality data for 53 WFP Programme indicators, including 22 mandatory outcome, 18 output, 9 cross-cutting and 4 process indicators. In addition, each indicator sheet clarifies the frequency, operational modalities and responsibilities for each control, with the aim to systematize CO practices for ensuring data quality.

Indicators are grouped on indicator sheets as follows:

- **Outcome indicators** are grouped according to their data flow and CRF Area

- **Output indicators** are grouped according to three criteria:

    1. Modality: *what is being transferred* (i.e. food, goods, cash in hand, digital CBT (cash), paper voucher, digital CBT (voucher), capacity strengthening or service delivery);
    2. Transfer Agent: *who is doing the transfer* (i.e. WFP, Cooperating Partner (CP) or Financial Service Provider (FSP)); and
    3. Transfer System: *what system is used to make the transfer* (i.e. SCOPE, Building Blocks, CP System, SCOPE paper vouchers, FSP system or Not Applicable (N/A)).

Please refer to the table 'Output Indicators by Indicator Sheet' in Section V for a full list of output indicators and which sheets they are found on according to the three criteria mentioned.

The outcome and output indicator sheets should be read in conjunction with WFP's Indicator Compendium, which contains complementary information on each indicator's methodology.

II. Preventive Measures

Preventive measures strengthen monitoring systems, processes and tools to prevent inaccurate, nonsensical or manipulated data from materializing. There are 10 recommended preventive measures to ensure that monitoring systems produce high quality data, and examples below:

1) **Design & Piloting of Data Collection Tools:** Ensure data collection tools are:
    i.) properly designed, including logical question order and inclusion of SMART indicators (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time-bound);
    ii.) piloted to check that questions measure what they intend to, the wording is clear/accurate, and all respondents interpret the questions in the same way; and
    iii.) standardized across Field Offices.

    - *Include and appropriately group mandatory indicators in a 'Post Distribution Monitoring Survey' and place sensitive questions at the end of the interview. Test the questionnaire with beneficiaries to ensure it is the appropriate length and they understand what is meant by the 7 food groups that make up the Food Consumption Score and report accurate consumption. Use the same questionnaire across Field Offices to ensure data standardization.*

2) **Training & Distribution of Guidelines:** Distribution of guidelines and training of enumerators, call center operators, partners and activity managers before, during, and after data collection.

    - *Guidelines for representative respondent sampling are especially important for quantitative data collection, while training on how to collect qualitative data through Key Informant Interviews or Focus Group Discussions ensures the interviewer communicates effectively and asks the right questions.*

3) **Segregation of Duties:** The monitoring and programme implementation functions should be separated in order to avoid any potential conflict of interest. This should particularly be the case between Programme Officers and Field Monitors to ensure that staff members who design programmes, negotiate FLAs with CPs and implement activities are not the same as those who monitor programme implementation and outcomes.

    - *While ensuring the day-to-day management of malnutrition prevention activities, the Nutrition Officer should not also be the one performing the independent monitoring function of these same activities to avoid any bias or potential manipulation of the data.*

4) **Rotation of Enumerators and Field Monitors:** Ensure the rotation of Enumerators and Field Monitors so that it is not always the same staff members visiting the same sites and collecting/verifying the same data.

    - *If rotation of staff is not implemented, enumerators who repeatedly visit the same sites may grow to be less diligent and therefore less likely to observe problems, such as with food storage facilities or cooking equipment.*
    - *Similarly, if Field Monitors continuously monitor the same activities and implementors remain based in one activity site without rotation they may start developing too close relationships with CPs and become less impartial.*

5) **Random Checks on Field Monitor and Enumerator's Performance:** Checking a sample of data and/or questionnaires collected by Enumerators (in SPSS or written format) and site visit reports from Field Monitors to ensure there are no mistakes and that the data/findings are properly recorded. Data could also be checked for consistency between different Enumerators. This should be done by the supervisor or another staff member who did not complete the questionnaire.

    - *For the FCS, compare the average number of consumption days for each food category and the % of food consumption groups (poor, borderline, acceptable) calculated by Enumerators. Results should be comparable provided Enumerators conducted interviews in the same geographical areas and the number of interviews by each one is large enough (>30).*
    - *For Process Monitoring reports from Field Monitors, review and ensure that all questions have been diligently asked and that follow-up actions have been defined and recorded in the Issues Ticketing System.*

6) **Data Cleaning:** Closely examine individual data records to highlight and resolve any errors or inconsistencies. This includes checking the data for missing values, inconsistent data, out-of-range values, spelling mistakes and erroneous categorizations.

    - *Sometimes data values may be impossible or implausible. For example, a variable denoting the 'sex' of a respondent (1=male, 2=female) should take the values of 1 or 2. If a value such as 3 exists, a data entry mistake has occurred. Another out-of-range value might be, for example, 150 for a variable denoting a person's age.*
    - *Check the consistency of spelling and accuracy of naming conventions. Multiple spellings for any one variable will result in multiple variables when there should be only one. For example, spelling a village in two different ways will split the results from that village between two entry records, potentially reducing the appearance of any achievements.*

7) **Data Mining:** Analyse and explore datasets to identify patterns which may indicate potential data quality issues, manipulations or irregularities. These should be followed-up with further investigation on the reasons for such anomalies and corrective measures to address the underlying issues to prevent reoccurrence in the future.

    - *A time-series analysis of number of children receiving school-meals in a particular school may indicate that these numbers are identical each month and bigger than the total number of children enrolled in that same school.*
    - *For CBT programmes, analysis of beneficiary transactions could pinpoint that unusually high numbers of vouchers have been redeemed the same day at the same outlet far away from the targeted populations.*
    - *Transactional analysis may highlight trends (e.g. relatively high rates of beneficiary account inactivity) which would indicate the need to increase the frequency of verifications or adjust approaches to targeting.*

8) **Electronic Data Security:** Verify the use of secure data processing, transfer and storage, including protection of personally identifiable information (PII)[2], to avoid unauthorized tampering of data.

    - *Keep respondent lists confidential and do not share phone numbers – WFP's own databases should be kept under lock and key (when on paper) or in a password-protected encrypted file. When phone numbers are held, they should be converted into an anonymous ID – a randomly generated alphanumeric code that makes it impossible to retrace the original number – before data is shared.*

9) **Digital Audit Trail:** Keep a digital audit trail of step-by-step transformations of data, from data source records to aggregations and final reports.

    - *Systematically name all data files in a way that makes them easy to find, share, group or to distinguish from each other in a logical way, especially when the data is transformed or analysed. Data file naming could be by data collection method, location, date, participant profile or version (if the data is transformed).*
    - *One instance of data transformation that is important to keep track of concerns qualitative data recorded using a device. The recording is uploaded to a computer where it is saved and transcribed. The transcription is analysed and could be transformed into flow charts or narratives before final reporting.*

10) **Inline Validation:** Determine which data entry fields in tablets or web-based data collection tools need to be validated before submission. With the assistance of an IT Officer, apply inline validation (e.g. attribute required, correct value for attribute type, pattern attribute, etc.) to these fields to ensure that whoever is asked to fill it in, will be prompted with an error message to correct a mistake, should it occur, before submitting the data entry form.

    - *For the Food Consumption Score, the answer to the question 'Number of days eaten in past 7 days' for a specific food group should be a number between 0-7. If '0' is the number of days eaten, then the answer to the following question 'How was this food acquired' should automatically be N/A.*

[2] Personally Identifiable Information (PII) or personal data – Personal data is any information relating to an individual that identifies them (a direct identifier) or that can be used to identify them (an indirect identifier).

III. Detective Controls

Detective controls are applied at different points of an indicator's data flow to ensure the quality of data starting from its data source record, through intermediate aggregation levels, all the way up to final reporting. Each indicator has a unique data flow that determines which detective controls are needed.

Examples of Indicator Data Flows

For example, the primary data source for the 'Food Consumption Score' (FCS) (and similar food security and nutrition indicators) is a Post Distribution Monitoring (PDM) survey, whereby a WFP enumerator electronically records data used to calculate the indicator value. Data is then transferred to the WFP CO, where it is aggregated by region and reported on in a PDM Report.

The data flow for the FCS varies from the data flow for the indicator 'Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food' where the primary data source is a list of beneficiaries. In the case of WFP direct distribution, monthly distribution figures are aggregated across distribution sites, sub-office sites and finally country-wide, which is made available in COMET.

The attendance rate, a school feeding indicator, whose primary data source is a single, daily school register, also has a data flow that differs from the above two examples. A CP aggregates school register data by month and then across schools (site level), before reporting the data to WFP, who finally aggregates the data at country level in a quarterly or annual report.

In general, the frequency of detective controls should coincide with data collection/reporting, i.e. if data collection/reporting is quarterly, then controls should be implemented quarterly. Detective controls can also be applied to monitoring data that is collected more frequently, for example daily or weekly, to support programmatic decision making.

Applying the controls to an indicator's entire dataset is not feasible; therefore, each control should focus on a subset or sample of the indicator data. Recognizing there may also be resource constraints, and hence the need for COs to prioritize one control over another, this guidance classifies each control as either 'highly recommended' or 'recommended.' If all controls cannot be applied to a sample of data at the advised frequency, the CO should prioritize the 'Highly Recommended' controls.

Segregation of duties is also essential when determining responsibility for each detective control. The person who originally collected the data and/or calculated the indicator value, for example, should not be the one checking his or her own work, to ensure independence and credibility of the verifications.

There are 7 types of detective controls that could be applied to an indicator data flow:

1) **Documentation Review:** Review availability, completeness and timeliness of indicator data source records and of aggregated reports.

2) **Recounting & Reaggregating:** Recount and reaggregate reported beneficiary numbers, transfer values or other results.

3) **Recomputing Formulas:** Recalculate indicator values to identify possible mathematical mistakes.

4) **Reconciliation & Triangulation:** Compare indicator values with data from another internal system.

5) **Secondary Sources:** Check coherence and consistency of indicator values with other external secondary data sources or reports.

6) **On-Site Visits**: Visit selected sites to verify the actual delivery of transfers, payment instruments and/or existence of infrastructure or assets.

7) **Methodological Compliance**: Verify adherence to indicator definitions and methodologies.

Methodologies and examples of each of these detective controls is presented in the tables below:

1) DOCUMENTATION REVIEW	
Definition	
Review availability, completeness and timeliness of indicator data source records and of aggregated reports.	
Applies to:	☒ Output ☒Outcome ☒Cross-cutting ☒Process data
Ensures data:	☒Completeness ☒Timeliness ☐Reliability ☐Validity ☐Integrity
Method	
1. Determine number of expected indicator data source records and reports for the reporting period. 2. Review availability, completeness and timeliness of all: ○ indicator data source records (i.e. primary data source) for the reporting period; ○ reports at each aggregation level (Site Level, CP Central Office, WFP Field Office, WFP Country Office) for the reporting period. - *Availability:* data source record or report exists. - *Completeness:* data source record or report contains the reported count or value relevant to the indicator and, in the case of activity implementation records, the necessary details to determine that the activity corresponds to agreed parameters. - *Timeliness:* data source record was collected as per schedule or report was received by due date.	
Calculation	
- % of available data source records or reports = Number of data source records or reports that are available/total number of data source records or reports - % of complete data source records or reports = Number of data source records or reports that are complete/total number of data source records or reports - % of on-time data source records or reports = Number of data source records or reports that are timely/total number of data source records or reports	

Example
A CP distributes food assistance at 5 sites in a country. For each site, the CP should submit a Distribution Report by the 20th of each month detailing the number of households receiving food transfers during the previous month. The M&E Officer finds that the CP submitted all 5 reports; However three (3) of the reports were not submitted on time, one (1) report did not include household head disaggregated data and another (1) report was missing data for some areas of the site. - % of available reports: 5/5 = 100% - % of complete reports: 3/5 = 60% - % of on-time reports: 2/5 = 40%
Further resources/notes
N/A

2) RECOUNTING & REAGGREGATING	
Definition	
Recount and reaggregate reported beneficiary numbers, transfer values or other results.	
Applies to:	☒ Output ☐Outcome ☐Cross-cutting ☐Process data
Ensures data:	☐Completeness ☐Timeliness ☐Reliability ☒Validity ☒Integrity
Method	

1. Recount and reaggregate the number of people/transfers recorded in data source records, site reports and reports from different aggregation levels (including reports from CPs or WFP) during the reporting period.
 	
2. Compare the recounted/reaggregated numbers to the reported number of people/transfers (from CPs or WFP) during the reporting period.
 	
3. Determine the degree of disparity between the recounted/reaggregated and reported numbers:
  ○ Over-reporting: <100%
  ○ Under-reporting: >100%
 	
4. Identify possible reasons for the discrepancy, if any (i.e., data entry errors, arithmetic errors, missing source documents, data tampering, other reason). This should especially be done for values that are below 90% or above 110%.	

Calculation	
- % of over/under-reporting = Recounted or Reaggregated value/ Reported value	
Example	

The M&E Officer refers to school programme tracking sheets and recounts the number of feeding days (the number of days where school feeding was provided through onsite meals, snacks and/or take-home rations in a given period) per month over a 10-month period. The number of feeding days per month and the sum over a 10-month period is recounted at 144 feeding days. These numbers are compared to monthly summary report figures and the 10-month sum (150 feeding days) as reported by the Cooperating Partner.

- % of over/under-reporting: 144/150 = 96%

Further resources/notes
N/A

3) RECOMPUTING FORMULAS	
Definition	
Recalculate indicator values to identify possible mathematical mistakes.	
Applies to:	☐ Output ☒Outcome ☒Cross-cutting ☒Process data
Ensures data:	☐Completeness ☐Timeliness ☐Reliability ☒Validity ☒Integrity

Method

NOTE: This control only applies to indicator values computed through mathematical formulas beyond recounting and reaggregating.

1. For each relevant indicator, refer to the value reported in an aggregated report.

2. Recompute the formula (in SPSS or manual) used to calculate the indicator's reported value, to determine a recomputed value.

3. Calculate the % error between the recomputed and reported value:

4. Identify possible reasons for the discrepancy, if any (i.e., data entry errors, mistakes applying the mathematical formula, missing source documents, data tampering, other reason). This should especially be done for indicators with greater than +/- 5% variance in error.

Calculation

- % Error = (Reported value – Recomputed value/ Recomputed Value) x 100

Example

The CO M&E/VAM Officer recomputes the Food Consumption Score (FCS) for a population of WFP beneficiaries that was originally calculated by a Field Monitor. The M&E Officer uses the same data

set and standard FCS syntax and recomputes the FCS as 60, which varies from the original reported score of 56.

- % Error: (56 – 60) / 60 X 100 = -6.6%

Further resources/notes
A simple and user-friendly tool for assessing data quality: Participatory Data Verification & Improvement Tool Recomputations should be based on standard methodologies/syntaxes outlined in the Indicator Compendium. Please refer to the Indicator Compendium for indicator calculation methodologies.

4) RECONCILIATION & TRIANGULATION	
Definition	
Compare indicator values with data from another internal system.	
Applies to:	☒ Output ☐Outcome ☐Cross-cutting ☐Process data
Ensures data:	☐Completeness ☐Timeliness ☐Reliability ☒Validity ☒Integrity
Method	

NOTE: This control only applies when another internal system captures identical or associated information related to the same activity than the one monitored by the source monitoring system producing the indicator value (e.g. LESS, WINGS, SCOPE, Financial Service Provider).

1. Identify if there is another internal system which contains identical or associated information related to the same activity being monitored.

2. Depending on the data type, triangulate or reconcile the indicator value with the data in the other internal system.

3. Identify possible reasons for the discrepancy, if any, observed between the indicator value and the information contained in the other internal system.

- *Reconciliation:* The verified information is the same but is captured by different systems (e.g., Metric Tons in COMET and LESS, Beneficiary Numbers from SCOPE and CP Reports, etc.). In such instance, the numbers in both systems should match and be identical.

  (NOTE: When reconciling data between COMET (Metric Tons distributed) and LESS (Metric Tons dispatched) please note that small variations can be linked to the time lag between the moment food is dispatched by WFP to the CP and the moment the CP distributes food to beneficiaries).

- *Triangulation:* The information contained in both systems is different but related because linked to the same activity (e.g., number of beneficiaries in COMET and transfer amounts to these same beneficiaries in LESS). In such instance, the numbers in both systems should corroborate each other.

Calculation
- % difference = indicator value /reported value in system X
Examples
1) The M&E Assistant refers to COMET for the total amount of food distributed by the Country Office in one month (8,200 Metric Tons). He/She then compares this number to the amount of food dispatched to a CP, as reported in LESS (8,000 Metric Tons) to determine if there is a discrepancy between the reported indicator value and the data in LESS. - % difference: 8,200 / 8,000 = 102.5 % 2) A CP report states that 22,000 households in one region were reached with a Cash Based Transfer. This indicator value is also captured through SCOPE when beneficiaries redeem a CBT transfer. The M&E assistant therefore compares the number reported by the CP with the one contained in SCOPE which indicates that 24,910 households in the region were reached with a CBT transfer. - % difference: 22,000 / 24,910 = 88 % 3) A WFP Field Office Distribution Report states that 10,000 Pregnant and Lactating Women (PLW) were reached in one month with rations of Super Cereal Plus. An M&E Officer compares this indicator value with the number of kgs of Super Cereal Plus dispatched during the month (in the field office region) as recorded in LESS and finds that the Super Cereal Plus transfer amount corresponds to fewer than 10,000 PLW, indicating that the WFP Field Office Distribution Report may not be accurate.
Further resources/notes
Transfer reconciliation is especially important for CBT operations and consists of confirming whether entitlements were delivered to beneficiaries for each payment cycle (either via external transfer agents or in-house delivery systems), as was intended or instructed by WFP. This could include reconciling beneficiary lists, payments/transfers and actual recipients, to confirm that the intended beneficiaries received assistance. For further guidance on transfer reconciliation please refer to the CBT Corporate guidance for Transfer Reconciliation For further guidance on food reconciliation please refer to the Partner Distribution Report checks outlined in the COMET Manual. For further guidance on COMET & LESS reconciliation please refer to the COMET Manual.

5) SECONDARY SOURCES	
Definition	
Check coherence and consistency of indicator values with other external secondary data sources or reports.	
Applies to:	☒ Output ☒Outcome ☒Cross-cutting ☒Process data
Ensures data:	☐Completeness ☐Timeliness ☐Reliability ☒Validity ☐Integrity

Method

1. Determine if external secondary data sources exist for the activities being monitored (e.g. other UN, Donor or Third-Party Monitoring assessments or monitoring reports, Government bulletins or surveys, etc.).

2. Cross-check the internally reported values with identified external secondary data sources to ensure that information corroborates, is consistent and that contradictory findings do not exist.

3. Identify possible reasons for the discrepancy, if any, observed between WFP reported values and information contained in external secondary data sources.
   Note: WFP numbers and those found in external secondary data sources are not necessarily expected to be identical (for example due to different targeting approaches, sampling strategies, etc.); However, they should corroborate each other and not be contradictory.

Calculation

N/A

Example

According to a WFP Distribution Report, WFP reached 13,000 internally displaced households in a camp with general food assistance. A WFP Programme Officer would like to verify that this number is consistent with external reports and therefore consults an International Organization for Migration (IOM) Report that states that IOM assisted 8,500 displaced households in the same camp during the same period. In addition, the WFP Programme Officer refers to an OCHA Situation Report indicating that there are only 10,000 displaced households in the camp. The figures from these three reports vary highly, therefore requiring further investigation.

Further resources/notes

N/A

6) ON-SITE VISITS

Definition

Visits to selected sites to verify the actual delivery of transfers, payment instruments and/or existence of infrastructure or assets.

Applies to:	☒ Output ☒Outcome ☒Cross-cutting ☒Process data
Ensures data:	☐Completeness ☐Timeliness ☐Reliability ☒Validity ☒Integrity

Method

1. Visit selected sites and conduct spot-checks that could involve:
    - selecting a sample of beneficiaries from data source documents recorded as having received a transfer or payment and verifying that they actually received their entitlement (at least 5-10 persons should be sampled, depending on available resources)
    - selecting a sample of farmers recorded as having sold through WFP supported farmer aggregation systems and verifying that they are active members of the aggregator and are actually contributing to the collective sales.
    - for FFA activities, observing whether infrastructure and assets exist and their state for the targeted populations

2. Identify possible reasons for the discrepancy, if any, observed between the reported information and findings from the on-site visits.

Calculation

N/A

Example

After the M&E unit collects data for the ABI indicator *'Proportion of the population (%) in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced livelihood asset base'*, the FFA Officer decides to conduct on-site visits to verify the number of assets and their status. In particular, the FFA Officer wants to verify the number of wells built, and if these wells are benefitting the community, including making water accessible for livestock consumption, small scale irrigation or fishery purposes.

The FFA Officer observes that there are 6 functioning wells, while 7 were reported to exist at the site. In addition, the FFA Officer notes that while the positioning of the wells makes the water easily accessible for the majority of the community, there are some households who live on the outskirts of the community and need to cross a bridge to reach a well, resulting in difficulties to access water for their livestock. One of the wells, while still functioning, is due for maintenance, which could have an impact on the benefit the communities receive from it.

Further resources/notes

N/A

7) METHODOLOGICAL COMPLIANCE	
Definition	
Verify adherence to indicator definitions and methodologies.	
Applies to:	☒ Output ☒Outcome ☒Cross-cutting ☐Process data
Ensures data:	☐Completeness ☐Timeliness ☒Reliability ☒Validity ☐Integrity
Method	

NOTE: For each indicator, the 'Indicator Compendium' defines key terms and specifies what should or should not be counted. For example:

- *For the indicator 'Average number of school days per month on which multi-fortified or at least 4 food groups were provided,' multi-fortified foods are defined as foods or fortified products that contain at least six vitamins or minerals, one of which must be iron.*
- *For the indicator 'Number of children receiving deworming with WFP support' the Indicator Compendium specifies that only deworming tablets provided with support from WFP, and not exclusively by a partner, should be counted.*

1. Review data sources or reports for the reporting period to verify that what is counted for each indicator is in line with definitions/methodological guidance in the 'Indicator Compendium'.

2. Where relevant and possible, interview CP and WFP staff involved in collecting data or reporting on results to determine that the definitions included in the indicator calculations were understood and applied correctly.

3. Identify possible reasons for discrepancies, if any, between the methodological guidance and observed practices to determine how this might have affected reported numbers.

Calculation
N/A
Example

The M&E Officer reviews how data was collected for the indicator *'Number of national food security and nutrition policies, programmes and system components enhanced as a result of WFP capacity strengthening'*.

He/She reviews a total of 20 documents to verify that policies, programmes and system components were defined in line with guidance from the 'Indicator Compendium' which precisely defines 'WFP Capacity Strengthening,' 'National,' 'FSN System' and 'Component'. The 'Indicator Compendium' also specifies that *'The component should only be counted if the related end-result has been achieved or completed (endorsed by a competent authority/stakeholder).'*

While reviewing the data sources, the M&E Officer finds that two of the examples used as evidence of WFP's support for strategic planning and sustainable financing are not aligned with the 'component' definition and furthermore were not fully implemented. Therefore, they should not have been counted in the indicator calculation and results.

Further resources/notes
Indicator Compendium (refer to the 'Definition' section of each indicator)

IV. List of Indicators

This guidance focuses on 53 WFP Programme indicators[3]. Complementary information on data collection, analyses and interpretation for each indicator can be found in the Indicator Compendium.

Please note that the detective controls that are specified for each of the 53 indicators in this guidance can also be applied to other indicators.

Outcome Indicators	
CRF Area	**Indicator**
Food Security	Food Consumption Score
	Average Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI)
	Economic Capacity to Meet Essential Needs
Nutrition/Nutrition-sensitive	Proportion of children 6-23 months of age who receive a minimum acceptable diet (MAD)
	Minimum Diet Diversity for Women of Reproductive Age (MDD-W)
	Food Consumption Score - Nutrition
	Percentage of targeted smallholder farmers reporting increased production of nutritious crops, disaggregated by sex of smallholder farmer
	Percentage increase in production of high-quality and nutrition-dense foods
	Proportion of target population that participates in an adequate number of distributions (adherence)
	Programme coverage for Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) treatment
	Programme coverage for Nutrition Prevention Programming (MAM, stunting, micronutrient Deficiency)
	Default rate of clients from anti-retroviral therapy, tuberculosis directly observed treatment (TB-DOTS) and prevention of mother-to-child transmission of HIV (PMTCT) programmes
	Moderate acute malnutrition treatment performance rate: recovery, mortality, default and non-response rate (including ART/TB/PMTCT nutritional recovery rate, when applicable)
Livelihoods/food assistance for assets	Proportion of the population in targeted communities reporting benefits from an enhanced livelihood asset base
Adaptation & resilience to	Proportion of targeted communities where there is evidence of improved capacity to manage climatic shocks and risks

[3] Indicators should be disaggregated by relevant criteria such as activity, sex, age, disability, beneficiary category, commodity type, programme area/sector, etc.

climate & other shocks	
School Feeding	SABER school feeding national capacity
	Retention rate/Drop-out rate (by grade)
Smallholder agricultural market support	Percentage of targeted smallholders selling through WFP-supported farmer aggregation systems.
	Value and volume of smallholder sales through WFP-supported aggregation systems
Capacity Strengthening	Number of national food security and nutrition policies, programmes and system components enhanced as a result of WFP capacity strengthening
Partnerships	Partnerships Index
Services/Cluster Coordination	User Satisfaction Rate

Output Indicators	
CRF Area	**Indicator**
A. Resources Transferred	Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food/cash-based transfers/commodity vouchers/capacity strengthening transfers
	Quantity of food distributed
	Total amount of cash transferred to targeted beneficiaries
	Total value of vouchers (expressed in food/cash) redeemed targeted beneficiaries
	Quantity of non-food items distributed
	Number of institutional sites assisted
	Number of women, men, boys and girls with disabilities receiving food/cash-based transfers/commodity vouchers/capacity strengthening
B. Nutritious Food Provided	Quantity of fortified food provided
	Quantity of specialized nutritious food provided
	Percentage of staple commodities distributed that is fortified
C. Capacity development and technical support provided	Number of people engaged in capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities

D. Assets created	Number of assets built, restored or maintained by targeted households and communities, by type and unit of measure
	Number of people provided with energy assets, services and technologies
E. Social and behaviour change communication (SBCC) delivered	Number of people reached by interpersonal SBCC approaches
	Number of people reached through SBCC approaches using media
F. Purchases from smallholders completed	Number of smallholder farmers supported or trained
H. Shared services and platforms provided	Number of shared services provided, by type
N. School feeding provided	Feeding days as percentage of total school days

Cross-Cutting Indicators
Proportion of assisted people informed about the programme
Proportion of targeted people receiving assistance without safety challenges
Proportion of households where women, men, or both women and men make decisions on the use of food / cash / vouchers, disaggregated by transfer modality
Proportion of targeted people who report that WFP programmes are dignified
Proportion of targeted people having unhindered access to WFP programmes
Proportion of food assistance decision-making entity – committees, boards, teams, etc. – members who are women
Proportion of activities for which environmental risks have been screened and, as required, mitigation actions identified.
Proportion of activities for which beneficiary feedback is documented, analysed and integrated into programme improvements
Type of transfer received by participants in WFP activities, disaggregated by sex and type of activity

Process Indicators	
Theme	**Indicator**
Beneficiary Sensitization & Feedback	Percentage of complaints that have answers/actions transmitted to complainant
Monitoring & Tracking of Action	The percentage of findings solved by technical unit/field office

Activity Design & Management	Percentage of participants who report that the capacity development efforts were aligned with their needs
Distribution Point Management	Percentage of Final Distribution Points or Distribution Points compliant with minimum quality standards

V. Output Indicators by Indicator Sheet

Indicator	Modality	Transfer Agent	Transfer System	Sheet
Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving food	Food	WFP	N/A	1
			SCOPE	2
		CP	N/A	3
			SCOPE, Building Blocks or CP System	4
Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving cash-based transfers	Cash in hand	WFP	N/A	1
			SCOPE	2
		CP	N/ A	3
			SCOPE, Building Blocks or CP System	4
	Digital CBT (cash)	FSP	FSP System	6
		WFP	SCOPE or Building Blocks	5
Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving commodity vouchers	Paper Voucher	CP	N/A	8
			SCOPE Paper Vouchers	7
	Digital CBT (voucher)	FSP	FSP System	6
		WFP	SCOPE or Building Blocks	5
Number of women, men, boys and girls receiving capacity strengthening transfers	Capacity Strengthening	CP	N/A	10a
		WFP	N/A	9a
Quantity of food distributed	Food	CP	N/A	3
			SCOPE, Building Blocks or CP System	4
		WFP	N/A	1
			SCOPE	2
Total amount of cash transferred to targeted beneficiaries	Cash in hand	CP	N/A	3
			SCOPE, Building Blocks or CP System	4
		WFP	N/A	1

			SCOPE	2
	Digital Cash (CBT)	FSP	FSP System	6
		WFP	SCOPE or Building Blocks	5
Total value of vouchers (expressed in food/cash) redeemed by targeted beneficiaries	Paper Voucher	CP	N/A	8
			SCOPE Paper Voucher	7
	Digital CBT (voucher)	FSP	FSP System	6
		WFP	SCOPE or Building Blocks	5
Quantity of non-food items distributed	Goods	CP	N/A	3
		WFP	N/A	1
Number of institutional sites assisted	Food	WFP	N/A	1
	Goods	WFP	N/A	1
	Capacity Strengthening	CP	N/A	10a
		WFP	N/A	9a
Number of women, men, boys and girls with disabilities receiving food	Food	WFP	N/A	1
Number of women, men, boys and girls with disabilities receiving cash-based transfers	Cash in hand	WFP	N/A	1
Number of women, men, boys and girls with disabilities receiving capacity strengthening	Capacity Strengthening	WFP	N/A	9a
Quantity of fortified food provided	Food	WFP	N/A	1
		CP	N/A	3
Quantity of specialized nutritious food provided	Food	WFP	N/A	1
		CP	N/A	3
Percentage of staple commodities distributed that is fortified	Food	WFP	N/A	1
		CP	N/A	3
Number of people engaged in capacity-strengthening initiatives facilitated by WFP to enhance food security and nutrition stakeholder capacities	Capacity Strengthening	CP	N/A	10a
		WFP	N/A	9a

Number of assets built, restored or maintained by targeted households and communities, by type and unit of measure	Food, Goods or Cash	WFP	N/A	1
		CP	N/A	3
	Capacity Strengthening	CP	N/A	10a
		WFP	N/A	9a
Number of people provided with direct access to energy assets, services and technologies	Goods or Cash	WFP	N/A	1
		CP	N/A	3
	Capacity Strengthening	CP	N/A	10a
		WFP	N/A	9a
Number of people reached by interpersonal SBCC approaches	Capacity Strengthening	CP	N/A	10a
Number of people reached through SBCC approaches using media	Capacity Strengthening	CP	N/A	10a
Number of smallholder farmers supported or trained	Capacity Strengthening	CP	N/A	10b
		WFP	N/A	9b
Number of shared services provided, by type	Service Delivery	WFP	N/A	11
Feeding days as percentage of total school days	Food	WFP	N/A	1
		CP	N/A	3
	Digital Cash (CBT)	FSP	FSP System	6