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MODULE C: Design and Implementation

Module C is designed to assist WFP staff in designing and implementing safety nets following the programme cycle logic and in partnership with governments and partners.

Before a strategic decision is made to engage in the design of a safety net, considerations should be made for prerequisite commitments, see below. If the decision is made to go ahead, the following module provides guidance for engaging in the design of safety nets.

### Are you prepared?

WFP has:
- A clear understanding of the policy context: government and partner roles, policies and capacities
- A clear understanding of the stakeholders in social protection and safety nets
- A clear understanding of WFP’s corporate and country portfolio level strategic direction on safety nets
  - Role
  - Purpose
  - Vision
  - Comparative advantages
  - Existing activities
- Funding for an interdisciplinary team to work on building safety nets systems with governments and partners over the long-term under an enabling office structure
- Internal capacities and human resources in the relevant policy and technical areas
  - Technical skills on programme design and implementation (i.e. livelihoods, public administration/policy, nutrition analysis, vulnerability and needs analysis, basic literacy on safety nets and social protection)
  - Soft skills on engagement

If all the boxes are checked:
- WFP is well-positioned to engage in the design and/or implementation of safety nets.

If not all the boxes are checked:
- Consult Modules A and B of these guidelines.

### 3. How to design and implement a safety net


These guidelines build upon that framework, presenting a more consolidated ‘How to’ specifically for safety nets.

**What’s different about food security and nutrition safety nets:**

- Design and implementation choices are heavily influenced by what will build systems in government structures for information management, design and implementation capacity

---

Design and implementation are done in collaboration with government and partners; see this video on good practice in social protection: [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3I5pExe2ATI&feature=youtu.be](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3I5pExe2ATI&feature=youtu.be)

Design and implementation may require a country office to engage with more and non-traditional partners including new government ministries and departments

Design is focused on the principles of a quality food security and nutrition safety nets, section 1.1.4

Because good safety nets are designed to be predictable and long-term, there are more demands on the design process. Research has shown that spending time and spending resources investing in the design phase of safety nets – asking the difficult questions and building consensus among partners – saves money in the long term and contributes significantly to successful reaching intended outcomes.²

**How is capacity development for a safety net done?** WFP offices help build country government capacity by designing and implementing safety nets with governments, civil society partners, and affected populations. Key elements include reducing burdens, providing technical support and ensuring accountability. For more, please refer to forthcoming ‘WFP Capacity Development Guidance’.

Figure 1. Key areas in the project life cycle for safety nets:

Along the path of the normal programme design and implementation process, safety net programmes have particular emphasis in key areas, highlighted above.

→ Navigate this Module by using the linked Annex E (same as Figure 1 above) to click through to different areas of focus for design and implementation according to the project life cycle

OR

→ Navigate this Module by using the checklist below

---

A design checklist to help you through the process:

The overall design of a safety net can be broken down into top level steps, which can provide an overall guide that complements existing aspects of the programme design framework. Adjust the steps below according to your needs and the context as well as the goals and objectives of the programme.

Throughout the process, engagement with partners remains essential. Action on capacity development for government, civil society and affected populations is taken at each step in order to build safety nets systems.

The following checklist provides a top-line guide for actions and decisions throughout the safety nets design and implementation process, in line with the WFP Programme Design Framework3.

**Checklist to design a safety net:**

**Analyse the context:**
- Engage with government and partners
- Do an external and internal scan (Module B of these guidelines)
- Do a comprehensive analysis of underlying factors
- Consider informal safety nets, gender and humanitarian protection issues
- Use seasonal livelihoods planning and community based planning tools

**Put together the administrative and programmatic pieces:**
- Set clear programme objectives
- Select target population
- Select transfer modality, value, and delivery mechanism
- Determine enrolment and registration process including beneficiary identification
- Design complaints and feedback mechanism
- Decide on conditionality
- Develop monitoring and evaluation processes
- Determine the Management Information System to build government capacity

**Add in elements to use WFP’s expertise for better results:**
- Link to local supply chains
- Consider risk financing and insurance options

**Build sustainably from the beginning:**
- Determine how to build in a transition strategy
- Plan for optimal coverage and expansion
- Plan for audit and control mechanisms in a joint programme with government
- Determine programme exit criteria and goals

**Already working on an existing safety net?**

If you are already working on a particular safety net, then you can use the WFP Safety Nets Diagnostic Tool in **Annex L** to help you assess and improve quality using the information in this module.

---

3 This checklist was developed based on a review of the literature including *Safety Nets How-To: A Resource Guide for Practitioners* by the World Bank, *How to design and implement gender-sensitive social protection programmes* by the Overseas Development Institute and the Economic Policy Research Institute’s (EPRI) policy manual: designing and implementing social transfer programmes.
3.1 Existing external resources on designing safety nets

**Economic Policy Research Institute’s (EPRI) policy manual** — Designing and implementing social transfer programmes — provides a comprehensive guide to social transfers: their design, implementation, management and the growing body of evidence on their impacts. Though it focuses on cash transfers, WFP staff can interpret the guidance for multiple modalities.

**For Protection & Promotion: The Design & Implementation of Effective Safety Nets** — by the World Bank, provides guidance on the design and implementation of safety nets, including how to define eligibility and select beneficiaries, set benefits, and monitor and evaluate programs and systems.

**Safety Nets How-To: A Resource Guide for Practitioners** — by the World Bank, provides practical guidance on how to design and implement safety nets, in English, French and Spanish.

This is to highlight several prominent examples. For a more comprehensive overview of external resources, trainings and capacities please refer to Annex K.

3.2 Starting with a strong analysis

The basis of all WFP interventions, including safety nets is a thorough context analysis. According to the ‘**WFP programme design framework**’, a thorough context analysis includes developing an understanding of the culture and context in which WFP is operating, in particular livelihood and seasonal aspects and the gender roles of women and men, as well as exposure to vulnerability, trends of shocks and risks and related aggravating factors. Context analysis also includes developing an institutional awareness – an understanding of the policy context, roles of government and partners, implementation capacity and best practices including those developed through monitoring and evaluation.

Though context analysis is a precursor to all WFP planning and programming, there are distinct issues that are important specifically for safety nets programmes.

---

**Box 1. How to design safety nets to build resilience over time**

WFP puts together 3 distinct planning processes to design and implement effective resilience programmes.

1) Integrated Context Analysis
2) Seasonal Livelihoods Programming (SLP)
3) Community Based Participatory Planning (CBPP)

Each of these three processes can contribute to safety nets design and implementation. Particularly, the consultative nature of the SLPs (**section 3.5**) and CBPPs (**section 3.6**) allows issues around vulnerability to come to light and also brings out solutions to these problems, which can contribute to transforming communities, livelihoods and landscapes with the help of safety nets interventions.


---


What is different for safety nets:

Instead of analysing the current situation to determine the best response to a crisis, analysis for safety nets needs to look at multi-year, recurring issues focusing on chronic vulnerability.

Analysis for safety nets should identify existing solidarity mechanisms and informal safety nets, see below section 3.3.

What to do:

→ Use analysis tools to look at trends over time.
→ Develop an understanding of the context to develop multi-year, multi-sectorial programmes.
→ Develop and share analysis with partners – particularly government – through transparent collaboration.

There are a number of tools available to the WFP practitioner in order to analyse the context. As shown in the WFP toolbox, Annex F, vulnerability analysis, food security analysis, needs assessment, gender analysis, humanitarian protection analysis, and conflict analysis are likely all relevant tools to use in order to analyse the country context. Annex E includes links to the relevant resources on WFPgo.

The Integrated Context Analysis (ICA) is a particularly useful WFP tool to use in the design of safety nets because it looks at historical trends of food insecurity, undernutrition, and exposure to shocks, overlaying this data with other indicators such as land degradation, population density, access to markets, etc. ‘Shocks’ can range from natural shocks like droughts and floods; man-made like conflicts; or economic shocks like high food prices. The ICA indicates how frequently people have experienced these events and their likelihood of exposure to these events is in the future. It provides insights into the context of vulnerability found in different areas of a country, in order to determine areas where governments and WFP can consider developing a safety net programme and provides context for what might be considered in programme design. More information on the ICA can be found in the brochure, A WFP approach to operationalize resilience Part 1: Integrated Context Analysis.

Box 2. Gender analysis: understanding gender dynamics helped make the right programmatic choices in Bangladesh

An analysis of women’s and men’s roles helps provide more information for context analysis and programming. Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) activities in Bangladesh have been well designed to meet the different needs of women and men. Through a gender analysis, the country office learned that inside a household, while food is usually a woman’s domain, men often control cash. Therefore, in 2011, when cash was introduced as a transfer modality in FFA, a combination of cash and food was provided. The use of cash would expand women’s decision making into something that they did not have previously, while the provision of food could guarantee that some control was exercised by those women who were concerned that cash would be spent by their husbands or other household members.

→ Use a gender analysis to inform your overall context analysis, see section 3.4

---

Use your analysis to:

→ Contribute to the **overall rationale for a safety nets intervention**: a context analysis that is made up of an overlay of relevant vulnerability and shock information allows for identifying ‘hot spots’ and geographical priority areas, also for safety nets interventions.

→ Build the case for **targeted, predictable and long-term interventions**, particularly in a country or region where there is no safety net in place: trend analysis prompts longer-term thinking and accordingly, multi-annual planning, to tackle the underlying causes of vulnerability that cannot be addressed by ad-hoc, short, seasonal programmes that focus exclusively on saving lives and to some extent, livelihoods. For example, the trend analysis helps in determining focus areas and linkages between seasonal support, recovery efforts, and resilience building; and better defining where protective and/or productive safety nets could be placed.

→ Inform the development of safety net **programming strategies**: For example, an ICA done for Somalia in 2012 showed which areas have high population density, degraded lands and a coincidence with high food-insecurity and malnutrition over a series of years; this pointed out the need for longer-term, predictable transfers to the most vulnerable people via programmes that address the causes of vulnerability.

→ Prompt **joint planning with government and partners**: The multi-faceted challenges that inevitably emerge from the context analysis demand an equally diverse set of interventions that can only be done under the leadership of the (local) government and in partnership with relevant stakeholders.

→ Inform **policy and strategy of government and partners**: The analysis work ultimately needs to inform national level safety nets and social protection policies and frameworks.

→ Estimate potential **beneficiary numbers** per season by means of a trend analysis that includes previous operations’ beneficiary numbers. Next to informing the scale of a safety net programme, this is crucial for a timely adjustment of caseloads covered by a safety net programme in times of a shock.

### 3.3 Informal safety nets

Good safety nets are designed to support ‘informal’ safety nets, building on and enhancing local capacities and mechanisms.

Informal safety nets refer to existing household, community and individual coping strategies, solidarity mechanisms, and support mechanisms, which need to be taken into consideration when planning, designing and implementing programmes. In other words, informal safety nets are non-state support mechanisms – when a household in need is able to draw on the resources of another household.

Examples include:

- Remittances
- Informal loans
- Assistance with work or child-care
- Sharing food
Giving or lending money
Lending lactating animals
Sharing clothing
Zakat (cultural/religious contribution of money to poor and destitute groups)
Pastoralist practices: sharing milk, sharing livestock offspring
Funeral contributions
Offering employment (casual labour)
Social exchange systems where resources are pooled and distributed to those in need
Collective savings and loan groups

When designing or implementing a safety net programme, consider how to maintain existing social solidarity systems. Public transfers can crowd out informal assistance; for example, studies in the United States have shown that government aid displaces familial support.\(^9\) On the other hand, safety nets have been shown to support informal safety nets by alleviating strain on them. \textbf{Before intervening, consider if and how the intervention will impact solidarity systems.}

Also consider the limitations of informal safety nets. They:

- Cannot be demanded as a right
- Often exclude the marginalized because exchanges rely on social capital; the most vulnerable may not be included\(^{10}\)
- May be weaker in urban areas
- Potential limited opportunity to become part of a public or formal systems

How to design a safety net programme that builds on local capacities and protects existing support mechanisms:

- Identify existing solidarity mechanisms and informal safety nets in the analysis
- Consider the cultural acceptability of introducing a safety net programme
- Seek opportunities to strengthen existing mechanisms, i.e. purchase from smallholder farmers in order to increase their income, thereby increasing their capacity to support other members of the community
- Analyse whether and how a safety net programme will impact the informal safety nets and mitigate potential effects accordingly


\(^{10}\) Vulnerable groups may be marginalised from community systems or safety nets, i.e. street children, slum communities considered to be illegal squatters, etc. World Food Programme Policy Brief (2002): Urban Food Insecurity: Strategies for WFP. Rome, Italy.
3.4 Gender and protection issues

Overall, the same principles in terms of gender and protection apply to safety nets as in any other WFP intervention.

What to do:

- Do a gender analysis; do a protection analysis
- Incorporate your findings into program design, implementation and monitoring
- Prioritize gender and protection considerations throughout the programme cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WFP Guidance</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Protection:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender Equality in Food Assistance:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
http://pgm.wfp.org/index.php/Topics:Gender_Equality_in_Food_Assistance | WFP Humanitarian Protection Policy

Box 3. Plan for a gender analysis by the “W” question words

**WHO** is in need? In need of **WHAT?** **WHAT** are the different needs of and vulnerabilities faced by women and men? **WHO** oversees child nutrition and plays the role of caregiver? **WHO** plays the economic role? **WHO** has more control over resources and child feeding practices? **HOW** are women and men affected by conflicts or disasters? **WHO** are the beneficiaries, participants or recipients of food, vouchers and cash? **HOW** do women and men spend money? **WHO** are involved in the design of activities? **HOW** do women, men, boys and girls cope with a food crisis? **WHAT** are the other gender issues, e.g. gender-based violence, child marriage? **WHAT** can be done to make a difference?


Box 4. Designing with gender impacts in mind – the PSNP in Ethiopia

The programme design documents for the Productive Safety Net Programme in Ethiopia specify policies for women that intend to enable participation but also employ safeguards. For instance, women who are pregnant or lactating can receive direct support without contributing labour in public works. Instead, new and expecting mothers can participate in activities such as:

- managing a crèche (community child-care centre) at public works sites;
- community managed child care centres to (i) free adult able-bodied labour in other households in the community and (ii) free girls of school-going age from domestic chores to enable them to attend school;
- participating in child nutrition and growth promotion classes; and
- participating in adult literacy/numeracy classes.

Understanding protection risks leads to better outcomes in safety net programmes

Protection in practice means ensuring that the human rights of crisis-affected people are respected. For WFP, integrating protection means designing and carrying out food assistance activities that do not increase the protection risks people are exposed to, but rather contribute to their safety and dignity and recognise their rights.

Social safety net programmes should apply a safety, dignity and rights lens (or what is commonly referred to as a ‘protection lens’) during planning and implementation to ensure that the benefits of programmes are sustainable and prevent unintended negative consequences. WFP programmes that aim to provide predictable social transfers in a sustainable way, can create protective outcomes for example by reducing the risk of people resorting to negative coping mechanisms to survive, such as transactional sex, early marriage and exploitative working arrangements.

If people’s safety, dignity and rights are not taken into consideration there is the potential to undermine the programme’s intended effects. For example, if land entitlements are not secured for programmes that rely on people’s access to land, sustainability outcomes can be jeopardised. Similarly, in school feeding programmes targeting practices may unintentionally exclude the most vulnerable children as, often, they are the children not attending school. Programmes may also unintentionally create harm. For instance, in assets creation programmes it is important that work is safe and appropriate for the capacities of the participants to avoid that people sustain injuries.

In safety nets programming, as in all WFP programming, consult existing guidelines and policies to ensure protection in practice.

Box 5. Food Security for the ultra poor project in Bangladesh

Food Security for the Ultra Poor (FSUP) targeted ultra poor Bangladeshi women with the aim of achieving measurable and sustainable changes in the food security of their households. The women participants received predictable cash transfers whilst they established an income generating activity (IGA). To complement the IGA, women received training on entrepreneurship and skills related to their chosen IGA, as well as trainings on disaster risk reduction, nutrition, life skills, rights awareness and empowerment.

The combination of economic leverage with training and awareness-raising and group/peer support was an important factor in enhancing the participants’ dignity and rights. A study conducted in 2012 examining the protection and gender impacts of this programme found that women had gained confidence to engage with local leaders and access government services to exercise fundamental rights such as registration of their children’s births and their marriages. One woman was even elected to a local union council. The extra support also enabled households to send both girls and boys to school, whereas the education of boys was often prioritised over that of girls before the project commenced.

Women also reported that as a consequence of their participation in the project they were sought-out as resource persons for the community. And most vitally, the participants’ self-perception changed – they felt more like equal partners in the household.

In this example, a multifaceted approach to poverty reduction had significant impacts upon the dignity and rights of individuals with potential for long lasting positive change.
3.5 Seasonal livelihoods programming

**What is different for safety nets:** safety nets need to have a seasonal design and implementation that incorporates trends and beneficiary experiences. In nearly all contexts, WFP staff must develop a detailed understanding of seasonality in order to design and implement an effective programme, and also to ensure that the safety nets are flexible and scale-able. **Though a focus on seasonality may be stronger in rural areas or contexts where agriculture is a main livelihood strategy, in urban contexts and contexts where casual labour is a main source of income, seasonality is also an important factor.**

In order to better understand seasonal livelihood dynamics, WFP developed **Seasonal Livelihoods Programming (SLP):** a five-day planning session, done under government leadership on the regional level, which brings together community, government and partner representatives to discuss issues and organize interventions. It brings humanitarian and development interventions together by combining seasonal, livelihood, gender, crisis, and programme aspects to identify the most appropriate range of interventions, and then aligning these into complementary short and long-term plans for action. Together, the participants design integrated multi-sectorial and longer-term operational plans, showing which programmes should be implemented where, when, for whom, and by which partners.

While WFP developed the Seasonal Livelihoods Programming process originally, WFP’s role is not to be the leader but rather the catalyst of the process. Therefore, where WFP facilitates a SLP process, it is always done under government leadership, and a central component of the process is to pass on the knowledge of how to run an SLP to government officials in order to carry it out in the future.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WFP Guidance</th>
<th>Seasonal Livelihoods Programming (SLP)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A WFP approach to operationalize resilience – Part 2: Seasonal Livelihoods Programming: <a href="http://www.wfp.org/content/seasonal-livelihood-programming">http://www.wfp.org/content/seasonal-livelihood-programming</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Seasonal Livelihoods Programming produces a series of immediate, tangible outputs that can be applied to both the operational and policy dimensions of safety nets. **In particular, use the SLP to:**

- **Further add to providing the rationale:** After the ICA provides the rationale for a national and sub-national level safety nets intervention, the SLP further supports and refines the evidence to support the intervention. For instance, the SLP results in a **record of shocks** over past years that can build the rationale for not only inter-sectorial, but also multi-annual interventions.

- **Produce a livelihood calendar:** The seasonal livelihoods calendar provides a detailed overview of the livelihood activities and strategies in a given area (at aggregated level, e.g. district or state) in a typical and a bad year. This allows for the identification of livelihood systems: markets, relationships, connections, disruptions, and bottlenecks that could be addressed, also by safety nets interventions.

- **Find consensus on the appropriate times for investment** in livelihoods, **preparedness** for hardship and **protection** of livelihoods during a typical year and a bad year. Together with recorded
perceptions of transfer modalities (cash, food, vouchers or a mix thereof), this constitutes a basis for ensuring the most appropriate modalities are transferred during the appropriate times of the year.

Discuss and find consensus on what vulnerability is in a particular context and have participants provide an initial set of community level targeting criteria. These vulnerability profiles and targeting criteria are an essential first step towards developing a refined understanding of the target groups. (This is best done in conjunction with community participation. See section 3.6). Developing this understanding via consultation can help minimise inclusion and exclusion errors.

Identify existing programmes, partners and gaps: It provides an overview of safety nets or safety net-like programmes, identifies partners, and together with the livelihood calendar, is able to highlight gaps and potential areas where/when safety nets interventions can address those gaps.

Highlight complementarity, synergy and alignment: By identifying all partners, activities and gaps, it provides a unique opportunity to better understand synergy and complementarity of existing and potential new safety nets and other project interventions.

Inform policy and strategy: It provides solid evidence from the ground up to inform and refine safety nets and social protection policies, strategies and frameworks that are either under development or have been developed. At the same time it provides a solid set of arguments to advocate with partners and donors for multi-sectorial, multi-year and government-led interventions and investments in the right place and at the right time.

Set the stage for WFP to serve as an implementer for government-led safety nets, in contexts where such safety nets exist or are taking shape and/or create an entry point for WFP to form a strong partnership with officials engaged in social protection and safety nets within national and local government structures.

Spotlight on Cambodia: seasonal design

For many poor families in Balang, Cambodia, the most difficult time of the year is from August to November, during which food reserves from the previous harvest run low and people work long hours to replant for the next harvest. WFP's FFA programme – implemented together with the Government of Cambodia – provides labour opportunities to poor and food-insecure families who receive food as payment. At the same time, the work builds or rehabilitates rural assets such as roads, dykes and canals to improve agricultural output or improve access to schools, markets and other basic services.


Photo: Cambodia FFA programme participant. Credit: David Longstreth
3.6 Community participation and planning

In designing safety nets, food insecure communities should be in the driver’s seat of planning and implementation of activities. WFP has developed the Community-based Participatory Planning Tool (CBPP) to put people in charge of resilience building efforts and development.

CBPP is a practical and easy-to-use planning tool for vulnerable communities, government extension staff and cooperating partners. It is a 2-5 day field exercise to develop a three-year plan. CBPP is done together by communities, partners and local government staff who discuss and agree on priority activities to significantly improve the food security of the poorest and most vulnerable households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WFP Guidance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The same exercise can be used to inform how safety net interventions can be employed to support resilience building and to implement effectively. Use the CBPP to:

- Identify the recipient households and individuals for **accurate targeting and monitoring of activities**
- Create **community ownership** and generating a **social contract with all community members**
- Tailor identified interventions and activities to community needs and also link interventions to the communities’ landscapes to enable **productive safety nets** to contribute to building resilience
- Apply a **gender lens** to planning and programming
Check in on the checklist – by now you should be able to check off the first section:

Analyse the context:
- Engage with government and partners
- Do an external and internal scan (Module B of these guidelines)
- Do a comprehensive analysis of underlying factors
- Consider informal safety nets, gender and humanitarian protection issues
- Use seasonal livelihoods planning and community-based planning tools

In the next section, use your analysis to decide, with partners including government and affected populations, the basic features of the safety net. Who will receive what transfers – and for what purpose?

Put together the administrative and programmatic pieces:
- Set clear programme objectives
- Select target population
- Select transfer modality, value, and delivery mechanism
- Determine enrolment and registration process including beneficiary identification
- Design complaints and feedback mechanism
- Decide on conditionality
- Develop monitoring and evaluation processes
- Determine the Management Information System to build government capacity

Add in elements to use WFP’s expertise for better results:
- Link to local supply chains
- Consider risk financing and insurance options

Build sustainably from the beginning:
- Determine how to build in a transition strategy
- Plan for optimal coverage and expansion
- Plan for audit and control mechanisms in a joint programme with government
- Determine programme exit criteria and goals
3.7 Targeting and eligibility

If you decide to target, and not have a universal approach, one of the key principles of quality safety nets is a transparent targeting mechanism that is aimed at including the most vulnerable and provides a platform for other initiatives.

When targeting, consider:

- Programme objectives and goals
- Options for targeting method, criteria and mechanisms
- What Management Information System exists or is being built, see section 3.13
- Potential costs
- Potential inclusion/exclusion error
- Potential tensions
- Community awareness
- Complaints and Feedback mechanisms
- Seasonality and transient food insecure populations
- Available mechanisms for identification
- Opportunities for systems-building and capacity development

The following references provide a basis for decision-making related to targeting, eligibility and enrolment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Guidance</th>
<th>Targeting:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Analysis and Assessment Tools</th>
<th>Food Security Analysis and Guidelines:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[<a href="http://www.wfp.org/food-security/">http://www.wfp.org/food-security/</a>]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The safety nets debate around targeting and safety nets is a lively one, which includes major strategic questions:

- When is it best to have a universal approach and when should targeting be used?\(^{11}\)
- When is it best to use a ‘blanket’ geographical approach and when is it appropriate to use eligibility criteria and some sort of targeting mechanism?
- How will the eligibility criteria and targeting method affect outcomes?
- How much does cost effectiveness matter?
- What are the social costs of targeting?
- How can eligibility criteria be formulated to resonate with beneficiaries and affected populations, as opposed to creating seemingly arbitrary lines within communities?

Beyond the strategic questions, there are debates regarding mechanisms and best practices:

- How to set eligibility criteria?
- How to decrease targeting errors?
- What targeting mechanisms to use?

---

How to begin developing answers to these questions:

- Consider the objectives of the assistance and use that to guide programmatic choices
- Consider the context analysis and the findings of seasonal livelihood programming exercise
- Set the targeting criteria in partnership with communities together with government and non-government stakeholders
- Evaluate potential transfer mechanisms for their usefulness in achieving objectives

What’s different about a safety net:

- Focus on the most vulnerable. Safety nets are the component of social protection targeted to the people in greatest need. However, attention should be paid to the multidimensional nature of poverty, food security and malnutrition, its relative uniformity in many contexts, and the fact that exposure to one risk – such as malnutrition – may not correlate to vulnerability in other dimensions, such as income poverty. Moreover, attention should be paid to the rest of the context, i.e. those that are not better off and their role in existing social support mechanisms. Safety nets should be gender-sensitive and tailored to meeting the needs of children, youth, the elderly and other vulnerable groups.

Challenges:

WFP expertise is mainly linked to programmes aimed at addressing food-insecurity and malnutrition. Often social protection programmes have a larger scope (i.e. reducing poverty) and we have to take care of these challenges for targeting.

Operationally there are questions regarding the extent to which WFP should be using government criteria and systems. Government criteria are not always aligned with WFP goals and objectives.12

What to do:

- Map out your options based on existing experience and potential new approaches
- Consult with partners and aim for a best possible alignment with others’ approach. Always look for the ‘common denominators’
- Guarantee transparency and accountability no matter what option is chosen. Take donor-reporting requirements into account

3.7.1 Targeting error – inclusion and exclusion

There are two types of targeting error:

**Inclusion error**, also known as leakage: the proportion of beneficiaries who benefit from the programme even though they do not meet the eligibility criteria (In other words, they are getting the transfer, even though they shouldn’t be.)

**Exclusion error**, also known as under-coverage: the proportion of eligible people who are not beneficiaries. (In other words, they are not getting the transfer, even though they should be.)

---

How to measure inclusion and exclusion error: If measurement can be made of eligible households and beneficiaries against eligibility criteria – via surveys, participatory data or another data source – then the above diagram can help to measure the type of error. See Figure 2.

Reducing inclusion error is the potential benefit of targeting; exclusion error adds to the cost.

What to do:

→ Consider your targeting mechanism of choice: what types of targeting error might result, by whom and at what point in time?

→ Outline additional actions needed in light of potential anticipated errors including validation mechanisms through external partners, peer reviews or the like.

→ If targeting and registration do not happen concurrently (e.g. targeting is conducted by WFP and partners while the registration is conducted in a second step by a financial institution in case of a cash transfer), it may offer an opportunity for validation.

3.7.2 Costs associated with targeting

Costs associated with targeting include:

- Administrative costs, i.e. time, money and human resources (also for re-targeting)
- Incentive costs, i.e. setting a livestock quota may alter household investments strategies
- Social costs, i.e. stigma, eroding informal support mechanisms or creating social tension and conflict (see also, section 3.4)
- Political costs, i.e. eliminating political incentive for populations not included in criteria

What to do:

→ Consider the costs associated with the targeting method you are considering before you settle on a targeting methodology

→ Outline additional actions needed to offset anticipated costs

→ Remember that, even though not always feasible, a common and harmonised targeting system for all stakeholders often proves to be more cost-efficient than multiple parallel targeting mechanisms
3.7.3 Targeting methods

Below are descriptions of different targeting methods, which can help you map out your options using also existing experience and knowledge for potential new approaches.

**Means tests:** This method collects (nearly) complete information on households’ income and/or wealth and verifies the information collected against independent sources. Where suitable databases exist and interagency cooperation can be obtained, information may be verified by the crosslinking of registries. When this is not possible, households may be asked to submit copies of records of transactions such as pay stubs, utility bills or tax payments.

**Proxy means tests (PMT):** This method generates a score for applicant households based on observable characteristics of the household such as the location and quality of its dwelling, its ownership of durable goods, and so on. The information provided by the applicant in a survey is usually partially verified by either collecting the information on a home visit by a programme official or by having the applicant bring written verification of part of the information to the programme office. Eligibility is determined by comparing the household’s score against a predetermined cut-off.

**Community-based targeting:** This method makes use of a group of community members, whose principal functions in the community are not related to the programme, to decide who in the community should benefit. Usually, special committees composed of common community members, or a mix of community members and local officials, are specially formed to determine eligibility for a programme. Typically, WFP will develop criteria prior to engaging the community and then reform after consultation with the community.

**Geographic targeting:** With geographic targeting, eligibility for benefits is determined by location. People who live in the areas designated are eligible; those who live elsewhere are not. Very few programmes target only on the basis of geography. Very many programmes use geographic targeting in conjunction with other methods.

**Demographic targeting:** The common and simple forms of demographic targeting are based on age - child allowances and social pensions being the most common. Part of the rationale is that individuals may be particular vulnerable in childhood and old age.

**Self-targeting:** Self-targeted programmes are technically open to all, but designed in such a way that take-up for them is expected to be much higher among the poor than the non-poor. One of the most common applications of self-targeting is the use of low wages in public works programmes to induce participation only among the poor. The assumption is that the less poor will be able to command higher wages elsewhere.

---

**Box 6. Community based targeting in Malawi**

For example, in Malawi, for the Cash and Food for Livelihoods Programme, WFP developed a list of beneficiaries via community-based targeting. WFP then engaged the Malawi Savings Bank to make a registry for smartcards that were used for cash transfers. This process then served as a verification exercise for the targeting.

**TIP:** In the case of Malawi, many beneficiaries carry an English and a local name; ensure that you agree on how to capture names in the design phase.
Below is a comparison of some advantages and disadvantages of different types of targeting methods that can help making appropriate decisions in a given country context:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantages and disadvantages of different targeting methods</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDIVIDUAL HOUSEHOLDS LEVEL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Means tests: Eligibility is based on income, which can be assessed through independent administrative verification of income (salary or tax records) or through household-level data collection.</td>
<td>Rigorous indication of eligibility; low inclusion errors; potential high exclusion error; once this data exists, can have multiple uses</td>
<td>High requirements for strong data collection systems that cover the whole population; administrative records frequently exclude informal sector and independent workers; only captures economic indicators of vulnerability and is very costly in terms of both money and time, unless the programme is very small; data errors probable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proxy means test: A score is generated based on observable characteristics such as location and quality of housing, ownership of goods, demographic structure of household, education and occupation of members (usually derived from statistical analysis of household survey data)</td>
<td>Depending on construction of the score, can provide a more multi-dimensional measurement of poverty; since it is based on easily observable characteristics, it can be easier to collect than income data; asset indicators (economic, social and human) may better reflect poverty over time, compared to income</td>
<td>Requires highly developed empirical evidence and well-developed indicators; requires high administrative and technical capacity (and costs) to develop score, ensure updating and implement assessments; may incur significant inclusion and exclusion errors if particular causes of vulnerabilities (e.g. social) are not considered; may not be very useful in cases where income is more or less than the first 2-3 quintiles (if everyone is poor, then inclusion errors are negligible and PMT is too costly for that); on the other hand, PMT does not address exclusion errors unless you have a census done for that ID part already; written verification can be difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community-based targeting (CBT): Community members are part of the eligibility assessment and/or verification based on assumption that they are familiar with community characteristics and may have insider knowledge</td>
<td>May increase ownership and validation of the programme and in some contexts strengthen existing community mechanisms; community participation may increase transparency of selection; does not require high technical capacity but usually requires careful selection of criteria for and sufficient training of community members</td>
<td>Risk of bias or manipulation due to uneven power relations within a community; difficult to apply in urban settings; may increase tensions between selected and unselected groups; can be less attractive for government due to being time consuming and labour intensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>OTHER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Categorical and Demographic: Eligibility defined based on broad social categories and/or groups such as age, physical ability, gender, ethnicity, social status</td>
<td>Limited technical capacity required and lower costs; simple and easily communicated criteria may create greater transparency and make eligibility less prone to manipulation</td>
<td>Verification of status may be a challenge – e.g. if birth registration is not widespread or in the case of disability or illness; may not address structural vulnerabilities and/or impacts of particular risks on families and communities that are not strongly associated with the categories; stigma associated with targeting particular groups, e.g., OVS and individuals affected by HIV and AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geographical: Selection of beneficiaries based on location, often through mapping to identify poorest regions or districts</td>
<td>Limited technical capacity required and low administrative costs; efficient where poverty or vulnerability is geographically concentrated</td>
<td>Requires sufficiently reliable data to differentiate poverty at the relevant level of disaggregation (region, district, etc.); can be politically charged in contexts where geography or vulnerability are correlated with other political or social dimensions such as religion or political party</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-selection: Programme design components (size or type of transfer, timing of benefits, location of payments, etc.) make the programme attractive only to specific groups who self-select to participate</td>
<td>Limited technical capacity required</td>
<td>May create high exclusion (particularly of already-marginalized people) and inclusion errors; certain self-selection criteria can be stigmatizing or impose heavy costs on participant to target the poor – e.g., provision of culturally undesirable/inferior goods or requirement to travel, work or wait for the benefits – raising ethical and protection issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WFP often combines targeting methods. For example, programmes often combine geographical and categorical methods (e.g. nutrition and school feeding), geographical and community-based methods (e.g. General Food Distribution and Food Assistance for Assets).

**What to do:**
- Consider context-specific pros and cons for different targeting methods
- Work together with government and partners to strengthen the targeting criteria and approach
- Refer back to WFP-specific guidance and resources, see p. 15 of these guidelines

### 3.7.4 Seasonal targeting, targeting for shocks and resilience

Safety nets target three populations:

1. **The chronic poor:** households who require assistance to meet minimum needs, including nutritional needs, even in ‘normal or good times’.
2. **The transient poor:** households who live near the poverty line, and may fall into poverty when the family or the national economy faces hard time or on a seasonal basis (i.e. lean seasons, post-natural disasters, during commodity price spikes, times of financial crisis, shocks from conflict, etc.)
3. **Those with special circumstances:** households that need special programmes targeted to their specific needs, including disability, chronic illness, discrimination due to ethnicity or displacement due to conflict.

Increasingly, safety net programming attempts to provide predictable and appropriate transfers to different populations at different times, and in different forms. In many ways, this type of programming is putting ‘adaptive social protection’ (see section 1.3, Box 8) into practice, combining social protection, disaster risk reduction and climate change adaptation sectors in the design of the safety nets.

**What to do:** use the SLP (and potentially other available information from CBPPs, etc.) to:
- Consider seasonality in designing your targeting criteria
- Consider what transfers are needed in what form, and at what time, for these different populations
- Understand the seasonal needs of various livelihoods strategies in the community
- Consider options for linking to transitional funding to scale up/down to serve transiently food insecure populations, see Module B, section 2.6.4 Risk financing and safety nets.

### 3.7.5 Targeting as a source of tensions

Understanding the impact of any type of food assistance on a particular environment is key to ensuring WFP does not do harm by providing food assistance. Unless the criteria for targeting are clearly explained to all in the community, tensions may arise and/or be exacerbated by the provision of assistance to some and not others. Communication with the affected populations as well as complaints and feedback mechanisms (see also, section 3.4) are therefore key to ensuring food assistance does not do harm.

---

13 The safety nets conversation is often concentrated on concepts and measures of poverty. WFP expertise tends toward ‘food insecurity’, so we speak of the chronically hungry or the transient hungry. In the safety nets conversation, it’s likely going to be necessary to speak comfortably in both ‘languages’.

14 Adapted from World Bank (2012) Presentation presented at the Core Course on Social Protection.
### 3.7.6 Developing a common targeting system: supporting government leadership

WFP has expertise to offer in targeting, eligibility and enrolment that when shared in partnership with government (see Module B), can help design a successful, government-led targeting mechanism for a government-led safety net. In addition to providing technical assistance, WFP can support government systems to build country capacity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What WFP Can Do:</th>
<th>Help governments target the right geographical areas, communities, households and individuals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How:</strong></td>
<td>Use WFP data creatively to analyse contexts, vulnerabilities, trends and shocks, see section 3.2. Use WFP’s internal expertise including the Seasonal Livelihoods Programming, Community Based Participatory Planning, and other WFP tools to target at community, household and individual levels.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong></td>
<td>WFP data contributed to the targeting for the districts in phase 1 of Kenya’s Hunger Safety Net Programme. It also included national poverty statistics and UNICEF malnutrition data.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What WFP Can Do:</th>
<th>Provide targeting systems for governments to build upon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>How:</strong></td>
<td>WFP targeting systems can become the basis for a common targeting system. See 3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong></td>
<td>WFP Djibouti has included a seasonal food voucher component in its transfer modalities since 2012. This programme is jointly managed with the State Secretary of National Solidarity (SESN), which considers it as part of their national safety nets activities. In 2013, WFP assisted 6,500 poor urban households under this modality. In 2014, WFP also prepared a third round of this seasonal voucher assistance, which will target the urban food-insecure households residing in the poorest districts of the capital. The SESN is the government institution leading the activities to achieve the objectives of the National Initiative for Social Development (INDS), which is based on the principle of national solidarity and poverty reduction. The voucher activity implemented by WFP in Djibouti has introduced a new targeting methodology for the government. Using the proxy means indicators to target the urban poor households is now the methodology that the SESN is planning to use in the elaboration of its National Social Register, in targeting the urban poor. WFP put a database in place including information on all the households living in the targeted areas (approximately 19,000). Using a proxy means tool, WFP then selected the targeted poor households (6,500). WFP also implemented a complaint mechanism, which is more focused on the inclusion and exclusion errors in order to treat them in a timely manner and correct the database accordingly. The voucher programme is managed by a steering committee, which is led by the SESN. During the elaboration of the programme, WFP shared the methodology used to target the urban households in its programme, and shared a presentation with the steering committee regarding the methodology of the targeting, the database &amp; the complaints mechanism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Different root causes of vulnerability and poverty will require different safety nets interventions; however, different interventions can use a common targeting system to identify and register...
beneficiaries in a single database. Developing or using a single registry or beneficiary system is a major step toward integrated service delivery.\textsuperscript{15}

However, there are challenges in converting to a common targeting system. The example below illustrates a dilemma one country office is currently facing regarding the use of a common government targeting system instead of the WFP system.

One country office recently expressed a dilemma on whether or not to use government targeting systems. The below shares arguments both for and against.

In that particular country, WFP currently uses its own targeting system for WFP programmes. However, the government has a different targeting system.

The dilemma: \textbf{Is it ok to use a parallel system? For how long?}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WFP System</th>
<th>Support to Government System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argument: It is better to continue using a WFP-specific approach.</td>
<td>Argument: It is better to use the imperfect government targeting system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’ve developed it according to our criteria, experience and best judgement.</td>
<td>If it’s going to get better, it needs practice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will slow us down to change over. It will reduce our effectiveness. Needs are high.</td>
<td>We need to run water through the pipes to find the leak.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The WFP system is not politicized. Government systems can be biased by political decisions.</td>
<td>It’s the only sustainable solution – it’s an investment in a long-term solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are scarce resources. WFP needs to get to the most vulnerable people in the most efficient way possible.</td>
<td>If WFP keeps using a parallel system to provide services directly, we are undermining the government’s accountability to provide services.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our donors request that we maintain an independent targeting and verification system so as to avoid having to follow a potentially politicised process that may not necessarily objectively target the most vulnerable.</td>
<td>If we don’t use and strengthen it, how will we ever live up to our promises to eventually hand it over to the government?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

WFP staff members are increasingly finding themselves needing to balance between taking a government-systems building approach and continuing to work in the way WFP has established is best in order to deliver effectively for beneficiaries.

\textbf{What to do?}

The country office in this case could consider:

\begin{itemize}
    \item Exploring if there are existing efforts going on to strengthen and/or build up government owned targeting systems
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{15} United Nations Children’s Fund (2012) Social Protection Strategic Framework, see page 44.
Making a roadmap to get from WFP systems to government systems exploring jointly with the UNCT
Establishing that the road map needs to be clear about government partners and key stakeholders
Keeping it realistic in terms of time and resources that need to be invested
Aligning programmes to include this road map and advocate with other partners to do the same
Considering the proposal of an MOU to work on a short-term project with the government to bring targeting systems into alignment
Considering the creation of a secondment to the government ministry in charge of the targeting system to facilitate incorporation in the medium term
Considering joint fundraising to employ expertise in government to manage the system

Capacity development for safety nets happens through the transfer and exchange of information, expertise and systems. In settings where systems are not in place, ‘an appropriate focus may be on setting up one or more core programmes and ensuring that these are supported by strong, basic administrative sub-system ‘building blocks’ that can be used across social protection programmes such as beneficiary identification and registry systems’.

The most basic of needs is food; therefore WFP can assist in helping set up administrative systems for safety nets, which can eventually be used across social protection programmes.

3.7.8 Takeaways for targeting
In summation, developing targeting criteria and mechanisms, selecting a targeting method and developing targeting components, starts with the following key steps:

- Considering the objectives of the safety nets assistance and its linkages with complementary programmes
- Considering the analysis at all three levels: context analysis, seasonal livelihood programmes, and community based participatory planning
- Setting the criteria in partnership with affected communities and in alignment with government requirements and complementing already existing mechanisms
- Evaluating potential transfer criteria and mechanisms for their usefulness in achieving objectives, considering:
  - Programme objectives and goals
  - Options for targeting method, criteria and mechanisms
  - What MIS exists or is being built
  - Potential costs
  - Potential inclusion/exclusion error
  - Potential tensions
  - Community awareness
  - Complaints and Feedback mechanisms
  - Seasonality and transient food-insecure populations
  - Available mechanisms for identification
  - Opportunities for systems-building and capacity development

Overall, the two key takeaways are to develop a transparent targeting mechanism that 1) is aimed at including the most vulnerable and that 2) provides a platform for other initiatives.

3.8 Transfer selection

In-kind, cash or voucher transfer selection guidance is provided by the Cash and Voucher Manual 2014.

3.8.1 Transfer modality

A transfer modality is the mode in which resources are transferred to targeted beneficiaries, which, for WFP, can be in-kind food, cash and/or vouchers. A transfer modality is a means; it is neither a project nor an objective per se.

- **Cash transfers**
  Cash transfers are monetary assistance in the form of physical cash or electronic disbursements to targeted individuals or households, which enables direct access (or access through a Cooperating Partner, host government and/or a Service Provider) to food and/or insurance from the market place.

- **Voucher transfers**
  Voucher transfers are assistance to persons or households in the form of a paper or electronic entitlement redeemable at pre-selected retailers or at specifically organized fairs for a predefined list a food items or insurance services consistent with the project objectives – but not for cash.

  The three main types of vouchers are:
  - **Commodity voucher**, which is redeemed for fixed quantities of specified foods. The value of this voucher is expressed in quantities of food.
  - **Cash voucher**, which is redeemed for a choice of specified food items with the equivalent cash value of the voucher. The value of this voucher is expressed in monetary terms.
  - **Insurance voucher**, which is exchanged for an insurance policy which triggers a payout if the event against which it insures occurs within the limits of the policy.

  Retailers where vouchers can be redeemed are selected and contracted by WFP or its partners based on specific selection criteria [B.3.1].

  Note: In some cases, beneficiaries are allowed to receive cash back for cash-vouchers. The CO should define the maximum amount.

- **In-kind transfers**
  In-kind transfers are assistance to persons or households in the form of dry or wet rations (cooked feeding) given in commodities. For more information on possible food baskets and ration sizes, please refer to http://pgm.wfp.org/index.php/Topics:Rations.

3.8.2 Transfer amount

Guidance on Transfer Value Calculation is provided in the 2014 Cash and Voucher Manual.

**What is different for safety nets:**

Safety nets will often have a programme objective beyond filling the food gap for affected populations. Still, WFP interventions usually set the transfer value at the amount that will fill the food gap.

**What to do:**
Review the objectives of the safety nets. If the objectives indicate a need for transfers beyond the food gap, use the tools at your disposal to bring in the complementary pieces of the safety nets system, beyond WFP:

→ Engage with other partners to ensure clarity on what WFP will provide with transfers and what needs to be provided complementarily
→ Coordinate efforts with other partners. Use existing coordination mechanisms and/or the Seasonal Livelihoods Planning Tool (SLP) to coordinate efforts locally and seasonally, see section 3.5

Consider the duration of the safety nets. Since safety nets are longer-term and predictable, the societal impacts of the programme will be different than short-term emergency interventions. The transfer amount should be set accordingly.

- Consider incentives/disincentives, e.g. dis-incentivising labour market participation through transfers higher than average wages
- Consider the long-term implications in the context

For example, a programme objective may be to build up household assets over time. In the design and implementation of such a program, WFP must be clear about the value of the WFP transfer so that other complementary efforts can be sought out to reach goals and ensure that long-term objectives are achieved.

### 3.8.3 Transfer technologies

Guidance on transfer delivery mechanisms is provided by the Cash and Voucher Manual 2014. To learn more about new technologies, see also a review of electronic transfer technology.\(^\text{17}\)

---

3.9 Enrolment and registration

Household or individual targeting in programme design requires identification to be made for beneficiaries to receive the transfers. Once beneficiaries are targeted and then identified, some form of identification serves to authenticate the identity of the beneficiary, which can be especially important in certain settings. Any form of targeting has potential to cause exclusion and inclusion error; consideration should be made to ensure that geographically or culturally marginalized people are not excluded.

Enrolment and registration is the point where you will collect information. Collecting information must be lawful and fair. See the forthcoming guidance on Personal Data Protection and Privacy for more information. To find out more, contact OSZPH.

Biometric Identification: Using biometrics for identification means assessing an individual’s identity based on a unique physical or behavioural trait. Fingerprint scans have historically been the most commonly used biometric, but iris recognition is becoming more prevalent, along with face prints. Increasingly, projects are making use of multimodal biometrics; that is, they use fingerprints along with iris scans and/or face prints.¹⁸

Identification Cards: Identification cards range from photo identification, to using barcodes or chips. Often, the challenge in identification is on the issuance of multiple identification cards to one person.¹⁹

For WFP, targeting is followed by identification and is generally made using already existing forms of identification. In refugee situations, WFP generally uses the identification done by UNHCR (usually ID cards but increasingly biometric identification). In other areas, identification is made by name. In geographic or community-based targeting, identification is not commonly needed or tracked. More and more, as cash and voucher programming increases, WFP is looking for targeting methods that require identification.

Key questions to consider:

- Will the preferred targeting method require identification?
- What type of identification is common in the area and are there existing identification systems (e.g. election cards) in place?
- What kind of identification is used in relation to the Management Information System (MIS), if one exists? What is the government proposing and what are other partners advocating for?
- What kinds of inclusion/exclusion errors are related to different forms of identification in this context in addition to targeting errors?
- What administrative requirements will be needed to develop identification systems?
- Will WFP share data at any point with another partner, including the government? If so, adhere to the principles below and see the forthcoming guidance on Personal Data Protection and Privacy. For more information, please get in touch with OSZPH.

When collecting data:

- Have legitimate reasons for collecting and using personal data


¹⁹ Ibid.
- Be transparent about how you intend to use the data
- Give the individuals concerned appropriate information
- Do not use the personal data in ways that have unjustified adverse effects on the individual concerned
- Handle personal data in ways that the individual concerned would reasonably expect
- Make sure you are compliant with the forthcoming guidance on Personal Data Protection and Privacy, particularly on sharing information with another partner including the government. For more information, please get in touch with OSZPH.

Complaints and feedback mechanisms are an important part of WFP’s Commitment to Accountability to Affected Populations. One of the five commitments is on Feedback and Complaints: Actively seek the views of affected populations to improve policy and practice in programming, ensuring that feedback and complaints mechanisms are streamlined, appropriate and robust enough to deal with (communicate, receive, process, respond to and learn from) complaints about breaches in policy and stakeholder dissatisfaction. Specific issues raised by affected individuals regarding violations and/or physical abuse that may have human rights and legal, psychological or other implications should have the same entry point as programme-type complaints, but procedures for handling these should be adapted accordingly. (IASC Task Force on Accountability to Affected Populations)
3.10 Community awareness and complaints and feedback mechanisms

It is essential to design complaints and feedback mechanisms that are accessible and can mediate conflicts that do arise. The Updated Cash and Voucher Guidelines provide further guidance.

**Box 7. Complaints and feedback mechanisms: spotlight on Kenya**

A new telephone hotline was piloted as part of WFP Kenya’s new complaints and feedback mechanism in Isiolo, Turkana and Wajir in 2012. It ran in conjunction with a “mobile money” services pilot, where unconditional cash transfers delivered through mobile phones replaced distributions of food. In the first 3 months of the pilot, the hotline handled more than 300 calls from beneficiaries asking for information or assistance. Intensive monitoring indicated that more than 90 percent of beneficiaries were aware of the new service. When WFP called beneficiaries who had used the hotline, 85 percent said they were satisfied with how their issue had been handled. The remaining 15 percent said that WFP had taken too long to resolve their complaint.


**What to do:**

- Lay out a plan for communication with affected populations
- Ensure a quality complaints and feedback mechanism is part of the safety nets
- Use participatory tools such as the Seasonal Livelihoods Programming Tool (SLP) and the Community Based Participatory Planning tool (CBPP) to set targeting criteria and mechanisms, including setting up a quality complaints and feedback mechanism
- Integrity of the mechanisms and their operators is essential for the system to function: develop or utilise comprehensive induction and training programme for staff that operate the mechanisms
- Emphasise the need for accountability within line management. Consider introducing a checklist for managers to review levels of compliance
- Consider including an equivalent system for staff that is running the system
- Ensure the mechanisms are included in monitoring and evaluation of the program
- Ensure integration with your Management Information Systems

**CHALLENGE:** Complaints and feedback mechanisms can be an effective way to identify inclusion or exclusion error. However, finding a way to take the feedback on exclusion error and reform the targeting criteria accordingly can be a major challenge, particularly for targeting methods that are more rigid, such as PMT. Ensure follow-up, including a re-evaluation of targeting criteria and mechanisms as necessary.

The WFP HQ unit concerned with ‘Humanitarian Protection’ (OSZPH) is piloting “Conflict Sensitive Programming” training and is working with the COs to better understand how food assistance positively or negatively impacts existing community tensions as well as how it can contribute to creating and/or deflating tensions. The objective is to minimize any negative impacts and build upon positive impacts of food assistance. For more information, please get in touch with OSZPH.
### 3.11 Conditionality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>WFP WIDELY USED TERMINOLOGY</strong>, as defined in the WFP Cash and Voucher Manual 2014</th>
<th><strong>INTERNATIONALY ACCEPTED TERMINOLOGY</strong>, as defined in the 2012 Update of WFP’s Safety Nets Policy: The Role of Food Assistance in Social Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Unconditional transfers**  
Unconditional transfers make no reciprocal demands on beneficiaries. | **Unconditional transfers**  
These provide people in need with direct support, without reciprocal activities – such as general food distribution. |
| **Conditional transfers**  
Conditional transfers impose requirements on beneficiaries such as participation in work, training, attending school and adhering to a health treatment (but no monetary contribution nor repayment from the beneficiary). The transfer is given after recipients have performed some task or activity as a qualifying condition of receiving the transfer.  
*Asset creation/training conditionality*  
WFP’s conditional transfers are usually made in return for participation in asset creation activities or training (e.g. food assistance for training). Food assistance-for-assets (FFA) activities are intended to directly help beneficiaries as well as support the wider community through the outputs of the work.  
*Behavioural change conditionality*  
Assistance can also be used to encourage or influence behaviour change (e.g. following health advice or treatment, attending nutritional education classes or sending children to school). | **Conditional transfers**  
These are provided contingent on a desired behaviour by beneficiaries – such as school feeding, take-home rations, food-for-training. |
| **Public and community works**  
Depending on the level of technical complexity, these can range from simple, labour-intensive livelihood activities such as maintenance of feeder roads, to more sophisticated, higher-quality asset creation programmes such as those linked to natural resource management. | |

It is important to note that various actors use terminology on conditionality/conditional/unconditional differently. Within WFP, it is common to refer to programmes that require labour contribution as conditional programmes. Not all actors outside of WFP would call such transfers ‘conditional’. Many people would use the words ‘conditional transfers’ only to describe a *behavioural change* conditionality as shown above. They might not use the words ‘conditional transfers’ to describe a *work/training conditionality*. Instead, they likely name it, saying ‘public works programme’. Therefore, be sure to
clarify your meaning when using the term ‘conditional’ to describe a work programme so that you are clearly understood.

**It is a programme decision on whether to use conditional or unconditional transfers; therefore, these programmatic guidelines do not set out criteria or provide further policy regarding conditionality.**

However, since the unconditional vs. conditional programming choice is an important one for safety nets design and implementation, these guidelines do attempt to provide more information and suggestions for consideration. Particularly as WFP moves from food aid to food assistance and a number of donors and national governments are increasingly sceptical of free food handouts, country offices are increasingly pursuing conditional programming in an attempt to move away from unconditional transfers such as GFD if and when appropriate.

While moving away from GFD will not always entail conditional transfer programmes, conditional transfers are one avenue through which WFP can break from a cycle of unconditional emergency relief responses.

As with all WFP programmes, safety nets should be designed to serve as solutions to problems of food insecurity and malnutrition in a given area, selecting conditional or unconditional design based on what is best suited to the context.

While there is a wide range of unconditional programming that can promote long-term development and help to break the deeply rooted hunger-poverty cycle (and advocates for unconditional transfers are certainly prevalent in the social protection community often including UNICEF and DFID), there is a strong role for conditional programming in certain contexts and to achieve certain objectives. For instance, major conditional cash transfer programmes in Latin America require children in the household to attend school and have regular medical check-ups in order for the household to receive the transfers.

The challenge in attaching conditions to WFP assistance is for country offices to:

- develop an understanding of what conditions are appropriate: when, how and where, in order to address root causes of food insecurity;

### Box 8. Programmes with work conditionality – do they provide income or build assets?

Some labour programmes have a primary objective to guarantee income security through wage employment. For example, the Mahatma Gandhi National Rural Employment Guarantee Act in India primarily aims to enhance the livelihood security of people in rural areas by guaranteeing one hundred days of wage-employment in a financial year to a rural household whose adult members volunteer to do unskilled manual work.

**WFP Food Assistance for Assets (FFA) programmes** have a dual objective: a) to fill an immediate food gap and b) to build livelihood assets. FFA programmes use food assistance (via one or more transfer modalities) to establish or rehabilitate a community asset (whether physical, natural and/or human) rather than to create employment and income.

In order to help address the underlying causes of food insecurity and build resilience, programmes with work conditionality must include a primary objective to build assets, for example to restore degraded lands or water tables, creating better market access or irrigation for farming. Whether in policy or programme work, work conditionality should go beyond providing labour and income to effectively utilizing labour for enhanced returns, improving food security and increasing resilience to shocks.
have effective and cost-efficient monitoring systems in place that are not overburdening the local capacity; and

devlop a clear idea on ‘what if’ needy beneficiaries do not meet or are not able to meet the introduced conditionality. It is essential that all these concerns are included in the design phase of any conditional transfer project from the very beginning.

Additionally, this shift requires country offices to consider the appropriate political framing of conditionality as well as a strong communication strategy at all levels including communities, which ensures all parties understand the objectives of the shift. Country offices may choose to use terminology such as co-responsibility, ‘soft conditions’ or ‘behavioural change-linked’, for instance.

**TIP: In meetings with partners, use the word ‘conditional’ carefully. Since the term ‘conditional’ when used outside of WFP is not necessarily linked to labour contribution and some actors may be opposed to placing conditions on assistance, using the term ‘conditional’ may confuse the conversation instead of building consensus behind the true objectives of the programme (i.e. building resilience).**

How to help design conditional programmes:

- **Consider government, donor and partner policies and strategies**
- **Use Seasonal Livelihoods Planning and Community Based Participatory Planning to inform decisions about conditionality**
  - Use the seasonal livelihoods calendar to see what type of activity (conditional/unconditional) should be done in the lean season, what type in the investment and preparedness periods
  - Refer to community plans for information on beneficiary preference related to type of activity and timing (particularly for labour conditions)
- **Consider supply side issues**
  - Do services exist to tie conditions to them? For instance, if medical check-ups or vaccinations will be required, are adequate services available?
  - Does WFP have the right partners already or will new partnership need to be developed? For instance, if attendance at a nutrition-training will be required, do WFP-implementing partners provide trainings or will a new partnership be needed?
- **Consider gender roles**
  - What are the different gender roles and how will additional burdens impact men, women, and children?
- **Consider time requirements**
  - Requiring conditions to be met will make demands of the beneficiary – consider the repercussions on individuals and the household, and ensure feedback loops to learn what works well and what does not in applying conditions to assistance
- **Consider monitoring needs**
  - WFP and partners need to establish mechanism to ensure that the agreed upon conditionality is adhered to; this should be kept light, manageable and transparent
  - In addition, at the onset of the activity clearly define and communicate what happens when/if a beneficiary defaults on the conditionality
3.12 Monitoring, evaluation and learning

Monitoring and evaluation at the programme level: WFP programmes already have established guidance on monitoring and evaluation to achieve programme objectives, including programme specific guidance:


WFP also has the Office of Evaluation to provide external evaluations such as policy, impact and operations evaluations, which can be used to improve safety net programmes and policies:


3.12.1 Benchmarks

To monitor individual safety net programmes: In addition to existing monitoring and evaluation standard WFP processes, country office staff are encouraged to use benchmarks specific to safety nets to monitor and evaluate a specific programme. These benchmarks are based on the principles for quality safety nets set out in Module A, section 1.1.4.

- **Clear objectives** aiming at reducing hunger and ensuring food security and nutrition
- **Predictable and appropriate transfers**: modalities, benefit levels, timing, frequency and duration
- **Rooted in context** and political realities at all levels based on a thorough livelihood and context analysis, including a context-based analysis of the differences between men and women
- **Transparent targeting** mechanism that is aimed at including the most vulnerable and provides a platform for other initiatives
- **Full alignment/integration with Government** national social protection and safety nets policies and strategies
- **Complementarity and integration** with other existing safety net programmes, interventions and systems (nutrition programmes, disaster risk reduction, early warning systems)
- **Cost-effective and efficient** with a view to transfer modality, delivery and administrative mechanisms
- **Seasonal design and implementation** with attention to trends and beneficiary experiences
- **Flexible and scalable** to cater for additional or reduced needs in times of crisis and times of improved livelihood conditions
- **Attention to gender and other social and cultural constructions** for intended and unintended consequences
- **Livelihoods-based** and designed for a diversity of livelihood strategies
- **Financially sustainable** with a minimum period of guaranteed funding including risk financing
- **Supports ‘informal’ safety nets** building on and enhancing local capacities and mechanisms

These benchmarks directly translate into monitoring and evaluation criteria, becoming the basis for the diagnostic tool for monitoring and evaluation of safety nets.

---


21 Examples of informal safety nets include remittances, zakat, rotating savings and credit schemes, resource sharing in lean seasons and others.
3.12.2 Diagnostic tool for monitoring and evaluation

Use the safety net diagnostic tool\(^2\), also in Annex L, to assess the strength of the safety nets (in design or existing programmes) against established benchmarks. It can be adjusted and further detailed at the country level to be programme and context specific.

### Safety Nets Diagnostic Tool

On a scale of 1 (weak) to 10 (strong), how strong is the food security and/or nutrition safety nets according to the following principles?

- **Clear objectives** aiming at reducing hunger and addressing food and nutrition insecurity
  
  1-…………………………………………………………..10

- **Predictable and appropriate transfers**: modalities, benefit levels, timing and duration
  
  1-…………………………………………………………..10

- **Rooted in context** and political realities at all levels based on a thorough livelihood and context analysis
  
  1-…………………………………………………………..10

- **Transparent targeting** mechanism that is aimed at including the most vulnerable and provides a platform for other initiatives
  
  1-…………………………………………………………..10

- **Full alignment/integration with Government** national social protection and safety nets policies and strategies
  
  1-…………………………………………………………..10

- **Consolidated programmes, complementary and integrated** with other existing safety net programmes, interventions and systems (nutrition programmes, DRR, EWS)
  
  1-…………………………………………………………..10

- **Cost-effective and efficient** with a view to transfer modality, delivery and administrative mechanisms
  
  1-…………………………………………………………..10

- **Seasonal design and implementation** with attention to trends and beneficiary experiences
  
  1-…………………………………………………………..10

- **Flexible and scalable** to cater for additional or reduced needs in times of crisis and times of improved livelihood conditions
  
  1-…………………………………………………………..10

- **Attention to gender and other social and cultural constructions** for intended and unintended consequences
  
  1-………………………………………………………………10

- **Livelihoods-based** and designed for a diversity of livelihood strategies
  
  1-………………………………………………………………10

- **Financially sustainable** with a minimum period of guaranteed funding including risk financing
  
  1-………………………………………………………………10

- **Supports ‘informal’ safety nets** building on and enhancing local capacities and mechanisms
  
  1-………………………………………………………………10

**Use the scores to:**
- Focus on areas of weakness
- Use WFP tools to improve in certain areas
- Work with partners to bring in complementary comparative advantages to make improvements
- Evaluate your programme design at any stage in the programme cycle

---

\(^2\) There are no compulsory reporting requirements for this monitoring exercise. The exercise is meant for learning purposes only. It is not meant to compare across countries or programmes. It will continue to be adapted over the course of 2014 and 2015.
What to do:

→ Assess the programme yourself or in a small group, informally. Keep in mind that the assessment is subjective and should be a reflective exercise with a strong emphasis on qualitative data and discussion – not an exercise with precise right and wrong answers.

**SHOULD YOU CALL A MEETING?** Normally, the programme section or unit will lead this assessment – leading a meeting, even with external stakeholders or as part of a working group, may add value. This will depend on the context and judgement of the Programme Officer.

→ Use the outcome of these rankings to establish a qualitative baseline.

→ Then use the baseline to check-in on progress during implementation by repeating it throughout the course of the project cycle as a learning exercise.

**SUGGESTION:** Do this exercise on a regular basis (e.g. once a year) to track change over time.

### 3.12.3 Monitoring and evaluation at the national level (SPA)

Government safety nets and social protection systems are evaluated at the national level. Because hunger-related safety nets are subsets of safety nets, and because safety nets are part of the larger social protection system in any country (no matter how comprehensive), it is important to look at the larger picture for monitoring and evaluation.

WFP is working with other UN partners, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and other partners on a standard assessment of social protection systems, currently known as the Inter-Agency Social Protection Assessment (SPA), at the country government level. The assessment looks at a country’s social protection system and applies a Core Diagnostic Instrument (CODI) to assess the system’s performance. In addition to the CODI, the SPA also zooms into particular aspects of the social protection system, for example by assessing the identification system that is used in the country’s programmes and by assessing particular types of programmes, namely public works and community asset creation programmes. The public and community works assessment has been tested in Liberia and El Salvador and is now available publicly.

**What to do:**

→ Engage with partners to know whether the Government and others are discussing this assessment in your country.

→ Use existing assessments to evaluate on-going social protection and safety net projects, generate strategic dialogue for improvement and/or new safety net programmes, and as a baseline to measure performance and progress over time.

→ If no SPA tools have been applied yet, consider advocating with government and partners for using the CODI and other relevant SPA tools in your country.

This national level assessment is a tool that WFP staff can use when working on government-led safety nets to advocate for community and public works programmes in social protection and safety nets strategies, to generate a discourse on the topic and to assess performance over time.

### 3.12.4 Knowledge sharing for capacity building

Sharing WFP monitoring and evaluation data and reports, as appropriate, can help to build and improve safety nets systems. Results from M&E processes can also serve as effective policy tools, providing
evidence to strengthen support for a particular approach and intervention, sustain programmes even in contexts of political instability and support proposed expansions and increases in budget allocations.²³

**Box 11. Case study on sharing knowledge for capacity building:** Sharing lessons and jointly analysing qualitative and quantitative data with partners including the national government, UN agencies, the World Bank and NGOs increase the potential for learning and adjusting programmes to maximize impact. The 2011 strategic evaluation of WFP’s Role in Social Protection and Safety Nets found that WFP was effectively collecting and sharing data with a wide range of partners in Senegal for its cash/voucher pilot projects. At the same time, the World Bank and other partners were also sharing data from similar projects. Collectively this sharing of data was being used to inform discussions of the national social protection platform and future programme design. The Senegal WFP Country Office was also found to be collaborating with the Regional Bureau to develop a regional evaluation of cash/voucher programmes to compare learning from experiences in Senegal and Burkina Faso.


**What to do:**

- Share Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning data and reports with partners using existing national, regional and global platforms and networks
- Share Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning data and reports with government and partners at the national and local levels
- Share data and reports for internal WFP learning on the Social Protection and Safety Nets Topic Pages
- Ensure opportunities are taken to advance South-South cooperation

3.13 Management information systems (MIS)

Management information systems (MIS) are the systems that house beneficiary information and use it in programme design and implementation. They are directly linked with the targeting method and mechanism, see section 3.7.

Box 9. SCOPE: the WFP corporate beneficiary and transfer management platform

SCOPE is WFP’s beneficiary and transfer management platform. It is a single IT tool to manage all your interventions simultaneously from beginning to end for cash, voucher or in-kind transfers. SCOPE is a resource that can support targeting, identification and intervention management for safety nets.

Beneficiary Management

SCOPE is used to keep the interventions’ beneficiaries and household information in a single database. Once registered, beneficiaries can be enrolled into interventions in the platform and users can manage distribution cycles. SCOPE functionality includes ability to enrol beneficiaries in multiple interventions simultaneously or enrol them in interventions based on specific target criteria. Target criteria can include a variety of vulnerability indicators.

Once the platform captures beneficiary information this data can be re-used eliminating the need to re-register already existing beneficiaries and prevent errors or duplicate entries from occurring.

Beneficiary information can either be imported from an existing database (e.g. from national safety nets or WFP’s cooperating partners) or can manage registration of new beneficiaries directly in the platform. Registrations can be carried out in an online or offline setting. Optionally, SCOPE can capture photos and fingerprints.

Transfer Management

SCOPE can manage all interventions simultaneously regardless of transfer modality (cash, voucher or in-kind), including those that rely on third-party service providers. Payment lists and distribution lists can be sent securely from SCOPE. Information received from providers can be used to monitor and track intervention information such as beneficiary figures, whether beneficiaries received their benefits and how they utilize them, participation or attendance for all interventions and at an individual beneficiary level. This information can then be used for reconciliation and to understand beneficiary behaviour, ensuring operational controls are in place, and a feedback loop is established for programmatic information.

SCOPE has electronic voucher transfer solutions available that can be used where appropriate, such as when third-party delivery mechanisms are not available locally. The platform is equipped with diverse delivery instruments that are WFP-developed that can manage multiple benefit transfer types such as value or commodity and can be extended to safety net benefits.

For more information, go to http://go.wfp.org/web/scope.

Management information systems range from the simplest programme documentation – i.e. documenting a geographic distribution point and the tonnage of food aid or cash/voucher value distributed – to electronic systems that capture socio-economic information on beneficiary individuals and households, such as age, gender, residency, income level, education, employment, housing...
characteristics, etc. MIS are primarily used to administer and track transfers made to individuals or households; they are sometimes also used to facilitate targeting.\(^{24}\)

It is increasingly recognized that Management Information Systems are best housed in government institutions. While WFP has its own systems, such as SCOPE, WFP also has a role to play in helping build Management Information Systems with government and partners (including local civil society) where such systems do not yet exist or using and improving upon them where they do.

Management information systems can be used to:

- Capture individual or household information;
- Identify beneficiaries for particular programmes;
- Register individuals or households for particular programmes;
- Provide transfers, particularly for cash transfers or vouchers;
- Provide a record of transfers made to individuals or households;
- Link targeting, enrolment and payment;
- Store information on complaints and feedback (grievances);
- Offer monitoring information;
- Provide data that can be used for reforms, re-design and reporting;
- Manage and administer transfers; and
- Harmonise safety nets and social protection interventions with humanitarian assistance and therewith to generate partnerships.

Building an MIS is a large part of sustainable design. When the system is country-government operated, it allows for consolidation and coherence among programmes and puts government in the lead.

What to do:

- First, make sure you are compliant with the forthcoming guidance on Personal Data Protection and Privacy, particularly on sharing information with another partner including the government. For more information, please get in touch with OSZPH.

  \(\rightarrow\) Understand your office’s Management Information System (MIS).
  \(\rightarrow\) Explore if and how SCOPE can be used in your context.
  \(\rightarrow\) Find out what kind of MIS exists in the country and/or is being developed by the government and partners. In particular, ask about registry systems, identification systems, or distribution systems – all of which contribute to a MIS.

  **TIP:** The World Bank is often a lead partner on developing Management Information Systems. Your in-country World Bank contact should therefore be a good resource for more information in addition to the national government.

  \(\rightarrow\) If your country office is not yet participating in a relevant working group, consult the national government – the ministry relation to social protection or the inter-ministerial focal point (if one exists) – to find out how WFP can assist in the development of a stronger MIS.

  \(\rightarrow\) Use your understanding of what Management Information Systems exist to inform WFP decisions on targeting with the goal of supporting and building local safety nets systems. Refer to section 3.7 for details on targeting mechanisms.

\(^{24}\) Particularly when using a Proxy Means Test targeting method, the information captured in the MIS can be used for targeting. See more in section 3.7.
Box 10. Case study: Laying the foundation for a national management information system in Djibouti

The context in Djibouti: The droughts of the last six years and the continued rise of commodity prices have affected the livelihoods and coping mechanisms of about 212,000 people. Among them, 132,000 people, including the refugee population, need food assistance. According to the latest rural Food Security Assessment conducted in May 2013, the food security of rural households has slightly improved. However, the rural households remain very vulnerable to shocks and their food security status remains critical with very low dietary diversity. Overall, 67 percent of the assessed rural households are food-insecure (82,000), of which 22,000 people are severely food-insecure while 60,000 are moderately food-insecure. Moreover, this situation has led to the urbanization of the population in Djibouti; where already over 60% of the population is urban. The country has some of the worst social indicators in the world; 42 percent of the population lives in absolute poverty, unemployment is very high, i.e. 60% of the population. The country compensates its food gap by importing 90 percent of its food essentials, which makes the country highly dependent on international market prices. Any variation on the international prices has a considerable impact on the poorest segment of the population, who spend 77 percent of their household budget on food. The last SMART survey has also indicated very high levels of malnutrition, in fact the Global Acute Malnutrition (GAM) was found to be 17.8%, which is far beyond the emergency threshold as fixed by WHO (15%). Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) is at 5.7%. Rates are very high in urban areas where it shows 18.2% and 6.4% respectively for the GAM and SAM. WFP Djibouti has included a seasonal food voucher component in its transfer modalities since 2012. This programme is jointly managed with the State Secretary of National Solidarity (SESN), which considers it as part of their national safety nets activities. In 2013, WFP assisted 6,500 poor urban households under this modality. In 2014, WFP also prepared a third round of this seasonal voucher assistance, which will target the urban food insecure households residing in the poorest districts of the capital.

The State Secretary of National Solidarity is the government institution leading the activities to achieve the objectives of the National Initiative for Social Development (INDS), which is based on the principle of national solidarity and poverty reduction. The voucher activity implemented by WFP in Djibouti has introduced a new targeting methodology for the government. Using the proxy means indicators to target the urban poor households is now the methodology that the SESN is planning to use in the elaboration of its National Social Register, in targeting the urban poor.

**WFP’s Management Information System:** WFP put a database in place including information on all the households leaving in the targeted areas (approximately 19,000), using a proxy means tool, WFP then selected the targeted poor households (6,500). WFP also implemented a complaint mechanism, which is more focused on the inclusion and exclusion errors in order to treat them in a timely manner and correct the database accordingly.

**WFP’s Role in developing the government MIS:** The voucher programme is managed by a steering committee, which is led by the SESN. During the elaboration of the programme, WFP shared the methodology used to target the urban households in its programme, and shared a presentation with the steering committee of the methodology of the targeting, the database and the complaint mechanism.
An integrated information management system brings together different record-keeping systems into one system. It brings together the different administrative and programmatic pieces to make administering different programmes more efficient. Information is produced in each step of the safety net: enrolment lists, transfer delivery records, complaints records, records on whether conditions have been met or not by beneficiaries, monitoring data, and more. An integrated system ensures that these pieces of information are put together in a coherent way to help administer and continually improve the programme.

Check in on the checklist – by now you should be able to check off the first and second section:

Analyse the context:
- Engage with government and partners
- Do an external and internal scan (Module B of these guidelines)
- Do a comprehensive analysis of underlying factors
- Consider informal safety nets, gender and humanitarian protection issues
- Use seasonal livelihoods planning and community based planning tools

Put together the administrative and programmatic pieces:
- Set clear programme objectives
- Select target population
- Select transfer modality, value, and delivery mechanism
- Determine enrolment and registration process including beneficiary identification
- Design complaints and feedback mechanism
- Decide on conditionality
- Develop monitoring and evaluation processes
- Determine the Management Information System to build government capacity

In the next section, add in innovations that WFP has developed recently to add value to the programme for participants and their communities. How can the programme scale up and down according to changing needs and in response to shocks? How can the programme cover a household so that people are ready to respond to shocks before they happen? How can safety nets be used for their purchasing power in order to establish a steady market for smallholder farmers to increase their production?

Add in elements to use WFP’s expertise for better results:
- Link to local supply chains
- Consider risk financing and insurance options

Build sustainably from the beginning:
- Determine how to build in a transition strategy
- Plan for optimal coverage and expansion
- Plan for audit and control mechanisms in a joint programme with government
- Determine programme exit criteria and goals
3.14 Local supply chains

The 2014 strategic plan identifies the importance of linking safety nets systems to local agricultural supply chains.25 Moreover, governments are increasingly interested in building safety nets that connect to local supply chains.

Purchase for progress

For the last five years, WFP has been building experience in this area through the Purchase for Progress (P4P) pilot. P4P has successfully enabled WFP to experiment with new ways to leverage its purchasing power to support agricultural and market development. By helping smallholder farmers learn skills, improve quality and increase their sales, P4P has transformed WFP’s local procurement into a vital tool to address hunger. Pro-Smallholder Farmer procurement is one of the tools in WFP’s Toolbox on Safety Nets, Annex F.

P4P has gathered significant knowledge and research about what works most effectively when linking smallholder farmers to formal markets; and how a procurement footprint can be a catalyst for development. Sharing those lessons widely will be vital in WFP’s on-going efforts to link smallholder farm families to safety nets systems. As a pilot, P4P has emphasized an honest and transparent examination both of what works and of what does not. P4P pilot countries are actively documenting the key lessons learned after five years of implementation. This exercise will continue through 2014 when the final evaluation of the pilot will take place. For the 20 countries that have been involved in P4P, WFP can bring this expertise and lessons learned directly into building safety nets systems with partners and governments. For countries not yet involved in P4P, emerging learning and resources on Pro-Smallholder Procurement will be shared across WFP in 2014.

The usual entry point for P4P is smallholder farmers who are producing, or have the potential to produce a surplus. While some of these people are targeted to receive transfers through a food-based safety net, the majority exist at barely above this threshold. As P4P builds the capacity of these farmers to withstand shocks, which could easily tip them into the food assistance category without P4P’s intervention, P4P can be seen as building individual and community resilience thereby contributing to social protection.

These resources will assist WFP staff working to improve the design of WFP programmes and those working with partners to build sustainable safety nets systems.

→ See more at http://go.wfp.org/web/purchaseforprogress and http://www.wfp.org/content/p4p-primer

Home-grown school feeding programmes

Home-grown school feeding (HGSF) is a school feeding programme that provides food produced and purchased within a country to the extent possible. According to the 2013 School Feeding Policy, the link between school feeding and local agricultural production should be developed whenever possible and feasible. Visit http://pgm.wfp.org/index.php/Home_Grown_School_Feeding to learn more.

25 ‘Goal 3: Strengthen the capacity of governments and communities to establish, manage and scale up sustainable, effective and equitable food security and nutrition institutions, infrastructure and safety-net systems, including systems linked to local agricultural supply chains.’ “It [WFP] will provide advice and support to link safety nets to local agricultural supply chains, through programmes such as home-grown school feeding.” WFP’s Strategic Plan 2014-2017. Available online: http://www.wfp.org/about/strategic-plan.
3.15 School feeding

According to the current School Feeding Policy, the link between school feeding and local agricultural production is one of the five objectives of WFP’s work in school feeding and it should be developed whenever possible and feasible.

One of WFP’s roles is to place school feeding efforts in the context of the social protection policy and institutional environment. For example, a national school feeding programme managed by a line ministry may be a well-developed programme, but be poorly integrated into broader national schemes providing transfers that are managed by other institutions/ministries. WFP can have an important role in advocating and supporting government towards improving the integration of such programmes, perhaps by working to link information management platforms, targeting mechanism, or M&E systems, or improve institutional coordination to achieve greater outcomes.

What do Country Offices need to know about it?

- Given WFP’s organizational shift from food aid to food assistance, country offices (COs) now have at their disposal new implementation modalities that expand the positive impacts of school feeding to beyond its direct beneficiaries.
- Linking school feeding to local agricultural production should be pursued as long as it does not jeopardize the purpose of SF. This aspiration, however, does call for reflecting on the current school feeding programme and considering ways to improve it.
- There is no “one-size-fits-all” approach to achieve this objective. Available options depend on funding source, implementation and monitoring capacity and possibility of partnerships, not to mention the intervention’s rationale and its alignment with national goals.
- WFP COs around the world are already experimenting, either directly or through supporting governments, with the following innovations: domestic purchase, especially from smallholder farmers and/or their associations; decentralized procurement; cash and vouchers; introduction of different foodstuffs, including perishables, in the school feeding programme; supporting the processing of local products; and facilitating connections between smallholders and the food-processing industry, to name just a few.

Who should be involved? Country Director and Deputy Country Director, Programme Unit/SF Team, P4P Unit (if present), and other areas that might have to adapt to support the new operation (e.g. Purchases, Logistics, etc.)

See more at:
Box 12. Case study: The farmer-to-school model of Côte d’Ivoire

The Government of Côte d’Ivoire began its “One School, One Canteen” programme in 1999. It is led by the National Directorate of School Cantines (Direction Nationale des Cantines Scolaires), a unit within the Ministry of Education, in partnership with the Ministry of Agriculture. The programme, which provides school feeding to children, includes a component of technical and financial support to smallholder farmers, who are mainly women, to link school canteens with smallholder farmer production. Under the programme, local communities are supported and encouraged to manage the programme within five years by producing food for their school canteens. WFP has been supporting the government programme over a long period of time.

The government focuses on helping smallholder farmers organize around schools. The programme includes support to enable the smallholders to increase productivity and progressively meet the school food requirements. The support includes providing: seeds and tools; advice on the establishment of cooperatives (e.g. legal support, creation of internal rules and regulations and financial management); and training on farming and livestock techniques, livestock health protection (including vaccinations), sanitation, food conservation and processing and marketing techniques. Agricultural extension services are provided by an institution linked to the Ministry of Agriculture, in close collaboration with the school feeding unit.

The government also buys food for the programme from large suppliers when smallholders cannot meet the demand. For all transactions, a central market board sets commodity prices. Transportation is organized either through nationally contracted service providers, if coming from large-scale suppliers, or by local women’s groups. Food is prepared at the school. Staff from the Ministries of Education and Agriculture monitor and supervise the programme at the school and farmer organization levels.

In the 2008-2009 academic year, 265,000 schoolchildren in 2,027 schools in Côte d’Ivoire benefited from this programme. In addition, 961 production centres participated and sold 1,270 tons of food.

3.16 Risk financing and transfer (insurance)

Adding a risk transfer and financing element to a safety net can enhance effectiveness. In principle, risk of loss due to natural or man-made disasters may be financed and transferred by one entity to another in a variety of ways. All methods of transfer fall into three basic categories:

- insurance (transfer to an insurer/reinsurer under an insurance contract);
- judicial (transfer to another party by virtue of a successful legal action); and
- contractual (transfer to another party under contracts other than insurance).

Risk transfer (insurance): when an entity transfers some of its risk of loss to another entity. For example, when an individual buys insurance, he/she transfers some of his/her risk to the insurance company. For this service, the individual pays a fee called a premium. Similarly, when an insurance company buys insurance for itself from another insurance company, it transfers some of its own risk to another entity (called reinsurance). This risk transfer allows it to take on more risk.

Risk financing: financing the risk of loss, including risk transfer, funded retention by way of reserves (often called self-insurance and/or contingent financing) and risk pooling (see Africa Risk Capacity as an example below).

In the context of our operations, WFP is involved in risk transfer and financing in two main ways:

- **National and regional level**: Working with governments and regional bodies set up functioning risk financing systems to ensure that early warnings actually translate into early action. Disaster risk financing mechanisms (such as weather-index based insurance/ bonds, contingent grants, or contingent loans) enable predictable and timely availability of funds when a disaster hits. Such mechanisms are increasingly recognized as an important way of reducing disaster-prone countries’ dependence on the cumbersome humanitarian appeals process, and increasing the speed and cost-effectiveness of humanitarian assistance, often through existing safety nets mechanisms.

- **Community and individual level**: Implementing programmes that help individuals or a group of individuals to access insurance. The focus is on agricultural weather-index based insurance.

For WFP risk transfers and financing have always been closely interlinked with safety nets based on the understanding that a good safety net is a safety net that can flexible up or down-scale in times of increased or reduced needs. It accordingly needs flexible financing structures and contingency plans, see Module B, Section 2.6 Funding Safety Net Programmes.

At the national and regional level

Early response demands early funding to be available and for institutions to have the ability to disburse the resources in a timely manner. This includes ensuring systems are at hand that can absorb and deliver immediately. Safety nets can serve as such platforms and provide an opportunity to temporarily scale-up to cater for additional needs and protect the gains achieved through the investments made in the safety nets.

Currently, WFP is working on a Food Security Climate Resilience Facility (FoodSECuRe) that will significantly improve early response and resilience building. Building on a robust planning foundation which uses WFP’s Integrated Context Analysis (ICA) to identify and target areas most in need of resilience building, and Seasonal Livelihood Programming (SLP) to identify the most relevant resilience
building interventions, FoodSECuRe will achieve these improvements by determining early action based on climate forecasts and providing multi-year financing for post-disaster resilience building activities. For more information, see the Executive Director’s Keynote address to the IFPRI 2020 Conference (see minute 7:20 and onward): https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YThDtgcqtd4.

Examples of how to set up a risk financing component:
For instance, in Ethiopia, the WFP supported LEAP project provides a risk financing component is provided by the Risk Financing Mechanism, the government’s national-level mechanism for scaling-up the national safety net (PSNP) in case of a major shock. This mechanism allows the disbursement of a donor-provided contingent fund, to increase PSNP cash and/or food transfers to meet additional needs in case of a severe drought or other shock.

Box 13. LEAP: a tool to rapidly scale up Ethiopia’s national safety net programme in case of drought

In 2008, WFP developed a mechanism in collaboration with the Ethiopian Government to trigger the disbursement of additional funds to respond to humanitarian needs in a time of crisis through an existing safety net (the Productive Safety Net Programme). The Livelihoods, Early Assessment and Protection (LEAP) software tool runs localized weather and crop models to estimate future crop yields and rangeland production. It then converts these production estimates into the number of people projected to be in need of livelihood protection in case of drought, by district. The beneficiary estimates are used to calculate the financial resources needed to scale-up the PSNP. This can then trigger the timely and predictable disbursement of contingency funds needed to scale-up the PSNP, thus enabling assistance to reach households early on— before lives and livelihoods have been lost.

The risk financing mechanism’s early response framework is based on the recognition that rapidly addressing transient needs in case of shock is central to the sustainability of the overall PSNP. Providing additional assistance to chronically food insecure PSNP households in case of shock is also essential to maintaining the hard earned-developmental gains achieved through the PSNP.

WFP is exploring ways to support other countries to implement similar systems to support the timely and reliable scale up of national safety nets in times of shock. For more information on LEAP, please visit http://www.wfp.org/disaster-risk-reduction/leap. See also “WFP Policy on Disaster Risk Reduction and Management: Building Resilience and Food Security” (WFP/EB.2/2011/4-A).

The WFP supported Africa Risk Capacity (ARC), a special secretariat of the African Union (AU) and a project designed to improve current responses to drought food security emergencies and to build capacity within AU member states to manage these risks. As an African-owned, continent-wide index-based weather insurance pool and early response mechanism, ARC offers an African solution to one of the continent’s most pressing challenges. By bringing together the concepts of insurance and contingency planning, ARC aims to create a new way of managing weather risk by transferring part of the burden away from African governments, and their vulnerable populations who depend on government assistance, to international financial markets that are much better equipped to handle the risk. By linking contingency funding to effective response plans including the potential scaling-up of
safety net interventions, ARC could help African governments reduce negative impacts of droughts on the lives and livelihoods of the vulnerable, while increasing the efficiency and efficacy of external aid.\(^{26}\)

**What to do:**

- In engaging with the government, advocate for linking the safety net with a risk financing mechanism.
- Once general agreement is made to link the safety nets with a risk financing mechanism, consider facilitating south-south cooperation with counterparts in Ethiopia to learn from the LEAP experiences\(^{27}\).
- If you are in an ARC country (look at the following website to see if you are in an ARC country: [http://www.africanriskcapacity.org/countries/signatories](http://www.africanriskcapacity.org/countries/signatories)), then consider working with the relevant ministries in-country to discuss how the contingency financing released through the ARC mechanism can be linked to scaling up the safety net in times of emergency.

WFP is also working with IFAD in a joint initiative through the Weather Risk Management Facility (WRMF) to support the sustainable development of weather risk management instruments in developing countries. Learn more at [http://www.ifad.org/ruralfinance/wrmf/](http://www.ifad.org/ruralfinance/wrmf/).

**At community and individual level**

The R4 Rural Resilience Initiative is testing an innovative approach to help food-insecure communities build resilience, through a set of four risk management strategies: insurance, improved natural resource management, microcredit, and savings. R4’s innovative “insurance-for-asset” mechanism links insurance to WFP’s well-established FFA programme and government safety nets. The Initiative is closely aligned with WFP’s third strategic objective of reducing risk and building lasting resilience through comprehensive safety net systems: R4’s focus on risk management mechanisms such as insurance and natural resource management is designed to help vulnerable communities and countries shift from managing disasters to managing risks. [http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MlfYTVfgll4](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MlfYTVfgll4)

**What to do:**

- A quality FFA program must be in place to provide the foundation for an insurance-for-asset program. The insurance-for-asset element is essential so that people can access and insurance policy paying in labour. The quality FFA, which must be based on Seasonal Livelihoods Programming, provides the basis for a successful program.
- Consider adding an insurance-for-asset element by working with OSZIR to assess feasibility.
- Find out about more about national, regional, and local efforts to provide risk financing/transfer.
- Seek out opportunities to link to existing efforts.

For more information refer to forthcoming guidance by OSZIR.

---

27 For Further Information, see the LEAP website: [http://www.dppc.gov.et/Pages/leap.html](http://www.dppc.gov.et/Pages/leap.html) and contact: infodrmfss@gmail.com or leap.info@wfp.org.
Check in on the checklist – by now you should be able to check off the first three sections:

Analyze the context:
- Engage with government and partners
- Do an external and internal scan (Module B of these guidelines)
- Do a comprehensive analysis of underlying factors
- Consider informal safety nets, gender and humanitarian protection issues
- Use seasonal livelihoods planning and community based planning tools

Put together the administrative and programmatic pieces:
- Set clear programme objectives
- Select target population
- Select transfer modality, value, and delivery mechanism
- Determine enrolment and registration process including beneficiary identification
- Design complaints and feedback mechanism
- Decide on conditionality
- Develop monitoring and evaluation processes
- Determine the Management Information System to build government capacity

Add in elements to use WFP’s expertise for better results:
- Link to local supply chains
- Consider risk financing and insurance options

In the next section, make sure you are building a sustainable programme from the beginning so that it can expand successfully.

Build sustainably from the beginning:
- Determine how to build in a transition strategy
- Plan for optimal coverage and expansion
- Plan for audit and control mechanisms in a joint programme with government
- Determine programme exit criteria and goals
3.17 National ownership and phase-out strategy (also known as transition strategy, building-in sustainability, handover, activation & graduation)

Modules B (Engagement) and C (Design and Implementation) lay out how to do capacity development for safety nets at each step because engaging, designing and building elements of the safety nets with government – from the beginning – builds-in sustainability and is at the core of WFP’s mandate. The safety nets quality principles (Module A, section 1.1.4) guide a focus on national ownership and capacity, particularly through encouraging full alignment/integration with the Government’s national social protection and safety nets policies and strategies, and complementarity and integration with other existing safety net programmes, interventions and systems. Focusing on capacity development throughout the process puts WFP in a position to successfully phase out operations over time.

To review, WFP works on safety nets in two main ways: through providing transfers for food assistance and through capacity development and augmentation activities.

- WFP transfer-based activities that may be employed in safety nets programming consist of: (i) general food distributions; (ii) food assistance for assets; (iii) school feeding; (iv) nutrition interventions; and (v) HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis (TB) programmes.

- Capacity development and augmentation can consist of sharing information and capacity on transfer-based activities and related activities: purchase for progress (P4P), logistics, preparedness and emergency response, procurement, risk and vulnerability analysis, participatory facilitation, vendor relations, early warning systems and more. Importantly, capacity development and augmentation occurs through joint planning, design and implementation of government-led safety net programmes.

Developing a phase-out strategy engages both of these activities, using experience with transfer based activities to develop and augment capacities throughout engagement, design and implementation.

Box 14. Terminology

Handover: Usually means handover of programme to government, can also mean handover of beneficiary to other partner. Always clarify your meaning.

Graduation: Can mean handover of programme to government, but usually means ‘graduating’ beneficiary to other partner or out of assistance. Always clarify your meaning.

CAUTION: Both terms seem to indicate a linear process. Both also seem to indicate that at some ‘snapshot’ in time, the program or the beneficiary will not need WFP engagement. However, neither are linear processes.

For example, WFP might transition some elements of implementation to local government, but not all. Over time, responsibilities may shift back and forth between government and WFP.

Phasing out food assistance to affected populations is also a non-linear process, often with seasonal aspects, and calling for complementary efforts to WFP transfers.

See more on graduation in section 3.17.2.
3.17.1 How to develop a phase-out strategy

How to develop a phase-out strategy depends on your specific context and what safety nets arrangement you have with the government. Overall, every WFP safety nets intervention should eventually aim at fully handing over to government. Roles in different arrangements:

Country Government-Owned and Implemented Safety Nets

- Developing and augmenting skills and capacities of people along the safety nets system, using WFP’s experience related to transfer-based activities
- Adapting to changing context – arrangements that involve country government ownership and implementation capacity for safety nets will become increasingly important for WFP as many of our partner countries are moving into middle income country status. Please refer to forthcoming MIC policy and guidelines for more related information.

Country Government-Owned, WFP Implemented Safety Nets

- Transitioning skills and capacities related to WFP’s transfer-based activities to people along the safety nets system
- Developing accountability and for government to take on implementation role

WFP managed and implemented safety nets, in the process of handover to country government

- Building on an existing strategy to handover the programme to the government
- Continuing to transition skills and capacities related to WFP’s transfer-based activities
- Continuing to develop accountability for government to take ownership and an implementation role of the programme

WFP managed and implemented programmes, in alignment with government

- Transitioning skills and capacities related to WFP’s transfer-based activities to people along the safety net system
- Developing accountability for government to take ownership and an implementation role

What to do:

→ Plan for it from the beginning.

→ Use existing WFP resources and follow existing guidance.

Consult the following guidance on sustainability, handover, phase out and closure:

http://pgm.wfp.org/index.php/Sustainability_and_Handover


http://pgm.wfp.org/index.php/EMOPs_and_PRROs:Phase_out_and_closure

→ Mobilize resources to finance capacity development and handover activities, also incorporating these activities, where appropriate, into existing programmes and developing funding proposals
for national government contributions, in-country donors, the private sector and other non-traditional funding sources. See section on Funding, Module B, section 2.6.

→ Develop a phase-out strategy according to your specific context. Consider:

- WFP’s purpose on safety nets is to support national and local capacity to build safety nets systems to ensure that all people at all times have access to the food needed for an active and healthy life. Module A, Section 1.2.1.
- Lessons learned from evaluations of safety nets, particularly: Close engagement with national governments in the design and implementation of safety nets can create dilemmas for humanitarian organizations in certain contexts, which should be carefully considered by WFP. Module A, Section 1.2.4.
- Opportunities to get financial contributions from governments, co-financing and other opportunities. Module B, Section 2.6.
- Engaging with partners, Module B, particularly for information on formulating WFP’s role in developing capacity, resources for engaging with government, information on the role of national politics and other related information.
- In this Module C you can find information on supporting government systems, particularly by joint designing and implementation, developing a common targeting system, and using monitoring and evaluation to develop capacity.

Further guidance is country and program specific. See below a country case study of a transition strategy and more information on school feeding and nutrition.

Figure 3. WFP transition strategy within Cambodia’s social protection context
School feeding guidance on transition

The overall vision of WFP school feeding is to transition to quality nationally-owned school feeding programmes as safety nets that help increase children’s access to education and learning, and strengthen their health and nutrition status. This may take years or decades in some cases. Almost all countries in the world have national school feeding programmes, and WFP seeks to support countries that need support to develop the capacity. About half of countries where WFP is running school feeding programmes have a separate government programme. The Brazil Centre of Excellence has been critical in building support from governments to develop national school feeding programmes.

What to do? First, your CO should identify in which transition stage the school feeding operations are in your country. These stages are defined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Latent</td>
<td>Government relies on WFP and others to implement school feeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emerging</td>
<td>Government may rely on WFP and others to implement school feeding but transition planning can be initiated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established</td>
<td>Government has established a national programme but lacks the capacity to cover all requirements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced</td>
<td>Government has an established national programme managed without WFP support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The transition stage can be identified using the SABER tool, see SABER guidance.

Second, your CO should define a strategy for WFP school feeding operations based on the current transition stage and the transition stage that follows. For example, in most cases, countries in Stage 1: Latent should seek to move to Stage 2: Emerging. The strategy should define WFP’s role, engagement with the government and goals for the programme’s operations. The transition stage and its implications for the programme should also be streamlined into programme documents and funding proposals.


Be ready for WFP programme cycle management processes

The inclusion of a handover/exit strategy into project documents is mandatory for PRRO/EMOPs. In DEV and CP templates, under the Strategic Focus section, the templates prescribe that: “National ownership and an eventual phase-out strategy should be clearly mentioned. Outline measures that the Government would be making or will make to assume greater responsibility for the programme”. The Programme Review Committee is monitoring whether this is addressed.

What to do:

(DIR) When developing a country strategy, include developing a strategy for national ownership and eventual phase-out as part of the process
3.17.2 Programme Exit and Graduation

In general, graduation refers to the concept that at some point in time, participants in a given programme will ‘graduate’ from the programme because they will no longer need assistance.

‘Graduation refers to the move out of extreme poverty and into food security and sustainable livelihoods. Criteria that indicate people are ready to graduate are context-specific, but usually include measures of nutrition, stable and diversified incomes, increased assets, better access to healthcare and education, and improved self-confidence. These criteria are used to assess not only the status of an individual at a specific point in time, but also aim to incorporate a predictive measure of resilience to future shocks.’

It is a highly debated topic and one that illustrates both the limits of safety nets and the opportunities that lie in linking livelihoods programmes and finding structural solutions to poverty.

In some cases, if graduation is included in the design a national safety net, it may be appropriate to present WFP corporate indicators as part of the criteria for graduation.

The graduation criteria depend on the type of targeting. For instance:

- If the targeting as based on individual criteria (i.e. malnutrition) then one of the graduation criteria may be the malnutrition indicator (MUAC if W/H).
- If the targeting criteria were used to target a geographical area, for example, based on prevalence of malnutrition, then the graduation criteria will include reduced prevalence in that geographic area.

  **RISK:** Consider the role of food assistance in meeting graduation criteria. For example, if you 1) target a household because the household is food insecure, 2) run a programme to deliver a transfer to the householder, and then 3) find in subsequent data collection that the household is now food secure, this does not mean that the household can ‘graduate’ from food assistance. First consider the role that the food assistance continues to have in supporting that household. In other words, a household may meet graduation criteria in part because of the food assistance being received. Therefore additional criteria should be used to indicate ‘graduation’ has been achieved, ones that ensure the dynamics have changed so that food assistance is no longer necessary. For this reason, graduation and targeting criteria are not necessarily based solely on the same indicators.

- Household level criteria for graduation can be used only if a constant monitoring at household level is conducted. Many indicators including the food consumption score for example are generally used to establish the prevalence at area level, not to select households. Safety nets are likely to target the household and indicators therefore need to be adjusted.
- Recurrence of shock and seasonality must be taken into consideration for graduation. For instance, safety nets transfers may be seasonally downscaled over time. Graduation plans need to consider setbacks by frequent shocks.

**Caveats**

Graduation is often an attractive strategy to government and donors because the financial commitment seems to be temporary. In reality, however, graduation is an important but challenging goal that warrants a great investment of resources over a long period of time. Since safety nets are targeted to households that face the deepest challenges of poverty, then a program that states graduation in its goals must address driving forces of chronic poverty.
In addition to corporate indicators, which form the basis for WFP engagement on the issue of graduation, best practices from other organizations efforts (see below), and potential pitfalls should be taken into account.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Four reasons to take a critical view of graduation</th>
<th>For some populations, particularly labour-poor households, the elderly, or households with severe illness or disability, the primary goal is not to graduate these households from assistance programs but rather to find solutions to provide continued and individualised assistance based upon specific needs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For WFP practitioners, the beneficiary populations we serve are particularly poor and vulnerable populations; at times, political incentives may exist that could influence the exclusion of such populations in the safety net design phase because of the difficulty that will be faced in graduating them out of assistance in the future. While this is highly dependent on political context, it is important to be aware of this possibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Political incentives may exist that could influence pre-mature graduation. For example, political pressure to achieve results and ‘graduate’ households could result in ‘graduating’ households that are in fact still in need of assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The term graduation seems to indicate a linear process. It also seems to indicate that at some ‘snapshot’ in time, the program or the beneficiary will not need WFP engagement. However, phasing out food assistance to affected populations is a non-linear process, often with seasonal aspects, that calls for flexibility, particularly with complementary efforts to WFP transfers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Complementarity**

Complementary efforts to support livelihoods and address other drivers of poverty are needed in order to achieve graduation, if it can be achieved at all. For instance, WFP safety nets transfers need to be complemented with efforts to provide market access, extension services, skills and/or access to credit among others.

**What to do:**

- Have a clear understanding of the objectives of the safety net programme that you are supporting and design accordingly.
- Use the internal and external scan to identify potential complementary efforts. (See Module B)
- In addition, use participatory tools such as the Seasonal Livelihoods Programming and Community Based Participatory Planning tools.

**REMINDER:** WFP sets the transfer amount to fill the food gap. To achieve objectives beyond, complementary efforts are needed.

---

29 For example, the CGAP/Ford Foundation Graduation model can be referenced for best practices: It is composed of ‘five core elements: careful targeting of the poorest members of a community; temporary support through cash stipends or in-kind transfers to foster food security; access to savings services; the transfer of a productive asset—typically livestock—to kick-start an economic activity; simple skills training and on-going coaching by program staff to help participants get the most of these assets and accompany them through the program’. See more online: Targeting the Ultra Poor: The BRAC Model, [http://www.cgap.org/about/programs/cgap-ford-foundation-graduation-program](http://www.cgap.org/about/programs/cgap-ford-foundation-graduation-program).
Module C was designed to assist WFP staff in designing safety nets following the programme cycle logic and in partnership with governments and partners. Consider the final checklist to review.

**Checklist to design a safety net:**

**Analyze the context:**
- Engage with government and partners
- Do an external and internal scan (Module B of these guidelines)
- Do a comprehensive analysis of underlying factors
- Consider informal safety nets, gender and humanitarian protection issues
- Use seasonal livelihoods planning and community based planning tools

**Put together the administrative and programmatic pieces:**
- Set clear programme objectives
- Select target population
- Select transfer modality, value, and delivery mechanism
- Determine enrolment and registration process including beneficiary identification
- Design complaints and feedback mechanism
- Decide on conditionality
- Develop monitoring and evaluation processes
- Determine the Management Information System to build government capacity

**Add in elements to use WFP’s expertise for better results:**
- Link to local supply chains
- Consider risk financing and insurance options

**Build sustainably from the beginning:**
- Determine how to build in a transition strategy
- Plan for optimal coverage and expansion
- Plan for audit and control mechanisms in a joint programme with government

Finally, since the real work of designing and implementing safety nets is done by a multifaceted team, consider your design and implementation to see if you are managing to meet the objectives laid out for the programme.

Use the safety net diagnostic tool in Annex L to prompt thinking and learning regarding the different aspects of your safety net design and/or implementation. Use the tool as an opportunity to see work in progress.