

Synthesizing MRV Systems for Community-Based Food Security

Vinay Chawla

Executive Director, Langar Carbon, India

doi.org/10.64643/IJIRTV12I8-190319-459

Abstract—Current Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) frameworks generally require digital records, professional personnel, and formal management systems, which are beyond the capabilities of community-based food security operations with limited data resources. This study addresses this gap by synthesizing techniques from seven established MRV frameworks into a unified verification system specifically designed for low-data contexts. Through a comparative analysis of these frameworks, 19 practical techniques were identified and subsequently integrated into the Langar Credit Protocol. This protocol incorporates categorical indicators, evidence triangulation, community-based verification, and tiered quality assurance. Survey validation confirmed the feasibility of stakeholders' perceptions. The resulting approach demonstrates that rigorous verification is achievable without imposing prohibitive requirements on community kitchens or cafés. This synthesis methodology offers transferable insights for addressing verification challenges in India's informal sector.

Index Terms—MRV frameworks, low-data verification, community food security, synthesis methodology, sustainable development goals

I. INTRODUCTION

Conventional Measurement, Reporting, and Verification (MRV) systems typically presuppose the presence of professional personnel, digital monitoring tools, and formal management structures (UNDP, 2013). These assumptions are often not applicable in community settings, where records are maintained in notebooks, staff are volunteers, and operations adhere to cultural traditions rather than to corporate protocols. Instead of developing entirely new verification methods, this study adopted a practical synthesis approach. We examined seven MRV frameworks that have demonstrated effectiveness in resource-constrained environments, extracted their most

beneficial techniques, and integrated them into a cohesive system specifically designed for community kitchens and cafés. This approach acknowledges that many verification challenges have been addressed in various contexts. The objective of this study was to identify which solutions can be adapted and combined for community food security verification.

The selection of the seven frameworks was based on three criteria: successful implementation at scale, methodological validation through research or practice, and relevance to low data challenges. The Gold Standard's Participatory Guarantee System (PGS) has trained thousands of community verifiers in 50 countries. The Clean Cooking Alliance has validated fuel efficiency measurements in 10 million households. The IFOAM PGS employs simple thresholds effectively for smallholder farmers. The UNDP provides evidence guidelines for low-data projects. The FAO offers participatory meal-counting methods. The UNECE effectively measures food loss. Verra VCS ensures quality in distributed verification systems. Collectively, these frameworks offer complementary techniques that can address the multifaceted verification requirements of community kitchens.

This paper illustrates how 19 specific techniques from existing frameworks can be synthesized into the Langar Credit Protocol, a verification system specifically designed for low-data food security contexts. Our approach demonstrates that rigorous verification is attainable without necessitating community operations to adopt complex systems that exceed their capacity.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

The selected frameworks offer distinct advantages for synthesis. The Gold Standard's Participatory

Guarantee System illustrates how community members can effectively serve as verifiers through targeted training rather than extensive professional education. This approach achieved an 85% certification rate with only six hours of training, maintaining strong consistency through peer calibration methods (Gold Standard Foundation, 2024b).

The Clean Cooking Alliance provides validated methods for categorizing fuel efficiency using simple ladder systems. Their approach achieved 95% accuracy across millions of households by integrating direct observation with basic documentation (Clean Cooking Alliance & Berkeley Air Monitoring Group, 2022). This demonstrates how visual assessments can complement incomplete records.

IFOAM's Participatory Guarantee System offers practical threshold approaches. Their 70% compliance standard provides clear benchmarks while accommodating the inherent variability in small-scale operations. This balance between rigor and practicality has been validated by 150,000 organic producers (IFOAM Organics International & FAO, 2019).

The four additional frameworks offer specialized techniques. The UNDP's low-data guidance provides evidence of reliability coefficients that assist verifiers in evaluating different information sources (UNDP, 2013). FAO community monitoring methods achieve 91% accuracy in meal counting through participatory approaches (FAO, 2009). The UNECE food loss measurement effectively tracks surplus redistribution. Verra's quality assurance protocols ensure consistency across distributed verification systems (Verra, 2024b). Collectively, these frameworks address a comprehensive range of verification needs for community kitchens, from basic measurements to quality control.

2.1 Community Verification from Gold Standard PGS
Gold Standard PGS offers a model for community-based verification, which we have adapted for community kitchens. Their system is based on three practical techniques. First, their six-hour modular training program effectively builds verifier competence. Through structured scenarios and practice exercises, community members are trained to apply verification standards consistently. Validation data indicated that this approach achieved inter-rater reliability, with kappa scores ranging from 0.82 to

0.88, comparable to professional systems. Second, their peer calibration process ensures that verifiers uphold consistent standards. Regular group sessions, where verifiers collaboratively review sample cases, foster a shared understanding and resolve judgment differences through discussion rather than through hierarchical instruction. This collaborative method respects local knowledge while maintaining the verification quality. Third, their tiered authorization system enables verifiers to progress from provisional to independent status based on demonstrated competence. This creates a developmental pathway that acknowledges growing expertise while ensuring that new verifiers receive appropriate oversight. These three techniques directly informed our Langer Seva Verifier model, maintaining rigor while substituting professional credentials with community-based training.

2.2 Practical Measurement from Clean Cooking Alliance

The Clean Cooking Alliance's fuel ladder methodology offers exemplary models for practical measurements in resource-limited environments. Their five-tier classification system, validated across various cooking contexts, illustrates how categorical approaches can be used to streamline complex measurements. We adapted their ladder to categorize three community kitchen types based on the primary cooking fuel utilized.

Their composite energy weighting technique recognizes that many kitchens employ multiple fuel types. Instead of necessitating intricate calculations, their method estimates the primary fuel contribution through straightforward observations and basic record-keeping. This practical approach achieved 95% accuracy while accommodating the limited documentation typically available in community settings.

Significantly, their multi-source evidence approach integrates purchase receipts, physical observations, and user testimonies to construct a comprehensive overview despite incomplete records. This triangulation method effectively addresses the documentation gaps in community kitchens. Their validation across millions of households demonstrated that such methodologies can attain professional-grade accuracy in low-data contexts.

2.3 Threshold-Based Assessment from IFOAM PGS
The IFOAM PGS exemplifies the efficacy of threshold-based assessments. Their 70% compliance standard establishes a definitive benchmark that accommodates operational variability while upholding the meaningful standards. This methodology acknowledges that small-scale operations may not achieve perfection but can demonstrate substantial compliance with sustainable practices. Their visual assessment protocols achieved an 85% accuracy rate compared to laboratory testing using structured observation checklists. For community kitchens, this implies that verifiers can evaluate the food composition, utensil materials, and facility conditions through direct observation, eliminating the need for test results or extensive documentation. Their peer-review consensus mechanism provides a practical quality control method. In instances where verifiers disagree on assessments, differences are resolved through group discussions and consensus building rather than hierarchical appeals. This approach harnesses collective wisdom while maintaining the accountability. These threshold-based methods are particularly suitable for community kitchens, where all-or-nothing standards would exclude many valuable processes.

2.4 Complementary Techniques from Four Frameworks

The remaining frameworks offer specialized techniques that enhance the verification system. The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) provides evidence of reliability coefficients that serve as practical tools for verifiers to assess various information sources (UNDP, 2013). This system assigns numerical values to different types of evidence: authenticated documents are assigned a value of 1.0, corroborated testimony 0.7, and single source claims 0.3. Verifiers aim for a cumulative score of 2.1 or higher, ensuring that multiple sources substantiate each finding without necessitating perfect documentation.

The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) has developed participatory meal-counting methods to address one of the most challenging measurement issues in community kitchens (FAO, 2009). Their approach, which involves multiplying the headcount by capacity, achieves 91% accuracy through straightforward observation and basic calculations.

This method complements the visual headcounts already performed by many kitchens, adding structured documentation and cross-verifications.

The United Nations Economic Commission for Europe (UNECE) provides methods for tracking surplus food redistribution, which is crucial for community cafés that rescue food from hotels and events (UNECE, 2021). Their intake-log approach facilitates simple yet effective documentation of food rescue volumes.

Verra's quality assurance protocols offer practical methods for maintaining consistency across distributed verification systems (Verra, 2024b). Their requirement for a 5% field re-audit ensures quality control without imposing excessive over-sight.

III. BUILDING THE LANGAR CREDIT PROTOCOL

3.1 Integration

Nineteen techniques derived from seven frameworks were integrated into the Langar Credit Protocol, a twelve-clause verification system specifically designed for community kitchens. Table 1 illustrates how the techniques from each framework address specific verification requirements. This integration results in a cohesive system in which each component enhances the others, thereby creating a verification capability that surpasses any single framework.

The community verification techniques of the Gold Standard form the foundation of the Langer Seva Verifier program. Their training methodology, which is adapted for kitchen contexts, empowers community members to conduct credible verifications. Their peer calibration methods ensure consistency across various regions and kitchen types, while their tiered authorization provides a developmental pathway for the verifiers.

The Clean Cooking Alliance's measurement approaches structure our indicator system. Their fuel ladder was utilized as our Fuel Type indicator, and their evidence triangulation methods ensured reliable assessments despite documentation gaps. Their practical measurement philosophy guided our overall approach to indicator design.

IFOAM's threshold methods were applied across all categorical indicators. Their 70% standard offers consistent benchmarking for fuel use, utensil materials, meal composition, ingredient sourcing and

operational models. Their visual assessment protocols facilitate verification without the need for laboratory testing, and their consensus approach collaboratively resolves the verification questions.

Table 1: Technique Integration into Langar Credit Protocol

Source Framework	Key Techniques	Application in LCP
Gold Standard PGS	Community verifier training, peer calibration, tiered authorization	Langer Seva Verifier program design
Clean Cooking Alliance	Fuel ladder classification, evidence triangulation, practical measurement	Fuel Type indicator, evidence protocols
IFOAM PGS	70% thresholds, visual assessment, consensus resolution	All categorical indicators, verification procedures
UNDP	Evidence reliability coefficients, cumulative scoring	Evidence weighting system
FAO	Participatory meal counting, headcount methods	Verified Meals quantification
UNECE	Food loss measurement, intake documentation	Operation Type classification for cafés
Verra VCS	Quality assurance, field re-audits, consistency protocols	Quality control systems

3.2 Verification

The synthesis establishes a verification system that upholds professional rigor while operating within the constraints of the community. Categorical indicators with defined thresholds offer meaningful assessments without complex measurements. Evidence triangulation ensures credibility, even in the presence of documentation gaps in the data. Community verifiers contribute local insights while adhering to the standardized procedures. A tiered quality assurance process ensures consistency in the system.

Significantly, the system integrates cultural sensitivity from its outset. Verifier training includes modules on seva ethics and kitchen traditions. Assessment methods accommodate religious practices, such as recognizing the ritual use of biomass fuels alongside cooking fuel assessment. The system is verified within cultural contexts rather than by imposing external standards.

The resulting Langar Credit Protocol exemplifies how synthesis can generate new capabilities. None of the individual source frameworks could effectively verify community kitchens independently. The Gold Standard focuses on agriculture, Clean Cooking on households, and IFOAM on organic production. However, collectively, their techniques create a verification system that is specifically tailored for community food security. This synthesis approach may provide solutions to other verification challenges where existing frameworks do not fully align with operational realities.

3.3 Analytical Validation

We performed an analytical validation of the synthesized system utilizing our framework, which confirmed that all essential verification components were comprehensively addressed. The scope definition was meticulously crafted to concentrate verification efforts on meal volumes and sustainability practices that community kitchens can feasibly demonstrate. The design of the indicators employs categorical metrics, drawing on IFOAM's extensive experience with small-scale producers. Evidence protocols are structured to implement triangulation methods, effectively addressing the 3-7% variance observed in community kitchen recordkeeping (TERI, 2024). The competence targets for verifiers are aligned with the proven training outcomes of the Gold Standard, while the quality assurance processes incorporate Verra's robust audit methodologies. Cultural sensitivity is seamlessly integrated into the system design rather than being appended as an afterthought. Crucially, the system upholds alignment with ISO verification principles while operating within the constraints of the community. This analytical validation substantiates that the synthesis results in a comprehensive and coherent verification system, as opposed to merely aggregating disparate techniques.

3.4 Stakeholder Validation

Survey data from 422 Indian professionals provided empirical evidence to support our synthesis approach. Respondents with varied exposure to community kitchens evaluated five critical aspects of the verification system. Each of these areas received feasibility scores above the threshold: Training Adequacy (3.58 out of 5), Indicator Feasibility (3.54),

Tier Clarity (3.62), Impartiality (3.59), and Protocol Readiness (3.56). These consistent scores across different dimensions suggest that stakeholders generally perceive the synthesized system to be viable. Notably, respondents with direct experience in community kitchens demonstrated significantly higher confidence in the system. Respondents who had visited or volunteered in kitchens provided an average feasibility score of 3.75, compared to an average of 3.28 among those without such familiarity. This disparity indicates that operational familiarity enhances confidence in the verification methods. Encouragingly, 47.9% of respondents expressed a willingness to become Langer Seva Verifiers, suggesting that the verification model could attract a sufficient number of participants for successful implementation.

IV. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

Based on our synthesis experience, we identified four fundamental principles for designing verification systems in low-data environments. First, categorical simplicity is more effective than complex measurements. Utilizing straightforward A-B-C categories with well-defined thresholds allows for meaningful assessments without requiring perfect records or intricate calculations. Second, evidence triangulation is crucial. Employing multiple information sources with weighted reliability addresses documentation gaps while preserving the credibility. Third, community embeddedness enhances practical verification capacity. When provided with focused training, community members can conduct credible verifications by integrating local insights with standardized procedures. Finally, tiered proportionality aligns verification intensity with performance claims. Basic compliance necessitates simpler verification processes than claims of excellence, thereby applying materiality principles practically. These principles have emerged across various frameworks and have proven essential for establishing functional systems. They may serve as a guide for verification designs in other low-data contexts beyond community kitchens.

V. CONCLUSION

This study illustrates that robust verification systems for low-data environments can be developed by

synthesizing techniques from previously established frameworks. Our analysis of seven MRV systems identified 19 practical techniques that collectively address the verification needs of community kitchens. The integration into the Langar Credit Protocol resulted in a coherent system that upholds professional credibility while operating within community constraints.

The synthesis approach offers several advantages over developing entirely new verification methodologies. It builds on proven methods rather than initiating from scratch, and combines specialized techniques from various domains to address complex verification challenges. It creates systems that respect operational realities, rather than attempting to alter them. Our stakeholder validation indicates that this approach produces viable systems that are deemed credible and feasible by those familiar with the operations of the community.

Looking ahead, synthesis methodology may assist in addressing verification gaps in the informal sector. From community healthcare to handicraft production to smallholder agriculture, many essential activities lack credible measurements because existing verification systems do not align with their operational realities. By analyzing effective practices in similar contexts and adapting those techniques, we may develop verification approaches that acknowledge informal sector contributions without imposing formal-sector requirements.

For community kitchens, the synthesized Langar Credit Protocol offers a pathway from obscurity to recognition. By demonstrating their contributions in credible and standardized formats, community kitchens can access resources, partnerships, and policy support commensurate with their vital role in ensuring food security in India. More broadly, this study suggests that professional verification standards and community operational realities can be reconciled through careful synthesis of existing knowledge. Sometimes, the most innovative solutions combine established ideas in novel ways.

REFERENCES

- [1] Agarwal, M., Jain, A., & Rathore, P. (2021). Food loss and waste in India: The knowns and unknowns. WRI India & FOLU India Coalition. <https://wri->

- india.org/sites/default/files/Food%20Loss%20and%20Waste_August%202021.pdf
- [2] BioCarbon Fund. (2023). ISFL validation & verification requirements v1.3. https://www.biocarbonfund-isfl.org/sites/default/files/2024-11/ISFL%20Validation%20and%20Verification%20Requirements_2023_Ver1.3.pdf
- [3] Champions 12.3. (2025). SDG Target 12.3 on food loss and waste: 2025 progress report. <https://champions123.org/publication/sdg-target-123-food-loss-and-waste-2025-progress-report>
- [4] Chan, S., Weitz, N., Persson, Å., & Trimmer, C. (2018). SDG 12: Responsible consumption and production A review of research needs (SEI Working Paper 2018-06). Stockholm Environment Institute. <https://www.sei.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/sdg-12-responsible-consumption-and-production-review-of-research-needs.pdf>
- [5] Clean Cooking Alliance & Berkeley Air Monitoring Group. (2022). Introductory framework for measurement, reporting, and verification: Clean cooking MRV in the Paris context. <https://cleancooking.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/Introductory-Framework-for-Measurement-Reporting-and-Verification.pdf>
- [6] Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC). (2019). Why and how to measure food loss and waste: A practical guide (Version 2.0). <https://www.cec.org/files/documents/publications/11869-why-and-how-measure-food-loss-and-waste-practical-guide-version-20-en.pdf>
- [7] DAkkS. (2020). ISO/IEC 17029:2019 accreditation rules (R 17029). https://www.dakks.de/files/Dokumentensuche/Dateien/R-17029_e.pdf
- [8] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2007). Organic certification schemes: Managerial skills and associated costs (FAO Technical Report). <https://www.fao.org/4/a1227e/a1227e00.pdf>
- [9] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2009). Community level monitoring of the right to adequate food. In *Methods to monitor the right to adequate food*: Volume II. <https://www.fao.org/4/i0351e/i0351e06.pdf>
- [10] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2020a). Rethinking our food systems: A guide for multi-stakeholder collaboration. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/27108a68-d7ac-49c9-a7e3-5bbb469b95fc/content>
- [11] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2020b). Sustainable food systems: Concept and framework. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/b620989c-407b-4caf-a152-f790f55fec71/content>
- [12] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2021a). Food loss and waste measurement methodology: Executive summary. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/912ddd3d-b8a7-48b4-a361-3089b41cf30c/content>
- [13] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2021b). Methodology for Monitoring SDG Target 12.3. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/a551b26f-6d33-4e3e-ba29-122725ebe464/content>
- [14] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2024a). EX-ACT MRV tool: Quick guidance. https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/ex_act/EX-ACT_MRV/MRV_Quick_Guidance.pdf
- [15] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2024b). For sustainable food systems and healthy diets. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/3cd3e90a-4a17-4617-aa66-e631a976988c/content>
- [16] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2025a). Food loss and waste prevention guidance content. https://www.fao.org/fileadmin/user_upload/save-food/PDF/Guidance-content.pdf
- [17] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). (2025b). The state of food security and nutrition in the world 2025. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/items/ea9cebff-306c-49b7-8865-2aef3bfd25e2>

- [18] Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations FAO. (2025c). Tracking progress on food and agriculture-related SDG indicators 2025. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/bitstreams/26c46645-5ff0-4343-8c91-e5cb6655589b/download>
- [19] Gold Standard Foundation. (2024a). Annual impact registry report 2024. <https://www.goldstandard.org/publications/annual-report-2024>
- [20] Gold Standard Foundation. (2024b). Validation and verification standard V1.0. Gold Standard for the Global Goals. https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/standards/113_V1.0_PAR_Validation-and-Verification-Standard.pdf
- [21] Gold Standard for the Global Goals. (2025). Requirements for methodology development v1.0. https://globalgoals.goldstandard.org/standards/446_V1.0_Requirements-for-methodology-development.pdf
- [22] Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., & Ram, S. (2004). Design science in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*, 28(1), 75–105. https://wise.vub.ac.be/sites/default/files/thesis_info/design_science.pdf
- [23] IFOAM – Organics International & FAO. (2019). Participatory Guarantee Systems (PGS): Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. <https://openknowledge.fao.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/271c894c-7eb3-45fd-8f7a-e00f17133ac1/content>
- [24] International Accreditation Forum. (2024). IAF MD 6:2024 Mandatory document for the application of ISO 14065:2020 (Issue 3, Version 2). https://iaf.nu/iaf_system/uploads/documents/IAF_MD_6_Issue_3_Version2_11092024.pdf
- [25] ISO 14064. (2019). ISO 14064-3:2019 greenhouse gases Part 3: Specification with guidance for quantification and reporting. <https://cdn.standards.iteh.ai/samples/66455/dfeb4db53de43ddaec0ef7187f3dd30/ISO-14064-3-2019.pdf>
- [26] ISO 17029. (2019). ISO/IEC 17029:2019 conformity assessment General principles and requirements. <https://cdn.standards.iteh.ai/samples/29352/44bdc79f244e4bfe9f118c2e67562e37/ISO-IEC-17029-2019.pdf>
- [27] ISO 20121. (2024). ISO 20121:2024. Event sustainability management systems Requirements with guidance for use. <https://cdn.standards.iteh.ai/samples/86389/441068b4f4194c119cf80e13ea246159/ISO-20121.pdf>
- [28] Peffers, K., Tuunanen, T., Rothenberger, M. A., & Chatterjee, S. (2007). A design science research methodology for information systems research. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 24(3), 45–77. https://indico.cern.ch/event/1542774/contributions/6494311/attachments/3080345/5465431/Peffers_2007_A%20Design%20Science%20Research.pdf
- [29] ProTerra Foundation. (2023). ProTerra monitoring and verification standard v1.0. https://www.proterrafoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2024/01/ProTerra-MRV-Standard-v1.0_EN.pdf
- [30] Ramírez-Hernández, A., Domene-García, M. Á., & Palma-García, M. O. (2022). Community-based participatory interventions to improve food security and/or its dimensions: A systematic review. *BMC Public Health*, 22(1), Article 2407. https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC9807164/pdf/12889_2022_Article_14831.pdf
- [31] TERI. (2024). SDG blueprint on sustainable agriculture. The Energy and Resources Institute. https://www.teriin.org/sites/default/files/2024-02/SDG%20Blueprint%20Summary_2024.pdf
- [32] UNDP. (2013). Measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) technical paper: Building from a low data and knowledge base. UN CC:Learn. <https://www.uncclearn.org/wp-content/uploads/library/undp-lecb-measurement-reporting-mrv-technical-paper-201x.pdf>
- [33] UNECE. (2021). Food loss and waste measuring methodology for fresh produce supply chains. United Nations Economic

- Commission for Europe.
<https://unece.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/FoodLossMeasuringMethodology.pdf>
- [34] UN-REDD Programme. (2021). MRV framework document. https://www.un-redd.org/sites/default/files/2021-10/MRV%20Framework%20Document_V1_Draft2.pdf
- [35] Venable, J. R., Pries-Heje, J., & Baskerville, R. (2017). Choosing a design science research methodology. In the ACIS 2017 Proceedings (pp. 1–11). University of Tasmania. https://rucforsk.ruc.dk/ws/files/61055477/ACIS2017_paper_255_FULL.pdf
- [36] Verra. (2024a). Sustainable Development Verified Impact Standard program guide. <https://verra.org/programs/sd-verified-impact-standard/>
- [37] Verra. (2024b). Verified carbon standard: VCS standard verification manual (v4.5). <https://verra.org/programs/verified-carbon-standard/>
- [38] World Bank. (2023). Strengthening food assistance programs for vulnerable populations: Community kitchens program (Project ID P180092). <https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/099070723094033922/pdf/P1800920c620e80a0a301046f37154079b.pdf>
- [39] World Bank. (2024). Food security: World Bank response to food insecurity (Issue 111). <https://thedocs.worldbank.org/en/doc/40ebbf38f5a6b68bfc11e5273e1405d4-0090012022/related/Food-Security-Update-111-December-13-2024.pdf>