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...poor health, malnutrition and diseases...affecting hundreds of millions of poor children...reduce enrolment, increase absenteeism and diminish cognitive development and learning.
more and more countries are implementing cost-effective, evidence-based policies and interventions to achieve EFA…including school fee abolition, ECD programs, targeted school health and feeding programs.
9th Meeting of the High Level Group on EFA
Addis Ababa Declaration, Feb 24 2010

Action Point No 1:
We call upon Education for All Partners to
intensify efforts to support initiatives
targeted at the most marginalized, such as
cash transfers, school feeding,
scholarships and gender-specific-interventions.
What do we mean by “Level the Playing Field?”
Helping Sick and Hungry Children Catch Up
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How Important are Hunger and Ill Health as Barriers to Achieving EFA?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prevalence</th>
<th>Total Cases (millions)</th>
<th>IQ points lost per child</th>
<th>Additional cases of IQ &lt;70 (millions)</th>
<th>Lost years of schooling (millions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Worms</strong></td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stunting</strong></td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Anemia</strong></td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparative cost and effectiveness in terms of EFA outcomes

## What Works to Level the Playing Field?
### Top 10 Solutions of Copenhagen Consensus 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SOLUTION</th>
<th>CHALLENGE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Micronutrient supplements for children (vitamin A and zinc)</td>
<td>Malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Doha development agenda</td>
<td>Trade</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Micronutrient fortification (iron and salt iodization)</td>
<td>Malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Expanded immunization coverage for children</td>
<td>Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Biofortification</td>
<td>Malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Deworming and other nutrition programs at school</td>
<td>Malnutrition &amp; Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Lowering the price of schooling</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Increase and improve girls’ schooling</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Community-based nutrition promotion</td>
<td>Malnutrition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Provide support for women’s reproductive role</td>
<td>Women</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rethinking School Feeding:

Social safety nets, child development, and the education sector
Poverty: Percentage of population living in households with consumption or income per person below the poverty line

Hunger: Percentage of population below the minimum level of dietary energy consumption (2002-05)

The proportion of the population below the minimum level of dietary energy consumption, referred to as the prevalence of undernourishment, is the percentage of the population that is undernourished or food deprived. Figures are from latest available year. Standards derived from an FAO/WHO/UNU Expert Consultation (FAO et al. 2004). Sources: FAO (2007). State of Food and Agriculture; FAO (2008). State of Food Insecurity.
Primary school completion rate (2000-06)

Primary completion rate is the total number of students in grade 6 (excluding repeaters) divided by the total number of children of grade age. Figures are from latest available year. All data are from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics except for Australia, Canada, China, Japan, New Zealand, Sweden, Thailand, and the United Kingdom, which are from national data.

School feeding: Country programs (2006-08)

**Category 1**: Countries where school feeding is available in most schools, sometimes or always; **Category 2**: Countries where school feeding is available in some way and at some scale; **Category 3**: Countries where school feeding is available primarily in the most food insecure regions; **Category 4**: Countries where there is no school feeding. The sources, as detailed in the database link, are WFP data for low income and lower middle income countries and national data for the remaining countries. As this is a work in progress, comments and any further information on school feeding programs are welcomed.

*Sources*: [http://www.schoolsandhealth.org/Pages/SchoolNutritionFoodforEducation.aspx](http://www.schoolsandhealth.org/Pages/SchoolNutritionFoodforEducation.aspx)
## THE EDUCATION BENEFITS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School feeding activity</th>
<th>Enrolment</th>
<th>Attendance</th>
<th>Educational achievement</th>
<th>Cognition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ (♀ effect)</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In-school meals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take-home rations</td>
<td>+ (♀ effect)</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fortified biscuits</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementation</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deworming</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

+ = evidence from quasi-experimental evaluation
++ = evidence from at least one RCT
+++ = evidence from more than one RCT
NA = not assessed
# SCHOOL FEEDING AS A SAFETY NET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appropriateness</td>
<td>Relatively easy to scale in crisis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequacy</td>
<td>Good (&gt;10% of HH income)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity</td>
<td>Moderate to Good (lowest where ED low)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost-effectiveness</td>
<td>Poor to Moderate (20-40% non-transfer costs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incentive compatibility</td>
<td>Good, could be Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sustainability</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamism</td>
<td>Usually not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PLANNING FOR SUSTAINABILITY

• Very sharp decrease in the relative costs of school feeding as GDP increases

• Supporting countries through this transition is a key role for development agencies

Ratio of per child cost of school feeding in relation to per child cost of basic education, versus GDP per capita.

Source: The GDP per capita (purchasing power parity, constant 2005 international $) and the education costs per child are from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, and the school feeding costs per child were calculated from country program documents and WFP reports.
## The Transition of School Feeding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Stage 1</th>
<th>Stage 2</th>
<th>Stage 3</th>
<th>Stage 4</th>
<th>Stage 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Programs rely mostly on external funding and implementation</td>
<td>Programs rely on government funding and implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy framework for school feeding</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government financial capacity</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>strong</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government institutional capacity</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>limited</td>
<td>moderate</td>
<td>increased</td>
<td>strong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Countries
- Afghanistan
- CAR
- Ethiopia
- DRC
- Haiti
- Tanzania
- Sudan
- Zambia
- Malawi
- Cambodia
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Lesotho
- Mali
- Rwanda
- Kenya
- Madagascar
- Ghana
- El Salvador
- Ecuador
- Honduras
- India
- Chile
- Jamaica
- Brazil
- Nigeria
- Botswana
- Namibia
Percentage of countries in different transition stages with school feeding in education sector plans.

This work-in-progress is based on a sample of 57 countries from a WFP database for which information could be confirmed and which could be assigned to a transitional stage.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard setting and policy</td>
<td>Defining national policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defining objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Setting nutritional standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Targeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Defining food basket composition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Determining number of beneficiaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establishing criteria for school selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial management</td>
<td>Disbursing funds to appropriate entities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Managing tenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Performing quality control of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Purchasing the food (preferably locally)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coordinated with agriculture sector and local farmers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>Transporting food to distribution points or schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-site preparation and feeding of children</td>
<td>Cooking of food</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distribution of food to children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managing food stocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>Outcome, output and process monitoring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evaluation of program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The transition: transferring functions and activities gradually

Stage 1: Program relies mostly on external funding and implementation

- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Stage 5: Program relies on government funding and implementation

- Gradual transfer of responsibilities to government as capacity increases in a planned manner
- Transfer of functions is context specific and tailored to the country

External resources and implementation

Government resources and implementation
THE TRANSITION OF FUNCTIONS IN EL SALVADOR

Stage 1 (10 years)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Transition (9 years)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Stage 5 (3 years)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Responsibility of external partner
Responsibility of the government
THE TRANSITION OF FUNCTIONS IN ECUADOR

Stage 1
(2 years)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Transition
(12 years)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Stage 5
(10 years)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Responsibility of external partner
Responsibility of the government
LESSONS FROM COUNTRIES IN TRANSITION

• There is a need to protect the programs from negative effects of political support

• Institutional integrity and capacity matter

• The transition needs to be paced and sequenced: transferring all functions at once may have negative consequences

• The transition is a dynamic process of learning and collaboration
TRANSITIONING TOWARD SOURCING LOCALLY

• Successful national school feeding programs tend to rely on locally produced food.

• As with other functions, local sourcing happens gradually as agricultural capacity increases.
The Home Grown School
Feeding Revolution
Thank You
# Two Countries in Transition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Country A</th>
<th>Country B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>When the program started/beneficiaries</strong></td>
<td>1980/770,000</td>
<td>2005/630,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Objectives</strong></td>
<td>Education, safety net</td>
<td>Education, nutrition, safety net, agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institution responsible</strong></td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
<td>Ministry of Local Government (six ministries involved)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implementation modality</strong></td>
<td>Community based</td>
<td>Decentralized – district based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resource trajectory</strong></td>
<td>MoF – Schools – Traders</td>
<td>MoF – MoLG – Districts – Caterers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Issues/challenges</strong></td>
<td>Implementation working well</td>
<td>Political influence/corruption/no targeting/lack of institutional integrity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convergence or divergence</strong></td>
<td>Convergence</td>
<td>Divergence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE TRANSITION OF FUNCTIONS IN COUNTRY A

Stage 1 (28 years)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Transition (2 years)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Stage 5

Responsibility of external partner
Responsibility of the government

Final transition to be determined
THE TRANSITION OF FUNCTIONS IN COUNTRY B

Stage 1 (1 year)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management

Stage 5 (6 years)
- Standard setting and policy
- Planning
- Financial management
- Procurement
- Logistics
- Preparation of food and feeding of children
- Monitoring and evaluation

Responsibility of external partner
Responsibility of the government
RESULTS FROM THE TRANSITION IN 4 COUNTRIES

CONVERGENCE IN EL SALVADOR

Stage 1: Programs rely mostly on external funding and implementation
Stage 5: Programs rely on government funding and implementation

NOTIONAL POLICY: DE JURE
REALIZED POLICY: DE FACTO

CONVERGENCE IN ECUADOR

Stage 1: Programs rely mostly on external funding and implementation
Stage 5: Programs rely on government funding and implementation

NOTIONAL POLICY: DE JURE
REALIZED POLICY: DE FACTO

CONVERGENCE IN COUNTRY A

Stage 1: Programs rely mostly on external funding and implementation
Stage 5: Programs rely on government funding and implementation

NOTIONAL POLICY: DE JURE
REALIZED POLICY: DE FACTO

DIVERGENCE IN COUNTRY B

Stage 1: Programs rely mostly on external funding and implementation
Stage 5: Programs rely on government funding and implementation

NOTIONAL POLICY: DE JURE
REALIZED POLICY: DE FACTO

DIVERGENCE
SOME SUGGESTIONS ON THE WAY FORWARD FOR HAITI

• Define national policy on school feeding
• Form advisory board for school feeding program (national and international)
• Design optimal operational model for Haiti
• Define concrete milestones and timeframe for the transition
• Rely on WFP operational expertise to slowly increase government capacity (outsource as in El Salvador)
Changes in the costs per child of school feeding and primary education with economic growth (per capita Gross Domestic Product) for 58 countries.

Source: The GDP per capita (purchasing power parity, constant 2005 international $) and the education costs per child are from the UNESCO Institute for Statistics, and the school feeding costs per child were calculated from country program documents and WFP reports. A rigorous search for data was undertaken but it is not claimed that the data are comprehensive.