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School feeding supports the nutrition and education of children. **Home-grown school feeding** introduces new objectives and target groups, by linking school feeding to agricultural development.

In social protection terms, HGSF has multiple objectives and can potentially achieve multiple impacts on multiple beneficiaries.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Social protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutrition</td>
<td>Schoolchildren</td>
<td>Provision/ Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Schoolchildren</td>
<td>Promotion/ Transformation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Caterers</td>
<td>Promotion/ Transformation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
HGSF Impact Pathways

HGSF programme
- creates
- Structured demand
  - stimulates
  - Translates into
    - Sustainable, nationally owned, cost-effective HGSF programme

Response by smallholders
- “Improved” income
  - enables
  - Improved livelihood status of smallholders
- “Improved” income
  - results in
  - Improved education, health & nutrition outcomes

Food for SF programme
- provides
- results in

HGSF Impact Pathways: Social protection

#5: School feeding leads to improved education, nutrition, and health outcomes for children.

Evidence from SF evaluations is strong and uncontroversial.

#3: Structured demand leads to improved income and nutritional status for smallholders.

Evidence from HGSF evaluations is weak; it needs to be built.

#7: Synergies between (3) and (5) – many schoolchildren come from smallholder families.

No evidence – needs to be investigated in HGSF evaluations.
## 4 categories of social protection

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provision</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Social assistance</strong> to poor and food insecure people (safety nets)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prevention</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Social insurance</strong> to prevent hunger, malnutrition, destitution and mortality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Promotion</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Investment in livelihoods</strong> and asset accumulation for income generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transformation</strong></td>
<td>• <strong>Addressing social inequity</strong> (e.g. gender bias) to achieve <strong>social justice</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Theory of change: PROVISION

1\textsuperscript{st} beneficiary group – School children
Delivering school meals to poor children alleviates hunger and malnutrition. Also an indirect income transfer to the child’s household – enhances household food security.

2\textsuperscript{nd} beneficiary group – Farmers
“Home-grown” school feeding adds a second beneficiary group – food supplying farmers. If these farmers are poor and food insecure, HGSF will raise household income and reduce their food insecurity.
Theory of change - PREVENTION

1st beneficiary group – School children
School meals help poor families to avoid damaging ‘coping strategies’ during times of economic stress (e.g. hungry season, or drought), like withdrawing children from school, or selling key productive assets.

2nd beneficiary group – Farmers
If the farmers supplying food for HGSF are poor, earning predictable income allows their children to remain in school, rather than being withdrawn to save money or earn income when times are tight.
Theory of change - PROMOTION

Provision

1st beneficiary group – School children
Many positive impacts of school feeding on education have been recorded: higher school enrolment and attendance; lower drop-outs – which enhance lifetime livelihood opportunities.

Prevention

Promotion

2nd beneficiary group – Farmers
If farmers’ children also receive meals at school (e.g. if all children in local schools benefit), then they also derive benefits of investment in human capital formation.

Transformation
Theory of change – TRANSFORMATION

**Provision**

1st beneficiary group – School children
School feeding can address gender gaps in education, by targeting girls or making take-home rations conditional on girls’ enrolment and attendance.

**Prevention**

**Promotion**

2nd beneficiary group – Farmers & caterers
Involving women in HGSF – as farmers, cooks and caterers – can empower them by generating independent income and giving them financial autonomy.
Impact pathway depends on **procurement**

1. Procurement at school/community level
   i. From local farmers/market
   ii. From suppliers
      a. Associations
      b. Traders
   iii. From caterers
2. Procurement at district/provincial level
3. Procurement at national level

*Spatial dimensions of the procurement-production relationship are critical*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social protection category</th>
<th>School-farmer model</th>
<th>School-Supplier model</th>
<th>School-Caterer model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Provision**             | • Demand at local level  
• Higher income and food  
• Synergies with child  
• Liquidity multiplier | • demand is not concentrated – less effect  
• Higher hhld income  
• Synergies with child? | • Local farmer may not be involved  
• Depends on marketed foods  
• Can increase dietary diversity |
| **Prevention**            | • secure price  
• L-term demand  
• Child stays at school | • scale of production may increase multiplier effect  
• Association may increase market power | • Security is limited to the caterers |
| **Promotion**             | • sustainable livelihoods  
• Local synergies  
• Community level | • Traders – market dynamism  
• More diverse, nutritious food | • Depends on the share of production income that reverts to small farmers |
| **Transformation**        | • Transform opportunities for boys and girls due to ag-school closeness | • Depends on spatial scale  
• possible exclusion | |
Impact pathway depends on procurement

Need to select a procurement model that:

1. maximises the hunger safety net function of HGSF
2. maximises the education impacts and multiplier effects of HGSF
3. maximises the social equity outcomes of HGSF
4. targets most food insecure children – at school and food supplying farmers
5. generates high income and employment for poor people

Spatial dimensions of the procurement-production relationship are critical
1. Who are the secondary beneficiaries of HGSF under alternative procurement models? How significant are the social protection impacts that accrue to each beneficiary group?

2. Which procurement model is most empowering of local farmers and communities? How can these “transformative” social protection impacts be maximised?

3. Under what conditions can HGSF support “graduation” of poor food supplying farmers to food security and self-reliance?

4. What are the implications of different procurement models for: reliability of food supplies; costs of purchase and delivery of food supplies; workloads of school staff; employment creation and income generation for local farmers and caterers?