Enabling Vulnerable Children to Learn

The Namibian School Feeding Programme

A Case Study

WFP
wfp.org

PCD
The Partnership for Child Development

African Union

NEPAD
A PROGRAMME OF THE AFRICAN UNION
NEPAD Planning and Coordinating Agency (NPCA)

Republic of Namibia
Ministry of Education

Republic of Namibia

Namibian School Feeding Programme Case Study
Conducted by Justin Ellis of Turning Points Consultancy CC

World Food Programme, Partnership for Child Development and New Partnership for Africa's Development provided financial and technical assistance.

Cover image by Justin Ellis: A primary school learner preparing to have his mid-morning meal at *Moses van der Byl Primary School,* Katutura, Windhoek

Republic of Namibia

Ministry of Education

The Namibian School Feeding Programme:
A Case Study

September 2012

Enquiries:
Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance
Private Bag 13186
Windhoek, NAMIBIA
Tel: (+264-61) 293 3220
Fax: (+264-61) 293 3219

Foreword

School Feeding has been an integral part of the government's strategy to address inequalities and expand access to educational opportunities to disadvantaged children, particularly orphans and vulnerable school learners. Since 1990s, the school feeding programme in Namibia has received strong political support as evidenced in the various legal and policy instruments in which it is embedded. The fourth National Development Plan also recognises the role of school feeding in addressing the nutritional needs of children. The Ministry of Education (MOE) will therefore continue to support efforts aimed at strengthening the school feeding programme in Namibia so that it could contribute to the realisation of the National Development goals.

In May 2012, the MOE commissioned the Namibian School Feeding Programme (NSFP) case study to analyse and document the characteristics of the school feeding programme. The study which was supported by the World Food Programme (WFP), the Partnership for Child Development (PCD) and New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD) is part of the MOE's efforts to strengthen the evidence base on school feeding. The case study benefited from new tools for analysing and determining good practises in school feeding. Using five standards developed in the World Bank, WFP and PCD publication (*Rethinking School Feeding*, Bundy et al., 2009) the study focused on the design and implementation of the NSFP, financial arrangements, institutional set up, local procurement and supply chain arrangements.

The report highlights valuable lessons and positive aspects of the NSFP and also sheds light on challenges and bottlenecks of the current design and implementation of the programme. The report goes further to suggest ways the MOE and other stakeholders can improve the implementation of the NSFP. The MOE has a crucial role to play in coordinating efforts to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the school feeding programme. I call upon our development partners and stakeholders to join hands with the MOE to address inefficiencies that limit the programme from realising its potential.

I commend government ministries, development partners, civil society, and private sector for their continued support to the NSFP. Special thanks also go to staff from the Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance (PQA), Regional inspectors and Regional hostel officers for their contribution to the study. Your valuable support is a demonstration of the commitment the government has towards strengthening the Namibian school feeding programme.

_____

Mr. Alfred Ilukena
Permanent Secretary
Ministry of Education
September, 2012

Abbreviations

ETSIP	Education and Training Sector Improvement Programme
EMIS	Education Management Information System
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GRN	Government of the Republic of Namibia
HGSF	Home Grown School Feeding
MOE	Ministry of Education
MGECW	Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare
NAB	Namibian Agronomic Board
NAFIN	Namibian Alliance for Improved Nutrition
NDP4	Fourth National Development Plan
NEPAD	The New Partnership for Africa's Development
NHIES	Namibia Household Income and Expenditure Survey
NSFP	Namibian School Feeding Programme
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PCD	Partnership for Child Development
PQA	Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunity and Threats
UNTAG	United Nations Transitional Assistance Group
WFP	World Food Programme

Executive Summary

Namibia is an arid southern African country with a population of 2.1 million people spread across 824,000 square kilometres. It is classified as an upper middle income country but this disguises very high levels of inequality. One of the most important means of bringing about greater equity is education.

This case study aims at increasing the body of knowledge on school feeding programmes, seen as an important means to improve access to education and reduce poverty. Information was gathered through an inception workshop, study of documents, thirty interviews, a questionnaire administered to the thirteen regional hostel officers, and visits to fifteen schools in six regions during which focus group discussions took place with learners, cooks and parents.

The Namibian School Feeding Programme (NSFP) has been in existence for 21 years. Started by the World Food Programme in 1991, it was fully taken over by the Namibian government in 1996/1997. Currently, the programme supports approximately 270,000 primary school learners, mainly orphans and vulnerable children in 1,300 state and private schools across the country and is planning to scale up the number to 300,000 by 2015.

Stakeholders interviewed during the study, suggest that the NSFP:

- attracts needy learners to enrol in school
- keeps them attending regularly
- enables them to concentrate and learn in class
- enables them to participate actively in learning
- improves the health of learners

The programme has trebled in size during the past five years, which can be considered as an impressive achievement. Eighty-six percent of primary and combined schools[1] are currently participating. Within the schools that are participating in the NSFP, the proportion of children participating in the NSFP varies between regions, from 97 to 34 percent, with much higher participation in rural areas as compared to urban areas. In the more highly socially-stratified urban areas a certain stigma seems to be associated with participation in the NSFP. The programme was initially designed to target Orphans and Vulnerable Children (OVC), however, in practise any child in beneficiary schools who wishes to partake of the food is allowed to benefit from the programme, whether he or she meets the criteria or not.

1 Combined schools have both primary and secondary grades.

The NSFP provides a standardized mid-morning meal to learners at participating schools. The meal consists of a maize blend, which is cooked as porridge at schools. The maize blend is fortified and by weight consists of 63% maize meal, 25% protein (soya) blend, 10.8% sugar and 1.2% salt.

The NSFP is managed, at the national level, by the Division Management Planning, Appraisal and Training in the Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance in the Ministry of Education. At a regional level the NSFP is the responsibility of regional hostel officers, who work with circuit inspectors at a district level and schools at the local level.

The procurement of the food for the NSFP, and its distribution to the participating schools, is managed through three national-level tenders, (1) to provide protein blend, sugar and salt, (2) to mix the protein blend, sugar and salt with maize meal and fortification, and transport it to regional warehouses, and (3) to transport the maize blend from the regional warehouses to schools. Each tender, however, is awarded per region, and a tenderer can be awarded several regions.

The expansion of the programme has necessitated that the amount of maize blend purchased by the Ministry of Education grow by threefold, from 2 294 metric tons in the 2007/8 financial year to 7 040 metric tons in the 2011/12 financial year. The purchase of food in the 2012/13 financial year is estimated at N$60 million. Although this amount is less than one percent of the Ministry of Education's budget, there has been a perennial problem in securing these funds. The cost of the maize blend and its delivery to school, per child per day is in the region of N$1 or N$200 per child per year. This is US$ 00.12 and US$ 23.50, respectively[2]. Non-food costs, which have not been quantified, are mostly borne by schools and communities.

For the purposes of this case study, the NSFP is described and assessed by making use of international standards for school feeding as stated in the joint World Food Programme and World Bank publication, *Rethinking School Feeding* (Bundy et al., 2009). These standards concern: programme design and implementation, strong policy frameworks, institutional structures and coordination, stable funding and planning arrangements, and community participation.

Programme design and implementation: It is found that the objectives of the programme and its target groups are generally well understood and supported, but they could be more clearly formulated in policy documents. The NSFP has an acceptable food product, though

[2] Exchange rate: US$ 1.00 = N$ 8.33

learners would like it to be sweeter, and sweeten it by various means if they can. A single ration would yield 1 988 kilojoules (475 kilocalories) which is below the 2 323 kilojoules (555 kilocalories) recommended by WFP for school feeding, but similar to that of India (1 882 kilojoules or 450 kilocalories.) The Namibian ration is relatively high in protein at 15.25 grams per ration, compared to WFP recommendation of 13.8 grams. The 5.75 gram fat content of the Namibian ration is lower than the recommended 10.59 grams. The moisture content of the blend, its manufacture, transportation, and especially the storage arrangements at schools, however, are all potential dangers to the safety of the food.

Two thirds of the schools visited had experienced cases of food going bad, and sometimes took inappropriate action to try and restore it. Cooking arrangements are not optimal because of unpaid cooks, a shortage of measures and pots, and an absence of heat-conserving stoves. Most learners do not have the bowls and spoons that are needed for the hygienic consumption of the porridge. The food commodities used in the maize blend, and centralised procurement do not favour small-scale local production. The availability of the maize blend depends largely on Namibia's ability to import food products from its neighbours, particularly South Africa and sometimes Zambia. Currently, Namibia does not produce enough food to meet its own needs and any changes in the NSFP to use more locally produced food products will be slow and complex, though not impossible. Supply and demand of the maize blend are poorly calibrated and balanced, and there appears to be a lot of inefficiency in the system, due to inadequate record keeping and measurement of the amount of food to cook, the provision of smaller portions than planned to children, and cooks receiving more maize blend as compensation than is allowed for in the guidelines. Monitoring and evaluation, though not totally absent, are not a priority at any level, and are ineffective.

Strong policy frameworks: The need for school feeding seems to be well recognised at a national level, and within the education sector. However, there is no specific policy on school feeding. The Manual that serves as a policy document is in need of revision. School feeding is part of the education sector strategy, ETSIP, but is not part of any other sector strategy.

Institutional structures and coordination: The NSFP is understaffed at national, regional and circuit levels. Staff assigned to perform various functions does not have the time, and often the training, to properly perform their duties. Amongst other functions, the building of alliances and links with potential partners and donors is not given sufficient attention. At a national level the NSFP maintains strong links with the Ministry of Health and Social Services and the Office of the Prime Minister, but not with the Ministry of Agriculture,

Water and Forestry or the Namibian Agronomic Board. There is no formal inter-sectoral body to coordinate the activities of the NSFP.

Stable funding and planning arrangements: In the current financial year, expenditure is expected to reach N$60 million (about US$7.2 million). The Ministry has achieved a threefold increase in funding during the past three years, but funding remains unpredictable and complex and this affects the quality of the implementation of the programme. Formulating a policy, strengthening the school feeding sub-division with a proper staffing structure and dedicated budget line, strengthening monitoring and evaluation, and generally raising the profile of the NSFP, would make the funding of the NSFP more sustainable.

Community participation: It would seem that the NSFP does enjoy a degree of community participation and ownership. Parents and community members have provided firewood, cooks and shelters. Occasionally local businesses have made donations to school feeding in their area. However, parents and caregivers have not been able to provide cooking and eating utensils, soap and pot scourers, and, crucially, adequate storage space. The matter of inadequate storage space is a weakness in the design of the programme, in that the capacity of poor communities to provide storage was over-estimated.

Based on the findings contained in the assessment of the NSFP in terms of the Bundy standards, and a SWOT[3] analysis, it is recommended that the Ministry of Education develop a medium-term plan to reform the NSFP.

[3] SWOT analysis is a strategic planning method used to evaluate the Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, and Threats involved in a project.

Fact Sheet: Namibian School Feeding Programme, 2012-2013

Year Began	1992[4]
Lead Institution	The Namibian School Feeding Programme (NSFP) is the responsibility of the Ministry of Education, coordinated and implemented by the Division Management Appraisal and Training within the Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance.
Objectives	The objective of the NSFP, according to its Manual, is to provide school feeding to OVC in primary schools in order to contribute towards: • increased enrolment • regular attendance • improved retention and progression through grades and • improved general health and concentration levels The intention is that local produce should be used when feasible.
Targeting	School feeding is targeted to OVC and other needy learners in primary schools (Grades 1-7).
Implementation	The NSFP is managed at a national level by the Division Management Planning, Appraisal and Training in the Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance within the Ministry of Education. All bulk food commodities (soya blend, sugar, salt, and maize meal), blending, packaging and transport are procured at national level, though awarded per region. The day-to-day operations are decentralised, managed and coordinated at Regional and school levels. Activities are coordinated by the thirteen Regional Hostel Officers in the Ministry of Education in cooperation with circuit inspectors, principals, teachers and local school boards. Food allocations are delivered in full on a per term basis. The principal and/or focal point teacher is/are responsible for monitoring, control, reporting and quality assurance of the programme at school level.
Modality	The design is for one cooked mid-morning meal of maize blend porridge (125 grams) provided daily at school (200 days per year) to all beneficiaries during each school term. Beyond the staple porridge, content may sometimes vary depending on contributions provided by the community, private businesses and parents.
Coverage	In 2011, 270 772 children were benefitting from the programme. An expansion to 300,000 beneficiaries in 2012 is planned.
Annual budget	The annual budget for the Namibian School Feeding Programme for 2012-2013 is N$55,000,000. However, funding allocations for the programme typically require negotiations throughout the fiscal year and arrangements are being made to increase the allocation to N$60 000 000 (US$7,202,881) which is the likely level of expenditure in this financial year (the actual amount spent in the 2011/2012 financial year was N$49 466 805).
Source of funding	Funding allocations for the Programme are paid from the Ministry of Finance to the Ministry of Education. School feeding is embedded in an internal budget line (027) 'other services' in the budget of the Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance.

[4] In 1991 WFP implemented a 1-year pilot school feeding project, an expansion in the region of an on-going private farm school feeding programme in southern Namibia, which served as the framework for the subsequent 4-year Namibia School Feeding Programme (1992-1996).

Table of Contents

PART ONE

INTRODUCTION

The recent food, fuel and financial crises have highlighted the importance of school feeding programmes both as a social safety net for children living in poverty and food insecurity, and as part of national educational policies and plans.[5] As school feeding programmes run for a fixed number of days a year and have a pre-determined food basket, they can also provide the opportunity to benefit farmers and producers by generating a structured and predictable demand for their products, thereby building the market and the enabling systems around it.[6] This is the concept behind Home Grown School Feeding (HGSF), identified by the Millennium Hunger Task Force as a quick-win in the fight against poverty and hunger. At impact level, HGSF programmes in sub-Saharan Africa are driven by the New Partnership for Africa's Development's (NEPAD) vision for nationally owned, sustainable HGSF aimed at improving smallholder farmer food security (NEPAD, 2003).

The recent joint World Bank and WFP analysis identified five stages in the transition towards sustainable school feeding programmes (see Figure 1) and draws three main conclusions (Bundy et al., 2009). First, programmes in low-income countries exhibit large variation in cost, with concomitant opportunities for cost containment during the transition process. Second, programmes become relatively more affordable with economic growth which argues for focused support to help low-income countries to move through the transition. Finally, the main pre-conditions for the transition to sustainable national programmes are mainstreaming school feeding in national policies and education sector plans, national financing, and national implementation capacity. Countries that have made this transition have all become less dependent on external sources of food by linking the programmes with agricultural development. At least twenty sub-Saharan African countries are interested in or are already implementing HGSF in some form.

The evidence-base on the costs and benefits of school feeding from an educational perspective is relatively well established.[7] Despite recent efforts though there are still gaps in the evidence on optimal implementation and measures of effectiveness of school feeding linked to agriculture development. There is a need to also support the learning and knowledge exchange processes between countries that have been implementing school

[5] Bundy D. et al., 2009. *Rethinking School Feeding*, The World Bank.
[6] Espejo et al., 2009. *Home-Grown School Feeding: a framework to link School feeding with local agricultural production*.
[7] See Alderman, H. & Bundy, D. 2011. *School feeding programs and development: Are we framing the question correctly?* The World Bank

feeding for many years with others that have only recently begun the transition to sustainable, nationally owned programmes.

Figure 1: The transition of school feeding



	Stage 1		Stage 2	Stage 3	Stage 4		Stage 5	
	Programs rely mostly on external funding and implementation						*Programs rely on government funding and implementation*	
Policy framework for school feeding	limited		increased	strong	strong		strong	
Government financial capacity	limited		moderate	increased	strong		strong	
Government institutional capacity	limited		limited	moderate	increased		strong	
Countries	Afghanistan	Malawi	Mali	Kenya	Lesotho		Nigeria	India
	CAR	Ethiopia	Cambodia	Côte d'Ivoire	Ghana	El Salvador		Chile
	DRC	Haiti	Rwanda	Madagascar		Ecuador	Jamaica	Brazil
	Sudan	Tanzania	Niger	Senegal	Honduras		Botswana	
	Zimbabwe		Pakistan	Mauritania			Namibia	
Case study examples	Sudan, Haiti (see chapter 6)		Cambodia, Mali (see chapter 3)	Kenya (see chapter 7)	Ecuador, El Salvador (see chapter 4)		India, Brazil (see chapter 2)	

Source: Authors, based on information in the WFP database and on discussions with key informants.
Note: CAR = Central African Republic; DRC = Democratic Republic of Congo. The allocation of countries to a particular stage is a work in progress.

Source: Bundy et al., 2009: 41

About this Case Study

The World Food Programme, the World Bank and the Partnership for Child Development are currently conducting case studies of different national school feeding programmes to better understand the characteristics of national programmes relative to the context, the different trade-offs in design, the institutional structure, the link with local agricultural production and the process of transition to national ownership. A compilation of case studies will be published by the three organisations in a sourcebook, which will serve as a practical review of current country experiences around the world.

This case study is also the first step of a longer term engagement between the WFP country office and the government of Namibia to improve the school feeding programme in the country. It is an operational review of the current school feeding programme with a focus on design and implementation of the programme, its policy frameworks, institutional set up, funding and planning arrangements and community participation.

The objectives of the study is to:

- strengthen the evidence base on school feeding in Namibia
- analyse the school feeding programme as it is today using the five standards for school feeding described in *Rethinking School Feeding* (Bundy et al., 2009)

- provide recommendations to government on the way forward

Data for this case study was collected mainly through qualitative methods. An inception workshop was held at the beginning of the process to discuss the methodology. A validation workshop was held at the end of the study to validate the findings. Key informants in the education system, and in other relevant agencies, were interviewed (see Appendix A). Focus group discussions were held with school managers, cooks, learners and parents. (see Appendix B). Fifteen schools in six of Namibia's thirteen regions[9] were visited during the first two weeks of June 2012 to gain a detailed understanding of the NSFP at the local level.

It was felt that the regions selected would cover both rich and poor communities, while including northern, central and southern parts of the country. The Caprivi Region was of particular interest as it is the only region where small-scale maize producers are to be found. All hostel officers who are responsible both for the NSFP and school hostels at regional level completed and returned the questionnaire about most aspects of the NSFP (see Appendix B). In addition, data from the Education Management Information System (EMIS) and other sources were analysed. The standards for school feeding programmes suggested by Bundy et al (2009) were used to assess the NSFP and this resulted in a number of findings and recommendations for consideration by the Ministry of Education.

Namibia in Brief

Namibia is often referred to as a land of contrasts. The phrase "Contrasting beautiful Namibia" is present in the national anthem that has been sung since independence from South Africa in 1990.

Contrast is to be found in the people, who are of diverse cultures, languages and colours. Namibia's small population of 2 104 900[10] is however spread over a vast territory of 824 000 square kilometres, with about half the population living in the northern part of the country where rainfall makes crop production barely feasible. The country also has a long Atlantic coastline, and shares borders with South Africa, Botswana, Zambia and Angola.

Contrast is also to be found in the geography of the country. Namibia can be described as an arid country, with three different desert systems found within its borders. The name of the country comes from the western Namib Desert, but there is also the Kalahari in the east and the Karoo in the south. Nevertheless, there is enough rain and vegetation, more particularly in the central and northern areas, to support extensive livestock production. In

[9] The regions visited included: Caprivi, Hardap, Khomas, Omaheke, Oshana and Otjozondjupa.
[10] According to the 2011 population census

the extreme northern areas seasonal rainfall is high enough for rain-fed crops, and there is a further influx of water through drainage systems originating in Angola. The northern parts of the country experience recurrent floods. With global warming, it is expected that Namibia will continue to suffer from extreme weather conditions.

Inequality

Even though classified by the World Bank in 2010 as an upper middle income country, with a per capita gross national income of US$6 420, Namibia still has extreme inequality to contend with. The most recent calculation of the Gini coefficient for Namibia is 0.58, based on preliminary results of the 2009/10 National Household Income and Expenditure Survey (NHIES). While slightly down on the 2003/4 figure of 0.6, and 0.7 in 1993/4, this coefficient remains one of the highest in the world. Similar rates are, however, to be found in several southern African countries. It appears that there has been some progress in reducing poverty in Namibia in recent years, but the rate of change has been slow. Based on the provisional NHIES data, 22 percent of households were poor and 2 percent severely poor in 2009/10, compared to 37 percent poor and 9 percent severely poor in 1993/4.

Map Showing the Regions and Towns of Namibia



Table 1: Indicators of changes in poverty and wealth in Namibia 1993 – 2010

Indicator	1993/4	2003/4	2009/10
Total GDP US$ million	3 945	5 763	7 357
Poorest 20% per capita income (US$)	167	413	1 012
Second poorest 20% per capita income (US$)	359	783	1 508
Middle 20% per capita income (US$)	646	1 242	2 023
Second-richest 20% per capita income (US$)	1 347	2 299	3 329
Richest 20% per capita income (US$)	9 396	10 411	10 557

Source: NHIES and NDP4, 2012.

The Fourth National Development Plan (NDP4) 2012/13 – 2016/17 promises 'a fresh approach' to Namibian development, recognising that while Namibia's economy has grown by 3.6 percent annually over the past five years, this has been accompanied by growing unemployment. In pursuit of Vision 2030, that foresees Namibia becoming an industrialised country, there will be a shift to growth and employment creation through enhanced services, manufacturing, and agriculture. Among the enablers specified in the new plan are education (including a new emphasis on early childhood development, and skills), health, and poverty reduction. In the latter category school feeding is mentioned as one of the safety nets.

Table 2: Contributions to Namibia's Gross Domestic Product 2010

Sector	Contribution to GDP	Percentage of GDP
Primary Industries (Agriculture, Fishing and Mining)	N$ 12 713 million	8.8
Secondary Industries (Manufacturing, Electricity and Water, and Construction)	N$ 17 087 million	14.4
Tertiary Industries (Wholesale and Retail Trade, Hotels and Restaurants, Transport and Communication)	N$ 45 735 million	11.9

Source: National Planning Commission, 2012. Available: www.npc.gov.na

Child Health, Nutrition and Protection

With an HIV prevalence rate of 13 percent, 29 percent of children under five years of age stunted, and an estimated 150,000 orphans, government introduced, amongst other measures, a system of child welfare grants. The Namibian Alliance for Improved Nutrition (NAFIN) was also initiated to raise awareness and advocate for improved nutrition in Namibia.

In 2012 Namibia released a National Agenda for Children[12] which contain the following priority commitments:

1. all children are healthy and well-nourished
2. all children have equitable access to quality integrated ECD services and pre-primary, secondary and vocational education
3. all children have access to age-appropriate quality HIV prevention, treatment, care and support
4. all children have an adequate standard of living and a legal identity
5. all children are safe from neglect, violence, abuse and exploitation

Access to micronutrient-rich foods among under-five year-old children is lower in rural areas than urban areas, indicating that there is an urgent need for community health promotion. The consumption of micronutrient-rich foods by infants increases across wealth quintiles as shown below.[13]

Chart 1: Nutritional Data in Namibia



Burden of Undernutrition	
Stunted (under-fives 000)	80
Share of developing world stunting burden (%)	<1
Stunting country rank	89
Underweight (under-fives 000)	46
Wasted (under-fives 000)	21
Severely wasted (under-fives 000)	5

Source: NAFIN, 2006.

[12] Government of the Republic of Namibia, 2012. *Namibia's National Agenda for Children 2012-2106*
[13] NAFIN, 2011. *Malnutrition in Namibia: The time to act is now!*

Chart 2: Access to Micronutrients by wealth quintile



Governance

Based on its praised constitution, Namibia has established itself as a stable and democratic state in which regular elections take place. The 2009 Index of African Governance (Harvard University) scored Namibia at 69.2 out of a possible 100, making it the second-best governed country in the Southern African region, after Botswana. The 2011 Ibrahim Index of African Governance gave Namibia a score of 70, and 7th place overall on the continent.[14] Namibia is ranked 57th in Transparency International's 2011 Corruption Perception Index (CPI) with a score of 4.4.[15] Namibia's Human Development Index is 0.625, which gives the country a rank of 120 out of 187 countries with comparable data[16].

Education

One of the most important means of bringing about greater equity is education. The right to education is enshrined in Article 20 of the Namibian constitution. In 2011, 607,627 learners were enrolled in school (about 29% of the population of 2.1 million.)[17] Of these, 13,459 were at pre-primary level, 408,804 at primary (grades 1-7), 181,407 at secondary (grades 8-12) and 1,957 at other levels. These learners were served by 23,039 teachers, 18,239 (79%) of whom had at least two years of tertiary education. The learners attended 1,703 schools (112 of which were private) many of them quite small because of the dispersed and sparse population pattern. Based on a projection of the 2001 census, the net enrolment ratio for

[14] www.moibrahimfoundation.org, 2011.
[15] www.transparency.org, 2011.
[16] www.undp.org, 2011.
[17] EMIS, 2011.

children aged 7-16 was calculated at 97.6% (female 99.4%, male 95.8%).[18] However, provisional tables of the National Household Income and Expenditure Survey of 2009/10 suggest that 9.1% of children aged 6 – 16 (8.4% female, 9.8% male) have never been to school.[19] A number of reforms are being brought about in the education system to improve quality and effectiveness through the Education and Training Sector Improvement Programme 2005 – 2020, inspired by Namibia's Vision 2030.[20]

There are undoubtedly a range of factors that affect school attendance, besides hunger. One of those currently being attended to is the matter of school fees levied by school boards. But there are still other compelling factors, perhaps to do with the distance from home to school, relevance of the curriculum, disability, stigmatisation, and social, cultural or familial conditions. School feeding is therefore an important part of an array of measures that are needed to fulfil the right of every Namibian child to education.

Agriculture

Given the arid and volatile climate, Namibia is not best suited to agriculture. Currently agriculture contributes about five percent to GDP, down from nearly nine percent twenty years ago. However, about sixty percent of Namibians live in rural areas, and half of rural households depend on subsistence agriculture, with *mahangu* (pearl millet) being the main crop. Forty-one percent of Namibia's land area consists of communal tenure farms, while a further 44 percent is made up of commercial farms owned by persons who hold title to the land. In the central and southern regions of the country agricultural potential is largely confined to livestock farming, while arable agriculture is mostly limited to the northern regions.[21] NDP4 therefore includes a range of measures to increase agricultural production and reduce the country's dependence on imported food. These measures include:

- development of agri-business and large-scale agro-industries
- infrastructure development, especially for piped water
- de-bushing
- encouragement of cereal and horticulture production for food self-sufficiency and security
- building of more silos for the strategic grain reserve
- control of foot-and-mouth disease
- financial and technical support for those engaged in agriculture

[18] EMIS, 2011.
[19] EMIS, 2011.
[20] www.etsip.na, 2012.
[21] Sherbourne, R. 2010. *Guide to the Namibian Economy 2010*. IPPR. Further information about agriculture in Namibia is provided in the next part of this study where the design and implementation of the NSFP is considered.

- expansion of the Green Scheme
- creating markets for trade in fresh produce, and linking buyers to producers to support local production and self-sufficiency in food
- exploring the establishment of a fertiliser mixing plant
- increasing access to markets for the 1.5 million cattle in communal areas

Although this has not yet been considered at national level, it would seem that Namibia's plans for improved agricultural production could result in a much higher proportion of the NSFP's food requirements being met from local production, even if this is more from large-scale than from small-scale farming units. This is further discussed later in the report (See page 29).

Brief History of the NSFP

The NSFP began as a pilot programme in 1991. Based on the success of a farm-school feeding scheme in southern Namibia, managed by the farm owners, the World Food Programme approached the then Ministry of Education and Culture, offering to distribute, over a one-year period, the surplus rations left over by UNTAG.[22] Support was expanded to five schools in the area, and 400 to 500 children were fed.

In 1992, following the success of the pilot programme, a four-year national school feeding programme was launched with WFP funding and assistance.[23] The support provided by WFP over the four-year period of cooperation with Government was recognised as time-bound and Government, concerned that the initiative was short-term, proceeded prudently. Implementation across the regions was gradual with 49,000 beneficiaries initially in the first year that grew to 78,000 beneficiaries by the final year of the cooperation in 1996. Vulnerable, needy children were geographically targeted in schools located in drought-prone, low-crop-producing regions, including pre-primary, primary, and poor private hostel institutions. The programme expanded to each of the seven educational regions in existence at that time.

A school feeding impact study conducted in May 1994, by the Government of the Republic of Namibia (GRN) and WFP highlighted the positive impact of school feeding on the children. The programme virtually eliminated absenteeism and improved concentration, overall school attendance and pass rates. A separate study by the Namibian Institute for Social and

[22] The United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) was a United Nations peacekeeping force deployed from April 1989 to March 1990 in Namibia to monitor the peace process and elections during the countries transition to independence.

[23] This section is largely derived from the work of Joyce Malcolm, a consultant with World Food Programme who carried out an analysis of the transition of the NSFP from WFP to the Namibian government. Readers who wish more historical detail are directed to this study which covers a longer time span.

Economic Research also corroborated the findings of improved attendance (WFP SFP Phase-Out Study, 2002).

The project was close to achieving beneficiary target numbers set in 1992 of 81% for primary schools and 84% for private hostels. It had exceeded the planned beneficiary target for pre-school feeding. The 300 institutions expected to be served by year four had actually reached 364 institutions within two years (WFP SFP Phase-out Study, 2002). At the conclusion of the cooperation in 1996, and as planned WFP's support for the 4-year school feeding programme ended, along with all of its operations in the country. The withdrawal of WFP from Namibia at that point corresponded with the WFP's global efforts to rationalise operations by closing most of its missions in middle income countries (WFP SFP Phase-out Study, 2002).

While the Ministry of Education had given some thought to seeking other donor support at handover, other government officials maintained that the programme should be managed by government. The operation was handed over in 1996 and Government declared its decision to continue providing and expanding the Namibian School Feeding Programme. In 1997, Government was in full control, managing and funding the programme on a day-to-day basis. Feedback from officials within the MOE and community reported the transition as seamless. The original ministry personnel fully trained on the detailed workings of the programme were operationally managing well. Communities continued to engage the programme enthusiastically, and daily routines functioned without major interruptions at all levels.

Shortly after the handover, alterations to the programme were introduced. Ration size was reduced from 146.5 grams per serving to 125.5 grams. The original protein blend ingredient of enriched dried skim milk was replaced with a soya blend, and vegetable oil was eliminated. Other arrangements continued as before. The beneficiary targets no longer included pre-primary schools, which were now under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of Regional and Local Government and Housing.

In 1999, WFP made a brief return in response to a severe drought in the country's northern region. The emergency operation lasted six months and 16 000 primary school children benefitted from school feeding in 73 schools. These children were later incorporated into the NSFP, and thus WFP helped expand the programme into the north of the country. Apart from this short interval of WFP support, the programme was once again fully funded and managed by Government.

Between 2000 and 2002 staff changes took place due to retirements and departures of the staff originally trained by WFP. A delay in appointments meant that adequate training of the new staff was not attended to. The programme, however, continued, with the number of beneficiaries remaining at around 80 000 between 1997 and 2007.

In 2008, however, Cabinet resolved to increase school feeding to reach an additional 100,000 Orphans and Vulnerable Children, as a measure to mitigate the impact of high food prices on low income consumers. This started a process of rapid growth for the NSFP, which was accelerated in subsequent years, in response to the impact of natural disasters (floods and droughts). Today the programme continues to grow in accordance with national plans to expand the number of beneficiary learners to 300,000 by 2015, a target which could possibly be achieved in 2012.

PART TWO

ASSESSMENT OF THE NSFP

This part of the report makes an assessment of the NSFP in terms of the standards for school feeding programmes as stated in Rethinking School Feeding (Bundy et al., 2009) published by the World Bank. Each standard is stated and this is followed by a consideration of the NSFP in terms of the standard.

1. Programme Design and Implementation

The Rethinking School Feeding Standards:
Sound program design and implementation

- *The program has appropriate objectives corresponding to the context and the policy framework.*
- *Program design identifies appropriate target groups and targeting criteria corresponding to the objectives of the program and the context.*
- *Program has appropriate food modalities and food basket corresponding to the context, objectives, local habits and tastes, availability of local food, and nutritional content requirements (demand-side considerations).*
- *Procurement and logistics arrangements are based on procuring as locally as possible as often as possible taking into account the costs, the capacities of implementing parties, the production capacity in the country, the quality of the food, and the stability of the pipeline (supply and procurement considerations).*
- *There is appropriate calibration of demand and supply, establishing what percentage of food demanded by the program can be sourced locally.*
- *There is a monitoring and evaluation system in place and functioning that forms part of the structures of the lead institution and is used for implementation and feedback.*

1.1 Appropriate Objectives

At the inception workshop for this case study, the Ministry of Education stated that the NSFP is now an essential programme to:

- address short term hunger for needy primary school learners
- provide better nutrition to OVCs
- increase community participation in school management activities

This statement does not however, appear to be derived from any policy document, and could be seen as a current understanding of the Ministry concerning the purposes of the NSFP, perhaps to be included in a future policy. The Manual of the NSFP[24] defines the goals and mission of the NSFP as follows:

[24] Ministry of Education (2006). *Namibian School Feeding Manual.*

> *To provide additional nutrition to non-registered grant-receiving OVC in needy primary schools to encourage increased enrolment and regular attendance whilst also improving their general health and concentration levels in order to optimise on their free education. It is also recommended that every effort possible be made to design and implement school feeding programmes as food plus other school-age health and nutrition interventions, like improvements in the water and sanitation environment among others.*

It is difficult to understand what is meant by 'non-registered grant-receiving OVC', and the study has not been able to unravel the meaning of this phrase. However, it seems to be linked to targeting, which is considered in the next section. The intention to encourage increased enrolment, attendance, concentration and the general health of vulnerable children is in line with what most of those interviewed and surveyed see as the purposes of the programme.

Practically all the individuals and groups interviewed or surveyed for this case study see the NSFP as a good and necessary programme. They asserted that the NSFP:

- attracts needy learners to enrol in school
- keeps them attending regularly
- enables them to concentrate and learn in class
- enables them to participate actively in learning
- improves the health of learners

As one school learner poignantly remarked, "When you are hungry you feel very lazy." The intention that school feeding should be linked to other interventions to improve nutrition, health and sanitation is also appropriate, though in practice only links to health have been pursued.

Teachers could cite specific examples of needy children that were being helped. This was confirmed when a school of the Kwe community was visited, a marginalised San group living in what is essentially a game reserve in the Caprivi region. Food was not delivered on time at this school, so the day of the visit, two weeks into the term, was the first day of feeding for the term. Only 123 out of 236 enrolled learners were present. This would seem to validate that the NSFP is an essential means in some communities of increasing school attendance.

1.2 Appropriate Target Groups and Targeting Criteria

From the Manual, it appears that the NSFP targets certain learners within primary schools in all 13 regions of the country. The target group for the NSFP includes learners:

- who are orphans or vulnerable children
- who are in need of feeding for economic or social reasons

The Ministry of Education has a system for registering orphans and vulnerable children at school level.[25] According to the National Policy on Orphans and Vulnerable Children[26] an orphan is "a child who has lost one or both parents because of death and is under the age of 18 years" and a vulnerable child is "a child who needs care and protection". Schools are required to maintain continuous individual OVC registers for each orphan or vulnerable child and to submit an annual summarised OVC register to EMIS. Categories (and subcategories, each with a code) are defined for orphans, physical-related difficulties, marginalised ethnic groups living in remote rural areas, family-related difficulties, school and learning-related difficulties, service-delivery related difficulties, and any other difficulty.

At the inception workshop for this case study, the Ministry of Education provided more detail about the target group, stating that the intended beneficiaries of the programme are:

- orphans
- neglected, abused and marginalized children
- children whose parents earn less than N$500 per month
- learners living with grandparents of unemployed parents or guardians
- learners showing signs of malnutrition
- learners who eat less than two meals a day at home

The regional hostel officers who have a key role to play in recommending which schools should be included in the programme considered the following factors in addition to the above criteria:

- status of the community and parents (perhaps in terms of marginalisation)
- remoteness of the community
- unemployment and income of the parents or caregivers
- food insecurity
- equal access to education
- distance from school to home

[25] Ministry of Education. 2007. *Registers of Orphans and Vulnerable Children: Manual for Schools.*
[26] Ministry of Women Affairs and Child Welfare. 2004. *National Policy on Orphans and Vulnerable Children.*

- children staying with pensioners
- community understanding of the programme and willingness to participate
- storage facilities at the school, and
- poverty in general

While schools are recommended by the regional education offices, the inclusion of additional schools is at the discretion of the Ministry Head Office, where the availability of funds is a major consideration. The following sections examine the participation of schools and learners in the NSFP to determine to what extent the target group is being included in the programme.

Participation of Schools

Over the past six years, the number of schools participating in the NSFP has almost doubled, from 666 in 2007 to 1,293 in 2011. Growth was particularly strong in 2009 when the number of beneficiaries increased by 177percent. This growth has been significant in the Kavango, Ohangwena, Omusati, Oshana and Oshikoto Regions that are prone to severe weather conditions and recurrent floods (see Chart 3 & Appendix C) and where food insecurity is more prominent.

Chart 3: Participation of Schools in the NSFP 2007 – 2011 by Region



Source: EMIS, 2012 & Appendix C.

The growth in the number of schools participating has meant that by 2011, eighty six percent of primary and combined schools were participating in the NSFP, as shown in table 3. Private schools are included as they are also eligible to participate in the NSFP.

At this stage in the development of the programme, it is especially difficult to justify why the remaining fourteen percent of primary and combined schools are being excluded. All schools include OVC and children who are hungry and would like to participate in the NSFP. Their exclusion is considered by some respondents as a discriminatory and unfair practice in terms of the Namibian Constitution and funding constraint is not seen as a strong argument for excluding other children from participating in the programme.

Table 3: Schools Participating in NSFP and All Primary and Combined Schools, by Region 2011

	Schools Participating	Primary Schools	Combined Schools	Total	% participating
Caprivi	85	48	41	89	96
Erongo	36	37	12	49	73
Hardap	45	39	7	46	98
Karas	35	30	11	41	85
Kavango	300	255	53	308	97
Khomas	57	52	14	66	86
Kunene	46	40	8	48	96
Ohangwena	209	120	103	223	94
Omaheke	26	30	3	33	79
Omusati	187	144	101	245	76
Oshana	84	62	51	113	74
Oshikoto	139	116	63	179	78
Otjozondjupa	44	48	9	57	77
Total	**1293**	**1021**	**476**	**1497**	**86**

Source: EMIS, 2012.

Participation of Learners

In schools benefiting from the school feeding programme, EMIS gathered data on the number of boys and girls who are fed. As shown in chart 4, the expansion of the programme in the past five years has meant that the number of learners benefiting by the programme has more than trebled.

Chart 4: Learners participating in the Namibia School Feeding Programme 2007-2011, by Region



Source: EMIS, Appendix D

Within the schools that are participating in the NSFP, a calculation was made per region, of the number of children benefiting from the programme as compared to the total enrolment of the schools and the number of OVCs in these schools.

Chart 5: Percentages of children that participate in school feeding and percentages that are OVC, within schools that are included in NSFP, per region in 2011



Source: EMIS, 2012.

It is evident from chart 5 that in some regions, the number of OVC is smaller than the number participating in school feeding, implying that many more children including those who do not fit in the established criteria for participating in school feeding are being fed.

Since the schools include combined schools, this means that junior secondary learners (grades 8-10) are also being fed.

In seven regions, the proportion of children partaking in school feeding is 20-44 percent higher than the proportion of the school population that are OVC. These seven regions are also the lowest in terms of household consumption (poorest) in the National Household Income and Expenditure Survey of 2009/10.

In five of the thirteen regions the proportion of children being fed is similar to the number of OVC (within seven percent.) However, in Khomas, a region considered to be the richest in the country, the proportion of children benefiting from school feeding is actually lower than the proportion of OVC, by 11 percent. This indicates that there is a certain stigma being attached to participation in the NSFP in more socially stratified urban environments. One young beneficiary at an urban school remarked in a focus group discussion that he wished that when they were eating, the other children "would go far away." A lower school feeding participation by girls in four regions, Erongo, Hardap, Karas and Khomas (Appendix E) seems to confirm that stigma issues are experienced in these regions too.

The picture that emerges from this information is that the NSFP has now extended well beyond the original target group, OVCs, particularly in poor rural areas. In practice, in beneficiary schools, feeding is open to any learner who wishes to make use of it, whether identified as an OVC or not. However, in urban areas the programme is seen to be for OVC only and other children do not take part. This may partly be because of the requirements of the Manual, and the amounts of food that are made available by the Head Office, based on the number of OVC reported to be present at the school. There is therefore a strong element of entitlement and self-selection. In Namibian culture, as in many other contexts too, it is very difficult to isolate some children to eat while others stand by and watch them eating.

Participation in the NSFP and Economic need

Chart 6 compares the proportion of learners being fed in a region to the proportion of learners in poor households per region. It illustrates that more children are being fed than is required, except in Otjozondjupa region, which seems to be under-served. The high provision to some regions in the north reflects the fact that the NSFP was deliberately expanded in these regions in response to the floods of this time.

Chart 6: Percentage Poor Households and Learners Fed by Region (2009-2010)



Source: EMIS and Provisional Tables of the NHIES 2009/10

1.3 Appropriate Food Modalities and Procurement

This section first looks at the food provided in terms of its design, and then at the long process by which the food is sourced, manufactured or blended, transported, stored, cooked and eventually served to the children, as illustrated below.



Figure 2: Maize blend supply flow Source: Author's compilation, 2012.

Design of the Product

The food ration provided to children has been described both as a snack (for instance by officials of the Ministry of Education) and a meal, although the NSFP Manual refers to it as a meal. In view of its bulk, the term meal seems appropriate. As previously indicated the meal is a cooked porridge made from a maize blend provided in 12.5kg bags to participating schools. The ration per child per day is 125g of dry mix. A 12.5kg bag therefore provides 100 rations. As 125g of dry maize blend is approximately 200 millilitres in volume, cooks are meant to make up the correct amount to cook by using a one litre measuring jug.

In the relevant tender the requirements for the protein blend, a component that makes up 25 percent of the maize blend, are specified in detail with minimum and maximum

requirements.[27] Specifications for the maize meal, sugar and iodised salt are not provided, but these are required to comply with relevant legislation specifying the qualities of such products.

Table 4 shows the specifications of the protein blend and the actual values determined from laboratory analysis of samples taken from 3 suppliers of the blend. The sample from supplier A is high in moisture but also very low in protein compared to the specifications. It is not known what action, if any was taken by the MOE to follow up on aspects of non-compliance in the provision of protein blend.

Table 4: Protein Blend: Minimum and maximum requirements of the tender and laboratory tests of the protein blend from different suppliers February 2011 (per 100 grams)

Component	Min and Max Required	Supplier A	Supplier B	Supplier C	UOM
Moisture	2.7 – 3.9	8.5	2.0	3.0	Grams
Energy	1 365 - 2000	1 576	1 973	1 942	Kilojoules
Protein	39 – 46.7	32.1	38.6	38.5	Grams
Total Fat	6.7 – 28.0	4.7	22.3	21.7	Grams
Total Carbohydrate	17 – 25	51.4	31.1	31.5	Grams
Iron	6.0 – 9.0	6.5	13	6.9	Mg
Zinc	1.0 – 5.0	3.5	3.9	3.7	Mg
Vitamin A	4 – 150	Not measured	Not Measured	Not measured	µg RE

Source: Analytical Laboratory Services, Windhoek, 2011.

For an international comparison, the specifications of a World Food Programme Product, Fortified Corn Soy Blends with sugar, [28] also called super cereals, have been inserted in an additional column in table 5. The average energy that could be derived from 100 grams of the maize blend is 1 591 kilojoules, implying that a 125 gram ration would yield 1 988 kilojoules (475 kilocalories.) This is about a quarter of a child's daily energy requirements.

The nutrient requirements for the maize blend as such are not specified by the Ministry. However, in terms of nutritional value, laboratory tests of the maize blend carried out in 2011 showed the following results (table 5).

[27] Different specifications for the protein blend are given in the tender for the manufacture of the maize blend
[28] WFP detailed specifications are available at http://foodquality.wfp.org/FoodSpecifications/BlendedFoodsFortified/CSBPlusWFPwithsugar/tabid/477/Default.aspx. CSB specifications have been upgraded in 2011 to increase the micronutrient content.

Table 5: Summary of laboratory analysis of nutritional value of samples of maize blend from suppliers, February 2011

Component	Supplier 1	Supplier 2	Supplier 3	Supplier 4	Average nutritional value of maize blend samples	WFP Product CSB + supercereal	UOM
Carbohydrates	71.4	71.3	71.4	71.5	71.4	No spec	g/100g
Energy	1568	1597	1628	1572	1591	1596	KJ/100g
Protein	13.8	10.6	11.5	12.8	12.2	15.5	g/100g
Fat	3.1	5.4	6.2	3.9	4.6	8.2	g/100g
Crude fibre	1.0	1.4	2.2	1.8	1.6	5 (max)	g/100g
Sodium	495	362	333	811	500	n/a	mg/100g
Moisture	10.0	10.2	8.7	8.4	9.3	10 max	g/100g
Ash	1.7	2.4	2.3	3.3	2.4	n/a	g/100g
Iron	3.8	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.5	9	mg/100g
Zinc	2.5	1.6	1.1	2.2	1.8	n/a	mg/100g
Calcium	20	23	35	18	24	401	mg/100g

Source: Analytical Laboratory Services, Windhoek. 2011. (Results reported on 'as is' basis, not corrected for moisture. To compare products with each other, it is better to report on dry weight basis)

By way of comparison, the WFP daily recommended nutrient intakes (RNI) for school-age children are (in part) as shown in table 6.[29] Such WFP rations would, however, tend to be served to children in food-insecure environments. The ration for school feeding in India provides 450 kcal (1 882 kilojoules) and 12 grams of protein, which is quite similar to the Namibian ration.[30]

Table 6: Recommended daily nutrient intakes for school feeding

Component	Estimated recommended daily nutrient intakes (RDI) for school age children	Recommended contribution from school ration (half-day school minimum contribution 30% of RDI)
Energy	1850 kcal – 7740 kJ	555 kcal – 2323 kJ
Protein	46 grams	13.8 grams
Fat	35 grams	10.5 grams
Iodine	120 µg	36µm
Vitamin A	500 µg	150 µm
Iron	17.8 mg	5.3mg
Zinc	11.2 mg	3.36 mg
Calcium	700 mg	210 mg

Source: WFP, 2012.

The protein content of the Namibian ration would seem to be a favourable (but perhaps costly) choice. The fat content is low. The matter of an increased fat component therefore needs further investigation. Laboratory investigation of the micronutrient value of the Namibian ration should be carried out. The first analysis shows low levels of iron and calcium content compared to most recent WFP guidance.

[29] For the detailed estimated RDI and nutrient targets please see Appendix H
[30] Information provided by WFP.

One of the Namibian nutritionists consulted pointed out that the ration does not include fresh vegetables, which would, of course, improve the nutrition of the children and provide an opportunity for local producers. The availability of water (year-round), procurement methods and cost would, however, be significant challenges to overcome.

It should also be noted that the size of the NSFP has caught the eye of Namibia Dairies who have proposed a long-life fortified milk product in a sealed package. This would obviate the need for cooking. The cost to the Ministry, however, would appear to be about double the current outlay. A biscuit made from *mahungu* has also entered the local market and could offer a supplement to the maize blend porridge for school learners. However this product is unlikely to be produced in sufficient quantities and at an affordable cost. If introduced in school feeding, the *mahangu* biscuits could increase demand and promote agricultural production of *mahangu* locally.

Sourcing and Manufacture of the Maize Blend

The local availability of the ingredients of the maize blend is a matter of interest as it is one of the intentions of the NSFP that local produce should be used whenever possible.[31] Furthermore, whether large-scale or small-scale producers benefit by the demand created by school feeding for agricultural produce is significant. A market for small-scale producers, particularly if it were near to where they live, might help to reduce poverty and inequality, since subsistence farmers are among the poorest in the country.

Assuming that in 2012 the NSFP reaches its target of 300,000 beneficiaries (as is the intention), and that children are fed for 200 days per year, the total requirement for a year will be 7,500 metric tons of maize blend, made up of:

- 4,725 tons of maize meal
- 1,875 tons of (soya) protein blend
- 810 tons of sugar
- 90 tons of iodised salt

It is estimated that about a third of the NSFP food requirement is produced in Namibia, representing about half the maize meal that is needed. In terms of monetary value, perhaps a similar proportion of every Namibian dollar spent on food for school feeding is being spent on Namibian produce, or value addition through transport, milling and blending. This is partly because of the high value of the imported protein blend (See Appendix G and the explanation in the following paragraphs).

[31] As specified in the tender

Most of Namibia is not suitable for growing maize. However, maize is produced in large-scale irrigation schemes and on large state-owned farms along the Kavango River. In the "maize triangle" formed by Tsumeb, Grootfontein and Otavi there is dryland rain-fed maize production on large commercial farms. Small scale maize production seems to be prominent only in the Caprivi region. In 2010 the national white maize harvest was 48,000 tons, approximately 45% of national consumption.[32] In 2011 this improved to 64,000 tons, and a record harvest of 74,000 tons is predicted for 2012.[33] There is a protected market for (non-GMO) maize producers in Namibia; maize may only be imported once all the local production has been purchased at a fixed price. Although it has been calculated that a further 5,000 hectares under irrigation could close the gap, the country is still some way from achieving that, and drought years will undoubtedly return.

Considered at a national level, therefore, the NSFP cannot be said to be enhancing national food security or the market for small-scale producers to any significant extent. Probably less than half of the maize meal procured for the NSFP is of Namibian origin. Even if it is provided by Namibian mills, they are obliged to use both Namibian and foreign suppliers to ensure year-round supply. Three of the four suppliers were visited and it was found that they are mostly reliant on Namib Mills, the Goliath of the Namibian milling industry. However the suppliers also buy from smaller millers, if the price is lower, to the extent that their needs can be met. The manufacturer in Caprivi Region has recently acquired a maize milling machine so this company might be the only one of the current suppliers able in future to buy the produce of small-scale maize growers.

Unfortunately, there does not currently appear to be an alternative to maize. *Mahangu*, a pearl millet, is the staple of most people living along the northern belt of the country. It is produced in small-scale subsistence agriculture. Some 60 000 tons was produced in 2010, but only about 3 000 tons came to market, despite efforts by the Namibian Agronomic Board (NAB) to buy and commercialise the product. Although surpluses are achieved in some years, most households prudently keep enough grain in storage for a year rather than risk selling it. One firm that markets packaged *mahangu* nationwide is said to have had to resort to imports to maintain the brand.

In 2010, Namibia produced 14,500 tons of wheat under irrigation, about 25% of national consumption. After successful import substitution schemes, Namibia produced 29% of horticulture fresh produce in 2010. Namibia does not currently produce soya beans. However, the Namibian Agronomic Board would like to incentivise legume production, not

[32] Information provided by the Namibian Agronomic Board
[33] Die Republikein. June, 05, 2012.

least to encourage crop rotation and resultant improvements in soil quality and productivity. Interest was therefore expressed by the NAB in the needs of the NSFP. There would, however, be a lead time in meeting the needs of NSFP as there would have to be an infant industry protection regulation and an investment in technology to produce soya meal with the required protein concentration and moisture level. Soya can probably only be grown under (large scale) irrigation in Namibia and is said to be a risky crop. Cowpeas, which are grown by subsistence farmers in northern Namibia, and other legumes such as ground nuts, might also be able to make up part of the protein mix, but contain only a quarter of the protein found in soya.

Namibia does not currently produce sugar, though projects have been mooted from time to time. Salt is available in abundance from two producers at the coast, and is iodised by law.

Procurement

The procurement of the food for the NSFP and its distribution to the participating schools is managed through three national-level tenders. Each tender, however, is awarded per region. The current tenders are for the period from 1 January 2010 to 31 March 2013. The first tender (A9-12/2009B) is for the provision of protein blend, sugar and salt. In summary the tenderer must:

- have storage capacity of at least 200 metric tons
- have suitable and experienced staff
- provide a protein blend with specified requirements in terms of moisture, energy, protein, fat, carbohydrate, dietary fibre, ash, minerals, vitamins, amino acids and fatty acids
- provide white or brown sugar able to pass through a 2360 micrometer sieve
- provide salt, which should be iodized and of Namibian origin
- pack the commodities in lined bags
- deliver the bags to the company that has the relevant contract to make the maize blend

Although it is not specified, in practice, the protein blend is derived from soya meal products imported from South African manufacturers.

The second tender (A9-12/2009) is for the provision of maize meal, blending of maize blend and transporting the blend to regional warehouses.

In summary the tendered must:

- use produce (maize meal) of Namibian origin as far as possible and inform the Ministry of Education when it is not possible to do so[34]
- have a capacity to manufacture 75 metric tons of maize blend daily, amounting to 6000 bags of 12.5kg each
- supply maize meal in accordance with prescribed national specifications
- blend the maize meal, protein blend, sugar and salt in the following proportions:
  - Maize meal 63.0%
  - Protein blend 25.0%
  - Sugar 10.8%
  - Salt 1.2%
- add a premixed prescribed fortification (if not supplied with the maize meal) and calcium carbonate per metric ton
- pack the maize blend in 12.5kg polypropylene bags lined with polythene
- deliver the ordered number of bags to the regional warehouse of the company that has the contact to deliver to the schools

The maize blend must have a shelf life of at least three months.

The third tender (A9-15/2010) is for the transport, storage and handling of food and non-food items. In summary, the tenderer must:

- have storage capacity of 250 metric tons (20,000 x 12.5kg bags) per region
- have vehicles available with a minimum capacity of one third of the tonnage to be delivered in the region
- comply with regulations concerning cleanliness, sanitation, fumigation and health
- receive consignments from the contractor for maize blend
- deliver consignments of maize blend to the schools, at the beginning of each term, as specified

The current holders of contracts to supply food products and transport for the NSFP are shown in Appendix I. The bulk of the work is allocated to two companies, Alason and Pena,

[34] In practice the suppliers no longer inform the Ministry of the origin of the maize meal that they buy, since the (seasonal) importation of maize is now subject to a national system.

for the supply of protein blend and maize blend to large regions. Seven other companies have smaller contracts for the supply of food products and transport.

Expansion of the programme meant that the amount of maize blend purchased by the Ministry of Education grew threefold, from 2,294 metric tons in the 2007/8 financial year to 7,040 metric tons in the 2011/12 financial year.

One source of tension in the programme concerns the timing of orders and deliveries of the maize blend to schools. The NSFP at Head Office has the responsibility of ordering food and transport from the contracted suppliers twenty days before the commencement of each term.[35] Placing timely orders is determined by availability of funds. The study found that orders from the Ministry of Education are often late. Some millers however proactively go ahead and purchase commodities required even before the orders arrive from the Ministry. In most case these millers will not begin to blend until they have the orders in hand. The millers are often given 30 days in which to complete the orders. One miller, Pena, was found to be working shifts, day and night to complete the order.

Due to the pressure to meet deadlines, it is also possible that errors can occur in the orders placed. In the case of the second term of 2012, for instance, there was an addition error that resulted in a shortage of 610 bags for Otjozondjupa region.

When the manufacturer for Caprivi Region was visited on 15 June, there was nothing going on, although some 500 bags of maize blend had still to be manufactured. It seemed that insufficient stocks were on site to complete the order. This was more than two weeks after the term had started. The date of the orders being delivered could not be confirmed.

The suppliers of the maize blend are required to pack the blend in polypropylene bags lined with polythene. The bags are sewn closed and each bag is printed in large letters:

Ministry of Education
Namibian School Feeding Programme
12.5 kg net
Not for Sale
(date of manufacture and batch number)
Term ( ) of (year)

The term and the year are sometimes printed on the bags, and sometimes filled in by hand. The date of manufacture and the batch number are hand-written, using a permanent black marker, however there is no 'expiry date' indicated on the bags. This was noted as a

[35] 20 days is specified in the tender

problem by several teachers interviewed. The tender requires that the maize blend should "retain its qualities for at least three months from the date of manufacture when stored dry at temperatures prevalent in Namibia." Some Ministry officials however, are of the view that the product has a shelf life of six months, which seems unlikely. As we will see later, the storage conditions at schools are a significant hazard and often shorten the viability of the product. The effects of using a polythene liner on the shelf life of the maize blend can also be debated.

The final obligation of the supplier of maize blend is to provide the bags to the regional warehouse of the company that has the tender to deliver the maize blend to schools in that region.

Transportation of the Maize Blend

Transporters are required to maintain regional warehouses, according to specified standards, but in practise they need these warehouses only for a week or two three times a year. Storage space is not easy to find in any case so transporters find this requirement financially inefficient. Some have resorted to having several small warehouses, and actually still have inadequate space. This has caused penalty expenses to the suppliers of the maize blend, who find their hired food delivery trucks being tied up unexpectedly at certain locations because they have not been offloaded on time, as transporters attempt to offload directly from the suppliers' large trucks to their own smaller trucks.

Transport companies are supposed to own vehicles with a carrying capacity of one third of the mass to be transported. The number of metric tons to be delivered to regions in the second term of 2012 varied between 31 tons for the Karas region and 469 tons for the Kavango region. The latter region has many small inland schools that can only be reached in 4x4 light delivery vehicles. It was not possible to assess all the transport companies but it seems that many of them do not have the required capacity for fast delivery. In the Caprivi region there is an exceptional arrangement in that the supplier of the maize blend also has the contract to deliver it to the schools. This entails a saving in terms of warehousing, but this company does not actually own trucks and has therefore resorted to hiring trucks from another company. With the complication of flooding (which increases need) in this region, deliveries were running late during the second term of 2012.

Schools are closed during the school holidays and staff members may only be available a few days before the term starts. Even when things are running on schedule, transport contractors have a narrow window of a few days in which to deliver, if food is to be available at the beginning of the term. Contractors do apparently have mobile phone

numbers of school principals, but this may not always solve the problem. Transport contractors often have a limited number of vehicles and some have several regions allocated to them. Their trucks are also not exclusively used for the needs of the NSFP. At best, it probably takes at least a week to deliver to all the schools in a region.

At the inception workshop in April 2012, it was mentioned that some schools try to solve the problem of food shortages by retaining some bags at the end of the term. The problem with this is the uncertain shelf life of the product, which would usually have expired before the commencement of the new term. At least transporters, in consultation with the regional education office, do prioritise schools where it is known that learners are unlikely to attend if there is no food, such as those with a high proportion of learners from marginalised communities.

From this study it was apparent that regional offices do not monitor or check the delivery of food to the schools. It seems that schools too have become accustomed to late deliveries and do not pester the regional office. The responses from the Regional Hostel Officers further show that they are not able to inspect all the warehouses of the transport companies as they ought. Only three officers had their own transport; the others had to request for vehicles from the Government Garage pool whenever they undertook field trips.

Storage of the Maize Blend at Schools

The Manual of the NSFP is clear about the requirements for the storage of food at school level. The manual states that a store should;

- be dry, well lit and ventilated with wire mesh screen over the ventilators
- be clean
- have smooth walls with a lime wash for easy cleaning
- have smooth cement or dung or mud floors with no cracks or holes
- have platforms lifted 10 cm from the bottom (floor presumably)
- have a fitted door that can be locked
- be built near the cooking shelter

However, few of the schools visited were complying with these requirements. Of the fifteen schools visited about two-thirds were using a storeroom at the school, usually a room with shelves intended for books. Bags were still found on the floor in some cases, or together with garden tools and other items being stored. In one case the back of a classroom was used, with the bags being stacked on the floor and against the wall, much to the frustration of the teacher. In two instances the food was being stored in a hostel kitchen.

One bad practice found was a dark mud-and-stick room built by parents. The floor was coated with maize meal, as it had not been cleaned for some time, resulting in rats being attracted to the place.

The record-keeping system in the NSFP Manual was not being closely followed at any of the schools visited. The system is lacking in that it does not encourage recording of the daily movement of bags in and out of stock, instead relying on a weekly record. One conscientious teacher had simply used an exercise book to record the movement of stock. But for the rest, there seems to be little real stock control. Often the keys to the storeroom were found to be in the care of a cleaner, since this was more practical than them being with the teacher in charge, who would be teaching when the bags were needed by the cooks.

Under these circumstances, 10 of the 15 schools reported instances of food going bad, either through infestation with weevils, other insects, fungi and other micro-organisms. This was sometimes reported to the regional office, but more often it seems that schools resort to their own remedies. The Manual states that food that has gone bad will not be replaced so there is perhaps no incentive to report it. The most unacceptable practice reported in several schools was that the cooks put the maize blend which has gone bad through a sieve. This would unintentionally remove the sugar. The meal was then served to learners despite the “off” odour and bad taste. In one clear instance, cooking of this

'cleaned' meal resulted in many of the children getting diarrhoea, and the programme being boycotted by many of the children.

It seems from the survey of regional hostel officers that their usual response to reports of food going bad is to call in the Ministry of Health inspectors and have the affected food destroyed. Hardly any reports of such incidents get through to the Head Office. Suppliers are sometimes not challenged to replace a batch of food that has gone bad as provided for in the contract. Presumably because of the difficulties in determining whether the food got spoilt while in the care of the transporter or due to poor storage in the schools. Despite the high standards pursued by most of the suppliers, it is conceivable that occasionally the supplier could be to blame because of the high moisture content in the blend. Schools accept deliveries without checking the quality of the product on delivery, at least for smell and taste. Since no procedure exists samples of suspected spoilt blend is not taken for laboratory analysis, and therefore remains an unknown factor at present.

In summary, it seems that a significant amount of food might be lost on an annual basis, due to bad storage. Estimating the extent of such loss would need proper investigation. Additionally, in some cases children are being fed food that might not be fit for human consumption.

Cooking Arrangements

The food is usually cooked in large pots on open fires. The procurement of firewood in many parts of Namibia is a severe problem. The manual suggests that each child should bring a piece of wood to school, and some schools have tried this, but it does not seem to work very well or be sustainable. Some school boards have instituted a rotation system in terms of which household in the community has the responsibility of providing firewood for one week. The problem with this system is that it is voluntary and if a household fails to take its turn, there is nothing much the school board can do. The food might not be cooked that week. One school was found to be regularly paying two bags of maize blend for a load of firewood, and one suspects that this practice might be more widespread.

The problem of cooking on open fires is that this method is very energy inefficient. In the days when the programme was under WFP, energy-saving stoves were provided, and a few of these were seen to be still in use. The Ministry of Education, however, did not continue this supply, although the stoves were made by a local producer in Rehoboth (no longer in business, but other versions are commercially available). Besides being inefficient, open fires are also a danger to the cooks and the children.

Most cooks do not have watches, so the time that it takes to cook the porridge is unknown, although it seems from the schools visited to be about half an hour. Cooks seem to rely on taste and texture to determine when to take the porridge off the fire. They are usually ready some time before the meal should be served, judging by the few cases observed.

According to the Manual, pots should be provided by the Ministry, but during the expansion of the programme, funds have not been available for kitchen utensils including pots. It seems that schools have purchased pots from their school development fund (financed by the fees charged to parents). The most suitable pot seems to be a large (No. 25) cast iron three-legged pot. But due to the cost, some schools have instead acquired large aluminium pots, which do not seem to last long on open fires and may be adding undesirable trace elements to the food. One school was found to be using an oil drum as a pot. One school visited, with not many learners to feed, had resorted to a gas stove. However, the gas cylinder was indoors, which is dangerous, and was said to be costing the school development fund about N$800 per term. Two schools were using the hostel facilities that use gas or electricity.

The cooks are volunteers organised by the school, and in particular the school board. The arrangement that seemed to work best was when there were two teams of two cooks, alternating every week. Having a large number of teams of cooks did not seem to work well as it seemed to bring into play the likelihood of a less skilled cook, who did not know how to cook the porridge well. According to the NSFP Manual, in return for their work the cooks have a daily meal and are entitled to three dry rations per day (or 15 rations per week). In a twelve-week term, a cook would get approximately two bags of maize blend per term. However, what was found during the visits to schools is that cooks are being compensated at a far higher rate. In fact cooks are receiving up to twelve bags per term (one per week).

It would seem that this is happening because cooks feel that the compensation offered is too meagre and food is available due to the reduced ration being given to children, late

deliveries, and inaccurate forecasting of the number of bags actually needed at a school. It is a further indication of the lack of monitoring and evaluation being carried out. Depending on the number of children being fed, cooks could get between five and 28 percent of the bags consumed. In addition, some schools pay cooks from their school development fund between N$260 and N$620 per term, at the schools visited.

Considering the reduced rations being given to children (as explained in the next section) and the unplanned allocation of bags to cooks at the fifteen schools visited, an analysis of what was likely to happen at each school during the second term of 2012 was carried out. This shows a considerable oversupply of maize blend to most of the schools, as shown in table 7 below.

Table 7: Estimation of bags that would be consumed if feeding was provided for 12 weeks in the second term of 2012

School	bags allocated by MOE HO	bags used per day	bags used per week	bags used for 12 weeks	bags consumed by cooks	total bags used	Projected Surplus at end of term
Moses vd Bijl PS	126	1	5	60	24	84	42
Okatana PS	112	1.25	6.25	75	12	87	25
Ehenye PS	98	0.4	2	24	7.2	31.2	66.8
Ediva PS	97	3	15	180	12	192	-95
Kandunda Kaseta PS	136	3	15	180	24	204	-68
Singalamwe CS	145	2	10	120	3.6	123.6	21.4
Kongola PS	264	2.5	12.5	150	24	174	90
Sangwali PS	157	2	10	120	24	144	13
Aris PS	126	2	10	120	0	120	6
Dordabis PS	197	1.5	7.5	90	24	114	83
Nossob PS	293	2	10	120	24	144	149
R5 Kamp	248	4	20	240	0	240	8
Usib	45	0.5	2.5	30	6	36	9
Oanob PS	455	5	25	300	15	315	140
K W von Maree CS	64	1	5	60	6	66	-2

Source: Data from 15 schools visited and NSFP orders for second term (29 May – 2 August) of 2012.

Had children been fed for all twelve weeks the total surplus from the 15 schools would have been 488 bags, or six metric tons of maize blend. Using the same model, but for ten weeks, considering late deliveries, results in a surplus of 834 bags, or over ten metric tons, as shown in Appendix F.

What seems to happen more often with surplus bags of food is that at the end of the term the maize blend is divided up among children to take home. Some schools may keep a few bags to begin the next term with as food deliveries are often late. However, given the shelf

life of the product, the poor storage conditions, and the one-month holiday in between the first and the second terms, none of the fifteen schools visited were applying this strategy. Regional offices, aware of surpluses at one school may move food to another school in need or use the food for (informal) community hostels, which are not provided for by the head office.

Serving of Food to Children

The general pattern in most schools is that meals to be served during the first break, at about 10.00 in the morning. The break is usually 20-30 minutes. However, at three schools it was found that the meal was not served until the noon hour, when children were going home, leaving the children hungry and unable to concentrate while in class. The explanation given at one school for delaying in serving the meals is to discourage children from disappearing from school after a mid-morning meal and encourage them to stay until the end of the day.

Judging from the visits carried out at the fifteen schools, it can be reported that some children are not receiving a full ration. In fact they only receive about a half to two-thirds of the intended ration (see Appendix J). Possible reasons are that cooks do not have scoops for measuring the right quantities of food to cook or to serve the right amount of cooked porridge. Moreover, the expected volume of the full cooked ration is in the region of 500 ml, and cooks may have learned by experience that this is just too much for young children to get into their stomachs at one brief sitting.[36]

From the focus group discussions it is evident that children like the porridge. On closer examination, it would seem that what they really like about the porridge is that, in their words, it "gives you energy." However, the learners are not very keen on the taste of the porridge and consistently ask that more sugar be added. Some schools have responded to the request by adding sugar to the maize blend at the expense of the school development fund. Children can also be seen adding sugar or powdered sweeteners that they have brought from home. One manufacturer of the maize blend found the taste too salty and after consultation reduced the salt content by half.

[36] Due to various measures in ETSIP, school principals and teachers are now under pressure to improve learning outcomes, and one of the first steps they must take is to ensure that learners remain on task for the whole school day. Extended breaks are therefore not likely to be allowed.

The porridge is cooked to a consistency that is referred to by many Namibians as 'soft porridge'. It is not liquid enough to be drunk from a cup, nor is it stiff enough to be made into a ball in the hand. Ideally it should be eaten with a spoon. However, spoons were very seldom in evidence, unless supplied by the school. Even then they tend to disappear. Some learners were seen using (broken) rulers, presumably at the expense of the school stationery supply, to eat the porridge. The stiff leaves of the sausage tree were being used as a substitute for a spoon. Most children were therefore eating with their fingers. The only distressing thing about this is that most schools, despite statements to the contrary, do not have a proper routine to ensure that the children wash their hands with soap before eating. Where there was some perfunctory washing of hands, for instance in a bowl of water, it usually did not involve the use of soap (or perhaps ash as a substitute). Indeed, the sanitation arrangements at many of the schools were not functional.

According to the NSFP Manual, it is the responsibility of parents to provide bowls or dishes. However, this often means that children come with inadequate 'plates' such as plastic lunch boxes, or none at all, and try to share with those that do have something. Pot lids can be commandeered. The cleanliness of these assorted receptacles also leaves much to be desired. The only system that seems to work well is when the school development fund has purchased bowls and spoons, which are rinsed by the children after eating, but washed and retained by the school.

Almost all the children interviewed, let alone the cooks and teachers, were not aware of what is in the porridge, and mostly thought it to be maize meal with milk and sugar, as is the tradition. There is little understanding of the nutritional value (and real cost) of the maize blend.

1.4 Calibration of Demand and Supply

What appears to be a possible oversupply of maize blend to the schools has been noted in the section above. One of the causes of this is due to the fact that schools do not keep a daily record of the number of boys and girls fed. Such information could have guided the school management in deciding exactly how much food to cook on a daily basis, and to measure it more accurately. It would also provide information on fluctuations in demand. For instance, teachers spoke of more learners joining in school feeding in the lean season or at the end of the month, but could not quantify the extent of such change. Importantly such data might also indicate if there is a gender dimension to who is eating and who is not, particularly in urban settings.

Maintaining actual figures of the number of children fed would allow schools to provide more accurate information to the regional offices and the Head Office, where food orders for each term could be adjusted. Data provided to EMIS would also be more meaningful. It is interesting that the regional hostel officers reported that they are supporting a total of 40 informal hostels through the NSFP. These hostels however, are not included in the planning figures for the NSFP that eventually go to the suppliers. Regional offices are therefore shifting food around to address particular needs.

1.5 Monitoring and Evaluation

It would seem that there is very little conscious effort to systematically monitor and evaluate the programme at any level. There was no indication during the interviews that the school feeding programme is discussed at national level. MOE officials responsible for the NSFP have paid few visits to schools. Regional hostel officers report between zero and 27 visits to schools per year to monitor the NSFP (i.e. one or two schools per month on average) despite that some regions have 100-200 schools to cover. It does not seem that written reports are generated from such visits.

The responsibility for monitoring and evaluating the programme is with the circuit inspectors and most of them, according to respondents, have briefly looked into the school feeding programme during school visits. Twelve out of the fifteen schools had been visited by the hostel officer or the inspector in the past year. In a discussion with a group of inspectors from the Ohangwena region it appeared that they were appreciative of the programme and well-acquainted with its challenges. At school level a degree of monitoring is carried out by the school board, where parents are well represented, but currently no procedure exists.

1.6 Assessment of the NSFP on this Standard

The objectives of the NSFP in the context of education seem to be well understood and supported, but have not been codified.

The target group for the programme needs to be redefined since the programme is clearly no longer just for OVC, but for any primary school children who wish to partake, on the basis of their hunger, irrespective of the cause. The exclusion of some schools from the NSFP cannot be justified.

The NSFP has an acceptable food product, though learners would prefer if it were sweeter. The moisture content of the blend, the manufacture, transport and existing storage arrangements however, are all potential dangers to the safety of the food. Cooking arrangements are not optimal because of unpaid cooks, shortage of measuring weights and scoops and pots, and absence of energy conserving stoves. Most learners do not have access to plates and spoons for eating their porridge in hygienic conditions.

The food commodities used in the maize blend and the centralized procurement arrangements do not favour small-scale local production. The availability of the food depends largely on Namibia's ability to import food products from its neighbours, particularly South Africa and sometimes Zambia. This reflects the general state of affairs for food security in Namibia but does not seem to pose a significant risk at this stage. Progress towards the use of products of Namibian origin for school feeding is feasible in the medium to long term.

Supply and demand of the maize blend are poorly balanced and there appears to be a lot of inefficiency in the system, due to the various factors described above. However, the simplicity in the design of the programme did make it possible to treble the number of beneficiaries in the space of five years.

Monitoring and evaluation, though not totally absent, is not a priority at any level and existing monitoring practises are ineffective.

2. Policy Frameworks

The Rethinking School Feeding standard:
Strong policy frameworks

- *The national-level poverty reduction strategy or equivalent national strategy identifies school feeding as an education intervention, a social protection intervention, or both.*
- *The sectoral policies and strategies identify school feeding as an education or social protection intervention (education sector plan, social protection policy).*
- *There is a specific strategy related to school feeding or school health and nutrition that specify the objectives, rationale, scope, and design and funding of the program.*

School feeding (and the need for it to be extended) is mentioned in a number of national policies, including:

- the Third National Development Plan (2008-2012), the Fourth National Development Plan 2012/13-2016/17
- the Education Policy on Orphans and Vulnerable Children (2006), the Education for All National Plan of Action (2002), and the National Policy on HIV/AIDS for the Education Sector (2003)
- the National Drought Policy and Strategy (1997), and
- the National Policy for School Health (2008)

In most of these policies, the concern is for the welfare of children. This is in accordance with Article 95 of the Constitution, on the Promotion of the Welfare of the People, sub-article (j) of which requires "consistent planning to raise and maintain an acceptable level of nutrition and standard of living of the Namibian people and to improve public health."

The expansion of school feeding is included in the Education and Training Sector Improvement Programme (ETSIP), in component 4 on meeting the needs of OVC, in the Sub-programme on HIV and AIDS. ETSIP represents the education and training sector's response to the call of Vision 2030. Its key purpose is to substantially enhance the sector's contribution to the attainment of strategic national development goals, and to facilitate the transition to a knowledge based economy. In the immediate future, it will improve the quality, range and threshold of skilled labour required to improve knowledge-driven productivity growth, and thus contribute to economic growth. By adopting a pro-poor approach to the distribution of opportunities for high quality and market-responsive education and training opportunities, ETSIP will also contribute directly to the attainment of equitable social development.[37]

The National Policy for School Health guides the activities of the Ministry of Health and Social Services in relation to schools. Among the objectives of the policy is to ensure that schools are implementing the Health Promoting Schools Initiative, to provide education towards healthy behaviour, to increase awareness, prevention and treatment of childhood diseases, and to ensure regular health surveillance. District level primary health care teams relate to the schools, and coordinate with other health services, for instance concerning

[37] Quoted from the ETSIP HIV and AIDS document. Available: http://www.etsip.na/downloads.php

immunisation and de-worming, oral health, disability and food and nutrition. As part of immunisation efforts, de-worming was witnessed whilst conducting fieldwork.

It should be noted that the Namibia National Plan of Action for Orphans and Vulnerable Children (2006-2010) required an activity (2.3 on page 52) concerning school feeding that has not been fully attended to. It states, "Ensure adequate provision of meals to OVC attending schools and Early Childhood Development Centres by revising guidelines for the school feeding programme and increasing numbers of OVC benefitting from the school feeding programme."

The motivation for school feeding in Namibia has always been educational, in that it is a means of getting poor or marginalised learners, or those affected by HIV and AIDS, to attend school, to do so more regularly and that such learners should do better at school by virtue of being better nourished. However, in the past decade, the impact of the HIV pandemic, droughts and floods, and the rising prices of food commodities, have tended to put more weight on school feeding as a safety net or means of social protection, or as a means of improved child nutrition.[38] The Demographic Health Survey of 2006 caused alarm when it showed that 29 percent of children under 5 were stunted. One result is the Namibia Alliance for Improved Nutrition, a coordination body led by the Prime Minister.[39] From the outset there has been some concern with school feeding as a way of encouraging local agricultural production, but it is only very recently that some more thought is being given to the possible agricultural implications of school feeding. The impact of school feeding on the environment was considered initially, when fuel-efficient stoves were provided at the start of the programme, but this initiative is no longer part of the programme.

Although mentioned in many policies, the NSFP does not have a policy of its own. In fact the only guiding document of the NSFP is its administrative Manual, which has not been updated regularly in the past twenty years. The presence of the Manual in most schools does not imply that its procedures are followed. If the NSFP were to have a policy it might be guided in part by the still valid major goals of the education system as defined in *Toward Education for All* [40], namely access, equity, quality and democracy. Clearly the NSFP does promote access to education and greater equity. In terms of quality, however, it might not meet expectations, for reasons that we have already seen under the previous standard. The community participation built into in the NSFP might count as a form of democracy.

[38] Interview of the Prime Minister, 2012.
[39] Although not formally constituted, NAFIN includes all relevant Ministries, UN agencies, the University of Namibia and civil society. A secretariat is provided by the Synergos Institute.
[40] Ministry of Education and Culture. 1993. *Towards education for all: a development brief for education, culture and training.* Gamsberg

The intention of the Ministry of Education is that a policy should be written for the NSFP, within the context of a programme to reform school feeding. However, it is clear that it may have to be a comprehensive and complex policy that considers not just education but also food security, nutrition, health, agriculture, and the environment. The management and funding of the NSFP must be clarified in such a policy, as well as the roles of different stakeholders and linkages with other sectors beyond education. Moreover, consideration may also have to be given to children attending early childhood development centres (under the aegis of the Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare) and secondary school learners (who may be required to spend a longer day at school under a new curriculum currently being developed.)

2.1 Assessment of the NSFP on this Standard

The need for school feeding seems to be well recognised at a national level, and within the education sector. However, the lack of a specific policy on school feeding means that many aspects of the NSFP remain to be clarified.

3. Institutional Structure and Coordination

The Rethinking School Feeding standards:
Strong institutional structure and coordination

- *There is a national institution mandated with the implementation of school feeding.*
- *There is a specific unit in charge of the overall management of school feeding within the lead institution at the central level and that unit has sufficient staff, resources, and knowledge.*
- *There is an inter-sectoral coordination mechanism in place that is operational and involves all stakeholders and partners of the institution.*
- *There are adequate staff and resources for oversight at the regional level.*
- *There are adequate staff and resources for design and implementation at the district level.*
- *There are adequate staff, resources, and infrastructure for implementation at school level.*

3.1 National Level Structures and Coordination

The Ministry of Education is charged with the implementation of the NSFP. The NSFP is a sub-division, under the Division for Management Planning, Appraisal and Training, in the Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance, in the Department of Formal Education, as shown in Chart 7.

Chart 7: Structure of the Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance



Source: Ministry of Education, 2011.

The Division has only three posts, a chief inspector, an inspector of education, and a chief hostel officer. (Many functions have, of course been decentralised.) The subdivision for the NSFP has four posts, one chief control officer, one chief clerk, and two clerks. However, only the first two posts are being used for the NSFP, while the two clerk posts have been utilised for other functions in the division. The level of a sub-division suggests that the functions to be carried out are mostly of an administrative nature. There is, for example, no post for a professional nutritionist. The association of the NSFP with the larger hostels programme could be apt, provided that there was sufficient and skilled management staff available to find the synergies.[41]

The Directorate of Programmes and Quality Assurance is one of three Directorates in the Department of Formal Education, the others being the Directorate of National Examinations and Assessment and the Directorate: National Institute for Educational Development. Chart 8 depicts the organization of the NSFP.

[41] The budget for school hostels in 2012/13 is just under N$142 million, according to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for 1 April 2012 to 31 March 2015. In 2010 there were 205 school hostels across the country catering for over 46 000 primary and secondary level boarders. Information supplied by Ministry of Education.

Chart 8: Organisation of the NSFP



Source: Ministry of Education, 2011.

The trebling in the number of the beneficiaries of the NSFP during the past decade has already been noted. However, there has not been a commensurate growth in the number of staff at the Head Office of the Ministry of Education to cope with the increased responsibility. This has meant, for instance, that there is no provision for the monitoring and evaluation of the programme, or for reflection on its improvement. Some consequences of this weak management can now be seen in the inefficiencies of the programme, including late orders, poor calibration of demand and supply, weak control, and weak monitoring and evaluation.

The NSFP Head Office staffs do have significant experience in the programme and appear to maintain good links with the Ministry of Health, the Office of Prime Minister, and others that have an interest in the NSFP. Through such contacts de-worming will be carried out by MHSS in 2012 in association with the inoculation programme. Links with the Ministry of

Agriculture, and its associated institutions have not been cultivated however. There are no formal structures for the coordination of the NSFP with other entities, whether within the Ministry itself or beyond. Opportunities for public-private partnerships have not been developed, at least at national level.

It should be noted that placement of the NSFP in the Ministry of Education is not without its tensions as many education officials do not regard school feeding as being part of the "core business" of the Ministry. Inclusion in the school feeding of ECD centres which fall under the Ministry of Gender Equality and Child Welfare should be guided by policy.

3.2 Regional and 'Circuit' Level Structures and Coordination

There is one hostel officer in each region, usually supported by a clerk, and this person is responsible both for hostels and school feeding. However, the regions differ vastly in population size and number of schools. The number of schools in the NSFP in a region range from 30 to 306. It is therefore not surprising that five of the hostel officers who responded to the survey appealed for the appointment of a regional school feeding focal point to deal specifically with the NSFP. Necessary as that may be, it would not solve the problem of how to relate to 306 schools. An option to be investigated is for the NSFP to be coordinated at a regional constituency level, or within education structures at the level of the circuit inspector. Supervision of the NSFP is part of the job description of inspectors, though they have never been trained in this function. Another option (which would be costly) would be to have a school feeding officer attached to each circuit office, in larger regions. Further consideration of this matter by human resource specialists may be advisable.

There are no formal coordinating mechanisms at regional level either. The survey showed that the thirteen regional hostel officers did not seem to be well coordinated with relevant ministries in their region. Five had links with the Ministry of Health and Social Services; three had links with the Ministry of Regional and Local Government and Housing (responsible for food security) and two had links with the Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry.

3.3 School Level Structures

From the visits to schools it appears that most school principals take an interest in the programme, and sign for the delivery of food. However, usually a teacher (often the one responsible for life skills or counselling) is in charge of the programme day-to-day, including record-keeping. Often this teacher solicits the assistance of a cleaner or institutional worker. The latter may be mobilised to cook or serve if (enough) parents fail to arrive on a particular day. The school board is involved because of the contributions expected of parents.

3.4 Assessment of the NSFP on this Standard

It appears that the NSFP is understaffed at national, regional and 'sub-regional' levels. Staff assigned to perform various functions does not have the time and often the training to properly do what is required of them. Amongst other functions, the building of alliances and links with potential partners and donors is not given sufficient attention. A new policy might also inform the alliances that need to be nurtured.

4. Stable Funding and Planning

The Rethinking School Feeding standards:

Stable funding and planning

- *School feeding is institutionalized within the national planning and budgeting process.*
- *There is a budget line for school feeding and national funds from the government or from donors that cover the needs of the program regularly.*

The budget and actual expenditure for the NSFP in recent years is reported as in table 8 below.

Table 8: NSFP Budget and Expenditure 2005/6 – 2011/12

Financial Year	Budget N$	Additional Funds from ETSIP	Total N$	Actual Expenditure N$
2005/6	9 883 980		9 883 980	9 883 980
2006/7	9 909 000		9 909 000	9 907 694
2007/8	9 892 000		9 892 000	9 949 925
2008/9	10 706 160	12 000 000	22 706 160	22 706 160
2009/10	10 706 160	10 000 000	20 706 160	20 706 160
2010/11	21 346 565	32 000 000	53 346 565	53 346 565
2011/12	50 000 000		50 000 000	49 466 805

Source: Ministry of Education, 2012.

What is apparent from table 8 is that the growth of the programme in recent years was financed by ETSIP, except for 2011/12 when the Treasury was able to fund the whole amount for the purchase of food. The expected expenditure in 2012/13 is likely to be in the region of N$60 million. At the time of writing arrangements were being made to transfer funds from other items to ensure that the NSFP could continue as planned. The total budget of the Ministry of Education for 2012/13 is N$ 9,415,973 000. An expenditure of N$60 million on school feeding would therefore amount to 0.64 percent of the education budget or less than 0.1 percent of GDP.

Making use of the prices awarded for the various tenders, and recent price adjustments, the study estimates that the current cost to the Ministry of Education Head Office of providing one meal is N$1.09. Nearly ten percent of this amount is for transport. The cost per learner fed per year is therefore N$218 (US$26).[42]

Data on the tonnages ordered and the annual expenditure provides information on the annual costs as shown in table 9 below. Fluctuations in the costs shown here may be because of payments made in one financial year relating to deliveries in another financial year.

Table 9: Tonnages of maize blend and costs per financial year

Financial Year	Maize blend ordered in MTN				Cost in N$			
	Term 2	Term 3	Term1	Total	Expenditure (N$)	Cost per MTN delivered	cost per meal	cost per 12.5 kg bag
2007/2008	724.54	793.47	776.15	2 294.16	9 949 925	4 337.06	0.54	54.21
2008/2009	827.70	827.70	1 920.08	3 575.48	22 706 160	6 350.53	0.79	79.38
2009/2010	1 665.41	1 728.75	1 645.04	5 039.21	20 706 160	4 109.01	0.51	51.36
2010/2011	1 871.99	1 984.23	2 042.08	5 898.29	53 346 565	9 044.41	1.13	113.06
2011/2012	2 503.46	2 219.41	2 317.76	7 040.64	49 466 805	7 025.90	0.88	87.82

Source: Ministry of Education, 2012.

It should be noted that these costs are Ministry of Education's costs for food and its delivery to schools. Other costs, some borne by learners and schools, or neglected, must still be factored in.[43] Among these are the following:

1. Staff costs
2. Cooking pots and equipment
3. Utensils used by learners
4. Firewood, or other sources of energy
5. Shelters for cooks
6. Storage at school level
7. 'Payments' to cooks, in kind through dry rations and meals
8. Provision of water for cooking, hand washing and cleaning up
9. Soap and cleaning chemicals
10. Security
11. Management of stock at school level
12. Monitoring and evaluation

[42] See Appendix G for the calculation
[43] It is beyond the scope of this study to calculate these costs

The Ministry of Education has struggled, almost on an annual basis, to allocate sufficient funds for this purpose during the process of budget formulation. This has led to rear guard actions, after the budget has been promulgated, to shift funds between activities, for fear of the children being without food and the consequences which this could have in terms of attendance and public opinion.

It has been a matter of policy for the Namibian government to fund the NSFP itself. There are currently no other major donors to the programme either. Even at regional and school level very few donors are involved. The expansion of the NSFP has, however, been part of ETSIP, which is funded both by the government and a consortium of development partners. It is, in fact this provision which made the recent expansion of the programme feasible.

The purchase of food for the NSFP is currently financed through an item under the budget line 027, 'Other Services', in the main division of the Ministry of Education budget for the Directorate Programmes and Quality Assurance. In comparison, the Ministry budget does have a main division for school hostels, under which it is possible to budget for all aspects of the hostel programme, including personnel, goods and services, transfer payments, and capital expenditure. This is presumably the kind of arrangement which is referred to in the standards as a "budget line".

4.1 Assessment of the NSFP on this Standard

Although funds have been allocated every year to implement the programme without major interruptions this does not constitute stable, predictable and timely funding. Late food orders and deliveries have reduced the effectiveness and efficiency of the programme. Cost fluctuations have been experienced year on year and essential equipment has not been provided. In addition, insufficient planning, training, oversight, quality control, and monitoring and evaluation at all levels and inadequate funding are affecting the quality of service delivery.

Formulating a school feeding policy, strengthening the school feeding sub-division with adequate staffing and allocating a dedicated budget for school feeding activities, strengthening monitoring and evaluation, and generally raising the profile of the NSFP, would make the funding of the NSFP more predictable and sustainable.

5. Community Participation

The Rethinking School Feeding standards:

Strong community participation and ownership (teachers, parents, children)

- *The community has been involved in the design of the program.*
- *The community is involved in the implementation of the program.*
- *The community contributes (to the extent possible) resources (cash, in-kind) to the program.*

The designers of the programme in the early 1990s did travel the country extensively to consult with communities about what they could and should contribute to the programme. Such an exercise has apparently not been repeated in recent times.

According to the NSFP Manual, the community should provide the following:

- fuel (sticks, wood, paper, plastic[44], coal, etc)
- water
- plates and spoons
- soap for cleaning
- materials for a cooking shelter
- materials for a storeroom
- cooking utensils

In addition, the community should do the following:

- prepare meals at the school
- construct a cooking shelter
- construct a storeroom
- protect the school premises
- organise at least three meetings per annum to discuss activities in connection with the NSFP
- organise fund raising activities
- recycle empty bags and oil containers[45]
- participate in community development projects
- assist with the school vegetable garden

5.1 Fuel

Obtaining firewood was one of the top five concerns that were raised by the Regional Hostel Officers. Exacerbated by wasteful open fires under pots, the acquisition of firewood is a constant battle for most schools participating in the NSFP. Because families have their own needs, quantities of firewood are no longer readily available. Several schools visited described how they had undertaken special trips to farms or forests to collect loads of firewood. One had even managed to get the army to provide a truck. It was previously noted that one school was paying two bags of maize blend for a load of firewood. However, despite the difficulties, it must be said that in most communities they have somehow kept their part of the agreement and managed to provide firewood.

[44] It is not advised that plastic be used as fuel for cooking food
[45] Oil containers refers to the vegetable oil that was included in the WFP ration

5.2 Water

At almost all the schools visited, portable water was available either at the school or at a nearby source. It should be noted however, that in 2010, 20.4 percent of schools did not have a water supply.[46]

5.3 Plates and Spoons

Many schools also do not have enough or suitable bowls and spoons for the learners to eat with. The expectation that parents in certain communities are going to provide such items is ill conceived.

5.4 Soap

It has also not been practical to rely on communities to provide soap. At best this has been provided at the expense of the school development fund, when such funds are available from that source. Many schools visited made additional requests for pot scourers and detergents.

5.5 Cooking Shelters

At the fifteen schools visited, in all cases but one, the community has been able to provide some kind of shelter for cooks. However, the quality and adequacy of such structures also reflect the economic level of the community and skills in building.

5.6 Construction of a Storeroom

As previously noted, storage is the Achilles heel of the programme, and at no school was there evidence that it is within the means of the school community to build an adequate storeroom.

5.7 Cooking of Food

It has been a challenge for most schools to arrange volunteer cooks. Often five hours of work per day is involved, which is difficult for anyone to offer without appropriate reward. The schools that have succeeded in arranging cooks did so at a cost, in terms of providing bags of food or using part of the school development fund as payment to cooks. One is inclined to wonder if it would not be cheaper to pay cooks in cash rather than in bags of food, as the cooks probably do not know the actual value of a bag of maize blend. This matter needs to be further explored at community level and a solution found.

[46] EMIS. 2010.

5.8 School Gardens

Several small school gardens were found at the schools visited. Usually this was because they are required in terms of the curriculum. The study however, found that the intention was usually to sell the very limited produce (often to teachers) as a way of raising funds for the school development fund. There was no intention of utilising the produce for the NSFP. The Ministry of Agriculture however, does have a programme to assist with such small gardens.

5.9 Meetings

It would seem that the arrangement between government and community concerning the NSFP is often discussed at school board meetings, but not necessarily at larger meetings with parents. During the focus group discussions, it was noted that visits by hostel officers help in raising awareness of the role of parents in the school feeding programme. It therefore seems that insufficient dialogue, sensitisation and consultation with communities and especially parents, compromises parents' participation in and understanding of the benefits of the programme.

5.10 Assessment of the NSFP on this Standard

On the whole it would seem that parents and community members have done what could reasonably be expected of them to support the NSFP, in that they have at least provided firewood, shelters for the cooks, and the cooks themselves. However, parents and caregivers have not been able to provide cooking or eating utensils, or soap and pot scourers, or adequate storage space. This is a flaw in the design of the programme, in that the capacity of communities was over-estimated. The shortcoming should have been detected and corrected some time ago. The negotiation with communities needs to be re-opened and a new agreement arrived at.

PART THREE

SWOT ANALYSIS

Strengths:	Weaknesses:
▪ A fair amount of community participation and support. ▪ Strong political support for the programme ▪ Appreciation of the school feeding ration by the children. ▪ Cost sharing with communities means that costs to the Ministry are reduced; the NSFP does not constitute a large proportion of the education budget. ▪ Almost all primary and combined schools have been included in the programme. ▪ The number of millers of maize blend has grown and three of the four millers are decentralised. ▪ Engagement with the private sector appears to have achieved some efficiency and provided opportunity for local entrepreneurs. ▪ Some data on school feeding is gathered through EMIS. ▪ There is a National policy that supports decentralisation.	▪ Weak management and implementation at all levels. ▪ Inadequate budgeting process and funding. ▪ Poor balancing of supply and demand. ▪ Weak multi-sectoral coordination. ▪ Inadequate storage facilities at schools. ▪ Limited monitoring and evaluation. ▪ Inadequate engagement and training of school inspectors on school feeding ▪ Inadequate systems for stock control. ▪ Cooks do not feel adequately compensated for their work. ▪ Insufficient canteen, kitchen and cooking utensils. ▪ Lack of measuring scales and scoops to allow correct portions to be issued. ▪ Shortage of energy-saving stoves. ▪ Lack of understanding of the NSFP ration and its nutritional value. ▪ Lack of a policy for the NSFP. ▪ Inadequate links between small-scale local food production and school feeding
Opportunities:	**Threats:**
▪ Interest of the NAB in increasing legume production. ▪ Ministry of Agriculture's initiative to promote mahangu products that could be used in school feeding. ▪ Policy requirement (NDP4) to expand school feeding to ECD centres. ▪ Growing investment by government in the marketing of fresh horticultural produce. ▪ Interest of the Namibian food industry in the programme. ▪ Some initiative in the country to improve child nutrition. ▪ Multi-sectoral coordination through NAFIN	▪ Rising food prices. ▪ Environmental degradation (excessive use of firewood). ▪ Stigma attached to participating in NSFP in urban areas. ▪ Likelihood of severe weather conditions increase vulnerability in the country. ▪ Poor sanitation and hygiene practices at schools. ▪ Low surplus production in most of the country

PART FOUR

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the findings contained in the assessment of the NSFP in terms of standards developed in the publication *Rethinking School Feeding*, and the SWOT analysis, the following recommendations are made for consideration by the Ministry of Education.

1. It is recommended that the Ministry of Education develop a medium-term plan (3-5 years) to reform the NSFP. This plan could consist of the following components, based on the standards.

   1.1 Develop a specific policy for the NSFP. *A* multi-sectoral reference group should be created by the Ministry of Education to assist in developing a school feeding policy. The objectives and target groups of the programme need to be revisited as part of the policy development. The approach should entail extensive consultation with all stakeholders at all levels. A role should be identified for civil society and the private sector, and the abilities of diverse communities to contribute at school level should be carefully assessed. Small action-research projects may be needed and the Namibian academic community should be mobilised to assist. The food commodity(ies) to be used should be carefully considered to maximise local production, preferably by smallholder farmers, and decrease dependence on international markets.

   The School Feeding Programme Manual should be revised and improved as an interim measure.

   1.2 Strengthen NSFP Structures. A work study should be carried out, in consultation with the Public Service Commission, to determine the posts that are needed for the proper functioning of the NSFP at national, regional and circuit levels. A capacity development programme of staff working on school feeding should be integrated perhaps as part of the ETSIP capacity-development component. Full use should be made of expertise available locally (for instance at UNAM) and internationally organizations to improve the Namibia school feeding programme. Particular attention should be paid to improved information flows and accountability through the structures. Annual reporting on the implementation of the NSFP should be introduced and cross-sectoral coordination should be institutionalised at all levels.
   Inspectors of Education should be trained to attend to immediate needs. Their role in assisting schools to improve school feeding infrastructure and training the school

board on school feeding matters should be clarified. Inspectors should be involved if collecting and quantifying data on school feeding needs (including requirements for heat-conserving stoves, pots, measures and utensils, bowls and spoons) for budgeting and procurement purposes.

The findings of this study should be widely shared with all stakeholders in order to raise awareness of the challenges the programme is facing and the recommendations for addressing these challenges

1.3 Stabilise Funding and Planning. A study should be *c*arried out to estimate the actual costs and financial needs of the NSFP. Based upon the findings of the cost analysis, a submission should be made to allocate a dedicated budget for the NSFP activities. A school feeding division should be established, or the sub-division of school feeding strengthened, with an empowered national school feeding coordinator and capacitated, adequate staff to carry out the school feeding functions. A detailed budget for NSFP, not just for food, should be prepared and submitted during the 2013/14 budget process. All aspects of the programme, from personnel to capital expenditure, should be accounted for, and a 3-year rolling budget maintained in accordance with the Medium Term Expenditure Plan.

Measures should be taken to ensure that orders for the maize blend and its transportation are always placed at least one month before the commencement of a new term. The current tenders, due to expire in March 2013, should be extended for one year so that the Ministry of Education could have sufficient time to undertake modifications to the programme.

1.4 Improve Programme Design and Implementation*.* There are several critical investigations that need to be carried out, some requiring expert assistance. The whole food supply chain needs to be examined to find out why food is going bad and to identify the micro-organisms involved.

The food basket needs to be reconsidered and adjusted, *inter alia* to determine the extent to which more local produce can be included (even if only in the long term), and regional and local variations accommodated.

All schools with primary level learners should be included in the programme as part of the expansion plan as there is no Constitutional justification for excluding the remaining 14 percent of eligible schools.

1.5 Procurement and logistics arrangements. This could include a reduction in the number of tenders to improve efficiency. To ensure timely delivery of food to all participating schools, orders for the maize blend and its transportation should be placed at least one month before the commencement of the school term.

In particular consideration needs to be given to the possibility of providing learners a morning snack on arrival at school, possibly a milk-based drink and/or a biscuit. The porridge should be served not later than the first break and the ration size should be appropriate. Sufficient pots, utensils, bowls and spoons should be provided and hand washing with soap should be encouraged as a routine practice.

The design and local manufacture of heat-conserving stoves and solar cookers needs to be looked into or explored. The matter of whether cooks should be paid in cash or in kind, or both, needs to be addressed. Proper kitchens and storage must be provided at schools.

A proper system for monitoring and evaluation should to be put in place, and opportunities for integrating of school feeding monitoring in the EMIS should be explored. A quality control regime should be designed and implemented drawing on the experience of the hostels feeding programme also managed by the Ministry of Education.

1.6 Strengthen Community Participation*.* A new arrangement that takes into account the capacities of communities to contribute to school feeding programme needs to be put in place. Care must be taken to regularly inform parents and caregivers about their role in the programme. Accountability from the programme to communities must be established, and upward communication from parents must also be encouraged and acted upon.

School Boards should be provided with guidance concerning the NSFP. Civil society, including structures such as the Council of Churches in Namibia, should be given a role to play in monitoring and community mobilisation in the support of the programme.

*S*chools participating in the NSFP should be guided on how to deal with challenges that they encounter in the implementation of the programme. Inter alia, schools should be required to solve storage problems, feed children before the first break,

and keep accurate daily records of the number of children fed and the amount of maize blend used.

Guidelines on how to prepare meals for children and what to do when food goes bad, or is left over at the end of the term should be prepared and disseminated widely. Hand washing routines should also be emphasised.

Appendix A: List of Persons Interviewed

Surname	Title and First Name	Position	Organisation
Angula	Rt Hon Nahas	Prime Minister	Office of the Prime Minister
April	Mr Rod	Education Officer	Ministry of Education
Bandlow	Mr John	Managing Director	Alason Trading Enterprises CC
Barbieri	Ms Cecilia	Senior Education PO	UNESCO, Windhoek Cluster
Bay	Dr Admir P M	Representative	FAO in Namibia
Bennett	Ms Norah	food manager	Retired
Beyleveld	Mr Gerhard	Director: Finance	Ministry of Education
Bohn	Ms Edda	Director: PQA	Ministry of Education
Brock	Mr Christof	Chief Executive Officer	Namibian Agronomic Board
Courtney-Haag	Dr Karen	Nutritionist	UNICEF Windhoek
Fenton	Ms Silke		USAID Windhoek
Haikera	Mr Conrad	Chief Control Officer	Ministry of Education
Hamm	Mr Hubertus	Managing Director	Namibia Dairies
Hausiku	Mr A K M	Managing Director	Makaha Trading Enterprises CC
Iteta	Ms Aina-Maria	Agricultural Economist	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Kabajani	Mr Charles	Under Secretary: FE	Ministry of Education
Kafidi	Mr Lamek	Director: Education	Oshikoto Regional Council
Keyter	Ms Charlotte	Senior Lecturer	University of Namibia
Mburu-de Wagt	Dr Anne S W	Nutrition Adviser	Global Nutrition Solutions CC
Mutorwa	Hon John	Minister	Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Forestry
Mukubonda	Ms Agnes	Chief Clerk	Namibia School Feeding Programme
Mwabi	Ms Viola	Supervisor	Halutusane Catering CC
Noabes	Ms	School Health	Ministry of Health and Social Services
Pea	Ms Nangula E	Managing Director	PENA Manufacturers CC
Rourke	Ms Elsabe	Dietician	Retired
Rukoro	Mr Manfred	Managing Director	Ehupo Trading Enterprises CC
van Wyk	Ms Marjorie	Nutritionist	Ministry of Health and Social Services

Appendix B: Interview Instruments and Questionnaire used with Regional Hostel Officers

Interview tool for school principal and/or the teacher responsible for NSFP

Identification:

Name of the School

Region

Name of school principal

Name of teacher responsible for school feeding (if any)

Environment of school: urban (town) /village/rural

Introductions/Basics:
Explain about the case study

Ask principal to describe the circumstances of the school relevant to school feeding.

How many learners? How many OVC?

Are the children fed every school day?

What time of day?

Are there children from marginalised groups attending the school?

Is there a community or informal hostel being supported by the NSFP?

Do all children participate in the NSFP? If not, how are the beneficiaries selected?

How long has the school been a participant in the NSFP?

Depending on timing, it might be better to observe the school feeding programme in action and then ask questions afterwards

What members of the school staff are involved with the NSFP? And what are their responsibilities? Does anyone have the responsibility to check the quality of the food when it is delivered?

Principal:

Teacher(s):

School Secretary:

Others:

Who supervises the children when they are eating?

Have each of these staff members received training in the NSFP?

When was such training done?

Policy:

Does the school have a copy of the NSFP Manual? Do they find it clear? Are there any problems in its interpretation?

Coordination:

How is communication with the regional hostel officer?

Does the school have links with the MHSS, eg concerning school health or de-worming?

What about MAWF, for instance re school gardens?

Or the Regional Council, concerning flood or drought relief or food security?

Information, Monitoring:

What records are being kept on the NSFP? Check report forms required in NSFP manual.

Who keeps the NSFP records, for instance on deliveries and usage?

When last did the hostel officer or inspector visit the school to ensure that implementation is being done correctly?

Finance:

Is the School Development Fund being used for the NSFP?

Has the school received any donations for school feeding?

Benefits:

What are the benefits of the programme as seen by the school?

Access to education? Attendance? Ability to understand and concentrate?

Health? Interest in agriculture?

Is the NSFP integrated in the curriculum of the school in any way? (E.g. agriculture, hygiene, nutrition education)

Issues:

Could the principal comment on the following:

Delivery of food at the beginning of the term

Storage of the food at the school

Bags of maize blend left over at the end of the term

Availability of water to cook the food, wash up etc.

Availability of parents or community members to cook

The rations given to cooks

The payment of cooks

The availability or cost of firewood

The availability of pots or stoves

The availability of measuring jugs

Instances of food going bad

Shelter built by community for cooks

Does each child have a bowl or plate and a spoon?

School garden

Taste of the porridge

Sanitation and hygiene at the school. Do the children wash their hands before eating and after going to the toilet? Are the kitchen utensils clean?

Community Participation:

Do any parents or school board members have responsibility for the NSFP?

Availability of parents or community members to cook or assist in food preparation

Willingness of parents to assist in NSFP

Do parents perhaps give less food to children at home because they know that they had something to eat at school?

What do you see as the successes and the problems of the programme?

Any suggestions to improve the NSFP?

Are there any food items you would like to see included in the NSFP? Are these locally available?

Anything to say in conclusion?

Questions for Focus Group Discussion with Cooks

Opening:

Thank you for making time available to meet with me. I am happy to meet you because the government want to know your feelings and thoughts about the porridge you are cooking here at school. Please don't be afraid, and feel free to say what you want to because that is what will help me to understand.

Introductions. How long have you been a cook here at the school?

Who explained or showed you what should be done to prepare the porridge?

What are the things that you are responsible for?

Please describe exactly how you measure and cook the food.

How is it served?

What records do you have to keep?

How many hours does it take per day?

What are you getting in compensation for your work? Do you think that is fair?

Do the children wash their hands before eating?

Are the kitchen utensils kept clean?

What are your views on:

- Firewood
- Shelter for the cooks
- Food going bad
- The pots and other equipment you are working with
- The measures or jugs you are using to dish the food
- The plates and spoons of the learners
- Water for cooking and washing
- Storage space for the bags of food
- The taste of the maize blend
- School gardens

What information do you have:

- What is the porridge you cook made up of?
- Who is providing the food or paying for it?

What do you see as the successes and the problems of the programme?

Do you have any suggestions about how the school feeding programme can be improved?

Anything else you would like to say about school feeding?

Questions for Focus Group Discussion with Learners

Opening:

Thank you for coming to meet with me. I am happy to meet you because the government want to know your feelings and thoughts about the porridge you are getting here at school. Please don't be afraid, and feel free to say what you want to. This is just a discussion to help me understand and not a test. There are no right or wrong answers.

Introductions – names and ages.

Did you eat the porridge today? How was it?

What do you like about the porridge?

What do you not like about the porridge?

Was the porridge enough, or was it too little or too much?

Do you think that other foods should be added to the porridge? What and why?

Did you wash your hands before eating today? (follow-up.)

Is there porridge every school day?

What time do you get the porridge?

What do you think is in the porridge? What is it made up of?

Where do these things come from?

Who do you think is providing this porridge?

How does the porridge help you and your family/household?

Do learners get less food than other children at home because they are getting food at school?

Since I am not from this area, please tell me all the things that you eat and drink during the day, besides the porridge at school. Let's look at the whole day, from early morning when you wake up until you go to sleep at night.

What do you see as the successes and the problems of the programme?

Anything else you would like to say about the food here at school?

Thank you for talking to me. Can I take your picture?

Questions for Focus Group Discussion with Parents and Community Members

Opening:

Thank you for making time available to meet with me. I am happy to meet you because the government want to know your feelings and thoughts about school feeding. Please don't be afraid, and feel free to say what you want to because that is what will help me to understand.

Introductions.

The school feedng programme has been described as a partnership between the government and school communities. Each partner should provide something. So I would like to hear your understanding of who is responsible for what? What should the government provide, and what should the parents or community provide?

How well do you think each partner is doing in their part of the agreement? (And why?)

What do the children say, do they like the porridge?

Do the children wash their hands before eating? What about after going to the toilet?

What are your views on:

- The dry rations that the cooks get as compensation for their work
- Firewood
- Shelter for the cooks
- Food going bad
- The pots and other equipment the cooks are working with
- The measures or jugs the cooks are using to dish the food
- The plates and spoons of the learners
- Water for cooking and washing
- Storage space for the bags of food
- The taste of the maize blend
- School gardens

Do learners get less food than other children at home because they are getting food at school?

What information do you have:

- What is the porridge made up of?
- Who is providing the food or paying for it?

What do you see as the successes and problems of the programme?

Do you have any suggestions about how the school feeding programme can be improved?

Anything else you would like to say about school feeding?

Turning Points Consultancy CC

Times of change are when we learn most.

Email justin@mweb.com.na, P O Box 11901, Klein Windhoek, Namibia

Tel + 264 -- 61 – 232422 Mobile +264 - 811244211 Fax 088624977

FOR ATTENTION ALL REGIONAL HOSTEL OFFICERS

Dear Colleague

You will remember that at our meeting in Windhoek at Nampower on 24 April 2012, we agreed that, as it would not be possible for me to visit all regions, I would send you some questions concerning the School Feeding Programme so that all of you (even those I will visit) could reply in writing. The questions are set out below, and I hope you will find them simple to answer. **Please fill in the form and send the form to Fax 088624977 no later than 1 June 2012.**

Justin Ellis

Consultant

Name:	
Region:	

1. How many schools in your region are participating in the NSFP?		Schools
How many informal/community hostels in your region are being supported by the NSFP?		Informal hostels

2. What are the factors that you consider in deciding whether or not to recommend that a school should be included in the NSFP?

3. How many staff members are involved in managing the NSFP at regional level?		
Post	Functions carried out	Full-time or part-time?

4. In your view, is this number of staff sufficient or not?	

5. What percentage of your time are you able to devote to the NSFP? (Given that you are also responsible for hostels.)		% of time

6. During the past year, how many times have you been able to inspect the regional warehouse where NSFP food is stored for your Region?		Times

7. How many MoE staff members, at schools or elsewhere, have you		MoE	staff

been able to train concerning the NSFP in the past year?		members

8. In your view, do regional staff members have sufficient knowledge and skills for the management of the NSFP?	

9. In your view, are implementers of the NSFP *at school level* sufficiently trained?	Yes / No

10. During the past year, how many schools have you been able to visit to see that the NSFP is being correctly implemented?		Schools

11. Do you have transport at your disposal to visit NSFP schools regularly?	Yes / No

12. How good is communication between the regional staff responsible for NSFP and NSFP counterparts at the Head Office?	
How good is communication between the regional staff responsible for the NSFP and circuit inspectors?	
How good is communication between regional staff responsible for NSFP and the schools?	

13. What links or joint activities do you have with the following:	
Ministry of Agriculture? (Gardening?)	
Ministry of Health and Social Services? (De-worming? School Health?)	
Regional Council? (Food Security?)	

14. Where are records kept, for instance on food delivery, stock in store, and number of children fed?		
Regional office?	Circuit Inspectors Office?	School level?
Yes / No	Yes / No	Yes / No

15. During the past year, how many times have you had reports of food going bad?		Reports
How did you deal with such instances?		

16. Please make a list of ten specific schools that you know well and that are participating in the NSFP, before answering these questions:			
Names of the Ten Schools:	1.	2.	
3.	4.	5.	
6.	7.	8.	
9.	10.		
How many of the schools on the list can easily obtain firewood?		/10	schools
How many can easily obtain the services of cooks?		/10	schools
In how many schools are the cooks satisfied with dry rations as compensation?		/10	Schools
How many have adequate pots or stoves?		/10	Schools
How many have adequate shelter for cooking constructed by the community?		/10	Schools
How many have proper measuring jugs?		/10	Schools
In how many schools do almost all of children have their own plates or bowls and spoons?		/10	Schools

How many have adequate storage space for the bags of food?	/10	Schools
How many have clean water on the premises?	/10	Schools
How many have school gardens?	/10	Schools
How many have adequate and functioning sanitation arrangements?	/10	Schools
In how many schools do the children like the maize blend?	/10	Schools

17. Have you been able to attract contributions to the NSFP from donors or the private sector in your region? Please give some details.

18. How many primary schools in your region do you think do **not** need or want to participate in the NSFP?		Schools

19. What would you say are the positive results and strengths of the NSFP? Has it improved the health, nutrition and education of children?

20. What changes would you suggest to improve the NSFP?

21. Anything you would like to say in conclusion about the NSFP?

Signature:	
Date:	

Appendix C: Data on schools in NSFP

Schools Participating in the Namibian School Feeding Programme, 2007 - 2011, by Region					
	Schools Participating, by year				
	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Caprivi	73	66	84	77	85
Erongo	29	27	33	32	36
Hardap	32	42	45	44	45
Head Office	3	2			
Karas	32	30	33	34	35
Kavango	212	181	295	292	300
Khomas	27	17	44	50	57
Kunene	39	36	40	44	46
Ohangwena	48	30	129	170	209
Omaheke	25	27	29	26	26
Omusati	47	54	176	173	187
Oshana	18	11	81	76	84
Oshikoto	54	45	126	122	139
Otjozondjupa	27	37	43	43	44
TOTAL	**666**	**605**	**1158**	**1183**	**1293**

Source: EMIS

Note: Head Office in this table refers to Special Schools that were decentralised to the Regions in 2009.

Appendix D: Data on Learners participating in the Namibia School Feeding Programme 2007-2011, by Region

	Total Learners Participating in the Programme				
	2 007	**2 008**	**2 009**	**2 010**	**2 011**
Caprivi	10 094	9 659	14 944	12 981	15 716
Erongo	3 882	3 742	5 114	4 929	5 381
Hardap	4 257	6 835	7 292	6 579	7 191
Head Office	66	18			
Karas	4 323	3 954	5 145	4 616	4 864
Kavango	23 155	20 206	46 189	46 283	49 430
Khomas	3 101	2 190	5 671	6 432	10 540
Kunene	6 786	4 155	6 891	7 554	8 772
Ohangwena	4 702	2 847	28 274	44 367	63 871
Omaheke	4 485	4 644	5 868	5 704	4 955
Omusati	3 970	4 656	41 977	39 126	43 563
Oshana	1 552	742	14 000	14 969	17 176
Oshikoto	10 090	7 674	24 684	24 372	31 046
Otjozondjupa	3 235	5 502	7 041	7 045	8 267
Total	**83 698**	**76 824**	**213 090**	**224 957**	**270 772**

Source: EMIS

Appendix E: Data on OVC and NSFP Beneficiaries

Learners in Schools that are part of NSFP by enrolment, NSFP beneficiaries and OVC, by region

Region	Enrolment			NSFP Beneficiaries			OVC		
	Male	**Female**	**Total**	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**	**Male**	**Female**	**Total**
Caprivi	9 625	9 045	18 670	8 219	7 497	15 716	5 978	5 656	11 634
Erongo	8 007	7 796	15 803	3 182	2 199	5 381	2 569	2 474	5 043
Hardap	6 973	6 756	13 729	3 817	3 374	7 191	3 765	3 805	7 570
Karas	5 656	5 654	11 310	2 696	2 168	4 864	2 682	2 726	5 408
Kavango	27 100	26 253	53 353	25 265	24 165	49 430	17 808	16 950	34 758
Khomas	13 467	13 916	27 383	5 609	4 931	10 540	6 717	6 812	13 529
Kunene	6 898	6 915	13 813	4 556	4 216	8 772	2 459	2 602	5 061
Ohangwena	32 661	33 113	65 774	31 791	32 080	63 871	16 825	16 487	33 312
Omaheke	4 455	4 548	9 003	2 469	2 486	4 955	2 508	2 511	5 019
Omusati	22 763	22 078	44 841	22 156	21 407	43 563	13 062	12 649	25 711
Oshana	11 545	11 295	22 840	8 810	8 366	17 176	6 513	6 155	12 668
Oshikoto	16 751	15 775	32 526	16 004	15 042	31 046	8 628	8 019	16 647
Otjozondjupa	9 215	9 061	18 276	4 593	3 674	8 267	3 592	3 396	6 988
Total	**175 116**	**172 205**	**347 321**	**139 167**	**131 605**	**270 772**	**93 106**	**90 242**	**183 348**

Appendix F: Prediction of surplus maize bags

(If children at 15 schools are fed for ten out of twelve weeks due to late deliveries)

School	bags allocated by MOE HO	bags used per day	bags used per week	bags used for 10 weeks	bags consumed by cooks 12 weeks	bags consumed by cooks in 10 weeks	total bags used	Surplus at end of term
Moses vd Bijl PS	126	1	5	50	24	20	70	56
Okatana PS	112	1.25	6.25	62.5	12	10	72.5	39.5
Ehenye PS	98	0.4	2	20	7.2	6	26	72
Ediva PS	97	3	15	150	12	10	160	-63
Kandunda Kaseta PS	136	3	15	150	24	20	170	-34
Singalamwe CS	145	2	10	100	3.6	3	103	42
Kongola PS	264	2.5	12.5	125	24	20	145	119
Sangwali PS	157	2	10	100	24	20	120	37
Aris PS	126	2	10	100	0	0	100	26
Dordabis PS	197	1.5	7.5	75	24	20	95	102
Nossob PS	293	2	10	100	24	20	120	173
R5 Kamp	248	4	20	200	0	0	200	48
Usib	45	0.5	2.5	25	6	5	30	15
Oanob PS	455	5	25	250	15	12.5	262.5	192.5
K W von Maree CS	64	1	5	50	6	5	55	9
Total								**834**

Appendix G: Estimation of the unit cost of a meal

Estimation of the cost per meal of the Namibian School Feeding Programme for 2011/12								
		Lowest Price accepted per Metric ton N$	Highest Price accepted per metric ton N$	Middle of the range price per metric ton N$	Price increase for inflation	Price per MTN including inflation increase	100 MTN consign-ment	cost of 100 MTN consignment N$
Provide protein blend	soya blend	14 480	15 378	14 929	1 642	16 571	25	414 280
	sugar	4 720	5 750	5 235	576	5 811	11	62 757
	salt	857	930	894	98	992	1	1 190
Provide maize meal, blend with protein and deliver to regional warehouse		3 920	4 999	4 460	491	4 950	63	311 853
Provide warehouse and deliver to schools		595	1 000	798	48	845	100	84 535
Total								**874 615**
Number of rations of 125 grams in 100 MTN			800000					
Cost per ration in N$			1.09					
Proportion of this taken up by transport			9.67	%				

Appendix H: WFP specifications for school feeding

All WFP-supported school feeding programmes should be fortified

- All school feeding rations, whatever the context and objectives, need to be nutritious and provide **at least** the same percentage of recommended nutrient intakes (RNI) for essential micronutrients as for energy (Kcal): The food ration should provide the following proportions of energy requirements of the target groups:

	Proportion of Energy Requirements	**Primary schools** (6-12 years)	**Pre-primary schools** (3-6 years)
Half-day schools	30-45%	555-830 Kcal	390-585 Kcal
Day schools	60-75%	1,110- 1,390 Kcal	780 – 975 Kcal
Boarding schools	85 to 90%	1,570– 1665 Kcal	

Diets low in protein, fat and micronutrients can result in malnutrition even if dietary energy supply is adequate. School feeding rations should provide adequate amounts of fats and proteins, expressed as percentage of total energy provided:

Ranges of Nutrient Intakes Goals (excerpt from WHO/FAO 2003)	
Dietary Component	**Goal (expressed as % of total energy)**
Total Fat	**15-30%**
Total Carbohydrates	55-75%
Free sugars	< 10%
Protein	**10-15%**

Appendix I: Current holders of contracts to supply and transport food

Region	Maize and blending	Protein blend, salt and sugar	Transport
Caprivi	Halutusane	Halutusane	Halutusane
Erongo	Alason	Alason	Ehupo
Hardap	Alason	Alason	Ehupo
Karas	Alason	Alason	Ehupo
Kavango	Tyno	Alason	Hakaranda
Khomas	Alason	Alason	Hakaranda
Kunene	Tyno	Alason	Ehupo
Ohangwena	Pena	Pena	FU Rd
Omaheke	Alason	Alason	TAA Mokondjo
Omusati	Pena	Pena	FU Rd
Oshana	Pena	Pena	ARC
Oshikoto	Pena	Pena	TAA Mokondjo
Otjozondjupa	Alason	Alason	Hakaranda

Appendix J: Proportion of ration actually received by learners

Name of School	No of children served	No. of bags cooked	Number of rations expected from the food cooked	Percent-age of ration received by children
Moses vd Bijl PS	190	1	100	53
Okatana PS	250	1.25	125	50
Ehenye PS	67	0.4	40	60
Ediva PS	300	3	300	100
Kandunda Kaseta PS	123	3	300	244
Singalamwe CS	253	2	200	79
Kongola PS	250	2.5	250	100
Sangwali PS	200	2	200	100
Aris PS	219	2	200	91
Dordabis PS	220	1.5	150	68
Nossob PS	541	2	200	37
R5 Kamp	450	4	400	89
Usib	112	0.5	50	45
Oanob PS	780	5	500	64
K W von Maree CS	100	1	100	100

Source: interviews of cooks and school managers, NSFP data. Due to the lack of accurate records being kept on the number of children eating, this data must be treated with caution.