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INTRODUCTION
1. INTRODUCTION

FoodForward SA (FFSA) commissioned Impact Amplifier (IA) to conduct an impact assessment of its multi-faceted FoodBanking model to establish the social impact of redistributed edible surplus food through its national network. The main focus of this assessment was to establish the financial value of the socio-economic impact of FoodForward SA’s model; and the social outcomes for the beneficiaries who receive food and other services provided by Beneficiary Organisations (BO) supported by FFSA.

The assessment period was 1 March 2019 to 29 February 2020. IA reviewed data provided by FFSA and from interviews and surveys completed with a representative sample of Beneficiary Organisations registered with FFSA.

This assessment was conducted between 1 September 2020 and December 2020 by the research team at Impact Amplifier. This report documents the research process, findings and recommendations to FFSA regarding ways to enhance the impact it is achieving.
IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY
2. IMPACT ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

The methodologies used to gather data for this impact assessment included internal information provided by FFSA, available data in the public domain and information gathered directly from FFSA’s Beneficiary Organisations.

The process involved first determining what impact FFSA wanted to measure, what data it already had and what new information would be required to measure its intended impact. Beyond pre-existing and publicly available information, it was determined that collecting data directly from FFSA’s Beneficiary Organisations using a combination of site visits, interviews and surveys offered the most efficient and comprehensive method of data collection.

IA elected to apply representative sampling of the FFSA BOs to reflect the characteristics of the entire BO network. To determine which, FFSA Beneficiary Organisations would be included, the Impact Amplifier team segmented this group by type of organisation, size of organisation, location, and the number of people receiving meals.
2.1 SAMPLING

Based on the data provided by FFSA, IA established that the BOs are classified mainly by size as small, medium, and large organisations based on their number of beneficiaries served. In addition to this classification, FFSA also classifies its BOs by type of services or programmes offered. Also relevant to the sampling was the location of the Beneficiary Organisations.

To simplify the sampling, IA applied its own further categorisation of the BOs into three broad types as per the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FFSA Categories</th>
<th>IA Grouped Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Orphans and Vulnerable Children</td>
<td>Community Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Shelters / Rehabilitation Care</td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Support Group / Club</td>
<td>Health/Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ECD / Creche</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. School / After-school Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Skills Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Aged / Frail Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Community Feeding Programme</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Disability Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. HIV / AIDS Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sample selected for site visits, interviews and surveys was proportionately representative of the entire group of FFSA’s Beneficiary Organisations for the period under review. The survey was sent to 80 organisations, which 22 completed and an additional 40 organisations were interviewed directly. Thus, a total of 62 BOs participated in the impact assessment process. This is 16% of the total BO network for the timeframe under review.

FFSA has more BOs concentrated in the Western Cape, KZN and Gauteng Provinces. However, IA was able to include six provinces in the sampled group to balance the insights as far as possible.

**BENEFICIARY ORGANISATIONS BY PROVINCE**
LIMITATIONS
3. LIMITATIONS

3.1 EVALUATION PERIOD
The review period for this impact assessment was limited to one financial year and was the first of its kind. As such, this impact report should also be considered a baseline to be measured against impact assessments done in the future. FFSA’s social impact will be much better understood over an extended period of time particularly with BOs that have participated in the programme for multiple years. Tracking impact over an extended period will allow FFSA to identify trends and isolate core elements of impact derived from the contributions made by FFSA that can now only be inferred.

3.2 THE COVID-19 EFFECT
Taking into account that this evaluation was conducted at the height of the COVID 19 Pandemic across the world, there were a number of challenges in isolating the data collection to the specified period as the respondents were absorbed with managing the effects of the pandemic on their daily feeding operations. Consequently, a number of the targeted respondents were not available for the assessment as they were no longer operating while others had significantly changed the core functions of their organisations. IA, managed to focus the respondent inputs for the specified period by excluding comments related to the period after 29 February 2020.

Some respondents raised a number of unverified concerns related to issues outside the period of this assessment. These issues have been documented under separate cover.

A further effect was that only 28% of the targeted survey respondents completed the online survey. Upon investigation, IA established that many of the organisations were not able to complete the survey as they were not working from their offices due to the COVID-19 restrictions and did not have reliable access to the internet at home.
3.3 RECORD KEEPING

Very few of the BOs included in this assessment keep records of their programme activities and outcomes beyond the attendance registers and demographic details of their beneficiaries. Of the few that do keep records, the information is kept for specific funders and not related to tracking food security indicators or related social outcomes. Consequently, not all the social impact outcomes generated by the BOs that can be directly attributed to the food provided by FFSA to BOs could be determined.
THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT
4. THE SOUTH AFRICAN CONTEXT

According to the 2017 ‘Food loss and waste: facts and futures’ report, compiled by the WWF, roughly a third of food in South Africa ends up at landfills and other dumping grounds. That means, of the 31 million tonnes of food produced annually in South Africa; 10 million tonnes are wasted. The losses are comprised of 44% fruit and vegetables, 26% grains, 15% meat, and 13% roots, tubers and oilseeds. Most of this wastage and loss occurs early in the food supply chain, where 50% is lost during the post-harvest phase, 25% during processing and packaging, 20% during distribution and retail, and 5% at consumer level.

The Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) has valued this loss at R61.5 billion. The energy wasted every year in South Africa for producing food that is not eaten is estimated as enough to power the City of Johannesburg for roughly 16 weeks. The water wasted would fill over 600 000 Olympic swimming pools.

About 90% of waste in SA is disposed of to landfills, where the food-waste component leads to the production of methane gas and carbon dioxide. Methane is a potent greenhouse gas that contributes to climate change, having 28–36 times more impact on the environment than carbon dioxide (over 100 years).

In South Africa, it is illegal to donate or sell perishable food that has passed its expiry date, even if it is still safe for human consumption. It costs R 5 922 per tonne to dispose of food waste to landfill (including opportunity + disposal cost). According to Section 61 of the South African Consumer Protection Act: “The producer or importer, distributor or retailer of any goods is liable for any harm caused wholly or partly as a consequence of supplying any unsafe goods, a product failure, defect or hazard in any goods and inadequate instructions or warnings provided to the consumer.” However, surplus food can be redistributed, which is a viable alternative to disposal. Diverting edible food to charity is an active strategy for a number of retailers and others in the food industry sector; either

---

1 Food Loss and Waste: Facts and Futures Taking steps towards a more sustainable food future Report 2017 by WWF
2 Food waste research for South Africa: Presentation by Prof Suzan Oelofse; Natural Resources and the Environment Unit - CSIR
directly through local charity relationships or through organisations like FoodForward SA. The legislation governing food waste is not distinct from legislation that covers waste management in general, which means that ‘food waste’ is not recognised in ‘general waste’ classifications. The broader legislation is enforced by environmental health practitioners, the Department of Water and Sanitation and the Department of Environmental Affairs.

South Africa does not just legislate food waste, but also the right to food. Section 27(1)(b) of the Constitution states that, “everyone has the right to have access to sufficient food and water.” This obligation is extended in section 27(2), according to which “the state must take reasonable legislative and other measures, within its available resources, to achieve the progressive realisation of each of these rights.”, and section 28(1)(c) states that every child has the right to “basic nutrition, shelter, basic health care services and social services.” The rights to food are not only recognised by the South African constitution but for part of the broader agenda of the United Nations. The UN Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural rights have recognized that the right to adequate food is of crucial importance for the enjoyment of all other human rights. The Committee considers that the right to adequate food implies: “The availability of food in a quantity and quality sufficient to satisfy the dietary needs of individuals, free from adverse substances, and acceptable within a given culture. The accessibility of such food in ways that are sustainable and that do not interfere with the enjoyment of other human rights”. The Committee on the Rights of the Child has also recognized the obligation of States to ensure access to nutritionally adequate, culturally appropriate, and safe food to combat malnutrition in all its forms.

Nonetheless, many individuals do not have year-round access to safe, affordable diets needed to promote health and wellbeing. As a result, malnutrition in all its forms is a problem of global proportion, and no country is free from its effects. According to the CSIR, 25% of SA households are at risk of hunger or experiencing hunger. Hunger is only part of the issues however, related to SA household food security. The availability and accessibility of affordable nutritious food affects most low-income families. One consequence of food affordability is that South African families are opting for more

---

2 **Sustainable Healthy Diets- Guiding principles** - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION Rome, 2019
processed foods as these are increasingly more financially assessable \(^4\). As the South African diet continues to shift towards one that is higher in processed foods and lower in fruit and vegetables, food insecurity is expected to continue increasing.

The Household Affordability Index \(^5\), published by the Pietermaritzburg Economic Justice and Dignity Group (PMBEJD) in 2019, noted that 56% of South Africans (30.4 million people) currently live below the upper-bound poverty line of R1,227 a month, with a quarter (25.2% or 13.8 million) living on even less (R561 a month). This level of poverty is a major contributing factor to food insecurity in the country.

It is within this context that FFSA's interventions to realise a South Africa without hunger and reduce food waste by redirecting this good food to feed families in need is of critical importance to the health and well-being of the majority of South Africans.

---

\(^4\) The South African Food Cost Review 2019 - NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL MARKETING COUNCIL

\(^5\) Household Affordability Index - Pietermaritzburg Economic Justice and Dignity Group (PMBEJD) 2019
INTERVIEW AND SURVEY FINDINGS
5. INTERVIEW AND SURVEY FINDINGS

FoodForward SA was established in 2009 to address widespread hunger in South Africa. It is the largest food redistribution charity in South Africa, and part of a global movement focused on alleviating hunger and reducing environmental impact by distributing good quality edible surplus food. FFSA reports that in 2021 it is implementing six core programmes with over 1,000 Beneficiary Organisations that are reaching 500,000 people daily with a combination of food and other social services.

For the purpose of this evaluation, IA focussed only on reviewing the primary food distribution activities including the FFSA warehouses across the country, Mobile Rural Depots and the direct distribution from retailers to BOs via their proprietary digital platform called FoodShare. The discussion below provides a summary of the key insights gained from the analysis of the interviews and surveys as insights about the impact that can be credited to FFSA for the period under review.

IA was able to collect data from senior managers, directors or founders of the targeted BOs, who were selected as part of the representative sample for this impact assessment.

5.1 BENEFICIARY ORGANISATIONS

Most of the Beneficiary Organisations registered with FFSA (97%) are Non-Profit organisations established in terms of the Non-Profit Organisations Act with the Department of Social Development which, is the standard registration for a charity; while only 3% are registered as a non-profit company (NPC) in terms of the Companies Act with the department of trade and industry, which has more onerous governance and compliance measures.

57% of these organisations provide services that fall under the Youth and Community Development services category, which includes Orphans and Vulnerable Children, Shelters / Rehab Care and Support Group / Club as core programmes.
Most of the BOs registered with FFSA are based in major Metropolitan areas in the Western Cape, Gauteng and KwaZulu Natal respectively. The other Provinces are serviced mainly through a network of Mobile Depots in vulnerable rural communities that receive food donations from designated locations on a set schedule each month, or via their FoodShare platform.

For the period under review, FFSA was active in six of the nine Provinces.

---

**INTERVIEW/SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AS %**

- **Western Cape**: 32%
- **Gauteng**: 27%
- **Kwazulu-Natal**: 22%
- **Eastern Cape**: 10%
- **North West**: 8%
- **Free State**: 2%

---

**ORGANISATION CATEGORY**

- **Youth and Community Development Services**: 57%
- **Educational Services**: 35%
- **Health Care Services**: 8%
The majority of the individuals participating in the assessment on behalf of the Beneficiary Organisations (62%) had been with FFSA for more than six years (some more than 15 years), in their roles as senior managers, directors or founders of the respective organisations; of which, 80% are female.

**ASSESSMENT PARTICIPANTS TIME IN CURRENT POSITION**

- **More than 6 years:** 62%
- **2-4 years:** 13%
- **4-6 years:** 12%
- **1-2 years:** 7%
- **Less than 2 years:** 3%
- **Less than 1 year:** 3%
5.2 FOOD RECIPIENT INFORMATION

For the period 1 March 2019 to 29 February 2020, 95% of the surveyed organisations were actively running their normal programmes for the full year with an average of three core social service programmes (feeding included) per organisation, with 35% of the organisations reporting an average enrolment between 51 and 100 beneficiaries with attendance rates for services provided consistently above 80%.

The following reflects a range of findings about the beneficiaries of FFSA Beneficiary Organisations.

NUMBER OF BENEFICIARIES SERVED PER ANNUM

Community feeding programmes (19%) and services for Orphaned & Vulnerable Children (19%) are the most common type of core programme offered by BOs registered with FFSA.
The majority of the programmes BO’s provide (46%) focus on providing services to children and teenagers between the ages of 6 and 19.
Although the questionnaire did not test for nationality, a small number of the black beneficiaries are non-South Africans.
Although the questionnaire did not test for nationality, a small number of the black beneficiaries are non-South Africans.
IsiXhosa (18%), IsiZulu (16%), and English (16%) are the most commonly spoken languages by the beneficiaries receiving services from the BOs registered with FFSA.
According to the BOs, 83% of their beneficiaries are reliant on social grants or support from family, which makes the average household income of individuals receiving services from the BOs registered with FFSA less than R1,000 per family.
The Social Grant amounts were set as R425 for child support, R1 000 for Foster care, R1 780 for disability and R1 800 for older persons in 2019. Most of the services/programmes offered by the BOs are provided free of charge to individuals.

5.3 BENEFICIARY ORGANISATION SERVICE FEES

72% of BOs that were part of this assessment do not charge a fee for the services they provide while 28% run fee-based programmes, which principally include the ECD/Crches and Residential Care Facilities (i.e., Homes for the elderly or orphans, frail care, disability, shelters, and rehab), which service a fixed group of beneficiaries.

The ECD / Creche facilities generally charge fees below R400 per child monthly for day care services, while residential care facilities charge more than R1,000 per adult monthly for 24-hour care services.

FEES CHARGED

Yes 28%
No 72%
**FREQUENCY FEE CHARGED**

- Daily: 10%
- Once Off: 6%
- No: 84%

**SPECIFIC AMOUNT CHARGED**

- R10-R20: 13%
- R250-R300: 13%
- R1000-R1500: 6%
- R2500-R3000: 3%
- R200-R250: 3%
- R800-R900: 3%
- R1500-R2000: 3%
- R450-R500: 6%
- R20-R30: 6%
- R75-R100: 16%
- R350-R400: 16%
- R10-R20: 3%
- R100-R150: 3%
- R40-R50: 6%
- R30-R40: 3%
5.4 FEEDING PROGRAMME

The following reflects how the Beneficiary Organisations feeding programmes function.

**Number Of People Fed**

All the assessment respondents confirmed that their organisations provide food to beneficiaries as part of their core programmes with the exception of ad-hoc activities in some instances.

Most of the BOs (51%) feed up to 100 people per month, while 16% feed more than 1,000 people per month. Residential care facilities deliver the most meals per person, which is three meals and a snack per day, seven days a week. The following reflects the number of people fed per month.

**PEOPLE FED PER MONTH**
Meals And People Served
The majority (75%) of the BOs keep track of how many times they provide meals per individual. For the most part, this is done through an attendance register or roll call, which is provided to the kitchen staff as a guide on how much food to prepare.

TRACK FREQUENCY SAME PERSON IS FED

MEALS SERVED

Meal Composition And Why
The average meal served by the BOs to their beneficiaries contains processed grains (25%) fresh meat (16%) fresh vegetables (16%) and canned foods of various types (13%). The following reflects the complete breakdown of the food that is served.
Although the food served does not vary dramatically when comparing the type and size of organisation. However, there are a few key variances worthy of noting as per the table below.

**Type Of Food Served**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Meat Products</th>
<th>Fresh Fruit</th>
<th>Fresh Vegetables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Development</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the most part, all BOs described their feeding programme in a similar way. Most have staff that prepare meals (mostly cooked) for their beneficiaries according to a pre-determined menu, which is consulted and adapted depending on the food items available.
“We use a menu that is based on a good mix of variety that is affordable and available”

Food Limitations And Inclusions
Many of the BOs indicated that they serve the food for the beneficiaries, but do not restrict the quantity of food unless there is not enough to go around.

LIMITS ON FREQUENCY PERSON FEED

Yes 40%

No 60%

For those that do impose limits on the number of meals provided to each person, the limits are mostly related to the frequency of the programme or activity rather than the quantity of food provided per session.
A small percentage also measure the weight of each meal served.

The majority of the BOs (77%) also offer food to their employees.
Beyond Cooked Meals

In addition to serving cooked meals many of the BOs also reported that they give food parcels to their clients for a variety of reasons. There are a few BOs that give food parcels as the main activity. The food parcels contain different things depending on what the BO has available.

BO PROVIDES FOOD PARCELS

The food parcels are not the only additional food distribution activity of FFSA's BOs as 25% of the assessment sample also provided food to other organisations.

“Our Staff are from poor backgrounds and so food is also provided for them to help support them. They eat the same meals as are being prepared for the later stage children”
5.5 BENEFICIARY ORGANISATION FOOD SUPPLY

FFSA is generally one of multiple ways each of the BOs access the food they provide to their beneficiaries. The following reflects the BO food supply chain and where FFSA fits in.

**Food From FFSA**

The following reflects how much BO receive from FFSA, what they receive, how they get it,

**AVERAGE KILOGRAMS OF FOOD FROM FFSA PER DONATION**
This also includes personal hygiene items (4%), Cleaning Products (4%) and non-essential edible items such as coffee, sweets, and carbonated drinks (9%).

**WHICH OF THE FOLLOWING FOODS DO YOU RECEIVE MOST FROM FFSA?**

Most of the items received from FFSA are in good condition, with most (55%) of BOs reporting that about 5-10% of the food items are spoiled, while the average is 14%. The spoilage is reported to occur mostly with vegetables (i.e., squished tomatoes) during transit and canned food items with damaged packaging. There were a few unverified reports of items provided by FFSA that had already expired (beyond 'use-by' date).
The BOs collect donations from FFSA monthly from designated warehouses or are delivered to mobile rural depot sites or more frequently through FoodShare, programme depending on where they are based.

FFSA FOOD DONATIONS ACCESS

The frequency of FFSA donations is also worth of noting, with 91% receiving donations monthly.
Although only a small percentage of the FFSA BO community use the FoodShare platform (local store pickup) it is relevant to note that 14% have used it or are using it actively. Of those who are using the FoodShare Platform, 70% log in weekly while 10% use it sometimes.
Many of the BOs indicated that they are happy to continue receiving donations from the warehouses. However, 31% indicated a preference for delivery to the door noting cost of travel to the warehouse and wait times as a factor for this preference.
BOs receiving donations from FFSA at mobile rural depots expressed gratitude for the reduction in cost of travel (which is sometimes across Provinces) that has been realised because of the accessibility of the depots closer to where they operate.

While some (23%) of the BOs are content with collecting donations on a monthly cycle as is currently the case, most (56%) would prefer to collect from the FFSA on a fortnightly cycle and some (11%) would like a weekly cycle.

The majority (75%) of the BOs reported that the food items received from FFSA are not enough to run their food programme and almost all (97%) would like to receive more food from FFSA.
Most organisations would prefer to receive more food from FFSA.

With the additional food, most of the BOs reported that they would be able to increase the number of people that they are able to feed; while some noted that they would focus on providing higher quality meals to the same number of beneficiaries.
“If we get more food - we will be able to support the parents of the kids to cook better meals at home”

“We would not feed more people, just feed the same amount more effectively and at a lower cost.”

“To get more we have to pay higher "membership fees" which we cannot afford to do now. But if affordable it would allow us to provide more substantial food parcels to the children we already assist.”

Role Of FFSA In The BO Food Ecosystem
The food donations distributed by FFSA to the BOs contributes 34% of the food for meals served; while more than 65% of the total food supply is sourced by the BOs separately as direct purchases, harvested from own food gardens and contributions from other organisations. The allocation of food received has critical implications for how FFSA reports the people it feeds per annum.
Other contributions are ad hoc donations from the community or in some instances once-off campaigns such as the annual Mandela Day events of private companies.

When considering this segmented by type and size of organisation, FFSA's role in the BOs food ecosystem does not change materially, but enough to be noted.
Based on how FFSA fits into the BO’s food budgets, it is consistent that only 37% of the assessment participants indicated that FFSA donations highly affected the meals programme.

**HOW FFSA FOOD AFFECTS MEAL PROGRAMME**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Effect</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal Effect</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**5.6 FOOD COSTS**

This section addresses the annual and monthly food costs of the BO’s, how FFSA fits into these expenditures, what the costs per meal are and the accuracy of these costs.

Based on reported figures by the BO’s, 32% have an operating budget above R1 million per year. Quite a few of the organisations were not able to provide accurate numbers despite holding senior roles in the organisations or as founders. However, IA was able to assist the respondents to estimate the annual operating budgets.
As a direct cost, only 6% of BOs reported that they spend R1,000 or less on groceries per month. All others reported a monthly spend ranging from R1,000 to well over R80,000 per month to purchase food items directly.
**FFSA Contribution**

Over 87% of the BO’s in the assessment reflected that FFSA positively contributed to their food budgets. The 13% that were neutral reflected that food from FFSA does not have a meaningful impact on the BO’s ability to feed its clients.

**AFFECTS OF FFSA FOOD DONATIONS ON BO BUDGET**

As a percentage of operating costs, 28% of the BOs reported that up to 10% of their food costs is offset by the donations received from FFSA.

**PERCENTAGE FFSA DONATIONS REFLECT OF ANNUAL OPERATING BUDGET**

- **Neutral**: 13%
- **Positively**: 87%

**Meal Costs**

The highest percentage (22%) of BOs indicated their cost per meal was between R20 and R25 for each serving, while others (15%) said they did not know and only 3% estimated their meal cost at R100 or higher.
A limited number of BO's (27%) indicated that the number of people served changed their costs per meal.

**FOOD COST VARIANCE PER PEOPLE SERVED**

- Changes a lot: 27%
- Does not change much: 47%
- Remains the same: 27%
However, these cost estimations often exclude factors such as transport, labour, and utilities, as the BOs admittedly, do not use food cost calculations as a norm.

Only 6% of the BOs included all the costs related to serving each meal. Most only included the direct costs of food purchased.

**MEAL COSTS INCLUDED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost Of Food Only</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, Gas &amp; Water</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent/Premises Costs</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Salaries</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utensils And Serving Materials</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FFSA'S CURRENT IMPACT
6. **FFSA'S CURRENT IMPACT**

Based on the data collected in this impact assessment, it is clear that FFSA is making a material social and ecological impact. In this section, the current impact FFSA is making, based on the data available will be documented. Based on analysis done, FFSA's impact has been categorised into three key areas:

- **Number of People Fed**;
- **Quality of Food**; and
- **Social Service Delivery**.

### 6.1 NUMBER OF PEOPLE FED

The role of FFSA's food in the feeding ecosystem is complex as the Beneficiary Organisations get the food they provide those in need from the following sources:

- FFSA – **34%**
- Donations from other organisations – **28%**
- Direct purchases – **29%**
- Food Gardens – **9%**
- Other (community donations) – **2%**

This is virtually in line with FFSA's target of 30%. It can therefore be concluded that with the support of FFSA, BOs can feed 34% more people. It however, is not that straightforward as FFSA has a more material impact for some organisations in its network in some instances providing 100% of all food delivered to those in need. The impact of this is best understood by reviewing how the assessment interviewees responded to a range of key questions as per the charts below.
WOULD YOU BE ABLE TO CONTINUE MEALS WITHOUT THE CONTRIBUTION OF FFSA?

Yes 70%

No 30%

From another perspective:

IS THE FOOD YOU RECEIVE FROM FFSA ENOUGH TO RUN YOUR FEEDING PROGRAM?

Yes 25%

No 75%

This reflects an average while the importance of the food FFSA provides changes materially by size of organisation.
IS THE FOOD YOU RECEIVE FROM FFSA ENOUGH TO RUN YOUR FEEDING PROGRAM?

This demonstrates that FFSA’s impact on the food ecosystem is far more material than the simple 34% metric. Without FFSA’s support, the BOs cost per meal will be higher, compromising their ability to feed more people and deliver their other social services.

PERCENTAGE OF FOOD COSTS FFSA DONATIONS REPRESENT OF TOTAL OPERATING BUDGET
“Without FFSA we would have to stop the programme. FFSA are the only people who supply our organization with food”

“We would have to reduce the number of children in the ECD or we would have to increase the fees”

“It would be very difficult because our finances are not stable. We would have to stop the programme. If people are not able to get food they would starve - most of them have to take medication - it would not be possible to continue without the FFSA food”

“Approximately 400 people would lose meals. We would have to stop the feeding programme; it would be very sad”
CASE STUDY:
DREAMERS DAY CARE

Organisation Type: Day Care
Location: Gauteng
Date Of Establishment: 2012
Size: Small

Dreamers day care centre provides an early learning programme for 36 kids ages 1 to 6 years, who return each year as they progress to school readiness and 'graduate' into grade 1 of the school system.

The Day care operates five days a week and offers the kids two cooked meals twice a day (breakfast and lunch) and a snack for the afternoon, usually fruit or a sweet/chocolate.

The meals are based on a standard menu, which is adjusted each month according to what is in the pantry and is able to be purchased for that week/month.

FFSA Impact
The donations from FFSA are used as a meaningful portion of the food sourced each month to feed the children.

Quote
“We are very happy with the quality of the food we get from FFSA, it is very helpful”. It helps reduce costs significantly and since joining the FFSA food programme, we have been able to hire a new person full-time because of the costs savings”. 
FFSA distributes food nationally to BO’s, which serve people in urban, peri-urban and rural contexts. Thus, how FFSA distributes its food also has a meaningful impact on the number of people reached. This is particularly relevant related to the mobile rural depots and their FoodShare platform. Consider:

IF YOU COULD NOT ACCESS/USE THE FOODSHARE PLATFORM, HOW WOULD THIS AFFECT THE NUMBER OF MEALS YOU CAN SERVE PER MONTH?

These results change meaningfully based on the size of organisation as the FoodShare platform appears to be most valuable to medium sized organisations.

FOODSHARE IMPACT ON MEALS: ORGANISATION SIZE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Meals Served</th>
<th>No Effect</th>
<th>Minimal Effect</th>
<th>High Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The access to FoodShare has also had a material impact on the expansion of the BO’s donor network thus enhancing their resilience and strengthening the local food ecosystems in which they operate. 54% of the BOs that use the FoodShare platform have expanded their donor network.

**HAVE YOU BEEN ABLE TO EXPAND YOUR DONOR NETWORK THROUGH THE FOODSHARE PLATFORM?**

![Graph showing 54% Yes, 46% No.

This is most relevant for medium and larger organisation as smaller have not realised the same benefits.

**NETWORK EXPANSION**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Meals Served</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“We were introduced to the local Pick & Pay from FFSA and it has been extremely helpful to redistribute food we receive.”
6.2 QUALITY OF FOOD PROVIDED

The impact assessment identified a vast distinction between the frequency and quality of meals the BO’s provide their beneficiaries. The averages are reflected as:

AVERAGE COMPOSITION OF MEAL SERVED

These averages demonstrate a balance of protein, vegetables and fruit. However, the averages mask the large variance between organisations.

FFSA is making a material impact not only on how many people are fed, but also on what they are fed. As food security is not just how much people eat but also what they eat this is of critical importance in preventing food insecurity within the BO network. The following reflects how relevant FFSA is to what is being served, again based on the impact assessment respondents.
This impact can be better understood by reviewing how much the FFSA food affects what the BOs serve to their beneficiaries. FFSA food for over 50% of the BOs affects 80-100% of what is being served.
FFSA food provisions affects BOs differently which is best understood by comparing the size of organisations (small and medium) as this more than type made a difference.

HOW MUCH DOES THE FOOD YOU RECEIVE FROM FFSA AFFECT WHAT YOU PROVIDE TO YOUR BENEFICIARIES?
“The food we receive from FFSA allows us to provide a nutritionally balanced meal to our beneficiaries that otherwise could not be done.”

“We are a very poor organisation and cannot afford to buy food, so FFSA food is critical to how many people we serve and what we serve them.”

“FFSA ability to continue providing a balance of protein, vegetables and fruit is critical to the quality of food provided in the ecosystem.”
CASE STUDY

OTSHEPENG OLD AGE HOME

Organisation Type: Frail Care, Live in Centre
Location: North West
Date Of Establishment: 2012
Size: Small

Otshepeng Old Age Home is located in Tlaseng village in the North West Province. It provides care and support to elderly persons who cannot take care of themselves. The residential care facility takes care of 32 elderly residents at a time.

Each resident contributes their social grant as resident fees to cover the expenses of accommodation, meals, medical care, and activities. The staff make sure that each resident gets their monthly medical check-up and also follow up for those who have chronic conditions like diabetes.

The residents enjoy three meals and two snacks per day, 7 days a week. The meals are prepared based on a menu developed in consultation with their doctor and nurses. The staff always serve the food for the residents to ensure specific dietary needs are adhered to.

FFSA Impact

Otshepeng Home does not rely on FFSA for its core food requirements as these are purchased directly like: mielie-meal, meat, dry beans and meat. FFSA is used to diversify and enhance the meals while sometimes functioning as the core provider.

Quote

“The contribution FFSA provides is extremely valuable to us especially at times when we were struggling financially”.
6.3  FFSA IMPACT ON SOCIAL SERVICE DELIVERY

The impact FFSA is having on the number of people and the quality of the meals provided is not a surprise based on size, duration, previous analysis and sophistication of the organisation. What previously has not been well understood is the role of food as an enabler of other social services. The BO network is comprised of many organisational types focused on very diverse issues including early childhood education, orphanage, skills development, disability, HIV/AIDS, community feeding and frail care. Food is either the primary service or merely part of a broader set of social services provided.

Based on the data collected, it is clear that FFSA’s food provision is making a material impact on the BO’s ability to deliver other social services beyond food.

Consider the responses from the impact assessment interviewees:

**IF YOUR ORGANISATION WAS UNABLE TO RECEIVE DONATIONS FROM FFSA, HOW WOULD THAT AFFECT YOUR OTHER PROGRAMMES?**

- **6%** would have to adjust the programme
- 41% would have to stop the programme
- 47% would have to adjust the programme
Beyond these material changes there are also more subtle changes to consider regarding the rates of attendance. The average attendance to BOs social services is 90%. The assessment participants could not determine for certain how attendance would be impacted if FFSA food was not provided as a tiny minority of studied attendance is direct relation to food provision over time. However, when asked more broadly 81% believed it would have an impact.

**WOULD ATTENDANCE TO YOUR NON-FEEDING PROGRAMMES BE AFFECTED IF YOU DID NOT PROVIDE FFSA FOOD?**

- Yes: 81%
- No: 19%
“If we do not offer food the attendance would be very low most of the beneficiaries come because they do not have other sources of food”

“We can only maintain certain programmes on the incentive of providing food. The meals allow a person to be comfortable and then they have the ability to learn or listen or open themselves up to counselling, assistance and other programmes.”

“Although the community members are enrolled in the skills development programme primarily, the meals are a huge incentive and we can't guarantee attendance if we lost the ability to provide meals at reduced cost.”

“Most of the children come to our space because the parents are unemployed and hungry. So, we are able to keep them in the system if there is something to feed them.”
CASE STUDY:
MASAKHE FOUNDATION
Organisation Type: Afterschool care
Location: Western Cape
Date Of Establishment: 2013
Size: Large

Masakhe Foundation runs four programmes across its four hubs in Leiden, Delft, Lentegeur (Mitchell’s Plein,) and Klapmuts. The programmes offer a safe space for vulnerable children to get assistance with schoolwork and kept busy with stimulating activities and be served a meal.

The organisation also runs an addiction awareness programme to educate the communities at large about the danger of substance abuse. They assist families and friends of addicts with group counselling sessions and assist the addicts with one-on-one sessions and refer them to rehabilitation.

The skills unlimited programmes teach unemployed youth from vulnerable areas trade skills such as tilling, woodwork, hairdressing, basic computer skills as well as preparing them for job interviews and skill language.

The organisation provides one meal per person a day on weekdays to 390 beneficiaries across their programmes.

FFSA impact
Food is a critical part of attracting and retaining beneficiaries of the other programmes. FFSA’s donations meaningful reduces the budget allocated to food, liberating those resources to be spent on delivering other programmes.

Quote
“Most of the children come to our space because the parents are unemployed and hungry. So, we are able to keep them in the system if there is something to feed them. The organisation provides food parcels to the vulnerable families in the community as well.”
SOCIAL RETURN ON INVESTMENT
7. SOCIAL RETURN ON INVESTMENT

7.1 INTRODUCTION

The Social Return on Investment (SROI) is a process of understanding, measuring and reporting the social, environmental, and economic benefits derived from all stakeholders, placing a monetary value to each element. This “return” is then compared against the cost of generating the outcomes, the “investment”. (Lawlor, Neitzert & Nicholls, 2008).

SROI analysis can be performed prospectively or retrospectively. The former forecasts the expected social value that will be generated by planned activities, the latter evaluates the social value that has been generated from past activities (Goodspeed, et al. 2012).

In accordance with the scope of the engagement Impact Amplifier has limited the FFSA SROI to the retrospective approach covering the financial year to February 2020. The calculation is limited, to only the social, environmental, and economic value that is derived from the Second Harvest, FoodShare, and Warehousing programmes. Additionally, Impact Amplifier’s engagement with stakeholders was limited to a sample of Beneficiary Organisations.

To ensure any SROI is measuring what matters, it is important to have developed a Theory of Change (ToC). The ToC documents: the assumptions an organization has about the particular social issue it intends to address; what its activities will be to address this social issue; and what it believes will be the results and impact of its activities. As FFSA does not have a Theory of Change at present, Impact Amplifier in consultation with FFSA, defined the scope of the following SROI calculation based on its experience and the information available.

The analysis that follows breaks down the calculation into four stages: impact mapping, cost allocation, impact valuation, and SROI calculation. Each stage derives vital information that generates the final SROI.
7.2 IMPACT MAPPING

The scope of the impact mapping has been limited to the key stakeholders in the FFSA value chains of the Second Harvest, FoodShare, and Warehousing Distribution programmes. The first group of key stakeholders can be grouped under Food Producers & Food Retailers, and the second group are the Beneficiary Organisations. The impact generated occurs across both groups of stakeholders at differing points of the value chain, the collection of surplus food or the distribution of food.

The Impact Mapping depicts the inputs, outputs and outcomes of the FFSA operations for each stakeholder group. The four outcomes are:

- Reduction in Carbon Emissions;
- Diverted Waste from Landfill;
- Meals Served to the Vulnerable; and
- Continued Support of Beneficiary Organisations.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact on Meals Served</th>
<th>Inputs</th>
<th>Output</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Producers &amp; Food Retailers</td>
<td>Surplus Food</td>
<td>Surplus Food produced/unsold is collected and re-enter value chain</td>
<td>Reduction in carbon emissions from wasted food</td>
<td>Net Cardon Emissions Data</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Rand per Tonne</td>
<td>Act No. 15 of 2019: Carbon Tax Act, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Food waste diverted from landfill</td>
<td>Net Tones of food saved</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>Rand per Tonne</td>
<td><a href="https://www.greencape.co.za/assets/Uploads/WASTE-MARKET-INTELLIGENCE-REPORT-WEB.pdf">https://www.greencape.co.za/assets/Uploads/WASTE-MARKET-INTELLIGENCE-REPORT-WEB.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beneficiary Organisations (BO)</td>
<td>Time and Food</td>
<td>Supply of food for vulnerable individuals / communities</td>
<td>Increase in number of meals served to vulnerable</td>
<td>Average number of meals served per BO</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Rand per Meal</td>
<td>Household Affordability Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Services: Number of children in School / After-school Care.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Rand per Month per Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Educational Services: People enrolled in Skills / Community Development.</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Rand per Month per Child</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth &amp; Community Development: Number of Orphans / Vulnerable Children.</td>
<td></td>
<td>810</td>
<td>Rand per Month per Child</td>
<td><a href="https://www.unicef.org/french/evaldatabase/files/SAF_01-801.pdf">https://www.unicef.org/french/evaldatabase/files/SAF_01-801.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth &amp; Community Development: Number enrolled in community feeding programme.</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Rand per Meal</td>
<td>Household Affordability Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact on Meals Served</td>
<td>Inputs</td>
<td>Output</td>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Metric</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Source</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Youth &amp; Community Development: Number enrolled in Support groups / Clubs.</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>Rand per Month</td>
<td><a href="https://www.gtac.gov.za/Researchdocs/Costing%20Centre-Based%20Early%20Childhood%20Development%20Programmes%20for%20Children%20Under%20Age%20Five.pdf">https://www.gtac.gov.za/Researchdocs/Costing%20Centre-Based%20Early%20Childhood%20Development%20Programmes%20for%20Children%20Under%20Age%20Five.pdf</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Health Care: Number of individuals with HIV / Aids in care.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>Rand per Month</td>
<td><a href="https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3080749/">https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3080749/</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table: FFSA Impact Mapping
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Measure / Units</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Extrapolation Factor</th>
<th>Total Return</th>
<th>Less Deadweight</th>
<th>Less Attribution</th>
<th>Annual Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Increase in number of meals served to vulnerable</td>
<td>6,277,632</td>
<td>Source: FFSA Interview Data</td>
<td>Extrapolation Factor: 6.32</td>
<td>Total Return: 1,536,021,658</td>
<td>Less Deadweight: 70%</td>
<td>Annual Return: 96,067,535</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table: SROI Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Measure / Units</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Extrapolation Factor</th>
<th>Total Return</th>
<th>Less Deadweight</th>
<th>Less Attribution</th>
<th>Annual Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8. Continued operation of associated social activities.</td>
<td>833,616</td>
<td>IA Interview Data</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>203,970,578</td>
<td>163,176,463</td>
<td>40,794,116</td>
<td>12,168,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>35,613,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,626,056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Continued operation of associated social activities.</td>
<td>21,696</td>
<td>IA Interview Data</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>128,138,384</td>
<td>73,221,934</td>
<td>54,916,450</td>
<td>26,747,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>26,747,470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28,168,980</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Continued operation of associated social activities.</td>
<td>31,560</td>
<td>IA Interview Data</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>19,935,400</td>
<td>14,951,550</td>
<td>4,983,850</td>
<td>1,324,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>1,324,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,659,245</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Continued operation of associated social activities.</td>
<td>247,572</td>
<td>IA Interview Data</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>8,350,851,132</td>
<td>6,680,680,906</td>
<td>1,670,170,226</td>
<td>360,230,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>360,230,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,309,939,337</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Continued operation of associated social activities.</td>
<td>17,052</td>
<td>IA Interview Data</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>393,148,070</td>
<td>262,098,713</td>
<td>131,049,357</td>
<td>89,705,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>89,705,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41,343,720</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Continued operation of associated social activities.</td>
<td>13,260</td>
<td>IA Interview Data</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>125,638,500</td>
<td>94,228,875</td>
<td>31,409,625</td>
<td>25,852,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>25,852,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,557,088</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Social Benefit**: 1,628,353,005
7.3 BENEFIT ANALYSIS

Desktop research was undertaken to identify an independent valuation for each outcome identified, the sources for each valuation have been included in the Table above. The fourth outcome; Continued Operation of Beneficiary Organisations, has been further broken down by organisation type and a value identified for the different social services provided.

The units or measure of benefits were identified from three sources of information; The WHO Green House FFSA GHG Emissions Estimate, FFSA Tonnage Data, and Impact Amplifier’s interview data. As the sample selected by Impact Amplifier was representative of the population of FFSA Beneficiary Organisations, these measures have been increased by a factor of 6.32 (60 / 379) the ratio of responses to total FFSA Beneficiary Organisations from the timeframe under review.

To understand the final SROI, Impact Amplifier also calculated the Deadweight and Displacement before calculating the Attribution. These are defined below.

Deadweight, estimates the value of the outcomes that would have occurred without FFSA’s intervention. For outcomes 1 & 2 this has been calculated as the percentage of FFSA donated food the Beneficiary Organisations are unable to use due to damage or spoilage. For outcomes 3 – 13 deadweight has been measured as the percentage of respondents signalling that their operations would have continued without FFSA’s support.

Displacement is another component of impact and is an assessment of how much of the outcome displaced other outcomes. For the FFSA calculation Displacement was assumed to be 0%.

Attribution is the amount of the total social benefit that can be attributed to FFSA. For outcomes 1 & 2, 100% of the benefit can be associated to FFSA as this is a direct impact of
their operations. However, for outcomes 3 – 13 where independent BO’s are generating
the impact, a low percentage of their social impact can be attributed to FFSA. This has been
calculated as the weighted average amount based on the food provided by FFSA.
Deducting the Displacement and Deadweight, the Attribution from the initial returns
calculated gives the final Annual Return for the year to Feb 2020 (SROI Table) of R1.6bn.

7.4 COST ANALYSIS

The February 2020 management accounts were provided by FFSA against which, several
adjustments were made to obtain the true cost of the social outcomes delivered. The
adjustments included; the reversal of the holiday pay accrual and wage control account,
the inclusion of the accrual for the 2020 audit fee, and adjustments for the value-in-kind
donations received by FFSA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost per Feb 2020 Management Accounts</td>
<td>R18,017,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salaries, Wages and Holiday Pay Accural Reversals</td>
<td>(364,102)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Accountancy Accrual</td>
<td>84,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gifts-in-Kind (Food, Services and Volunteer Time)</td>
<td>0*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Annual Costs</td>
<td>R17,737,795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* SROI calculations can be done with or without in-kind contributions included. In-kind contributions (food, volunteer time and other services FFSA
receives for free) have been excluded from this calculation. When included, the total costs attributable to the SROI calculation are R254,688,187
not R16,603,729. This dramatically reduces the final SROI to R6.83 instead of R98.07.
The FFSA management accounts are not prepared with a breakdown of costs per programme. To ensure the appropriate costs are evaluated against the measured social return it is imperative that costs are allocated per programme. Alongside the FFSA Finance team, Impact Amplifier performed this allocation for February 2020.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programme</th>
<th>Cost (R)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Warehousing &amp; Rural Depots</td>
<td>10,021,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FoodShare</td>
<td>5,849,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Harvest</td>
<td>732,717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Breakfast</td>
<td>1,117,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Internships</td>
<td>16,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Annual Costs</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,737,795</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less School Breakfast and Youth Internship</td>
<td>(1,134,066)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7.5 SROI

The FFSA SROI for year ending February 2020 was **R98.07**. For every R1 spend in pursuit of FFSA goals **R98.07** of impact is generated. This has been calculated from the costs and benefits documented above:

\[
\text{SROI} = \frac{\text{Total Social Benefits}}{\text{Total Attributable Costs}} = \frac{R1,628,353,005}{R16,603,729}
\]

### 7.6 SROI: FOOD DONATIONS, MEALS SERVED, ECONOMIC VALUE

Another way to understand FFSA’s SROI is by considering the amount of food (excluding non-grocery FFSA donations) it distributes to Beneficiary Organisations, the amount of meals the Beneficiary Organisations were able to serve with this food, and the economic value this creates.

This calculation revealed, in the year under review, that: FFSA distributed 5,082,308 kgs of food; the Beneficiary Organisations served 44,315,388 meals during the course of this year; the percentage of the meals served attributable to FFSA’s food donations was 34% of the total or 15,067,232 meals; and the value of each meal served as per the Household Affordability Index was R39 per meal. The total economic value FFSA created was R588 million, as represented below.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Total Kgs Food Donated} &= 5,082,308kg \\
\text{Meals Served} &= 15,067,232 \\
\text{Total R Value Created} &= R588 \text{ million}
\end{align*}
\]

1 Kg of Food = 3 meals = R117

### 7.7 REFERENCES

CONSTRAINTS TO UNDERSTANDING IMPACT
8. CONSTRAINTS TO UNDERSTANDING IMPACT

This section documents some of the constraints that currently exist within the FFSA food ecosystem that limit the ability to measure and monitor the impact FFSA is having. As FFSA is not directly providing food to people in need, but relies on its BO network, in a symbiotic relationship to realise its organisational intentions. If what and how the BOs operate is not or cannot be understood this will materially affect FFSA’s ability to understand its own impact. The limitations in this section have been categorised as follows:

→ BO Record Keeping;
→ BO Impact Measurement; and
→ BO Food Donation.

8.1 BO RECORD KEEPING

Most of the BOs that participated in this impact assessment track the number of people served and how many meals they serve. However, some don't know how many of the total meals served per month went to the same person. This makes tracking the number of people served difficult to rely on.

TRACK FREQUENCY SAME PERSON IS FED

- Yes: 75%
- No: 25%
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LIMITS ON HOW OFTEN SAME PERSON FED

Only 40% have any limitations on how often the same person is fed.

Another area where there is a lack of record keeping is in the source of food. Again, because the food sources are so diverse.

FOOD SOURCES

- 34% Food donations from FFSA
- 29% Direct purchases from our own budget
- 28% Donations from other organisations
- 9% Our own food gardens
- 2% Other
Keeping accurate records of what food was obtained from where is vital to understand FFSA’s role in the BOs food ecosystem. Although most BOs understand their monthly expenses and what was spent on food, they don’t have good multi month or annual data regarding all food sources. As donated food is a large part of the food budget, without records it is impossible to understand the total food costs. An extremely small percentage keep records of all the different food sources.

Food Records Kept

This lack of record keeping cascades into the cost of each meal served. Only 50% of the BOs include anything other than the cost of the food in delivering a meal. While only 6% include all the costs that go into providing each meal. This lack of record keeping prevents FFSA from supporting organisations that are more efficient and effective at delivering food to those in need.
8.2 BO IMPACT MEASUREMENT

Most BO’s track basic demographic information like race, gender and age about the people they serve. They also generally track how many meals they serve. Very few however, track the impact of the food and other social services they provide. Less than 10% of the participants in this impact assessment have any formal understanding of:

→ Poverty indicators of their beneficiaries like access to formal housing, energy, water, health care, education.
→ How the food provided fits into the food security of the recipient.
→ What the food enables regarding other poverty indicators like health care or education, family cohesion.
→ The impact of the other social services provided beyond food like, for example: education, job training, or healthcare.
Part of this issue is reflected in the relationships the BOs have with their beneficiaries. Only 33% of the BOs have any formal contact, which is documented with their beneficiaries post service delivery.

**CONTACT WITH BENEFICIARIES POST SERVICE DELIVERY**

Food is an extraordinary enabler to address poverty as it can have a multiplier on many other key social outcomes that are required to build resilience and enable people living in poverty to thrive. However, without measuring the affects of food provision, formally and over time, it is impossible to understand the impact of food provision.

**8.3 BO FOOD DONATIONS**

The outcomes that FFSA is able to measure through its BO network of meals served and people served, albeit flawed, provides relevant quantifiable metrics toward understanding its impact. When this information is not available, FFSA will consistently underreport on these two metrics. One way this happens is when BO’s donate FFSA food to other community-based organisations. This occurs as a normal course of operation or in an ad hoc way when the BO receives more food than it can use in a specific period of time. No BO that participated in the impact assessment, reported that it tracked how the food it donates is used, how many meals were created or people feed. 25% of the BOs reported they donated food to other organisations.
DO YOU DONATE FOOD RECEIVED FROM FFSA TO OTHER COMMUNITY ORGANISATIONS?

Understanding what is donated, how frequently and how it is used will extend FFSA's understanding of its feeding impact.

Yes 25%

No 75%
EXPANDING IMPACT
9. EXPANDING IMPACT

There is no doubt FFSA is making a material impact on South African food security and the provision of other social services. However there a range of additional ways it can enhance its impact. Some changes are related to the limitation outlined previously as well as other changes to consider. The suggestions below are made understanding that change is often complicated and time consuming. As such, some of the suggestions below are easier and more short terms while others are more complex and longer term.

→ Develop An Organisational Impact Framework.

This will include first developing a FFSA Theory of Change (ToC) - this is a critical tool to understand whether FFSA’s intended impact has been achieved. It defines:

- A range of assumptions FFSA has about the particular social issues it intends to address;
- What its activities will be to address these social issues; and
- What it believes will be the results and impact of its activities.

Once the ToC exists, FFSA should then develop specific outputs, outcomes and impact metrics it wants to measure on an ongoing basis. The ToC and specific measurement indicators will position FFSA well to both be clear about what impact means and how they can measure it.

As previously mentioned, FFSA exists within an impact symbiotic relationship with its BOs. To enhances its impact, it must enhance the impact made by the BOs. The following are a series of recommendations on how to enhance the impact measurement and monitoring of its BOs:

→ Meals Served Versus People Feed – require the BOs to track this distinction to ensure FFSA can report accurately on the total population it supports annually.
→ **Food Source Tracking** – currently accurate records are not being kept by most BOs recording the sources of food served. These records are needed to understand how FFSA fits in to the BOs sourcing to manage dependency, provide it with the ability to adapt its supply based on regional, organisational type or size needs. Smaller organisations and those in peri-urban and rural areas have less access to other food donor networks and are often less resourced. The more FFSA understands about how it fits into the broader food provision ecosystem, the more sophisticated it can become in creating impact with its resources.

→ **Total Cost Accounting** – as most BOs do not know what their total costs per meals are it is currently not possible for FFSA to understand feeding efficiency. This can be addressed by providing a simple tool online to help BOs understand what should be accounted for when measuring the costs of each meal served and then require them to report on this with annual verification of the costs reported.

→ **Meal Quality** – within the current reporting system FFSA has a limited understanding of the nutritional value of BO meals. Providing nutritional guidelines to the BOs and requesting it report on the average contents and size of the meals served will provide FFSA with a tool to distinguish the quality of nutritional value its BOs provide.

→ **Meritocracy** – as the cost per meal and quality of meals served are poorly understood, FFSA cannot fine tune its food allocation system toward those organisations that achieve better cost efficiency and quality to their beneficiaries. Although FFSA considers multiple factors in determining who its supports, this will allow it to both fine tune its allocation and enhance the impact it makes by rewarding BOs that perform best on these metrics.

→ **Impact Reporting** – as most BOs do not have a sophisticated understanding of their own impact, FFSA is limited in what it can understand about its own impact. Meals and people served is a blunt tool for understanding the value of FFSA food
contributions. To address this, FFSA can provide a simple online tool for all its BOs to use to develop impact metrics and ways to monitor them that are not overly taxing and can be applicable across the organisational maturity spectrum. FFSA can then require its BOs to measure and report on a broader range of impact metrics both about the food they provide, but also the other social services food enables.

→ **Donation Tracking** – as 25% of BOs donate FFSA food to other organisations on an ad hoc or on-going basis tracking what happens to this food, who is feed and how many meals are provided will provide additional impact metrics that are relevant for FFSA to track. This can be required of all BOs to monitor and provide feedback on quarterly or on an annual basis.

In summary, this report is evidence of the critical value FoodForward SA provides to addressing the food security crisis in South Africa. Addressing some of the limitation highlighted and recommendation made, will position the organisation to exponential increase, measure and monitor the impact it is making.