Food Distribution Programme for Europe's Most Deprived People

Results of the online consultation
INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background

The scheme to distribute free food to the most deprived persons in the Community (referred to here as “the MDP”) was launched in the exceptionally cold winter of 1986/87, when the European Community's surplus stocks of food commodities were given to Member State charities for distribution to people in need. Following a positive response, the measure was formalised.

With the subsequent CAP reform process intervention stocks, on which the Programme is based, are increasingly a thing of the past, making it necessary to examine options for the programme's future and propose a renewed regulation.

In line with the Commission's approach to better policy and law making, the legal proposal must be accompanied by an Impact Assessment, with the aim of examining options for the scheme's future. In order to ensure input from everyone concerned by the measure, the Impact Assessment process has included a broad consultation process with experts from charitable organisations and Member State services, as well as a public consultation. These consultations and meetings held during the assessment are an integral part of the process.

The public consultation took the form of an internet questionnaire asking for feedback on a number of key questions. It was open to everyone and available in the 22 EU languages, from 14 March to 14 May 2008, the closing date of the consultation.

In addition to the questionnaire, a functional mailbox was opened, where organisations or individuals wishing to contribute more detailed comments on the scheme and its future could send their observations. These more extensive comments were taken into consideration in the final report of the IA and are summarised, where appropriate, at the end of this document.

1.2. Questionnaire representativeness and limitations

The questionnaire aimed to give all stakeholders (citizens, NGOs, national administrations or agencies) the possibility to express their opinions and concerns. 12,522 responses were received, which represents a very wide participation.

There are important limitations in the representativeness of the answers. Respondents obviously had to be aware of the consultation and had to have internet access and the ability to fill in the questionnaire. However, the consultation was announced on the Europa website "Your Voice in Europe"1 and by a press release2.

A particular caveat is that the background of the respondents cannot be checked (e.g. a respondent could claim to represent an organisation without this being the case). Moreover, it would in theory be possible for one person to fill in the questionnaire several times.

1 http://ec.europa.eu/yourvoice/index_en.htm

2 Reference: IP/08/462, Date: 19/03/2008
An important bias is the different number of answers coming from each Member State. 74.7% of the answers come from Italy and 13.3% from France. The remaining 12% of the answers are shared between 25 MS. In order to ensure that this bias does not radically change the outcome of the questionnaire, disaggregated results are presented in the analysis.

A conscious effort was made to keep the questions relatively simple. No explicit allusion was made to the technical options and scenarios evaluated in the Impact Assessment. As a result, the rate of "Don't know" answers was very low (0 to 2% of the respondents for each question). This can be regarded as a positive outcome of the questionnaire.

1.3. Remarks on the report

This report sets out the views of the organisations and individuals who answered the questionnaire; it does not comment as to whether the Commission agrees or disagrees with the answers. It represents one of a number of documents resulting from the overall consultation process of stakeholders concerning the review of the Food Aid Programme for the Most Deprived. The report's aim is to highlight the main tendencies and concerns of each category. In view of the various limitations described, the report avoids any over-interpretation of the results.

All the questions were "closed". The responses are described in the following section by graphs which show the relative share of each different possible answer.
2. **THE RESPONDENTS (QUESTIONS 1-5)**

2.1. **Background of respondents (type - organisation)**

In total there were 12 522 replies to the questionnaire.

![Graph showing respondents by type](image)

More than 2000 people replied on behalf of an organisation or institution. In a number of cases different answers came from the same organisation, as many large social NGOs can have up to several thousand centres in the same MS (Red Cross, European Federation of Food Banks...).

When France and Italy are excluded, the proportions are relatively different: the rate of answers on behalf of organisations increases to 40%.

It appears that in most MS it is mainly the NGOs and the institutions more or less concerned by the Programme that have replied to the questionnaire, whereas in Italy and
France a wider public has participated, maybe as a result of more extensive publicity and mobilisation by stakeholders.

What is your age group?

![Bar chart showing age groups and participation counts.]

- **Total**
- **Excluding France and Italy**

1. Under 20: 0
2. 21-35: 50
3. 36-50: 100
4. 51-65: 150
5. Over 65: 200

Total: 500
Excluding France and Italy: 50
2.2. Nationality of the respondents

The majority of the respondents are from Italy (nearly 75% of the total) and France (more than 13% of the total). The other main countries of residence of the respondents are Poland (2.4%), Portugal (2.3%) and Belgium (1.1%). 75 answers were received from respondents residing outside the EU, 19 of which replied on behalf of an institution.

It is noteworthy that the MS with the highest participation in the online consultation are also the main recipients of the EU budget (with the notable exception of Spain and Greece). Only 165 replies were received from MS not participating in the scheme (i.e.1.3%).
2.3. Respondents' connection with the Programme

To the questions:

- Have you heard of the European Union's food aid programme for the most deprived people living in the European Union?

73.3% of the respondents answered YES (9176 replies)
12.1% of the respondents answered NO (1517 replies).

The respondent's nationality has no bearing on their awareness of the Programme's existence.

Most of the respondents are familiar with the scheme. It can be assumed that they are in some way involved in social initiatives or active in the social sector, as the current Programme is not widely known by the general public. However, the number of people who did not know about the Programme before answering the questionnaire (more than 1500) is significant.

- Have you, or has the organisation you represent, ever benefited from the European Union food aid programme for the most deprived persons?

Total:
75.3% of the respondents answered NO (9429 replies)
21.7% of the respondents answered YES (2722 replies).

Without France and Italy:
52.7% of the respondents answered NO (793 replies)
44.3% of the respondents answered YES (667 replies).

A high rate of people claimed to have already benefited from the scheme, which confirms the previous assumption of a wider participation by people active in the social sector. This can be regarded as normal, as this kind of public consultation always mobilises first the people concerned by the policy in question.

This is even more relevant when France and Italy are excluded. It confirms the impression that in these two MS a more diversified public participated compared with the other MS.
3. **KEY QUESTIONS**

3.1. **Question 6:**

The European Community is committed to supporting and complementing the activities of the Member States in "combating social exclusion" and "improving public health". Do you agree that these are important tasks for Europe and that food aid to the most deprived people in Member States can contribute?

The replies are very homogeneous: about 98% consider that social inclusion and the improvement of public health are valid objectives for Europe and that the Food Aid Programme for the Most Deprived can contribute.
3.2. Question 7:

*It has been said that "Food security is the most vital of all basic needs. Food insecurity undermines people's ability to learn, work and make progress on other fronts" (L.J.A Mougeot). Do you agree?*

Once again, the quasi totality of the respondents agrees. They recognise the importance of ensuring food security for everybody.
3.3. Question 8:

Do you think public administrations in each Member State have a duty to ensure that all their citizens have adequate food?

Following on from the previous question, 97% of the respondents consider that ensuring an adequate supply of food to all their citizens is a basic need that must be guaranteed by each MS.
3.4. Question 9:

*Is it appropriate for the European Union to support Member States in ensuring that all EU citizens have enough to eat?*

98% support EU action to complement MS food supply initiatives and policies.
3.5. Question 10:

In view of the growing problems of obesity and unhealthy eating habits, should a future Food Aid Programme for deprived people pay special attention to the nutritional value of the food provided by the Programme?

Though a large majority (about 80%) agreed that food distribution should have a nutritional dimension, about 7% of the respondents expressed reservations or opposed this idea. There could be a number of explanations:

– They might consider that the quality of the distribution comes after the quantity, particularly in the context of food deprivation.

– They might consider that it is not the responsibility of an administration to choose the appropriate food distribution.

– They might be afraid of potential discrimination against some products under the pretext of food quality choice.
3.6. Question 11:

Up to now, the EU's food aid programme for the European Union’s most deprived people has depended on surplus food stocks. Thanks to the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, surplus stocks have practically disappeared. Therefore, do you think the programme should be:

1: Phased out gradually as intervention stocks disappear
2: Continued but on the basis of food purchases
3: Expanded and linked with other EU initiatives to combat social exclusion
4: Cancelled immediately
5: Don't know

A very large majority of respondents are in favour of the Programme's continuation (answers 2 and 3). However, an important difference is seen when France and Italy are taken into account. The total results show a strong preference for the continuation of
distribution on the basis of food purchases; when France and Italy are excluded the situation looks different, with results being balanced between the second and third choices, i.e. "continued on the basis of food purchases" and "The expansion to other EU initiatives to combat social exclusion".

The difference in opinion regarding this question is also observable among the organisations that responded and among individual MS.
3.7. Question 12:

Should the EU target its support, to ensure that deprived people belonging to specific age groups or social categories have access to the healthy food they need (more than one answer possible)

A very clear majority of respondents considered that all deprived people should be helped. No explanation can be offered concerning the differences observed between the other possible populations that should be helped.
3.8. Question 13:

Would it be appropriate to introduce a European food voucher system to ensure that low-income families and children have access to a healthy diet? For example, eligible households could be provided with an electronic EU debit card, valid for a certain amount each month, with which they would be able to purchase a specified range of food.

Question 13 also saw variations in the answers of Italy and France compared with the other MS. Overall "No" was the most frequent reply. While 67% of the total opposed a voucher system, only 52% were against it if the two main contributing MS are excluded. Moreover, France and Italy were more categorical in their response (more "No, definitely
not" answers). This could be the result of a mobilisation by some charities in favour of a specific answer.

4. **DIFFERENCES IN ANSWERS FROM DIFFERENT TYPES OF RESPONDENT**

This section looks at the extent to which answers differ between certain categories of respondent. In particular, three groups of respondent were identified:

- Individual respondents v. replies representing an organisation
- Residents of a participating Member State v. a non-participating Member State
- Respondents familiar with the Programme v. with no previous awareness.

4.1. **Individuals compared with organisations**

From the total of 12,808 completed questionnaires, 10,502 (i.e. 82%) were submitted by individuals and 2,020 were completed on behalf of an organisation. Perhaps unsurprisingly, individuals showed less familiarity with the Programme than respondents representing an organisation.

There was a major difference between individuals and organisations concerning their relationship with the Programme: while the majority of replies from organisations said they had benefited at least once from the programme (71.1%) only 12% of individual respondents said they had directly benefited from it.

In terms of the importance of the Food Aid Programme in combating social exclusion, improving public health and recognising the negative effects of food insecurity on society, both groups of respondents coincide in their evaluation. The same applies to the need for an EU initiative, on which individuals and organisations alike agreed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 4.1: Opinion on the Future of the Programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisations</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cancelled immediately:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phased out gradually as intervention stocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individuals</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Cancelled immediately:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Phased out gradually as intervention stocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Don't know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Expanded and linked with other EU initiatives to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combat social exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Continued but on the basis of food purchases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opinions on the future of the MDP are shown in Chart 4.1. **Individual respondents clearly expressed their preference for continuation of the programme with the use**
of market purchases (66%) whereas organisations, as well as the market purchases option, also showed considerable support for the possibility of linking the Programme to other EU initiatives to combat social exclusion (45%).

4.2. Residents in participating Member States compared with non-participating Member States

Of the 12,809 replies received, only 165 were from people living in Member States not currently participating in the Programme. In other words, 96% of the questionnaires were completed by residents of the participating MS. Most of the replies from non-participating Member States came from Germany (33%) and the United Kingdom (29%).

As might be expected, the replies from non-participating MS showed less familiarity with the programme (27.3%) compared with respondents from participating MS (11.8%).

Despite the fact that most of the respondents from non-participating MS have never benefited from the programme, their attitude towards the role of food aid in combating social exclusion and improving public health is similar to that expressed by residents of the participating MS. In the same way, both groups shared the same positive opinion concerning the importance of public administrations ensuring food security. Moreover, respondents from non-participating countries expressed a similar level of agreement concerning the EU’s role in supporting MS to ensure food security.

Regarding the growing problems of obesity and unhealthy eating habits, around 30% of the participating group of respondents do not support the idea of paying special attention to the nutritional value of the food aid provided by the MDP, unlike non-participating MS respondents, 80% of whom consider the nutritional value to be important (as shown in Chart 4.2).

Interestingly, opinions on the future of the food aid programme show almost no difference between the two groups of respondents (Chart 4.3). 61% of respondents
from non-participating MS agree that the Programme should continue on the basis of food purchases, an opinion shared by 64% of the participating MS respondents.

Concerning a possible voucher system, there was no major difference between the negative opinions expressed by the two groups of respondents.

Concerning the key questions, it is possible to conclude that respondents from non-participating Member States share similar opinions as those expressed by respondents from participating MS.

4.3. Differences between respondents informed and not informed about the Most Deprived Food Aid Programme

On the basis of replies received to the questionnaire, the public’s familiarity with the MDP is fairly good; 73% of respondents - independent of nationality - claimed to have heard about the EU’s Food Aid Programme, whereas 12% were previously unaware of the Programme’s existence.
There was no major difference of opinion between the two groups of respondents concerning the role of the state in combating social exclusion and the importance of EU support to the MS in providing food aid.

Regarding the Programme’s future (Chart 4.4) the preferred alternative of respondents with a low familiarity with the MDP was Expansion and connection of the Programme with other EU initiatives to combat social exclusion (49.3% of respondents) while respondents familiar with the Programme showed a preference for the Programme continuing on the basis of market purchases (64.7% of respondents).

Concerning food distribution by means of vouchers, there was a slight difference between the two groups of respondents. Whereas almost 70% of respondents with a familiarity with the MDP clearly expressed their opposition to a possible voucher system, 37% of the uninformed respondents were in favour of vouchers (52% were against).

5. CONCLUSIONS - LESSONS FOR THE EU PROPOSAL ON A RENEWED MDP

- Respondents (Questions 1 to 5)

The response to the questionnaire was very high, reflecting the great interest the European public has in this programme and its future. More than 1,200 replies were received, about 2,000 of which were from organisations or institutions.

Participation was particularly high from two MS - Italy (more than 9,300) and France (more than 1,600) - probably thanks to a strong mobilisation of the public and NGO networks by some organisations in these countries. Except in a few cases, the answers from these two MS have not biased the overall results, in that they did not differ substantially to the replies received from other MS.

A high percentage of respondents had already benefited from the scheme (44% excluding France and Italy) and an even higher rate already knew about it (73%), confirming that
charity networks had probably mobilised respondents to express their views concerning the Programme.

Respondents from non-participating MS showed similar concerns as the others. Prior knowledge of the Programme's existence appears not to have substantially affected the results of the questionnaire and from this it could be supposed that the main ideas formulated in the key questions of the online consultation are supported by a wider public.

- **Objectives of EU support (Questions 6 and 7)**

The objectives of the Programme are clear for the respondents. Almost all recognise the importance of ensuring food security for everybody and consider that social inclusion, as well as the improvement of public health, should be associated objectives of the food aid programme.

- **Need for action (Question 8)**

Almost all the respondents also agree with the need for action to ensure that adequate food supplies are guaranteed to European citizens by the MS.

- **Subsidiarity (Question 9)**

Almost all respondents (98%) support EU action to complement MS food supply initiatives and policies.

- **Type of distribution (Questions 10, 12 and 13)**

A large majority of the respondents (about 80%) think that a future MDP should take account of the nutritional value of the food distributed.

In general they do not think that a specific population should be targeted but indicate that all deprived people should be helped.

As a whole, respondents would not support a voucher-based food distribution system. However, differences exist between MS: in particular, opposition to this type of system is much higher in Italy and France than in the other MS. From another perspective, acceptance of a voucher system is higher among the group of less informed respondents, i.e. those who state that they have no personal experience of the MDP.

- **Continuation of a food programme (Question 11)**

A very big majority of respondents are in favour of the Programme’s continuation. If replies from France and Italy are included, the clear preference is for the MDP’s continuation on the basis of food purchases. If France and Italy are removed from the reckoning the answer is more balanced between this option and that of expanding the programme and linking it with other EU initiatives to combat social exclusion. This attests to the differences of opinions regarding this question, both among charities and Member States.
APPENDIX: FULL RESULTS OF THE INTERNET CONSULTATION

Response statistics for Internet Consultation -
The Future of the "Most Deprived Persons Food Distribution"
Programme:
call for contributions to an internet consultation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date open</td>
<td>2008-03-12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End date</td>
<td>2008-05-31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are 12522 responses matching your criteria of a total of 12684 records in the current set of data.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Search criteria
Creation date between 01/01/2008 AND 14/05/2008

Meta Information

1. YOUR PROFILE

1. Are you replying:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. As an individual…</td>
<td>10502 (83.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. On behalf of an organisation or institution…</td>
<td>2020 (16.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. In which country do you live?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IT - Italy</td>
<td>9354 (74.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR - France</td>
<td>1662 (13.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL - Poland</td>
<td>305 (2.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT - Portugal</td>
<td>286 (2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE - Belgium</td>
<td>133 (1.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HU - Hungary</td>
<td>108 (0.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LU - Luxembourg</td>
<td>80 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>75 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI - Finland</td>
<td>72 (0.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE - Germany</td>
<td>55 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV - Latvia</td>
<td>55 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LT - Lithuania</td>
<td>50 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK - United Kingdom</td>
<td>48 (0.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SI - Slovenia</td>
<td>42 (0.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES - Spain</td>
<td>31 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RO - Romania</td>
<td>30 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MT - Malta</td>
<td>28 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NL - Netherlands</td>
<td>24 (0.2%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. What is your age group?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>36-50</td>
<td>4850</td>
<td>(38.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-35</td>
<td>3392</td>
<td>(27.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-65</td>
<td>2784</td>
<td>(22.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>553</td>
<td>(4.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>(2.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Have you heard of the European Union’s food aid programme for the most deprived people living in the European Union?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9176</td>
<td>(73.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>(12.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>(4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>(1.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Have you, or has the organisation you represent, ever benefited from the European Union food aid programme for the most deprived persons?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>9429</td>
<td>(75.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2722</td>
<td>(21.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>(3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Key questions

6. The European Community is committed to supporting and complementing the activities of the Member States in “combating social exclusion” and “improving public health”. Do you agree that these are important tasks for Europe and that food aid to the most deprived people in Member States can contribute?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much</td>
<td>10023</td>
<td>(80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2251</td>
<td>(18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. It has been said that "Food security is the most vital of all basic needs. Food insecurity undermines people's ability to learn, work and make progress on other fronts" (L.J.A Mougeot). Do you agree?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, very much</td>
<td>9230</td>
<td>(73.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2862</td>
<td>(22.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>(2.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>(0.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. Do you think public administrations in each Member State have a duty to ensure that all their citizens have adequate food?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>10881</td>
<td>(86.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>1279</td>
<td>(10.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>(1.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>(0.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know…</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Is it appropriate for the European Union to support Member States in ensuring that all EU citizens have enough to eat?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>11049</td>
<td>(88.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, probably</td>
<td>1220</td>
<td>(9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>(1.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>(0.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>(0.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. In view of the growing problems of obesity and unhealthy eating habits, should a future Food Aid Programme for deprived people pay special attention to the nutritional value of the food provided by the Programme?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>6469</td>
<td>(51.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3480</td>
<td>(27.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>(11.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>709</td>
<td>(5.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>(1.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No, definitely not</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>(1.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Up to now, the EU's food aid programme for the European Union's most deprived people has depended on surplus food stocks. Thanks to the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, surplus stocks have practically disappeared. Therefore, do you think the programme should be:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>(0.3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12. Should the EU target its support, to ensure that deprived people belonging to specific age groups or social categories have access to the healthy food they need (more than one answer possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, all deprived people should be helped</td>
<td>10271</td>
<td>(82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-school age children</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>(10.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-age children</td>
<td>1183</td>
<td>(9.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older people (over 70)</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>(8.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless people</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>(5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single parents</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>(3.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Would it be appropriate to introduce a European food voucher system to ensure that low-income families and children have access to a healthy diet? For example, eligible households could be provided with an electronic EU debit card, valid for a certain amount each month, with which they would be able to purchase a specified range of food.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Number of requested records</th>
<th>% of total number records</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, definitely not</td>
<td>7378</td>
<td>(58.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, definitely</td>
<td>1773</td>
<td>(14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>(9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1003</td>
<td>(8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perhaps</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>(7.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't know</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX: SELECTED CONTRIBUTIONS RECEIVED IN COMPLEMENT TO QUESTIONNAIRE


"Nous avons répondu à la consultation par Internet sur le futur du programme de distribution de denrées alimentaires aux personnes les plus démunies. Nous aimerions, comme vous nous l’avez proposé, apporter quelques commentaires complémentaires, et plus particulièrement sur les questions 11 et 13.

Complément à la question 11

Il ne nous semble en effet pas réaliste aujourd’hui de baser uniquement un programme d’aide alimentaire sur la disponibilité d’excédents ; l’expérience montre aussi qu’il ne faut pas en évacuer la possibilité et qu’il faut pouvoir en disposer lorsqu’ils existent. L’achat de produits finis devient une procédure nécessaire et plus productive en général, d’autant qu’elle n’exclut pas la possibilité d’initiatives particulières du type lait, fruits et légumes dans les écoles.

Dans cette optique il ne serait pas illogique de pluri-annualiser le programme européen d’aide alimentaire aux plus démunis.

Complément à la question 13

La mise en place d’un système de bons alimentaires ne nous semble pas répondre à la double nécessité :

– d’accompagner les familles dans leur recherche d’une plus grande autonomie
– de fournir des aides alimentaires répondant aux impératifs nutritionnel spécifiques (parents isolés, sans abris,…)

De plus, les procédures nécessaires à la mise en place et le fonctionnement du système des bons alimentaires nous paraissent d’une très grande complexité.

Cette dernière réflexion nous amène à redire la nécessité d’utiliser la grande expertise des réseaux existants en matière de distribution d’aide alimentaire en nature et de mettre en place des systèmes de contrôle efficaces et adaptés ou à la portée de ces réseaux de bénévoles au service des plus démunis et des plus démunis eux-mêmes."

Contribution from Banque alimentaire du Finistère

"Nous avons répondu à la consultation par Internet sur le futur du programme de distribution de denrées alimentaires aux personnes les plus démunies. Nous aimerions, comme vous nous l’avez proposé, apporter quelques commentaires complémentaires, et plus particulièrement sur les questions 11 et 13.

Complément à la question 11
Il ne serait pas illogique de pluri-annualiser le programme européen d’aide alimentaire aux plus démunis.

**Complément à la question 13**

Il utiliser la grande expertise des réseaux existants en matière de distribution d’aide alimentaire en nature et mettre en place des systèmes de contrôle efficaces et adaptés."

**Contribution from Federação Portuguesa dos Bancos Alimentares Contra a Fome, Confederação dos Agricultores de Portugal, Centro SOLVIT Portugal**


**Complemento à pergunta 11**

Não nos parece realista actualmente que seja basear um programa de ajuda alimentar unicamente na disponibilidade de excedentes agrícolas. A experiência demonstra também que não devemos eliminar essa possibilidade, sendo indispensável poder dispor desses excedentes sempre que existam. A aquisição de produtos transformados torna-se assim um procedimento necessário e, em geral, mais produtivo, tanto mais quanto essa aquisição não exclui a possibilidade de iniciativas particulares como o caso da distribuição de leite, fruta ou legumes nas escolas.

Nesta óptica, não seria descabido apresentar dados por mais de um ano do programa europeu de ajuda alimentar aos mais necessitados.

**Complemento à pergunta 13**

A implementação de um sistema de vales alimentares não nos parece responder à dupla necessidade de:

- acompanhar as famílias na busca de uma maior autonomia;
- fornecer ajuda alimentar respondendo aos imperativos nutricionais específicos (famílias mono parentais, idosos, sem-abrigo, ...).

Além do mais, os procedimentos necessários à instituição e funcionamento do sistema de vales alimentares parecem-nos de extrema complexidade.

Esta última reflexão leva-nos a reiterar a necessidade de utilizar a grande experiência das redes existentes em matéria de distribuição de ajuda alimentar em produtos e de implementar sistemas de controlo eficazes e adaptados ou alcance destas redes de voluntários ao serviço das pessoas mais necessitadas."

**Contribution from Banco Alimentar Contra a Fome / Aveiro – Portugal**

"O programa de ajuda alimentar deve ter como objectivo proporcionar aos carenciados uma alimentação saudável e digna da sua qualidade de pessoa humana.

Não se pode resumir na disponibilidade de excedentes agrícolas, pois quando estes não existirem deve-se proceder por verbas próprias, à aquisição de produtos transformados
que lhes permita usufruir, como anteriormente já foi enumerado, de uma alimentação saudável e digna.

A implementação de um sistema de vales, julgamos ser um sistema que exige um controlo muito apertado e sujeito a muitas fugas transformando, à posteriori, com conivência de fornecedores, os produtos recebidos por outros não aconselháveis e que não conduziam a uma alimentação saudável. O acompanhamento familiar igualmente se realizaria com menos oportunidade.

Atentamente .."

**Contribution from Associação Nun'Álvares de Campanhã**

"Somos uma IPSS da cidade do Porto, situados numa freguesia (Campanhã) onde as carencias alimentares e a outros níveis são enormes.

A resposta que demos ao questionário, via internet, sobre "O futuro do programa de distribuição de alimentos para pessoas carenciadas" merece-nos o seguinte comentário:

Pensamos que a distribuição de produtos transformados é um procedimento necessário, até essencial, não descartando os excedentes agrícolas.

Relativamente aos vales alimentares, não nos parece que seja esta uma solução mais viável, uma vez que a experiência no terreno diz-nos que qualquer ajuda que não seja com os próprios bens alimentares é desviada para outras situações.

Não iria de forma nenhuma ajudar as famílias carenciadas.

Toda esta problemática deverá ser articulada com quem no terreno tem conhecimento capaz e experiência nestas situações, ou seja, os Bancos Alimentares contra a Fome.

Melhores cumprimentos...

**Contribution from Pela Associação Auxílio e Amizade**

"A Associação Auxílio e Amizade, IPSS sediada em Lisboa, Portugal, dentro do âmbito que é a sua razão de existência, o auxílio a famílias carenciadas da área de Lisboa, e respondendo ao apelo feito pelo Banco Alimentar Contra a Fome, na resposta à consulta via internet, gostaríamos de acrescentar algo mais, relativo ao âmbito das perguntas 11 e 13.

Não nos parece de todo realista, basear um programa de ajuda alimentar unicamente nas disponibilidades de excedentes agrícolas. A experiência tem demonstrado também que não devemos eliminar essa possibilidade, sendo indispensável poder dispor desses excedentes sempre que existam.

A aquisição de produtos transformados torna-se pois um procedimento necessário, e de uma maneira geral, mais produtivo, tanto mais quando essa aquisição não exclui a possibilidade de iniciativas particulares como o caso da distribuição de leite, fruta e legumes nas escolas.

Quanto à implementação de um sistema de vales alimentares, não nos parece responder à dupla necessidade: de por um lado acompanhar as famílias no sentido de as ajudar a
caminhar para uma maior autonomia; e por outro lado, fornecer ajuda alimentar respondendo aos imperativos nutricionais específicos consoante os casos (idosos, crianças, famílias mono parentais, sem-abrigo, etc.).

Cremos por outro lado, que todo um sistema de vales alimentares, seria de tal modo complexo e burocrático, que não iria permitir alcançar eficazmente os propósitos para que são pensados.

Julgamos ser de suma importância não esquecer o papel fundamental das redes de ajuda existentes, que com o seu conhecimento prático das realidades que se vivem em cada local, com o seu partilhar de experiências, com a rede de voluntários que movimentam, poderão desenvolver um trabalho mais eficaz e profícuo nesta distribuição de ajudas alimentares aos mais carenciados.

É importante que aqueles que estão por detrás de uma secretária, encerrados num gabinete, do alto de um edifício, onde felizmente as necessidades alimentares e outras não se fazem sentir, não percam a noção da realidade, não esqueçam os milhares de seres humanos, homens, mulheres, crianças e jovens, que todos os dias acordam e se deitam com FOME. É obrigação dos mais favorecidos, contribuirem para erradicar os males do mundo, e se muitos deles não estão nas nossas mãos acabarem hoje ou amanhã, não é de todo admissível que em pleno século XXI, ainda haja fome, ainda se morra de fome, ainda nas ruas e cidades da nossa velha Europa, se arrastem concidadãos, implorando um pouco de pão para esconder a fome, tantos lares, onde a fome e a necessidade marcam presença diária, tantas crianças crescendo sem a conveniente alimentação.

Existe uma visão muito economicista das sociedades actuais, tudo é redutível a números, a estatísticas, a taxas. Mas o Homem é muito mais do que isso, é preciso dignificá-lo, é preciso ajudá-lo a CRESCER, é preciso que cada um de nós face a sua quota parte, e é preciso que aqueles que têm o poder de decisão, se lembrem de todos e não só de alguns.

Estamos a construir o futuro, estamos a preparar o mundo para as gerações do amanhã, que exemplos lhes queremos deixar? Era bom que todos meditassem nisso, e que no fim de cada dia, nos inquiríssemos, sobre o que fizemos de positivo para ajudar a modificar a sociedade em que estamos integrados. A acção de cada um pode passar despercebida, mas multiplicada por milhares, milhões, pode fazer toda a diferença. 

**Contribution from FEANTSA – Fédération Européenne d’Associations Nationales Travaillant avec les Sans-Abris (see next page)**
FEANTSA Response to the Internet consultation on
The Future of the “Most Deprived Food Distribution” Programme

FEANTSA is the European Federation of National Organisations working with People who are Homeless. It is a European NGO that brings together over 100 member organisations in almost 30 European countries and represents the service provider sector working with people who are homeless across a range of areas and needs (more details on FEANTSA mission, structure and activities can be found at: www.feantsa.org).

Based on its expertise and area of activities, FEANTSA’s contribution will focus only on specific questions of the online consultation, as appropriate.

4. Have you heard of the European Union’s food aid programme for the most deprived people living in the European Union?

Yes, FEANTSA was aware of the programme. However, not all our members knew about it, although they are aware of free food schemes in their own country.

5. Have you, or has the organisation you represent, ever benefited from the European Union food aid programme for the most deprived persons?

FEANTSA as such has never benefited from the EU food aid programme for the most deprived persons, as its main strands of work are: lobbying and policy work at European and national level; transnational exchange and networking; and research (European Observatory on Homelessness).

6. The European Community is committed to supporting and complementing the activities of the Member States in “combating social exclusion” and “improving public health”. Do you agree that these are important tasks for Europe and that food aid to the most deprived people in Member States can contribute?

FEANTSA agrees that the EU has an important role to play, together with Member States, to combat social exclusion, improve public health and ensure that everyone’s basic needs are met.

In this context, FEANTSA agrees that the free distribution of food to the most deprived can contribute to these aims. However, it is important to stress in this context that food distribution should be seen as an emergency answer to a situation, which should remain exceptional and temporary. Meeting food needs of excluded and deprived people should be seen as a first step towards their full reintegration into society. In general terms, employment and social policy measures should ensure that anyone has access to sufficient resources and support, for him/her to provide for his/her basic needs and those of his/her family, including food.

Food banks and free food distribution services are useful and necessary. However, they need to be complemented with and backed by appropriate policy measures, including adequate resources, capable of breaking the circle of extreme poverty and exclusion. In some countries, such as Spain, people who access free meals distribution services are given an appointment with a social worker within three days, in order to discuss their overall situation and see what steps can be taken to overcome the difficulties they are faced with. Also, children are not allowed into free food distribution services and are directly referred to the appropriate public service responsible for their welfare, which will find appropriate solutions. This aims at avoiding the risk of marginalisation and further exclusion at an early stage.

Similarly, emergency services aimed at people who are homeless are necessary and should be seen as a first temporary step enabling users to move forward towards full reintegration into society.

FEANTSA is supported financially by the European Commission
The views expressed herein are those of the author(s) and the Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained herein.
7. It has been said that “Food security is the most vital of all basic needs. Food insecurity undermines people’s ability to learn, work and make progress on other fronts” (L.J.A Mougeot). Do you agree?

There is evidence that malnutrition is an issue among people who are homeless, especially those faced with street homelessness. Of course, food security is a vital basic need, as the alternative is mere survival or starvation. However, FEANTSA would like to stress that food provision is not sufficient and that individual needs should be looked at in a much broader perspective, as fundamental human rights are interlinked. Access to a secure place to live, to health or to employment is crucial to anyone’s ability to live a life in dignity. The provision of free food should be seen as a first step in a process. It needs to be part of broader and long term policy framework, which aims at the full integration and participation of individuals in society.

In this context, one problem with free food distribution schemes is that in many countries, the way food is distributed contributes to add to the stigmatisation of the most deprived, especially if there is no perspective for them to move forward to mainstream channels of food provision.

8. Do you think public administrations in each Member State have a duty to ensure that all their citizens have adequate food?

FEANTSA believes that anyone has a right to adequate food.

9. Is it appropriate for the European Union to support Member States in ensuring that all EU citizens have enough to eat?

Yes. As mentioned above, food distribution should be part of a broader policy answer to extreme poverty and deprivation.

10. In view of the growing problems of obesity and unhealthy eating habits, should a future Food Aid Programme for deprived people pay special attention to the nutritional value of the food provided by the Programme?

FEANTSA believes that this is important, as good nutrition contributes to good health, which is a key determinant for individual well being and participation in society. It can be said that ill health conditions can be both the cause and result of social and housing exclusion. Moreover, accessing health care services is often very problematic for people who are homeless, including as a result of stigmatisation, and may imply very late recourse to care.

There is an increasing number of examples of good practice across Europe of healthy eating initiatives in low-income communities and of provision of healthy food within homeless services. The reintegration process can also be linked to the preparation of healthy meals for the whole community.

Also, environmental considerations should be taken into account when designing specific programmes.

11. Up to now, the EU’s food aid programme for the European Union’s most deprived people has depended on surplus food stocks. Thanks to the reform of the Common Agricultural Policy, surplus stocks have practically disappeared. Therefore, do you think the programme should be:

- Phased out gradually as intervention stocks disappear
- Expanded and linked with other EU initiatives to combat social exclusion
- Don’t know
- Continued but on the basis of food purchases
- Cancelled immediately.

In general, FEANTSA thinks that food deprivation is very often an element of extreme poverty and social exclusion, including homelessness. These are complex and multifaceted realities, which are partially but not exclusively linked to the lack of adequate resources. Therefore, there is no single or simple solution: extreme poverty and exclusion can be addressed effectively only as part of a wider holistic strategy.
In this context, we feel that the EU’s food aid programme for the most deprived people should not only depend on the availability of surplus stocks, but should be more structurally linked to a broader policy framework, both at EU and Member State level.

12. Should the EU target its support, to ensure that deprived people belonging to specific age groups or social categories have access to the healthy food they need (more than one answer possible):
- Pre-school age children
- Single parents
- Homeless people
- School-age children
- Older people (over 70)
- No, all deprived people should be helped.

FEANTSA believes that the programme should target those most in need. Anyone should be able to enjoy his/her fundamental human rights and see his/her basic needs met. When available resources are limited, the urgency of the need should help setting the priorities, in terms of who should be supported first.

13. Would it be appropriate to introduce a European food voucher system to ensure that low-income families and children have access to a healthy diet? For example, eligible households could be provided with an electronic EU debit card, valid for a certain amount each month, with which they would be able to purchase a specified range of food.

FEANTSA feels that this can be an option in those countries where there is already a voucher system open to the whole population, irrespective of their level of income (see for instance Belgium). In other countries however, vouchers might be seen as a measure only aimed at specific groups of the population, such as people who are identified as poor and who risk further stigmatisation when using them. The implications of such a measure should be assessed.

Also, it is important to keep in mind that the administrative procedure for the delivery of the vouchers can be extremely problematic for people who are the most vulnerable and who don’t have a place to live, such as people who are homeless.

To conclude, FEANTSA feels that food aid, although a necessary and useful tool to answer urgent basic needs, should be seen in a much broader framework. There is a need for integrated policies, which would have as a general objective to make sure that people are able to achieve food independence through the implementation of a range of appropriate policies. This should be taken into account when discussing the future of the EU’s food aid programme for the European Union’s most deprived people.

For more details, please contact Stefania.delzotto@feantsa.org.
Contribution from “Healthy Food for All” Initiative, Ireland

Healthy Food for All Initiative Response to Consultation on

“Future of the European Programme of Food Distribution to the Most Deprived Persons in the Community”

30th May 2008
1. Introduction
Healthy Food for All (HfFA) is a multi-agency initiative seeking to promote access, availability and affordability of healthy food for low-income groups on the island of Ireland. The initiative sets out to demonstrate the relationship between food poverty and other policy concerns such as health inequalities, welfare adequacy, education disadvantage, food production and distribution, retail planning and food safety. It seeks to identify and galvanise interest in, and commitment to, eliminating food poverty through raising public awareness, policy advocacy, promotion of best practice models and networking local initiatives with national structures.

In response to the invitation issued by the European Commission to contribute to this consultation process, HfFA held a round-table event with a number of stakeholders on 22nd May 2008 (a list of attendees is contained in Appendix 1). The event was attended by representatives from government departments, statutory agencies, and non-governmental organisations. While the content of this submission was informed by the discussions at this event, the document represents the position of HfFA only.

In Ireland, the Department of Agriculture and Food undertakes the distribution of aid from the Programme to charitable organisations. Normally the Programme is limited to voluntary organisations providing emergency and short-term accommodation for people who are homeless, day-care centres that provide meals for people who are homeless or food banks.

To date there has been little consultation and dialogue at a national level in Ireland between the key stakeholders involved in the management and implementation of the scheme and the distribution agencies. This event served to address this vacuum by raising awareness about the public consultation process and promoting discussion and dialogue with key stakeholders around potential policy options for the Programme’s future.

2. Social rationale for food distribution scheme

Food poverty

There are clear links between income status and quality of diet in Ireland. People in the lower income deciles eat less fruit and vegetables; more processed foods

---

and consume more saturated fats. This same cohort is less likely to meet healthy eating guidelines even though they spend more on food as a proportion of their income. The 290,000 people living in consistent poverty in Ireland (7% of the population) can be seen to be at risk of food poverty. This means they are living on a low income and are deprived of one or more basic necessities, including various food-related items.

Among those who were income poor in 2005\textsuperscript{2}:

- 11% went without a substantial meal on at least one day in the past two weeks
- 11% were unable to afford a roast once a week
- 9% were unable to afford a meat dish every second day
- 30% were unable to afford to have family or friends around for a meal or drink once a month

Rising food costs

Ireland has the second highest food costs in Europe\textsuperscript{3} and there is evidence that food costs will rise in the future. Global factors such as climate change policies, sustained rises in energy prices, biofuel production, serious droughts, growing demands for meat and dairy in Asia, high grain prices have affected, and will continue to affect the cost of food.

Obesity

Research clearly demonstrates that people from disadvantaged backgrounds eat a less healthy diet and are less likely to participate in daily physical activity and therefore more prone to becoming overweight and obese. The prevalence of overweight and obesity among children in the EU population is estimated at 30% in 2006.\textsuperscript{4} In Ireland, the National Task Force on Obesity published in 2005\textsuperscript{5}, reported that 300,000 children in Ireland were overweight or obese and projected an annual increase of 10,000 per year on this figure.

Market failure

Infrastructural deficits impact disproportionately on poorer people who are living in poorly resourced locations where the type of food outlet available determines the availability and cost of food. It has been observed in research conducted in Ireland\textsuperscript{6}, that the larger multipies that have a greater choice of healthy affordable

\textsuperscript{2} http://www.cso.ie/releasespublications/documents/eu_silc/current/eusilc.pdf
\textsuperscript{3} http://app.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/cache/ITY_OFFPUB/EN/STAT_07-090-EN.pdf
\textsuperscript{4} http://ec.europa.eu/health/ph_determinants/life_style/nutrition/documents/nutrition_wp_en.pdf
\textsuperscript{5} http://www.dohc.ie/publications/pdf/report_taskforce_on_obesity.pdf?direct=1
(Combat Poverty Agency)
food, tend not to enter many regional or other similarly undesirable areas where the catchment market in the surrounding areas is deemed insufficient to justify their entry. In such areas, the ‘symbol’ category and independent retailer category cater for both ‘one stop’ and ‘convenience’ shoppers alike. For households in areas that are considered undesirable to enter by larger multiples, transport to and from supermarket/multiples – often located in out-of-town sites with poor or no public transport – is often not feasible. They are forced by their circumstances to shop close to their homes, usually in the aforementioned ‘symbol’ category of retail outlets or the garage forecourt type of outlet where healthy food is more expensive and less available.

3. Issues, opportunities and proposals

The Most Deprived Programme has played a very important role in securing food provision for Europe’s most deprived citizens for over 20 years and must remain in place. However, it is necessary to consider options for the future of the Programme given the disappearance of surplus interventions stocks.

The afore-mentioned round-table event organised by HFFA represented the first opportunity for many of the stakeholders to debate issues relevant to the proposed Programme. Some of the key discussion points were as follows:

Disappearance of surplus food

Surplus food distribution is a rational response to saving waste and providing food to those most in need, thereby producing a ‘win-win’ situation. However, while surplus food distribution is valuable for the part it plays in alleviating food poverty, among vulnerable groups it has the potential to institutionalise food poverty. In addition the Irish and European policy context within which surplus food distribution operates is lacking.

Direct role for NGOs in implementation of programme

There is a need for consistent dialogue and consultation between the Member State Governments and the NGOs responsible for distributing the aid. In addition, NGOs should have a key role in decisions related to the implementation of the Programme and the distribution of the aid.

HFFA would like to suggest that the Department of Agriculture and Food in Ireland establish an advisory group consisting of NGOs, Health Authorities and welfare agencies to oversee the administration of the Programme and the distribution of funds. Should the future of the Programme rely solely on market

---

7 In Ireland, the scheme is run at a basic level where only a portion of Ireland’s designated aid is drawn down yearly.
purchases, HFfA proposes that the funding be administered by the Commission to the Department of Agriculture and Food for direct distribution to charitable organisations who will have ultimate responsibility for purchasing the food for distribution. This type of administrative approach could also be applied to the proposed option of directing the money towards the establishment of Community Food Initiatives and ensures fair and effective consultation with NGOs. HFfA is not in favour of a voucher system as proposed in the Internet Consultation document.

Support for Community Food Initiatives

Given that surplus intervention stocks no longer exist and the future of the Programme is under review HFfA believes this is an opportune time to review the Programme in terms of the wider food poverty context and consider other potential policy options for improving access to and affordability of food for low-income households. Community Food Initiatives are a means by which local barriers to healthy eating can be addressed in a practical manner. They provide an excellent opportunity to combat food poverty in a local area, giving the power of choice and change back to local communities. They are also identified in Irish government policy as a means of addressing food access issues.

Community Food Initiatives:
- stimulate collective community action on food issues
- prioritise local issues
- involve people affected by poverty in identifying their own needs and developing responses
- increase awareness and knowledge of food issues within the local community
- support local social economy by training local people
- highlight inequalities with regard to access, affordability and availability of healthy food
- contribute to the health and well-being of people in the local area
- provide an alternative route to market for local producers and suppliers.

Examples of Community Food Initiatives include: Food growing projects, community cafes, food co-ops, and local food markets.

HFfA supports the funding of Community Food Initiatives as a proposed option for the future of the Programme in conjunction with market purchases. Responsibility for the dissemination of finances to fund the Programmes should

---

be the responsibility of the NGOs which will minimize any administrative burdens on the Commission and Member States.

Programme embedded in broader social inclusion context

HFfA proposes that the future of the Programme is embedded in a broader social inclusion context. The prevention and amelioration of food poverty requires attention to be directed to alleviating both socio-economic inequality and the reasons for socioeconomic variations in dietary behaviour. Different approaches are necessary for different situations. Hungry people require immediate material and practical assistance in order to avoid harm to their health and survival. Social inequality on the other hand relates to the gradients observed in dietary behaviour which, whilst not requiring immediate action for survival purposes, if left long term will lead to continuing social inequality in related health and social outcomes. Addressing these issues require the assembly of appropriate partnerships involving relevant DGs such as Health, Economic and Financial Affairs, Employment, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities, Regional Policy as well as representatives from European NGOs and Member States.

Please note: HFfA also submitted a response to the online Consultation questionnaire.
Appendix 1: Participants at HfA Roundtable Consultation on Future of European Programme for Most Deprived Persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ursula O’Dwyer</td>
<td>Department of Health and Children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack Dunphy</td>
<td>Crosscare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Walsh</td>
<td>Combat Poverty Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maria Moonen</td>
<td>Tallaght Partnership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orla Walsh</td>
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