



# Evaluation of the Belgian FEAD OP I

Procurement and distribution policy

Johanna Greiss, University of Antwerp

# Content

- Framework for the evaluation
- Evaluation methodology
- Main challenges

# General framework of the evaluation

- The Belgian FEAD managing authority, the federal Public Planning Service for Social Integration (PPS SI), asks to evaluate two actions of their OP I
  - (a) Procurement and (b) distribution of foodstuffs
- Evaluation dimensions:
  - Quality
  - Efficiency
  - Coherence
  - Relevance
  - Added value of the current FEAD OP
- Research cooperation between two Belgian universities
  - University of Antwerp
  - Catholic University of Louvain

# Evaluation methodology

Based on an evaluation matrix (questions and indicators)

- Interview with the managing authority
- Document Analysis
- Discussion groups

# Evaluation methodology: Matrix

The questions concern inter alia:

- Quality requirements of products
  - 'Objective' and 'subjective' aspects
- Identification of beneficiaries (partner organisation level)
  - Who is eligible to benefit?
  - Harmonized and standardized procedures within and between organisations?

# Evaluation methodology: Discussion groups

- 2 with FEAD 'final beneficiaries' (Dutch - French) and 2 with FEAD partner organisations (Dutch - French)
- Groups consist of 8 to 10 participants.
- Objective: To create a comfortable productive conversation so that participants in the group feel at ease talking about the subject

# Main challenges

- Set up of indicators...
  - How to measure 'quality' (of products)?
  - Do objective quality measurements (have to) meet subjective and diverse needs of beneficiaries?
  - High standards (healthy, sustainable, fair-trade,...) vs. quantity?
  - Does the manner of food distribution also have to be taken into account?
  - How important is the freedom of choice in this context?



# Main challenges

- Recruitment of beneficiaries
  - How to reach and motivate the most vulnerable to participate?
  - (Practical issues like the preference for cash reimbursement)
- Discussion with beneficiaries
  - How to create the conditions for an 'authentic' and 'autonomous' dialogue?
    - so that the beneficiaries really feel free to express things that might be difficult for them
    - Ideally, there would be more time to prepare the groups, integrating the participants into the process, building trust, etc., otherwise running the risk of getting the views of only the 'best prepared' or the most comfortable speakers
  - How to interpret the results of the discussion groups considering these reflections/ limitations?

