



Sustainable Financing Initiative
for School Health and Nutrition (SFI)

School Meals Financing Rapid Assessment

Tanzania

April 2022

Flora Myamba, Ph.D
Women and Social Protection Tanzania

April, 2022

Table of Contents

Table of Contents	2
List of Acronyms	2
1 National Context (1-2 pages)	3
2 Current programme(s) (2 pages)	5
3 Public financing (3 pages)	8
4 Donor financing (2 pages)	11
5 Role of private sector and households (1-2 pages)	13
6 Efficiency and equity reflection (2 pages)	15
7 Observations on scope for financing scale-up of programmes (2 pages)	16
List of Consulted Personnel:	17
References	18

List of Acronyms

GoT	Government of Tanzania
HGSF	Home Grown School Feeding
MoEST	Ministry of Education, Science and Technology
MoHCDGEC	Ministry of Health Community Development, Gender, Elderly, and Children (now Ministry of Health is separate from the rest)
MoH	Ministry of Health
NGSFNSBES	National Guidelines on School Feeding and Nutrition Services to Basic Education Students
NMNAP	National Multi-sectoral Nutrition Action Plan
NBS	National Bureau of Statistics
PO-RALG	President's Office-Regional Administrative and Local Government
PSSN	Productive Social Safety Net

1 National Context (1-2 pages)

- Levels of reported malnutrition among school age children
- National school feeding policy – aims and objectives

Chronic malnutrition remains high in Tanzania despite government's effort to combat it. Malnutrition is much higher in the poorest households. According to the 2018 National Nutrition Survey (2014-2018), 32.1% of children under 5 in Mainland Tanzania are stunted; a decrease from 34% in 2016 (MoHCDGEC, MoH, NBS, 2016 & UNICEF, 2018). The Nutrition Survey further highlights that Iringa, Njombe, and Mbeya regions had higher stunting rates in 2014 (at 51.3%, 51.5% and 51.5%) accordingly, whereas the most affected regions in 2018 were Ruvuma, Iringa, Rukwa, Kigoma, Njombe and Songwe. Significantly decreased rates were recorded in Dodoma, Morogoro, Pwani, Lindi, Tabora, Kagera, Mwanza and Katavi.

The high rates of stunting among children are driven by poverty and food insecurity. Other factors include poor infant and young child-caring and feeding practices at the household level, along with poor access to health services and water, sanitation and hygiene. A combination of these factors necessitates school meals, if more positive and sustainable results are to be achieved.

Hiliza, J.N. et al (2020) estimated the prevalence of stunting and contributing factors among public primary school pupils in Kasulu District of Tanzania. The study found the overall prevalence of stunting being 31.8 %, (31.7% for girls and 31.8% boys). While there is limited data on the same at the national level, these rates are quite consistent with those for under 5 presented above. Pupils in lower classes -one (33.3%) and two(34.8) were more stunted than pupils in class three (21.1%). Older pupils (8-12years) were significantly more likely to be stunted (37.4%) as compared to younger pupils 5-7 years. This signifies a continuum chain of stunting for more or less similar kids from age 5 and below to primary school levels. Expanding school meals programs become inevitable.

Moreover, pupils who were stunted had a higher proportion of irregular school attendance (27.6%) compared to pupils who were not stunted (3.7%); and had significantly higher chance of failing at the end of year examination compared to those who were not stunted (6.7%). It has shown that inadequate food at home reduce children learning capacity at school. Low levels parent's of formal education, peasant or livestock keeper, and low income households were significantly associated with stunting.

The latest Household Budget Survey (HBS—2017/18) reports high primary school age children drop-out, resulting in much lower net enrolment ratios at lower secondary level (32.9%) than in primary school (83.4), poor children being far less likely to be attending school than the better-off. The primary school net attendance ratio was 59% for the poorest quintile compared to 91% for the richest quintile by 2015; and secondary school attendance at 6% for the poorest compared to 41% for the richest (TDHS, 2015-16).

The Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) developed the National Guidelines on School Feeding and Nutrition Services to Basic Education Students- NGSFNSBES (2020) (launched in 2021), with the main objective: "to guide supervisors, implementers and stakeholders on the best ways to participate, supervise, implement and improve food and nutrition service to Basic Education

Students.” (Article 1.4.1) The guidelines (2020) provide uniform guidance for schools, communities and the local government to develop, coordinate and oversee school feeding programs. It emphasizes on the role for key stakeholders to actively and effectively participate in the design and implementation of school feeding programs. The guide identifies the key stakeholders for school feeding program to include: MoEST; PO-RALG; Departments and Agencies (MDAs); regions; councils; Local Governments Authorities (LGAs); schools; parents/guardians; communities and Development Partners. The same document requires that food availability and provision of lunch to day scholars is mandatory to each school day, as strategy to reduce short-term hunger.

The NGSFNSBES (2020) has largely shifted the financing responsibility of the school feeding programs to parents/guardians for students in public day schools, while emphasizing that that parents/ guardians and communities will be mandated to be the primary source of food contributions to schools. The government will continue to fully finance school meals for public boarding schools. The guidelines further lists other financing opportunities to include i) Private school owners for day and boarding schools, ii. Education stakeholders, iii) Development Partners; iv) Private sector, and v) Schools through production projects such as farming, poultry and beekeeping, aquaculture, animal husbandry and gardening (Ibid). This is consistent with existing policies and regulations.

In 2016, Education Circular (No. 6) necessitated the provision of school meals but left the implementation responsibility of these programs to the parents. Other legislations include, the Education Fund Act (2001), which provides for functions and the role of the Tanzania Education Authority, a body managing funds from governmental and donations intended for financing of development projects in Education.

The Education and Training Policy (2014) states that, the Government will maintain conducive environment for provision of food and nutrition service for actors to participate in the process (MoEST, 2014). Likewise, the guideline (2020) outlines procedural path for actors to participate and, modalities for food contributions while exempting direct government involvement for school feeding funding, particularly day scholars. Education and Training Policy of 2014 emphasizes the need for schools and colleges to have access to basic public services including nutritious meals, communications, electricity, clean and safe water, and health services (URT, 2020).

In the effort to reduce and end the stunting prevalence nationwide, Tanzania framed a National Multi-sectoral Nutrition Action Plan (NMNAP) in 2016, with the primary objective to bridge the existing linkages and developing sector policies and strategies. The NMNAP succeeded the development of the National Strategy for Inclusive Education for 2018-2021 (URT, 2019), which has a prime objective to develop a community-based modality for provision of school meals for pre-primary school children as mechanism for inclusiveness for this group. The government is also committed to improve access and performance to pre-primary and primary education through the MoEST in collaboration with the President’s Office-Regional Administrative and Local Government (PO-RALG).

2 Current programme(s) (2 pages)

- **Number of children targeted/reached**
- **Brief summary of relevant evaluation evidence**
- **Line ministry responsible for delivery**

Through consultative discussions with the lead persons for School Feeding Programs in the MoEST and PO-RALG it was identified that the Government of Tanzania (GoT) through the MoEST implements school feeding for pre-primary, primary, and secondary schools in two or three ways:

- i) **Public schools boarding students:** for this group the government is fully responsible for all the meals the students must eat. Usually 3 meals, (about TZS. 405,000 (~USD 177) per student per year .
- ii) **Public day students:** the government does not provide any school meals; the parents and guardians are the primary implementers instead, together with the community. The NGSFNSBES (2020) further describes day school as community based hence parents and guardians are sensitised to form committees and agree on the modalities based on local settings, together with local governments. They should make their own choices based demand. The government does not have a budget for public schools-day schoolers.
- iii) **Private schools-day schoolers:** for this group, as is the case for private-boarding schools— the parents pay for the day meals directly to school. The government does not provide any meals nor it allocates budget for this. It is good to note that the government has guided through the guidelines (2020) the implementation of the school meals for private schools and expects accountability.

In addition, food is expected to come from home grown and/or school farms and contributions from various stakeholders. The government expects partnerships and collaboration with different stakeholders in the implementation of SFPs. This further confirms that the main source of funding day-school meals and associated services remain to parents/guardians contributions; communities in terms of work non-food items like firewoods and building kitchens; government (boarding schools) and donors.

The PO-RALG will be the main custodian of the guideline whereas the MoEST will be the lead and coordinator of all SFPs by government, Development Partners (DPs), and other private sector stakeholders.

According to the MoEST (2019) approximately 8,555 primary schools equivalent to 52% of all 16406 schools in the country provide food and nutrition services. The same source reports that between 50% and 70% of schools were not implementing feeding programs as of 2019. Among the schools that provide food and nutrition service, there are schools that feed their students for all five school days while other schools feed their students occasionally. Besides, there are schools that restrict food services to students whose parents contributed (MoEST, 2019). More innovative means to expand financial resources and coverage become crucial. This is especially given that students from poor and vulnerable households are the most victims in such case. It is worth noting that in most cases, school feeding programs have targeted areas with high poverty and school drop-out rates, poor primary school performance, and high levels of malnutrition.

School feeding programs in Tanzania have largely been led by WFP with minimum involvement of the government through the MoEST (Sanya, 2015). WFP started to implement school feeding programs in year 2000, in three regions of Tanzania: Dodoma, Arusha, and Singida. About 72,120-

day scholars from 210 schools benefited from the program, which provided porridge in the morning break and lunch in the afternoon (URT, 2013). Oganga (2013) reports that by 2013 this particularly school feeding programs was extended to Shinyanga, and Singida Regions, covering a total of 1,166 schools in 15 districts with a total of 601,572 students. In 2003, the New Partnership for Africa's Development (NEPAD), launched a home-grown school feeding (HGSF) in Tanzania supported by WFP and other international organizations (WFP, 2017).

Between 2011 and 2016 WFP in collaboration with Government of Tanzania and Project Concern International (PCI), a Global Communities Partner, piloted home-grown school feeding (WFP, 2016); Ikungi and Bunda districts were also part of this preliminary study in 2015. Through the HGSF program, local government and schools received cash from WFP to purchase and distribute locally grown food to schools in Singida and Mara Region. Over 28,000 students from 40 primary schools received a mid-day meal (WFP, 2016).

PCI is the only/main current programme in place implementing both the USDA-funded McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition program, called FFE III, in 231 primary schools, and the USDA Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement program, called Chakula Chetu-a Kiswahili term literally translated as "Our Food". The two sub-projects cover 16 primary schools all in Mara Region (Northern Tanzania). The McGovern-Dole project is implemented in close collaboration with the Government of Tanzania and many communities in Mara.

Although PCI focuses on enhanced local production and mobilization of community contributions, FFE III and Chakula Chetu strengthens the capacity of schools and communities to build self-reliance and gradually take responsibility to manage and sustain school feeding. Through consultations with the WFP, MoEST and PO-RALG it was reported that the project supports farmers to partner with local schools to ensure students and families have access to nutritious foods through our school feeding programs, benefiting children, families farmers and the greater community. Since 2016, the project has helped to deliver essential nutrition, education, health, and development services to more than 240,000 preschool and primary students in the Mara Region.

Global Alliance for Improved Nutrition (GAIN) through SUN POOLED Fund project supports the implementation of the national mandate for the provision of fortified school meals (SFM) in Tanzania. This project is being funded by the United Nations Office for Project Service (UN-OPS), with the main objective to improve nourishments for school age children with reaching about 12,000 pupils in 30 schools located in Kagera and Tanga regions.¹ About 10 dossiers machines used in maize flour fortification were donated to millers, and 1.4 tonnage premix was procured and distributed to the two regions to ensure accessibility of fortified foods in schools. The cash values of the donations are unavailable.

HGSF has been termed cost effective, participatory and food diversity productions (Development Initiatives, 2017). The program is essential as it increases participation of communities and inclusion of students. Stakeholders' involvement such as local government and development partners is also central to this model; it assures supply of natural resources such as land and water by the local government for production of nutritious food.

The PCI HGSF have led to better learning environments and improvements in students' attendance, concentration, literacy skills, nutritional status, and overall academic performance. These innovative programs have also equipped schools to manage food storage, train and mentor school administrators to supervise school feeding appropriately, engage local government structures to

¹<https://bitly.hk/9Z02C>

support and monitor school feeding, and mobilize communities to own and contribute to their school feeding programs.

Farm-to-school (F2S) program has similar approach to HGSF and shares the common objective of procuring and procuring locally produced healthy foods from smallholder farmers and schools grown food serving SFP at low cost (FIC, 2018; Christensen et al., 2019). In Tanzania the concept of F2S has been integrated into the HGSF program.

A study in 2019 by the MoEST found that in some areas of Tanzania parents/guardians collaborated with development partners to decide on contributing food and nutrition and other services (URT, 2020). The study further revealed that the provision of food and nutrition services was effective in areas where parents and communities were contributing. However, it acknowledged that the main source of food items was obtained from parents/guardians' contributions and communities. Food was expected to come from school farms and various stakeholders. This was more important for local markets and economic growth.

Several other studies conducted in Tanzania report positive impacts of school meals on academic performance, enrolment, attendance, and pupils' activeness in the learning process (Chaula 2015 & Lukindo, 2018). A study by Ngussa (2020) found significant positive relationship between teachers' involvement and pupils' engagement in the learning process, facilitated by provision of quality food. Further evidence shows improved teacher-pupils interactions, critical thinking, peer interaction and group discussions (Ngussa, 2020). A different study suggested that food redistribution within the household tend to favor boys over girls (Kazianga et. al, 2009), which means that school feeding promotes equal opportunities based on gender. A summary of the different school feeding programs is presented in table 1. Information on budget for the programs is generally unavailable.

Table 1: Summary of School Feeding Programs in Tanzania

Actor/Program	Year	Activity	Regions Covered	# of Pre & primary Schools	# of Pupils	Budget/di sbursed	Source	
WFP			Dodoma, Arusha Singida	210	72,120		WFP, 2016	
WFP, PCI & GoT	2011-2016	Pilot of HGSF	Shinyanga & Singida (15 districts)	1,166	601,572		WFP, 2016	
WFP, PCI & GoT	2011-2016	HGSF	Ikungi & Bunda Districts	40	28000 (out of 270,000 in need)		WFP, 2016	
PCI (McGovern-Dole International -USDA Fund)	2011-present	HGSF	Mara Region	231			PCI data	
PCI (McGovern-Dole) -FFE III and (Chakula Chetu)	2016	Procurement support	Mara Region	16	240,000		PCI data	
GAIN (SUN POOLED Fund)/UN-OPS		FSM	Kagera and Tanga Regions	30	12,000			
National Level	By 2019	~8,555 (52%) of all 16,406 primary schools received food and nutrition services						MoEST, 2019

3 Public financing (3 pages)

- **Level of financing from national and local government**
- **Revenue source (i.e. general taxation, earmarked taxation)**
- **National vs Local government mobilisation & expenditure**
- **(Where possible) financing by level of school system**
- **Is funding adequate and consistent with programme delivery goals**

According to the National Guidelines on School Feeding and Nutrition Services to Basic Education Students (2020) for Tanzania, school feeding and nutrition service will be jointly financed by the Government, parents, communities, and other stakeholders as listed in section one of this paper. The guidelines, however, continued to shift the responsibility of financing school feeding programs for public schools to parents/guardians and other stakeholders in the education sector and only the financing of the boarding schools to government.

The government issued circular No. 6 (URT, 2015) to make clear the role of parents regarding to fee-free public basic education. The circular stated that parents/guardians should ensure “provision of food for children attending day schools (in cooperation with the school leadership)” (URT, 2015). Other responsibilities parents/guardians should meet include; i) All school uniforms; learning materials such as books, pens and pencils ii) Medical and travel expenses for both day and boarding school pupils; and iii) Mattress, bed-sheets, and personal hygiene materials for boarding schools pupils and for those staying in government-owned hostels.

Government budget allocated to the education sector is 5.26 trillion shillings equivalent to 14 % of the total budget of TZS.36,681.90 billion, equivalent to around USD.15.95 billion. The education budget, as for the rest of the national budget is fully financed by central government from national revenues. It is worth noting, however, that about 30% of the national budget is expected from foreign aid. The government finances the cost for meals in public boarding schools (through capitation grants), which amounts TZS. 405,000 (~USD 177) per student per year (Shukia,2020). The administration cost of capitation grants transferred to public schools primary and secondary school set at 10% of total school budget (URT, 2015). Table 2 provides a break down of some of the figures.

It is worth noting that in 2016 the Government introduced a Fee Free Education through an Issue Document No.03. The policy abolished all direct school fees, including informal fees previously levied by schools, in Government pre-primary, primary and lower secondary schools. By reducing the direct costs of education, the progressive extension of fee-free education has contributed immensely to the increase in school enrolment at pre-primary, primary and secondary levels for about 41% by year 2020, especially by children from poor and vulnerable households. For the financial year 2019/2020 the government spent a total amount of TZS 79.9 billion (~USD 35 million) to fund fee-free education, replacing parental contributions. Nonetheless, the policy does not make primary school completely free, as parents still have to pay for indirect costs such as school uniforms and school materials, as well as school meals where they are not provided. Financial access barriers remain high, constraining access by poor and vulnerable households, at upper secondary level, where tuition and other fees have not been abolished. The increase in enrolment will have budget implications on the school feeding programs and should be reflected in financing requirement.

Some of the spending priorities are detailed in table 2. The budget for education is relatively high, in comparison to sectors like health and social development. Specific breakdown of the budget including the actual numbers for school meals costs is unavailable on the national budget table.

Table 2: Government Budget Allocation per Sector (2021/22)

Sector	2021/22 Budget (TZS billion)	Percentage	Education spending priorities
Education	5,257.29	14.3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 4.04 trillion shillings for preprimary, primary and secondary education (including school meals for boarding schools); teachers' colleges, schools' inspection, adult and informal education 976.8 billion shillings for Higher Education Science and Technology 137.6 billion shillings for Technical Education and Vocational Training 99.5 billion shillings for administrative expenses
	(TZS. 405,000 ~USD 177)		<i>Average cost for school meals per student per year</i>
	79.9 (~USD 35million)		<i>Fee-free education for pre-primary, primary and lower secondary schools for year 2019/20</i>
Health	2,019.19	5.5	
General Public Services	14,396.87	39.2	
Defence, Public order and Safety	3,532.72	9.6	
Economic Development	8,330.67	22.7	
Social Development	1,853.41	5.1	
Housing and Community Development	1,291.75	3.5	
Total	36681.9	100	
Source	Authors modified presentation of the Government Budget data (2022)		

The fact is, school meals for boarding schools are fully covered by the government and private schools day-scholars are financed by the parents and guardians (Roothaert et al, 2021). For instance, private schools provide a midday meal throughout the school year at a relatively low cost, with similar objectives as the national school feeding programs (Musamali et al., 2007). The 2014 Education and Training Policy give emphasis on provision of basic services and those services among others include nutritious meals for students in schools and colleges, and those basic services should be guaranteed by the government. The School Feeding guidelines (2020) at least sets specific

requirements to participate, supervise, implement and improve food and nutrition service to basic education students.

Limited financial resources is one major challenge that school feeding programs face in the country. Unlike Rwanda, which is already developing a national financing strategy for school feeding programs, Tanzania does not have a clear strategy for guiding the financing these programs, particularly for public day schools. The country have recently developed the school feeding guidelines in 2020 (launched in 2021). Guideline provides for: i. Parents/guardians should contribute foods that are locally available especially cereals, legumes and nuts; and, ii. Parents/guardians committee will ensure the availability of other food items such as vegetables, fruits, oils, meat, milk and iodated salt are supplied. P.12. As an example, as of January 2017 the the total resources available for the National Multi-sectoral Nutrition Action Plan (NMNAP) 2016-2021 from the Government, development partners and the private sector was US\$ 70.5 million against a planned budget of US\$ 268 million giving a total funding gap of US\$ 197.6. This was about 26.3% of the NMNAP funds available leaving a gap of 73.7% yet to be mobilized. The NMNAP is currently being reviewed, while revising all these figures.

As such, UNICEF (2017) suggested on utilization of available opportunities to create new fiscal space through domestic resources. For instance, when the government strengthens the tax administration system including to effectively address prevailing in-competencies in social sectors relating to budget execution, this option can expand fiscal space in financing child social protection countrywide.

What is needed following the establishment of the school feeding guideline is the financing strategy which should identify the full cost of delivering school feeding programs, and sustainably. The WFP-Tanzania team proposed that the package should not only look into the cash requirements but also all other associated costs including infrastructure (kitchens, storage, dining rooms, etc); sensitization on hygiene issues (WASH); capacity building and sensitization on productive agricultural livelihoods including school and non-school gardens, fish ponds, and other locally-grown nutritious foods that can be supplied for school meals.

Learning from Rwanda's forthcoming school feeding financing strategy and from other related programs in Tanzania including the NMNAP (2016/21), the list on the financing strategy should include, but not limited to the following aspects:

- Financial requirements package for the SFP (short term and long term); factoring in the present number of students and the projections, particularly the increasing numbers since the GoT introduced the fee free education policy in 2016.
- Financial resources available and the funding gap
- Resources mobilization plan including through innovative strategies and actions for tapping into national resources.
- Sources of external financial support both short and long-term
- Sustainability plan
- Strategic prioritization of implementation plans
- Coordination strategy for the funds coming from all the different sectors of government and stakeholders.

4 Donor financing (2 pages)

- Level of donor financing

- Type of donor financing (grant vs concessional etc)
- Major actors (WB, bilateral, McGover-Dole etc)
- Observations on coordination

For decades, the school feeding programs in Tanzania have been championed by the World Food Program (WFP) in collaboration with development partners. The government's involvement through the Ministry of Education is generally at low pace (Sanya, 2015).

Through a consultative meeting with a team at the WFP-Tanzania including the Country Representative, it was confirmed that currently WFP is not implementing any school feeding programs in the country. However, it continues to be involved and maintained strong partnership with government including in provision of technical and indirect support towards school meals like capacity strengthening and sensitization on various aspects of it.

Overall while government financing of school feeding is quite limited to public boarding schools, donor financing, more particularly for public schools is similarly limited both in terms of quality of benefits and quantity (number) of programs being implemented. This is largely contributed by the donors' specified strategic focus and interest on the different sub-focus of school feeding programs.

Donor programs and associated financing for school feeding are also patchy in nature. As an example, PCI implements the integrated school feeding programs in only 1 region (Mara) out of 31 Regions in Tanzania; GAIN is in 2 regions (Kagera and Tanga); WFP in 3 regions (Dodoma, Arusha and Singida), etc. Coverage is likewise low as the programs are not implemented in all districts and schools within these regions.

Most of the financing budgets are not available. In general information about amount of cash spent per student or the conversion of amounts spent on non-cash contributions including capacity building, promotion of school gardens, home grown school feeding, etc. is quite limited for donor-funds as it is for government budgets. The Integrated School Feeding Programs (ISFP) implemented by PCI, for example, states that it reaching about 240,000 pre-school and primary school students in the Mara Region of Tanzania. How much this is in monetary terms would help us understand the required financing for extending school feeding programs in other regions. We continue to seek for the information from the PCI. It is worth noting that data in the McGovern Dole website does not include Tanzania (nothing between 2017-2021).

to the consultative discussion with the Country Representative of WFP-Tanzania and her team, school feeding program will be part of next strategic plan for WFP starting in July 2022. The discussion further informed that WFP had asked government how WFP can finance; and presented three possible financing models to support school feeding. The models are not yet clear more will be determined at the planned stakeholders workshop. There is lots of potential to the coalition, including on the Zanzibar side.

The team further asserted that WFP can contribute through local and macro capacity building. The government agreed on the role WFP can play in helping government to sensitize in the campaign about school feeding. There is a lot more for partners to support as long as there is sustainability .

Years back WFP handed the school feeding program over to government after they phased out. Much could be learned from the phased our phase; more important is that fact that different geographical places had different needs so they handled the program differently and achieved outcomes and challenges differently.

Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the school feeding guideline (2020) has stated under 3.2.6 the expected roles of the Education Stakeholders and Development Partners including, but not limited to the following:

- i. To complement Government and communities efforts on school feeding and nutrition service by contributing resources as described in section 2.3.2;
- ii. To design and facilitate implementation of school feeding and nutrition programs and projects;
- iii. To participate in supportive supervision, monitoring and evaluation of school feeding and nutrition service delivery;
- iv. To participate in various local and international platforms on school feeding and nutrition service; and
- v. To provide professional advice and capacity building to implementers of this Guideline.

Coordination: The school feeding guidelines (2020) states the need for a national plan to coordinate contributions and programs conducted by stakeholders including private sector and NGOs in improving the provision of school feeding and nutrition service (4.2.3). According to the strategy mobilisation of stakeholders is mandatory and it should not be a one time activity. Mobilisation can be done by involving experts, Government and political leaders, private sector, media personnel and celebrities.

As the author proposed for the Rwanda (similar assessment) and for any multi-sectoral designed and implemented program, school feeding programs necessitates both vertical link (vertical coordination) and horizontal link (horizontal coordination) as important aspects of the coordination mechanism between the policy and the operational levels. TRANSFORM Training modules for Social Protection Floors² define vertical coordination as occurring along the hierarchy of structures or different structural levels; for example, national, sub-national/regional/district, and local/municipal/community levels. Horizontal coordination, on the other hand takes place across ministries where activities across sectors operationalise social protection policies.

5 Role of private sector and households (1-2 pages)

- Are private sector actors engaged (specify actors and levels of financing)
- Do households contribute

There is limited evidence of the engagement of private sector actors including CSOs in financing and implementing school feeding programs in the country. The 2020 school feeding guidelines, however, sets under 3.2.7 clear- anticipated roles for private sector actors including:

- i. To sensitize community to participate effectively in the implementation of school feeding and nutrition service;
- ii. To contribute to the availability of food and nutrition service in schools;
- iii. To provide technical and professional advice on the implementation of school feeding and nutrition service as per the national guidelines;
- iv. To participate in food fortification, including production of bio-fortified food crops;
- v. To participate in the construction of enabling infrastructure for provision of food and nutrition service in schools.

² TRANSFORM Training modules on Social Protection Floors are unpublished materials, also available through www.socialprotecion.org

Parents and guardians are required by the government to ensure children attending day schools eat school meals. The government does not provide indicative costs for the household contribution; only states the types of foods needed as listed above, and that parents have the primary responsibility to finance and manage the programs in cooperation with the school leadership. In some schools, parents contribute foodstuffs from their farms to the school to feed their children directly. In other cases, parents contribute money to enable the schools to purchase foods from the local markets. The NSFG lays out under 3.2.10 the following roles for parents and guardians:

- i. To collect food items, equipment and financial contributions from parents/guardians and communities;
- ii. To prepare and keep food items, equipment, financial contributions, and expenditure records;
- iii. To prepare reports on food contributions and consumptions and share with parents/guardians;
- iv. To collaborate with school management in storing the contributed food items, equipment, and managing financial resources;
- v. To ensure availability of a cook based on health care practices; and
- vi. To ensure the availability of funds for service provider's remuneration.

Shukia (2020) reveals that, 70% of the heads of schools and 61% of teachers, and majority of parents acknowledge parental contributions were necessary supporting the government in financing basic education delivery (Shukia,2020). The author further reveals that, the implementation of fee-free basic education significantly decreased the parents' direct contributory to education costs; however, parents still directly involved in covering the school security, meal programmes, and internal examinations-related costs. (Shukia, 2020). Mid-day meals at school are financed through parents/guardians contributions for most public schools. In some schools, the parents perform in-kind contributions to incur mid-day meals for their children, maize and beans are popular food items contributed in-kind, while in others it is a combination of cash and in-kind contributions (Shukia, 2020). Table 3 provides some details of the same from two different districts of Northern Tanzania.

Table 3: Financing and Procurement Modalities of Food for School Feeding Programs in Meru and Babati Districts of

Nature of school	Overseer of school feeding program	Financing	Nature of contributions	Source of food	Eligibility for school meals
Meru District Council					
Public Primary	School food committee of parents	Contributions from parents	In-kind (maize 32 kg, beans 8 kg) plus TZS 15,200/year	Direct contributions from parents	Students whose parents contributed
Private Primary	Director (owner of school)	Parents pay as part of school fees	Monetary contributions TZS. 160,000/year	Purchase from market	Students whose parents paid for food

Nature of school	Overseer of school feeding program	Financing	Nature of contributions	Source of food	Eligibility for school meals
Public Secondary	School food committee of parents	Contributions from parents	Monetary contributions TZS. 100,000/year	Purchase from farmers and market	Students whose parents paid for food
Private Primary and Secondary	Director (owner of school)	Parents pay as part of school fees	Fees 1,500,000–1,850,000 for hostel and 900,000 for day students	Purchase from farmers and market	Students whose parents paid school fees
Public-Special Education Primary	* Head teacher for special education students * School food committee for regular students	* Government for students with special needs and/or * Contribution from parents for regular students	* Capitation grant for students with special needs * Monetary contributions, TZS 36,400/year for regular students	* Public tenders for special education program * Purchased from farmers or market for regular students	* Students with special needs eat at school * For regular students it is based on contribution from parents
Babati District (Babati District Council and Babati Town Council)					
Nature of school	Overseer of school feeding program	Financing	Nature of contributions	Source of food	Eligibility for school meals
Public Primary	School food committee of parents	Contributions from parents	In-kind (maize 20 kg, beans 5 kg) plus TZS 6,000/year	Direct contributions from parents	* Students whose parents contributed * Vulnerable students (e.g. orphans)
Private Primary	Director (owner of school)	Parents pay as part of school fees	Fees TZS 550,000 for class IV and VII, 350,000 for pre-school and 450,000 for other students	Purchase from farmers and market	All students; school feeding program is mandatory
Public Secondary	School food committee of parents	Contributions from parents	In-kind (maize 40 kg, beans 20 kg) plus TZS 30,000/year/child	Direct contributions from parents	Students whose parents contributed

Nature of school	Overseer of school feeding program	Financing	Nature of contributions	Source of food	Eligibility for school meals
Public-Special Education Primary	* Head teacher for special education students * School food committee for regular students	* Government for students with special needs * Contribution from parents for regular students	* Capitation grant for students with special needs * In-kind for regular students (40 kg of maize, 10 kg of beans per year) plus TZS 4,000 per month	* Public tenders for special education program * Direct contributions for regular students	* Students with special needs eat at school * For regular students it is based on contribution from parents
Source	Author's modification presentation of data from Roothaert et al. (2021)				

According to the Household Budget Survey (HBS)- 2017/18, the mean household consumption basket is still dominated by food (59.9). The share is higher in Rural Areas (63.2%) than in Urban Areas (55.2%). The average monthly consumption per household in Tanzania Mainland is TZS 416,927.03 at the national level. This can be further calculated to determine estimated shares of costs on school meals spent per one child in a household.

6 Efficiency and equity reflection (2 pages)

- **Administrative costs of programme delivery**
- **Allocation against deprivation and targeting indicators**

Limited information is generally presented in terms of administrative costs for these programs. The government reports to have set 10% for overhead costs.

In terms of targeting, most school feeding programs have targeted areas with high poverty and school drop-out rates, poor primary school performance, and high levels of malnutrition Roothaert et al, (2021). Moreover, for public day schools, not all students benefit from the school feeding program. With the exception of a few schools, eligibility for the school feeding program was based on contributions. Students whose parents had paid for the school feeding program are given meal coupons. Most students who do not contribute to the school feeding program had poor parents or were raised by poor grandparents.

The Roothaert et al, (2021) study reported students whose parents were unable to contribute were the ones who needed it most as they were not assured of any meals at home. Students who were part of the school feeding program felt sad for their friends who were excluded. It was hard for them to eat in front of friends who were hungry, and sometimes they shared their food. During the school interviews, researchers saw some students lying lethargically in the grass while others were eating.

Poverty of parents and grandparents coupled with limited understanding of free basic education was cited as one of the major challenges in raising contributions for the school feeding program. Inability for parents to contribute was also caused by the big numbers of children per household/family, which required being enrolled to school. This is particularly in polygamist communities such as the Maasai whereby some families had up to 7 children enrolled in school, in primary or secondary school or both, making the total amount of required contributions too high (NBS-National Census 2012)..

Some parents were difficult and avoided to make contributions. The fact is most parents and farmers have had past experience with other projects, both positive and negative. This was coupled by the limited understanding of the free basic education system. Parents perceived that the free education system included free school meals. The recommended policies and guidelines must be implemented, and parents will still be responsible for the largest part of food supplies. As such, education and sensitization on importance of school feeding, availability of nutritious foods, awareness raising on the concept of HGSF, and roles and responsibilities of parents and farmers turns out to be crucial.

The important news is all students with special needs in the special education schools were entitled to access to meals through government financing. This is well indicated in table 3.

7 Observations on scope for financing scale-up of programmes (2 pages)

The WFP Country Representative reported (during the consultation visit) to have had several meetings with the Minister of Education and that the Minister confirmed his full commitment, and that of the government in implementing school feeding program. She argued:

“Government Commitment is there at the highest level of the Government and the Minister sees value of it, but the financing strategy is not clear yet; is in plan for developing....the govt is planning for a workshop of all stakeholders soon (March-April 2022) to discuss the whole set up, design, partners, implementation and the different financial models for the school feeding programs. The workshop is confirmed for government and all stakeholders. ”....

“Example, the Minister confirmed that the govt is ready to sign the International School Meals Coalition; the delayed signing may have been caused by the transition and change of high level leaders (Ministers) in the Ministry of Education.”

https://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/51/306 According to WFP, now that the guideline is developed (and WFP participated in its development), what is needed is to bring the various policies and the guidelines together for resource mobilization and implementation. The team further argued that Tanzania is a huge country; it requires localized/situated strategies for implementation. WFP further advised that the role of parents and community contributions is, and will remain a big part of the program in providing food, Hygiene (water and sanitation) sensitization, gardens, fish ponds, etc. This also ensures sustainability.

The NMNAP, for example, clearly speculates need for school feeding and the required package for effective implementation. MNAP has developed a budget; the school feeding should head towards the same direction.

The fact that school feeding is multi-sectoral involving multiple sectors beyond education provides opportunities for stakeholders as they can align their strategic plans and interests to multiple domains they can potentially contribute towards school feeding programs. The sectors include Prime Minister's Office, Finance and Planning; Health, Community Development, Gender, Elderly and Children; Energy; Minerals; Water; Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism; Agriculture; and Livestock and Fisheries as stated in the NSFNC (2020-3.2.5). More can still be learned and determined on the pathways towards resilient school feed.

A multi-stakeholder effort and commitment is required if we are to mainstream the program across as many public schools as possible. This is particularly given that in the past, WFP was a major initiator and promotor of school feeding programs in Tanzania, as in other countries. The demand goes beyond the limits of the WFP mandate. Moreover, multi-stakeholder approach involving parents, farmers, schools, students, and local government needs strengthening.

The patch nature of financing and implementing school feeding programs in the country creates major challenges. As an example, 52 out of 143 schools in Babati District were operating some form of school feeding, while the rest of the schools were still struggling to mobilize contributions from parents. The school feeding program varied from one school to another depending on whether they were public or private, and whether they were primary or secondary schools. With a few exceptions of donor support, public schools did not have established kitchens. Some of them used temporary wooden structures roofed with iron sheets. Pilots presented thus far have confirmed positive results important. What remains is bringing these programs to scale.

Based on the findings of this study and the experience presented by multiple pilots and programs including PCI-HGSF program in Musoma, it is expected that HGSF can be scaled up. In the HGSF program in Musoma, smallholder farmers, majority being women, have been mobilized to form producer groups, which have entered into contractual arrangements to supply nutritious food to public primary schools. Farmers and parents in Meru and Babati have expressed their eagerness to supply nutritious food to schools and generate income. This presents potential multiplier effects to provision of school meals.

Innovative financing strategies are required to support poor parents and grandparents who faced major challenges in raising contributions for the school feeding program. Provision of social protection subsidies, through social assistance, and the national-wide Productive Social Safety Net (PSSN) Program in particular is one of the best strategies for addressing coverage to this group of the population.

Political will and government commitment are the most important aspect for if we are to scale up school feeding programs and achieve more positive development outcomes, particularly in line with the SDG 2030 timing. Political will must not end with policy development but allocation of adequate resources required for effective implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the programs. Evidence through this paper can confirm to a large extent that there is a political will and commitment by high levels in the government authority to taking school feeding programs in this country to the next level.

The final information I wish to share is that in the process of making the consultations for this assessment, the focal person for school feeding programs at the PO-RALG invited the author—

following their understanding of what this assessment may bring in the near future—to participate in the workshops organized for School Feeding Stakeholders (mentioned earlier). They asked for a possibility to make a presentation on some key highlights of the concept note and the (current) assessment so as to identify the objectives and information gaps; likewise share any prospective financing models for a sustainable school feeding programs. The initial workshop is now planned for mid- April. This, similarly, indicates commitment by the government to take school feeding programs to the next level.

List of Consulted Personnel:

1. Grace Shileringo: Focal Person, Basic Education Department Ministry of Education, Science and Technology (Tanzania)
2. Dr. Yangson Mgogo- Focal for School Feeding, President’s Office-Regional Administrative and Local Government (PO-RALG)
1. Sarah Gordon-Gibson; WFP-Country Representative
2. Juliana Muiruri: WFP-Focal for School Feeding Program
1. Salum Mohamed Abdulla: Coordinator of School Feeding; Ministry of Education and Vocational Training-Zanzibar

References

1. Hiliza, J.N., Germana, L., Kasangala, A. & Joram, F. 2020. Prevalence and Factors Associated with Stunting among Public Primary School Pupils in Kasulu District, Western Tanzania
2. Ministry of Education Science and Technology, (2019). “National School Feeding Guideline Needs Assessment Report”. Dodoma, Tanzania.
3. MoHCDGEC, MoH, NBS, OCGS. Tanzania demographic and health survey and malaria indicator survey (TDHS-MIS) 2015–16. In. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, and Rockville, Maryland, USA; 2016
4. NBS. 2019. Tanzania National Nutrition Survey.
5. NMNAP United Republic of Tanzania (2016): National Multisectoral Nutrition Action Plan (NMNAP) for the period July 2016 – June 2021, §161 and § 164.
6. Oganga, B. (2013). Feeding students? Examining views of parents, students and teachers on the world food program's school feeding initiatives in Chamwino District in Tanzania (Master of Education), Amherst, MA: The University of Massachusetts.
7. Roothaert et al, (2021) Policies, Multi-Stakeholder Approaches and Home-Grown School Feeding Programs for Improving Quality, Equity and Sustainability of School Meals in Northern Tanzania
8. Sanya, H. (2015). The impact of school feeding on student attendance in school: A case of Kiteto District, Tanzania (Master Degree of Education), Dar es Salaam: Open University of Tanzania.
9. Shukia R. (2020), Fee-free Basic Education Policy Implementation in Tanzania: A ‘Phenomenon’ Worth Rethinking. Huria Journal vol. 27 (1), March 2020
10. UNICEF (2017) ‘Fiscal Space Profiles of Countries in Eastern and Southern Africa Case Study – Tanzania Mainland Fiscal Space Analysis’
11. UNICEF. Global nutrition report 2018.
12. United Republic of Tanzania (2014). Sera ya Elimu na Mafunzo. Dar es Salaam: Ministry of Education and Vocational Training.

13. United Republic of Tanzania (2015). "Waraka wa Elimu Namba 6 wa Mwaka 2015 Kuhusu Utekelezaji wa Elimumsingi bila Malipo" Dar es Salaam: Wizara ya Elimu, Sayansi naTeknolojia, 10 December 2015.
14. United Republic of Tanzania (2016) "Waraka wa Elimu Namba 3 Wa Mwaka 2016 Kuhusu Utekelezaji wa Elimumsingi bila Malipo" Dar es Salaam: Wizara ya Elimu, Sayansi na Teknnolojia. 25 May 2016
15. URT (2013). "Nutrition Country Paper –The United Republic of Tanzania," in CAADP Agriculture Nutrition Capacity Development Workshops (Dar es Salaam).
16. URT (2018/2019) Education Sector Performance Report for Tanzania Mainland
17. URT (2020) National Guidelines on School Feeding and Nutrition Services to Basic Education Students, Dodoma, Tanzania
18. <https://bitly.hk/pOEIF>
19. <https://bitly.hk/HNBOi>
20. <https://bitly.hk/pbTtA>
21. World Food Programme. 2013a. "Comprehensive Food Security & Vulnerability Analysis Tanzania 2012". <https://bitly.hk/qoUEW>
22. World Food Program (2016), Tanzania Country Brief