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Sharing and Diversion of Supplementary Food Rations

- Supplementary foods: FBF, FBF + oil, RUSF
- Different kinds of sharing/diversion have different implications for effectiveness
- How the supplement is delivered affects potential for sharing and diversion
- Consider substitution (breast milk, hh food)
- Why do we care? Cost of getting a specific dose to the target child.
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement

• Sharing within the household
  – Who gets the ration?
    • Other young children
    • Older children
    • Mother (lactating?)
    • Other household members (adults)
    • Non-family members
  – Why?
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement

• Giving the ration away
  – Could build social capital (mutual lending)
  – Cultural expectations of sharing
    • With neighbors/family/friends
    • With chief
    • With program staff

• Selling the ration
  – Who controls the income? How is it used?
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Different Foods, Different Patterns

• Corn Soy Blend (CSB) or fortified blended food (FBF)
  – Relatively low value: equivalent to grain, flour or local baby food product
  – Market price does not reflect nutritional value
  – CSB can be used in “adult” foods (dumplings, tortillas, cous cous)
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Different Foods, Different Patterns

• Fortified vegetable oil
  – Relatively higher value
  – Desirable for use in family cooking
  – Incentive to sell is parallel to the incentive to keep
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Different Foods, Different Patterns

- **RUSF / LNS**
  - Assumption that RUSF is treated as “medicine” (more than CSB/oil), and not shared, but
  - little evidence
  - Speculation that “special” food → might elevate risk of sharing or saving the food
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Evidence

• Concrete evidence on patterns of sharing and diversion is lacking
  – Anecdotes and assumptions

• Approaches to measurement
  – Measure amount reaching target child
  – Measure quantities used and left over
  – Self report by mother/caretaker
  – Direct in-home observation
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: CSB Compared with LNS

• “...there are few studies that exclusively compare a CSB product to an LNS product specifically in terms of distribution within the household” – Dewey and Chaparro 2010

• “Caretakers receiving any supplement [CSB, LNS] believed that the foods were a medical treatment and only 4 caretakers reported sharing the food with others. Most caretakers [stated] that medicine cannot be given to well children and ... that the food they received could not be shared.” – Matilsky et al. 2009
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Evidence

“A World Food Program study found ... a leakage of 46-82% if the ration was taken home.” – FAO Operational Guidelines 1998

“There is no empirical data on how to calculate how much extra energy to add. Past experience with food aid programs or trial and error may be the best way to determine the quantity of energy to add to account for substitution and leakage.” – USAID Commodity Reference Guide
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Programmatic Responses

• WFP: provide double the recommended ration for the target child
• USAID Title II: range from no accommodation for sharing to assumption of equal sharing among all household members
• PM2A: provide family “protective” ration to assure supplement reaches target child
• WFP: premix CSB with oil if CSB++ is not available to prevent diversion of oil
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Programmatic Responses

• Program guidelines typically emphasize education and SBCC to limit / discourage sharing
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Evidence from Malawi

- USAID-funded study under FAQR of Title II therapeutic supplementary feeding program in Malawi
- Goal was to test acceptability and cost of increasing ratio of oil to CSB in porridge as prepared
- Compliance with other recommendations also assessed
- Baseline data on hh behavior is presented
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Evidence from Malawi

- In-depth interviews with mothers/caretakers of beneficiary children, N= 287
- In-home observations over five days, N=18 households
- In-depth interviews with Lead Mothers, N=83
Percent Sharing Porridge with HH Members – Reported and Observed

- Percent of mothers/caretakers sharing porridge within the household, reported
- Percent of mothers/caretakers sharing porridge within the household, observed
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Who Consumed the Porridge - Reported

Sharing of Porridge with Others, as Reported by Caretakers

- Other Children <5
- Child’s Mother
- Other Children >5
- Other HH Members

n=284
Sharing and Diversion of Supplement: Who Consumed the Porridge - Observed

Sharing of Porridge, from Direct HH Observation

- Other Children <5
- Mother of Beneficiary Child
- Other Children Outside Family
- Other Children >5
- Other Family Members
- Other Adults Outside Family

n=63
Reasons for Sharing Within the Household

- Other children need...
- I get more than...
- Other adults need or...
- Food shortage
- Had leftovers
- It's culture to share
Use of CSB and Oil for Uses other than Child’s Porridge, Reported and Observed

% of HHs that use CSB other than porridge, reported
% of HHs who use oil other than porridge, reported
% of HHs who use oil other than porridge, observed
Reasons for Using Oil for Uses other than Porridge

- I cannot manage to buy oil: 20.00%
- Adding vitamins to other food: 5.00%
- Share vitamins with other kids: 10.00%
- Child's other food require oil: 25.00%
Percent Giving / Selling CSB and Oil, Reported and Observed

HHs that give CSB to other HH, reported
HHs that give CSB to other HH, observed
HHs that sold CSB, reported
HHs that give OIL to other HH, reported
HHs that give OIL to other HH, observed
% of HH that report selling OIL
Reasons for Giving CSB Away

- My friends or other children need it too: 60.00%
- We receive more than enough of CSB: 10.00%
- In exchange for other goods: 0.00%
- It's our culture to share: 20.00%
- To gain favor from program staff: 0.00%
Reasons for Giving Oil Away

- My friends or other children need it too: 45.00%
- It's culture to share: 45.00%
- To gain favor from program staff: 5.00%
Conclusions: Malawi Study

- Direct observation gives different information from self-report
- Sharing of porridge within the household is the norm – most sharing is with other young children
- CSB is given away more than oil
- Oil is used for other family cooking more than CSB
Programmatic Implications

- Eliminating sharing is unrealistic – and may not be desirable (implications for care)
- Estimate extent of sharing:
  - How much is needed to compensate for sharing
- Assess effect of protective (family) ration
- Estimate cost / effect of these options
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