

Overview of Programs

| | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>Country</p> |  <p>Chaco Region, Bolivia</p> |  <p>Port-au-Prince, Haiti</p> |  <p>Dadaab Refugee Camps, Kenya</p> |  <p>West Bank, occupied Palestine territories</p> |  <p>Thatta, Pakistan</p> |
| <p>Duration</p> | <p>January-April 2010</p> | <p>March-August 2010</p> | <p>February 2009-April 2010</p> | <p>January 2009-December 2010</p> | <p>September 2010-February 2011</p> |
| <p>Donor</p> |  <p>ECHO and SIDA €9,950 and €9,100</p> |  <p>Humanitarian Aid ECHO €2,000,000</p> |  <p>Liberté • Égalité • Fraternité RÉPUBLIQUE FRANÇAISE MINISTÈRE DES AFFAIRES ÉTRANGÈRES ET EUROPÉENNES CIAA/French Embassy €1,500,000</p> |  <p>UN World Food Programme €2,343,000</p> |  <p>Humanitarian Aid ECHO €2,510,000</p> |
| <p>Voucher</p> |  |  |  |  |  |
| <p>Beneficiarie</p> | <p>96 households received a voucher once a month for three months.</p> | <p>15,000 households received a voucher once a month for three months.</p> | <p>15,000 households with malnourished children received two vouchers monthly for 3 months post nutrition program discharge.</p> | <p>3,000 households received four equal vouchers per month, each valid for one week, throughout the program.</p> | <p>5,300 households received a voucher once that covered two months of entire food basket.</p> |
| <p>Objectives</p> | <p>The objectives for all projects included at least one of the following objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Contribute to meeting daily food consumption requirements; • Reduce negative coping mechanisms by protecting livelihoods and preventing asset depletion; • Support the local economy by increasing demand; • Test if cash based interventions can meet consumption requirements in a cost-effective manner. | | | | |

Lessons Learned

- Agencies must guarantee that beneficiaries have staple foods, provided either in-kind or through the CBI as existing ration;
- Fresh food vouchers can be used to improve food diversity and consumption, and as complement to nutrition-related activities;
- While a CBI may not always be the most *cost-efficient* option, it offers options and support to beneficiaries and the local economy that can make it most *cost-effective*.
- Voucher design has a major impact on its appropriate use. Validity period, distribution timing and monetary/commodity value are especially important as fresh food can spoil. Agencies need to continually monitor prices to make sure the value of the voucher is appropriate and still allows beneficiaries to meet their intended needs;
- Dietary diversity and consumption after the program should be monitored for sustainability analysis;
- Vouchers have the potential to be an alternative to supplements for the prevention of micronutrient deficiencies.

Good Practices

- Fresh food voucher design should reflect the nutrition analysis and specific food requirements of beneficiaries, and its design should promote the best possible use of the voucher.
- Fresh food vouchers can be used as incentive to get beneficiaries to participate in complementary programs, which increases the coverage of the program and can increase the agency's effectiveness.
- Programs with more specific nutrition-related objectives completed scrupulous monitoring activities so as to properly measure the impact of fresh food vouchers on the consumption of micronutrient-rich foods and anemia.

For more information please refer to *Meta-evaluation of ACF's Emergency Food Voucher Programmes in 5 Countries* (forthcoming).