Social Innovation and Entrepreneurship Development Fund

Intermediary Services for Building Capacity in Food Support Service

**Social Impact Assessment** 

# **Executive Summary**

# Introduction

- <sup>1</sup> In 2016, the SIE Fund has engaged St. James' Settlement (SJS) as the intermediary to launch its first Food Support Flagship Project (Flagship Project), FOOD-CO, in capacity building to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of food support services in Hong Kong. FOOD-CO is the first all-round collaborative platform in Hong Kong to connect food support service operators, corporate food donors and volunteers by making use of information technology and data analysis. FOOD-CO has been launched as a pilot run in three districts starting in May 2017 and expanded to cover all 18 districts across Hong Kong since November 2017.
- <sup>2</sup> It is crucial to evaluate the effectiveness of FOOD-CO to assess whether FOOD-CO has been able to deliver its intended goals and objectives. SJS has commissioned Social Policy Research Limited (SPR) to conduct the SIA (Survey) after launching FOOD-CO to examine the current situation of the food support services in Hong Kong and collect views from the beneficiaries.

# Methodology

- <sup>3</sup> The coverage of the Survey was all the service points providing food support services and their beneficiaries. In order to take snapshots of the situations, three cross-sectional surveys in 2016, 2017 and 2018 were successfully conducted. It is noteworthy that the survey design is a cross-sectional, but not a longitudinal one.
- <sup>4</sup> Regarding the service points, full enumeration was adopted for collecting statistics and views. In 2016 Survey, 161 service points were identified to provide direct food support services. After reviewing the statistics collected, three pilot districts (Yuen Long, Kwai Tsing and Kwun Tong) were selected for the pilot run of FOOD-CO. After launching the pilot run of FOOD-CO for 6 months, the 2017 Survey was conducted, 47 service points in three districts were identified to provide direct food support services. After the pilot run, FOOD-CO has expanded to cover all 18 districts in Hong Kong. In 2018 Survey, 352 service points were identified to provide direct food support services.
- <sup>5</sup> After the 2016 Survey, some service points suggested providing their crucial information for evaluation in a short questionnaire. Therefore, the approach of 2017 and 2018 Survey was re-fined. More service points could participate in the questionnaire survey and provide their information either by long or short questionnaire. The response rate has increased significantly and more accurate figures on the key outcomes could be presented. However, the number of service points responding to the long questionnaire has decreased.
- <sup>6</sup> Regarding the beneficiaries, a stratified random sampling design was adopted in the Survey to obtain a sample of the beneficiaries. A total of 1,044, 450 and 720 beneficiaries were successfully enumerated in 2016, 2017 and 2018 Survey respectively according to different target numbers of interviews that were set according to the objectives of each survey. The response rates of three surveys were satisfactory, achieving 65% or above.

### **Executive Summary**

# **Social Impact Assessment – Service Points**

#### Number of Service Points

- <sup>7</sup> One of the outcome indicators is set for an increase of 100 service points in all districts.
- <sup>8</sup> In 2018 Survey, 352 service points reported that they provided food support services to their beneficiaries in all districts. An increase of 191 service points is reported after full scale implementation of FOOD-CO, indicating that this outcome objective of the Flagship Project has been fully met.

	2016 Survey	2018 Survey
Number of service points providing direct food support services <sup>*</sup>	161	352
Hot meal services	84	156
Food bank services	104	192
Discount market and bulk purchase services	17	17

\* Some of the service points providing more than one type of food support services.

#### Capacity of Hot Meal and Food Bank Services

- <sup>9</sup> The outcome indicators are set for an increase of 50% of meals and an increase of 30% of beneficiaries in all districts.
- <sup>10</sup> In 2018 Survey, 156 service points provided 18,236 hot meals to 10,892 beneficiaries daily. The increase in the number of hot meals served was 6,377 and the percentage of increase was 54%. Besides, 192 service points provided 42,533 food packs (meals) to 15,456 beneficiaries daily. The increase in the number of food packs served was 21,228 and the percentage of increase was 100%. The percentage increase of hot meal and food bank services is 83% and the percentage of increase of beneficiaries is 78% after full scale implementation of FOOD-CO, indicating that these outcome objectives of the Flagship Project have been fully met.

	2016 Survey	2018 Survey
Number of service points	161	352
% of increase	119%	
Daily numbers of beneficiaries	14,825	26,348
Increase numbers	11,520	
% of increase	78%	
Daily numbers of hot meals / food packs (meals) served	33,164	60,769
Increase daily numbers	27,605	
% of increase	83%	

#### Amount of Food Recovered

- <sup>11</sup> One of the outcome indicators is set for an increase of 25% of food recovered seasonally in all districts.
- <sup>12</sup> In 2018 Survey, the total amount of food recovered (seasonal) was 997 tonnes in 2018. An increase of 396 tonnes of food recovered seasonally is reported after full scale implementation of FOOD-CO, indicating that this outcome objective of the Flagship Project has been fully met.

	Food reco	Food recovery service	
Food recovered	2016 Survey	2018 Survey	
Total amount of food recovered (seasonal)	601 tonnes	v	
Increase amount of food recovered (seasonal)	396 tonnes		
% of increase	+ 66%		

#### Manpower Deployment

- <sup>13</sup> Comparing two surveys, though less employees were deployed, the percentage increase in mandays per month of employees was 128%. In other words, after the implementation of FOOD-CO, some service points had deployed designated employees who focused their works on food support services.
- <sup>14</sup> Further, more volunteers were involved in providing food support service after the implementation of FOOD-CO, with a significant percentage increase of 238%. Correspondingly, the percentage increase in man-days per month of volunteers was 488%. The volunteer time on food support services was nearly five-folds.

#### Difficulties

<sup>15</sup> In 2018 Survey, about half of service points indicated that they had encountered difficulties in providing food support services. The corresponding proportion (49.2%) was significantly lower, as compared to 2016 Survey (72.7%). In 2018 Survey, the major difficulties encountered were lack of storage room (46.5%), lack of operating funding (39.4%) and lack of volunteer (38.0%).

## **Social Impact Assessment – Beneficiaries**

- <sup>16</sup> Beneficiaries were asked to rate the level of satisfaction with the food support services by a 10-point Likert scale (10 representing very satisfied and 1 representing not very satisfied). Slightly higher average score on the satisfaction with hot meal services (8.6) was reported in 2018 Survey, as compared to the average score (8.5) in 2016 Survey. For food bank services, beneficiaries' satisfaction remained at a very high level (9.0). Besides, beneficiaries were satisfied with the discount market and bulk purchase services, with the average scores at 9.1 and 8.6 respectively.
- <sup>17</sup> Besides, beneficiaries were asked to rate the impacts of food support services by a 5-point Likert scale (5 representing very helpful and 1 representing not helpful at all). Beneficiaries consistently perceived that receiving food support services could help them relieve their financial burden, relieve their mental stress and establish social network, with average scores ranging from 3.0 to 3.7. As compared to 2016 Survey, the scores on helpfulness level remained the same or higher in 2018 Survey, indicating that the impacts of food support services on beneficiaries were significant.

#### **Executive Summary**

## Social Impact Assessment –FOOD-CO Platform

- <sup>18</sup> The service points that registered as FOOD-CO partner were asked to rate the level of satisfaction with opportunity provided by FOOD-CO on two descriptions by a 10-point Likert scale (10 representing very satisfied and 1 representing not very satisfied). Significant higher average scores on the description "the service points are able to reach more service points through the network established by FOOD-CO" (7.4) and "the network established by FOOD-CO allowed me to have more opportunities on collaboration among service points" (7.3) were reported in 2018 Survey, as compared to 2017 Survey after the pilot run.
- <sup>19</sup> In 2018 Survey, service points expressed their expected assistance from FOOD-CO including receiving food resource from FOOD-CO (62.7%), provision of volunteers (33.3%), and channel of receiving information related to food (28.4%).

# **Geographical Overview**

- <sup>20</sup> Analysed by 18 districts, the top three districts for provision of hot meals and food packs to beneficiaries in 2018 Survey were recorded in Sham Shui Po (14,336 meals), Kwun Tong (9,182 meals) and Yuen Long (5,592 meals). As compared with 2016 Survey, the top three percentages increase in 2018 Survey after the implementation of FOOD-CO were recorded in Kwun Tong (9,182 meals; +279%), Tai Po (2,106 meals; +167%) and Islands (705 meals; +173%).
- <sup>21</sup> Efforts were made to estimate the supply rate of food support services including hot meals and food packs. The Supply Rate of food support services by 18 districts are compiled by the proportion of beneficiaries receiving hot meals and food packs of the poor population in the corresponding districts. According to the results of 2018 Survey, the top three supply rates were recorded in Sham Shui Po (9.5%), Kwun Tong (4.0%) and Yau Tsim Mong (3.5%).

