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# UK AID MATCH PROPOSAL FORM

This completed form will provide detailed information about your proposal and will be used to assess your proposal and inform funding decisions. It is very important you read the **UK Aid Match Guidelines for Applicants** and related documents before you complete this proposal form to ensure that you understand and take into account the relevant funding criteria.

How: You must submit a Microsoft Word version of your proposal and associated documents using the templates provided, by email, to **UKAidMatch@dfid.gov.uk****.** The form should be completed using **Arial font size 12**. We do not require a hard copy.

**When:** All documentation must be received by the published funding round deadlines. Documents received after the deadline will not be considered.

**What:** You should submit the following documents: (all templates are on the UK Aid Match web page: [www.gov.uk/uk-aid-match](http://www.gov.uk/uk-aid-match).

**1**. **Narrative Proposal**: Please use the form below, noting the following page limits:

* **Sections 3 – 7 : Maximum of 15 (fifteen) A4 pages.**

**For applications for projects which will work in more than 1 country, you may use an additional 2 pages for each additional country (ie. an application for working in 3 countries can be a maximum of 19 pages).**

* **Section 8 : Maximum of 3 (three) A4 pages per partner**

**NOTE:** Please complete **section 8 information** for your own organisation AND for each partner organisation involved in delivering your project.

**Please do not alter the formatting** of the form and guidance notes. Proposals that exceed the page limits or that have amended formatting will not be considered.

**UK Aid Match funded projects can work in up to 3 countries. For proposals to work in more than one country or in different regions within a country**, you will need to include information about each country/region where the project context, beneficiaries, approach or the expected results are different. This is to enable DFID to assess your proposal within each of the contexts you plan to use UK Aid Match funds in.

**2. Logical framework and activities log:** Please refer to the UK Aid Match Log-frame guidance and use the Excel log-frame template provided.

**3. Project budget:** Please use the template provided and refer to the UK Aid Match Guidance for Applicants (G1), the Budget Template Guidance (G3), and all tabs on the budget template. You also need to provide detailed budget notes (in the budget template) to justify the budget figures.

**For proposals to work in more than one country or in different regions within a country:** Where there are substantial differences in the costs of the project in different countries or regions within a country, you need to include these in the budget and provide an explanation for the differences.

**4. Risk register/matrix:** This should include the main risks related to the project and how you will manage these risks. Please use your own format for this.

**5. Project organisational chart / organogram:** All applicants must provide a project organisational chart or organogram which includes all the implementing partners and explains the relationships between them. Implementing partners are defined as those that manage project funds and play a prominent role in project management and delivery. The chart should also include other key stakeholders. (Please use your own format for this).

**6. Communications Plan:** You will also need to complete a Communications Plan and submit this with your application. The plan is comprised of two parts (communications plan and activity timetable). You must also include final written evidence of commitment from your communications partner(s).

**7. Cross-cutting issues:** Your proposal must explain how it will achieve **good value for money** and **inclusion of marginalised people or groups** who live in the project location(s). It should demonstrate how you have determined that the proposed project would offer optimum value for money and that the proposed approach is the most economic, effective and efficient way of addressing the identified problems. It should explain how the proposal will meet the needs of the target population equitably including how it will address any barriers to inclusion of people/groups which are in the project location(s) including in relation to gender, age, disability, HIV/AIDs and other relevant categories depending on the context (eg. caste, ethnicity etc.)

# 8. Capacity building, empowerment and advocacy: If your proposal includes capacity building, empowerment and/or advocacy objectives it must explain how they contribute to the achievement of the project's outcome and outputs. Please explain clearly why your project includes these elements and what specific targets you have identified. Refer to the Guidance for Applicants (G1) for advice on this.

**Before submitting your application, please ensure that you have included all relevant documents by completing the table at section 9.**

|  |
| --- |
| **UK AID MATCH PROPOSAL FORM** |
|  |
| **SECTION 1: INFORMATION ABOUT THE APPLICANT** |
| **1.1** | Lead organisation name | Mary’s Meals UK |
| **1.2** | Contact person | Name: David HaworthPosition: Executive Director, UK and Ireland Email:  david.haworth@marysmeals.org Tel:  0141-336-7094  |
|  |
| **SECTION 2: BASIC INFORMATION ABOUT THE PROJECT** |
| **2.1** | **Project title** | Reducing classroom hunger and improving access, participation and progression within primary education for 108,818 vulnerable children in Malawi and Zambia and increasing local, district and national capacity to deliver school feeding programmes. |
| **2.2** | **Country(ies) where project is to be implemented** | Malawi and Zambia. |
| **2.3** | **Locality(ies)/region(s) within country(ies)**  | Malawi: Neno and Mwanza Districts, Central Region.Zambia: Mambwe District, Eastern Province. |
| **2.4** | **Duration of grant request (***in months***)** | 36 months |
| **2.5** | **Project start date** (*month and year)* | April 2016 |
| **2.6** | **Total project budget?** *In GBP sterling* | £3,154,600 |
| **2.7** | **How much do you expect your appeal to raise ? What percentage is this of the total project/programme budget ?**  | £1,577,30050% |
| **2.8** | Please specify the % of project funds to be spent in each project country | MMM: 72%MMZ: 23% |

|  |
| --- |
|  |
| **SECTION 3:** PROJECT DETAILS  |
| **3.1** | ACRONYMSFor words which you would normally use acronyms for, please write these words in full the first time you use them, followed by the acronym in brackets, and use the acronym after that. Where you feel that it would be useful to provide an explanation of any acronym, please add these here. |
| MM - Mary’s Meals is the overarching name that encapsulates all Mary’s Meals entities and activities. MMI – Mary’s Meals International Organisation has universal responsibility for delivery of the feeding programmes, growing the global movement and international finance and operations. MMUK Mary’s Meals UK is a UK based organisation responsible for generating funds across the UK and Ireland in furtherance of the MM vision. MMM - Mary’s Meals Malawi, a trust registered in Malawi, operated and controlled by MMI. MMZ – Mary’s Meals Zambia, a subsidiary of MMI.  |
| **3.2** | PROJECT SUMMARY: maximum 5 lines - Please provide a brief project summary including the overall change(s) that the initiative is intending to achieve and who will benefit. Please be clear and concise and avoid the use of jargon *(This should relate to the outcome statement in the logframe).* |
| Reducing classroom hunger and improving access, participation and progression within primary education for 92,995 vulnerable children in Malawi (Neno and Mwanza Districts) and 15,823 vulnerable children in Zambia (Mambwe District), through Mary’s Meals’ school feeding programmes. Increasing community support for education and improving capacity to manage and deliver school feeding programmes at local, district and national level. |
| **3.3** | PROJECT RATIONALE (PROBLEM STATEMENT)Describe the context for the proposed project, by considering the following questions. What specific aspects of poverty is the project aiming to address? What are the causal factors leading to poverty and/or disadvantage? (If applicable) what gaps in service delivery have been identified and how has your proposal considered existing services or initiatives? Which specific groups/people do you expect to benefit? Why and how were these groups chosen? How does the proposal fit with national/regional development plans and with other efforts (eg. of governments, donors, the private sector) to address the development challenges which your proposal aims to address? How does it fit with activities of other development actors? Why has the particular project location(s) been selected and at this particular time?  |
| Targeting extremely poor communities in Malawi and Zambia, this project aims to simultaneously reduce classroom hunger levels and address low primary school enrolment, attendance and progression, with a particular focus on improving access to education for marginalised children. The project directly supports children who suffer from chronic hunger to gain an education by providing a nutritious daily meal at primary school. Children living in poverty have numerous disadvantages in being able to complete primary education. One of the greatest barriers to education is chronic hunger, as children lack energy or motivation to attend school and often opt, or are forced to work, or look for food, rather than go to school. For those under-nourished children who do attend school, classroom hunger negatively impacts on their ability to concentrate and learn. Hungry children are more likely to drop out from school and to fail to advance from class to class. This project will address this problem while increasing community support for education for all children, including the most marginalised, and building local, district and national level capacity to manage and deliver school feeding programmes in the future.Malawi is ranked 174 on the Human Development Index and Zambia ranked 141 (UNDP). 47% of Malawian children and 45% of Zambian children under 5 are moderately or severely stunted (UNICEF), indicating high levels of malnutrition among pre-school children. Chronic poverty remains endemic in the targeted districts of Neno and Mwanza in Malawi and Mambwe in Zambia. The causal factors for this widespread child hunger are chiefly; limited agricultural land, cyclical incidence of drought, climate change and variability compounding already meagre harvests which are dependent on rain fed farming, few economic alternatives to small holder agriculture or ‘piece work’ often in tobacco farms which utilise child labour. HIV/AIDS remains a very significant contributory factor in the high proportion of orphans and vulnerable children in the targeted communities. These factors combined with poor health and social services lead to a context in which gaining an education, particularly for orphaned and vulnerable children is extremely difficult. Relatively low support for girls’ education, coupled with the challenge of being able to support and provide for children for parents living in poverty, is a major contributory factor to drop-out as girls are often influenced to contribute to the domestic economy or to marry early rather than complete their education. Disabled children are often not supported to enrol at, or complete school. In Mambwe, Zambia, 2013 survival rate to the last grade of primary school was 37% for girls and 52.58% for boys[[1]](#footnote-1). Current Mambwe District Education data for the targeted schools shows that grade 4 enrolment represents 61% (girls) and 57% (boys) of grade 1 enrolment and the average 2014 attendance rate at primary schools in Mambwe was only 67%[[2]](#footnote-2), attributed largely to hunger. MMZ’s household survey found that 23% of primary school age children were not enrolled at school, 64% of whom had attended in the previous year and since dropped out. The main reasons for non-enrolment were ‘have to work for money’ (31%) and ‘don’t want to go to school’ (24%). MMZ impact assessment control group survey of 338 children (concealed identity) found that 26% of children never eat breakfast before coming to school. 77% cite ‘no food to eat at home’ as the reason for this. 98% of children said that they ‘always’ feel hungry at school, 1% said sometimes. Household surveying also found that parental involvement in activities related to the school (a contributing factor to child educational attainment) was 30%.In Malawi, standard 1 repetition rate was 27% for Neno and 28% for Mwanza (2011). S1 dropout rate is 16.5% for Neno and 16% for Mwanza and Standard 5 dropout rate for Neno is 24% and 14% for Mwanza. Data for the targeted schools shows that grade 4 enrolment represents 57% (girls) and 63% (boys) of grade 1 enrolment. MMM’s household survey (102 households) found that 14% of primary school age children were not enrolled at school, 26% of whom had attended in the previous year and since dropped out. The main reasons for non-enrolment were ‘don’t want to go to school’ (26%), ‘have to work for money’ (18%) and ‘early marriage’ (10%). MMM impact assessment control group survey of 363 children (concealed identity) found that 63% of children never or rarely eat breakfast before coming to school, 84% cite ‘no food to eat at home’ as the reason for this. 82% of children said that they feel hungry at school at least some days. Household surveying also found that parental involvement in activities related to the school was 22%.District selection was made in collaboration with the Government of Malawi (GoM) and the Government of the Republic of Zambia (GRZ). Areas of greatest need were identified through a comprehensive needs assessment focusing on high poverty indicators, poor education indicators and review of existing support for school feeding. Neno and Mwanza Districts in Malawi have high levels of food insecurity.[[3]](#footnote-3) Mambwe District, Zambia, is predominantly rural, and is one of the most deprived districts in the Eastern province with the highest provincial prevalence of underweight children[[4]](#footnote-4). Visits to schools in the targeted areas were made by members of the MMM and MMZ staff teams following meetings and discussion with national and district government representatives and officials. MMM and MMZ staff met teachers from the schools and community leaders to discuss the scoping exercise processes and individual visits were made to obtain information on the existing facilities and circumstances at the schools.Currently there are no school feeding programmes in the targeted districts other than the programme already delivered in part of Neno and Mwanza by MM. Both the respective district educational authorities and the respective national governments have confirmed that this initiative meets government priorities, meets recognised needs, and complements existing plans to improve educational outcomes and school health and nutrition.The project directly contributes to the implementation of the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy Il (MGDSll) 2011 - 2016, particularly with Theme 2: *Social Development* where it has a clear fit with the following Sub-Themes, 3: *Education*, 4: *Child Development*, and 6: *Nutrition*. It also supports the GoM’s Economy Recovery Plan (ERP), Sept 2012, particularly with the Government’s specific commitment to scale up the efficient delivery of the universal school meals programme (USMP). The project design is aligned to the GoM’s National School Health and Nutrition Policy (SHN), currently in its final draft, which MMM is contributing to formulating. The project directly contributes to the implementation of the four policy statements of Priority; *School Feeding, Nutrition and Sustainable Development* by delivering: (1) a sustainable school meals programme, (2) school meals that will benefit pupils and their communities, (3) utilization of environmentally sustainable technologies, and (4) promotion of locally produced foodstuff from smallholders and farmers. The GoM have committed to expand the USMP but recognize that budgetary constraints demand a partnership approach with MMM and other key partners[[5]](#footnote-5). MMM, as a key implementer of the USMP and an active participant in the national Technical Working Group (TWG) on School Health and Nutrition, HIV and AIDS, as well as a founder member of the national ‘School Meals Development Partners Committee’ is recognised as a significant contributor to GoM’s development of school feeding policy and practice.Recent African Union research from Malawi supported by the Malawian Government, also clearly highlights the link between child under nutrition and educational achievement, subsequently impacting on the national economy. 23% of all child deaths in Malawi between 2008 and 2012 were directly associated with child under nutrition. The report sets out a set of key actions to address this stating: “Another important element is strengthening health and nutrition programmes in school”[[6]](#footnote-6)The project supports the implementation of the Government of Zambia’s (GRZ) School Health and Nutrition policy (2005) which is administered by the MoE. The vision of this policy is to ‘Promote and provide quality and cost effective health and nutrition services to all learners in order to improve learning’. The key objective of this is to promote and improve the nutritional status of learners. In addition, the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Heath have a joint agreement for their School Health and Nutrition (SHN) programme (May 2010), which recognises that: ‘Good health and nutrition is an essential pre-requisite for effective learning’. Also, “‘The general objective of the SHN programme is to improve and provide equitable services in learning institutions, through integrated health and nutrition interventions, in collaboration with the community and other partners.” Objective 2, of the GRZ, 6th National Development Plan is: “to improve quality, access and equal participation to primary education”, with strategic aim (f): ‘Expand the school feeding programme’. On the basis of the above, the primary beneficiaries from the project will be primary school age children in the three districts. The project will also benefit local communities; MM’s structured school feeding training programme provided through the project and the active involvement of community volunteers in project delivery will lead to increased community support for education, better understanding of the benefits of education for all, and improved local capacity, knowledge and skills to deliver SFPs. In addition, demonstrating best practice in delivering SFPs will lead to increased capacity to deliver sustainable, environmentally friendly, inclusive, efficient, community based SFPs at local, district and national Government level.MM’s strong relationship with communities acts as a platform for other NGOs to build on at school level and we actively pro-partner with other organisations working on cross-cutting issues such as gender equity, education quality, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) and disability, complementing their projects through feeding children at school. District level working groups in both Malawi and Zambia include organisations and government institutions focusing on WASH, HIV prevention, de-worming and other health initiatives, improving school environment and infrastructure, dietary diversification, promotion of girl’s education, promotion of inclusive education for disabled children and children with special needs, and promotion of natural resource management. Engagement at district and national level will allow MM to demonstrate best practice in delivering SFPs, influencing other school feeding NGOs and Government on the benefits of Mary’s Meals’ low cost model and leading to increased capacity to deliver sustainable, environmentally friendly, inclusive, efficient, community based SFPs at local, district and national Government level.  |
| **3.4** | **TARGET GROUP (DIRECT AND INDIRECT BENEFICIARIES)** Who will be the DIRECT beneficiaries of your project, where direct means those benefiting at outcome level? Describe the direct beneficiary groups, and state how many people are expected to benefit, differentiating between male and female beneficiaries where possible, as well as other sub-groups. Also explain how you have calculated the beneficiary numbers.  |
| **DIRECT:** | a) Description of groups:  | Children attending 117 Primary schools in Malawi and 34 Primary schools in Zambia. |
| b) Number of beneficiaries: | Total: Female (53,912) Male (54,906 ) |
| Who will be the **indirect (wider)** beneficiaries of your project intervention and how many will benefit? Please describe the type(s) of indirect beneficiaries and then provide a total number. |
| **INDIRECT:** | 1. Description
 | Community members (Volunteers who are generally family members of children attending Primary school in Malawi and Zambia) |
| b) Number  | Total: Female ( 611 ) Male ( 611) |
| Direct beneficiaries: calculated from current enrolment records in each school (May 2015), verified by District Education Managers (Malawi) and District Education Coordinators (Zambia). This is the total providing for enrolment increases throughout the project period. Note that gender split is based on starting enrolment numbers, an aim of the project is to encourage children to progress through to Standard 8 and to maintain and improve this gender balance by the end of the project period. Indirect beneficiaries: Estimate based on three community members per serving pot. Note that all schools operate a rota system with community members (e.g. different local area per week over 10 week cycle) so that the actual number is likely to be much higher. Gender split has also been assumed as balanced. These will be accurately recorded and reported during the project period. |
| **3.5** | POTENTIAL PROJECT IMPACTPlease describe the anticipated impact of the project in terms of poverty reduction. What changes are anticipated for the beneficiary target groups identified in 4.4 (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) within the lifetime of the project? |
| This initiative will bring measurable change to impoverished communities and will contribute strongly to national goals stating all children in Malawi and Zambia complete a full course of primary education. Classroom hunger levels for 92,995 children in 117 schools in Malawi and 15,823 children in 34 schools in Zambia will be reduced. Numbers of primary school age children out of school will decrease and access, participation and progression in primary education will increase. MM’s inclusive approach will promote equitable access to primary education for marginalised groups including disabled children and girls.  By providing daily school meals to vulnerable children, child health, energy and well-being will improve and children will be encouraged to access, concentrate, participate and make progress within primary education. On a wider scale, the training provided by MM with the active involvement of the communities in project delivery will lead to increased community support for education, understanding of the benefits of education for all and improved local capacity, knowledge and skills to manage and oversee environmentally sustainable, SFPs. Purchasing locally produced products will improve local smallholder farmer livelihoods, whilst working through a centralised supplier ensures reliability, consistency and quality of supply.A key element of the initiative will be to actively increase local and national capacity to deliver SFPs. Frequent engagement with local authorities and strategic coordination at local, zonal, district and national levels will ensure alignment with government priorities, structures and planning and institutional sustainability. Engagement at district and national level will demonstrate best practice in delivering SFPs, leading to increased capacity to deliver sustainable, environmentally friendly, inclusive, efficient, community based SFPs at local, district and national Government level. MMI SFP provides one nutritious daily meal to every child in a place of education. This approach promotes the inclusion of vulnerable children, reduces stigmatization and helps foster community spirit within a school. MMI has a proven track record of promoting gender equality and girls currently represent 50.5% of all children in schools supported by MMM and 50.6% of all children supported by MMZ.Gender sensitisation training is integral to MMI SFP Training which will be delivered at all levels. It will include specific emphasis on the importance of education for girls and the inclusion of marginalised groups. Our experience shows the introduction of school feeding enables children who have dropped out of school to return to the classroom. The training provided will encourage schools to support this, with a particular emphasis on supporting girls and young mothers. It will also promote equitable access to education, with a specific focus on promoting the inclusion of disabled children, children with special needs and children living with HIV/AIDS. All training will be delivered in Chichewa (Malawi) and Nyanya (Zambia) and all monitoring, evaluation and learning data will be disaggregated by gender and disability.The project will provide permanent brick-built kitchen shelters at all expansion schools in this project. This will contribute to increased quality of education by improving the infrastructure at each school. Each kitchen is used for the preparation and serving of meals and also has secure storage facilities for the ingredients. While not in use for school feeding, the kitchens can be used as multi-purpose rooms, for example each kitchen includes a large blackboard provided on one internal wall. |
| **3.6** | DESIGN PROCESSDescribe the process of preparing this project proposal. Who has been involved in the process and over what period of time? How have the intended beneficiaries and other stakeholders been involved in the design? What lessons have you drawn on (from your own and others’ past experience) in designing this project? Please describe the outcomes achieved and the specific lessons learned that have informed this proposal.  |
| During MM’s 13 year history of delivering SFPs, the design of our programme delivery model has been developed in response to feedback received from community members, who are our equal partners. As with all MM projects, the design process for this project has been heavily influenced by the active involvement of school staff members, parents and community leaders, whose input is a core element of the project’s delivery and design. Robust community partnerships and community engagement are central to this initiative and hundreds of children of all age groups, teachers and volunteers at samples of schools in each district (Malawi and Zambia) have contributed via surveys and participatory focus group discussions. Collaborative feedback processes will continue to be adopted throughout the project period as part of project monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL).MMM’s work is strongly supported by the GoM and the Minstry of Education, Science and Technology (MoEST) has been an essential partner in the delivery of the programme since its inception in 2002. MMM enjoys strong relationships with the GoM and our work is officially recognised through a formal agreement and Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The MoEST has formally supported MMM’s application, by letter (1.6.15) which clearly supports MMM’s approach, acknowledges GoM ‘budgetary constraints’ in the GoM being able to deliver SFPs and addresses GoM efforts to improve education in Malawi. All schools in this project are Government schools. As part of strategic planning with the GoM’s Department of School Health, Nutrition, HIV/AIDS Prevention Programme and WFP, it was agreed that MMM would aim to support all schools in Neno and Mwanza in partnership with GoM. Planning meetings have been held with the District Education Managers (DEMs), including visits to the target schools. The content of MMM’s training programme will be delivered through the DEM’s office and has been planned collaboratively with the DEMs and the Department of School Health and Nutrition (SHN) at a national level. The establishment of MM’s programme in Zambia, included a two year programme initiation and planning phase, during which MMZ developed strong partnerships with national and government staff. Programme design is in line with the national plan[[7]](#footnote-7) and Mambwe was identified as a key area of need throughout this process and identified again during 2014 and 2015. GRZ Ministry of Education were involved in the project design at national level through direct meetings with the Permanent Secretary for Education, and the National School Health and Nutrition Coordinator. The provincial education office assisted MMZ to identify Mambwe district as an area of particular need and the District Education office and the district planning advisor have provided information on the individual schools and the general vulnerability of the district. In order to avoid duplication, we also collaborate with WFP. Published research demonstrates a strong causal link between hunger and poor school enrolment and attainment. School feeding is internationally recognised as a key investment in improving national education standards and is a “catalyst for development”[[8]](#footnote-8). Independent studies have shown SFPs significantly improves the growth and cognitive performance of disadvantaged children in a range of contexts[[9]](#footnote-9). School Feeding Programmes (SFPs) are widely recognised as “a catalyst for development”[[10]](#footnote-10). WFPhighlights increasing government support for school feeding, stating ‘a meal at school acts as a magnet to get children into the classroom’*[[11]](#footnote-11)*. Wider evaluation of school feeding concludes that interventions developed with local teams and communities, with the support of well organised schools, enhanced the effectiveness of this approach over models designed separately from communities[[12]](#footnote-12).We have also drawn upon DFID publications, including Learning for All: DFID’s Education Strategy 2010–2015, where DFID acknowledges that: “*Well designed school feeding programmes can help to increase attendance and improve learning outcomes*.”[[13]](#footnote-13) DFID also states that “*School feeding programmes help ensure that children who attend school remain healthy…Existing evidence, though limited, suggests that school feeding programme participants have consistently better enrolment and attendance than non-participants*.” [[14]](#footnote-14) MM’s on-going longitudinal quasi-experimental impact assessment in Malawi (independently verified by Intrac) supports this view. Early findings show significant outcomes achieved in improving enrolment, attendance, participation in class, child happiness at school and reducing hunger at school and levels of child labour for children at a representative sample of schools, within seven months of participation in MMM SFP. Enrolment at these schools increased by 40% following the introduction of feeding (boys 37%, girls 43%), highlighting the enormous impact school feeding has in encouraging children, particularly girls, to attend school. MM is provided free of charge and available to all children enrolled at school. Long-term data trends from MMM show enrolment increases of an average of 30%, three years after the introduction of feeding. Enrolment within the 25 Zambia programme schools has increased by 8.4% since Mary’s Meals began feeding in October 2014. MM’s collaborative approach enables the need for increased educational resources to be highlighted at a district and national level to inform the allocation of Government resources. The Malawi impact assessment also found a 15% increase in attendance (78%-93%), seven months after the introduction of feeding with children (307) reporting via surveys that, for example: 87% attend school more or much more. 97% of children said they find it easier, or much easier to learn now that they receive food at school. At baseline 42% of children felt hungry at school always or most days, this had reduced to 7% by initial impact stage. At baseline, 59% of children frequently found it difficult to join in lessons and answer questions due to hunger, this had reduced to 7%, with 93% of children saying they never or rarely find it difficult to participate. At baseline, 29% of children said the main reason they had left early within the past 2 weeks was hunger, by impact stage this had reduced to 6%. 32% of children said that they work for money less since Mary's Meals started feeding at their school. Children cited as the biggest difference which having a meal makes to their classroom as 'children in my class pay more attention to the teacher' (56%), the second biggest difference cited was 'children in my class are happier' (40%). 92% of children said that they feel happy or very happy at school, compared to 53% at baseline. Surveys with teachers (139) triangulated this, with 94% of teachers reporting that children are attending school more or much more since feeding began and 84% of teachers saying that children now leave early during the school day less or much less often. At baseline that 59% of teachers cited hunger as their main reason for children not attending school, this had reduced to 2%. 99% of teachers said that having Mary's Meals has made a difference to their class. The main difference cited by teachers was children pay more attention in class, the second most common difference was that the children are happier. The percentage of teachers who felt that parents/guardians are involved in school activities had increased from 79% (baseline) to 91% (initial impact).Mary’s Meals has significant experience in delivering school feeding programmes in many countries around the world and has continuously developed and refined our approach to reach as many children as possible in the most effective and sustainable way. MMI has in-depth contextual and practical knowledge of Malawi and Zambia, employing staff and conducting regular visits to engage with MMM and MMZ teams and supporting continuous improvement and development through monitoring, training and cross-working. In particular, all of our projects provide one nutritious daily meal to *every* child in a place of education promoting the inclusion of vulnerable children, helping to foster the spirit of community within each school. We also focus on developing strong organisational capacity in the countries we work in, recognising the importance of utilising local knowledge and expertise. We therefore recruit, develop and train national staff, in a structured programme covering topics including hygienic dietary preparation, child protection, gender equity in education, HIV/AIDS, access to education for disabled children, food preparation safety and hygiene, volunteer management, information, stock management and environmental sustainability; helping to maximise the lasting local impact of our programmes. We have a robust, well-developed model, but we also seek to continuously adapt our programme design to suit local needs and context and pride ourselves in adopting innovative new approaches wherever possible.Lessons learned have led to dramatic improvements at project level. For example, we have been able to obtain greater efficiencies through strong procurement practices for food suppliers. Food for the project will also be procured locally, meaning that we will buy from local suppliers, who buy from thousands of local small-holder farmers at a fair price, thereby providing support to the farmers and their families. This local procurement promotes local and national economic growth, providing an assured market for agricultural production. We have also learned that developing strong logistics results in reliability and consistency in the delivery of our programmes. Our aim is that schools are never without a food supply, which helps to strengthen community trust in Mary’s Meals and foster ongoing support.The school and local community are also equal partners with Mary’s Meals in delivering our programmes and our programmes rely upon community volunteers. Once the food is delivered to the schools, the school and volunteers take responsibility for organising the project, preparing the food and serving it to the children. We engage with the community, train the volunteers before the project starts and provide ongoing monitoring and support to ensure that the programme is running well. Mobilising volunteers in this way allows us to keep costs low and reinforces the community ownership of the project. Working closely with schools, highlighting for example, that food should be served during mid-morning break, to ensure the project does not disrupt lesson times. This also means that children are better equipped to learn after eating, whilst avoiding serving children immediately at the start of the school day as practice has shown that children are more likely to then leave and not attend school. This tried and tested method works well and reinforces messaging around the need to attend school for the whole day. |
| **3.7** | PROJECT APPROACHPlease provide details on the project approach proposed to address the problem(s) you have defined in section 3.3. Why do you consider this approach to be the most effective way to achieve the project outcome? Please justify the timeframe and scope of your project and ensure that the narrative relates to the logframe and budget. |
| Mary’s Meals has considerable experience in the efficient delivery of community-based school feeding programmes. Over the past thirteen years we have continually refined our approach to achieve an extremely effective delivery model that reaches as many hungry children as possible and represents good value for money. The project will deliver significant benefits for a large number of highly vulnerable children at a relatively low cost, using a modular approach which can be easily scaled up or down. The project will be delivered together with our wider programmes in Malawi and Zambia, achieving economies of scale through the bulk purchase of food, centralised logistics and low unit costs. The average spend per child for this project is calculated at £10.54 per year (global average £12.20) and demonstrates the efficiency of our high impact, low cost delivery model. The delivery model is dependent on the mobilisation and active voluntary participation of parents, teachers and community leaders who will work in partnership with MMM and MMZ to manage and deliver the project in each community. MMM and MMZ will establish and develop effective relationships and partnerships with district education officials, school administrations, PTAs and communities who will co-ordinate project delivery in each school and support schools to set up voluntary school feeding committees who will recruit and manage a rota of volunteer cooks to prepare and deliver meals. Meals are served during scheduled break times during the school day in order to avoid disruption in the delivery of lessons. MMM and MMZ will deliver a structured training programme to volunteers, schools and district education officials on the efficient delivery and project management of the SFP. This includes stock control, hygiene, safe food preparation, child protection, promotion of access to education for disabled children, woodlot maintenance, gender equity and the importance of education for girls. MOUs will be agreed with each school. In order to provide ongoing supervision and support to volunteers, MMM and MMZ school feeding officers will visit each school at least twice each week and will play a key role in monitoring enrolment and attendance rates, food consumption levels, and will provide ongoing training and support to volunteers, school administrators and community. MMM and MMZ will coordinate all food and utensil procurement, transportation and delivery to schools and construct a permanent kitchen/food store with community contribution.Each school will be supported to establish and maintain sustainable, productive community run woodlots, with MMM and MMZ facilitating the establishment of woodlot committees, providing tools, seedlings and regular specialised support and supervision visits. Substantial levels of voluntary community engagement are central to the success of our work. Our work across Malawi alone relies on the active participation of over 65,000 volunteers. The involvement of volunteers broadens and strengthens community participation and ownership of the programme. Our approach emphasises that it is the responsibility of the community to feed their own children. It also increases community support for education, particularly for girls and marginalised children (children who have dropped out of school, disabled children, those with special needs, and children living with HIV/AIDS). MMI has a proven track record of promoting gender equality and girls currently represent 50.5% of all children in schools supported by MMM and 50.6% of all children in MMZ. All training will be delivered in Chichewa and Nyanya and all monitoring, evaluation and learning data will be disaggregated by gender and disability.Great care has been taken to work in collaboration with key partners to clearly identify areas and schools with the greatest need. Meticulous planning for the project has taken place at local, district and national levels. Throughout the project, MMM and MMZ will collaborate and liaise with Government representatives and NGOs to provide meaningful inputs through District Executive Committees and District Technical Working Groups for School Health and Nutrition in Malawi, and through national, provincial and District School Health and Nutrition committees in Zambia. Both MMM and MMZ will host workshops and facilitate regular field visits and shared learning experiences for district school feeding representatives as well as relevant national level MoEST/MoE officials and respective Ministers of Education to demonstrate the benefits of school feeding and present MMI’s approach as a model of best practice in delivering SFPs. This will increase capacity and skills at different levels in the delivery of sustainable community based school feeding programmes.In Malawi and Zambia, we use a centralised logistics system which benefits local smallholder farmers and national economies. This centralised procurement and distribution system enables the distribution of food from food secure districts to food insecure districts, thereby providing a safety net in lean periods. We conduct transparent competitive tendering exercises for the supply and delivery of food each year, and award contracts on the basis of cost, quality and added value, whilst maintaining high standards. The food for our programme in Zambia is sourced from a Zambian supplier (currently COMACO, whose head office is in Lusaka), and food for our programme in Malawi is sourced from a Malawian supplier (currently RAB Processors Ltd and ETG Ltd, whose head offices are in Blantyre). Independent laboratory testing for aflatoxins will be carried out on a random sample basis as standard with both suppliers. We will also undertake competitive tendering among local companies for the construction of the kitchen shelters at schools.  |
| **3.8** | SUSTAINABILITY AND SCALING-UPHow will you ensure that the benefits of the project are sustained? How will costs of any posts or maintenance of infrastructure provided by the project be paid for after project funding finishes ? Please provide details of any ways in which you see this initiative leading to other funding or being scaled up through work done by others in the future.  |
| MMI aims to deliver projects that are institutionally, socially, environmentally and economically sustainable. Institutional sustainability is approached by delivering an intensive and structured capacity building and training programme directed at the respective ministries, at school, zone, district at national level thereby building skills, knowledge and establishing well understood systems and processes, as well as promotion of the cost effective and efficient MM SFP model. We recognise that every developed and middle income country in the world implements its own school feeding programme in line with their national economic growth and development, and this is a fundamental and cost effective pillar of the welfare state. We are recognised as a key implementing partner of national school feeding programmes and we have developed an efficient and effective best practice model that can be replicated by the GoM and GRZ in the long term. Mary’s Meals will continue to deliver our programme as an example of best practice in order to provide support to both Governments as long as necessary until they are able to implement their own school feeding programmes. MMM, through the SMDPC is working with the GoM to support the development of the USMP towards the goal of achieving a locally owned, nationally led and locally sourced programme. The GoM has increased its own budget for delivering school feeding with a budget of MK120 million in 2015 and intends to adopt a centralised model similar to MMM’s SFP. The transition for the respective governments to fully deliver the SFP initiated by MM in Neno, Mwanza and Mwambe in 2019 is unlikely however, there are indications directly from the Minister of Education that the GoM is interested in adopting part of the MMM programme. Social Sustainability is achieved through MM’s model of community sensitisation, mobilisation and engagement, the formation of School Feeding Committees, which are sub-committees of the School Management Committees and Parent Teacher Associations and the training of community members in all aspects of the SFP. MOUs are agreed with the SFCs which include an agreement that the SFC will assume responsibility for the maintenance of the kitchens. This is well established and successful in the MMM SFP. Environmental Sustainability: The use of fuel efficient stoves and the establishment of sustainable woodlots with community training are central to the programme design. Economic Sustainability: Mary’s Meals is committed to continue the school feeding project in all schools when funding from the UK Aid Match ends. The schools have been selected as part of our wider plans for expansion in Malawi and Zambia, and therefore we intend to continue for as long as required through funding received from our wide and diverse base of funding sources. Thanks to our many ‘grassroots’ supporters around the world, Mary’s Meals has experienced sustained growth in our income year on year. Fundraising activities are supported around the world by Mary’s Meals affiliated organisations in the USA, Austria, Canada, Croatia, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Spain, and also by Mary’s Meals UK. Other fundraising groups have been established in the United Arab Emirates, Australia, France and Portugal. Our latest annual report indicates an increase in income from the last financial year by 19%, and as our movement continues to expand, we are confident that we will secure sufficient funding to sustain the delivery of the project in all schools. This includes the costs of staff posts and maintenance of the kitchen shelters at each school. The voluntary school feeding committees at each school takes responsibility to maintain the kitchens as part of their MOU with Mary’s Meals. |
| 3.9 | SCALING YOUR PROJECT UP OR DOWNHow will you expand or reduce the scope of the project if your appeal income is different from what you have estimated it will be?  |
| Both projects form part of MM’s wider school feeding programmes in Malawi and Zambia. MMM is currently feeding 773,062 primary school children, MMZ is currently feeding 20,073. MM prides itself in its ability to respond quickly to need and rapidly increasing resources. Our global income has grown at a rate of 18.8% per year over the past five years and MMM’s programme in Malawi has grown by an average of 18% per year during this time. If the appeal income were to be higher, MM would have the scope to further expand its programmes in both Malawi and Zambia. The need for school feeding, as evidenced by high hunger levels and low school engagement, and recognised by both Governments is strong and wide-spread throughout both countries. We have very clear systems for expansion, with standard processes which have been followed repeatedly since our programmes began. Indeed, UNESCO recently acknowledged: “SFPs are internationally recognised as highly flexible programmes which can be ‘scaled up fairly rapidly’ (UNESCO EFA 2015). Both programmes have highly refined logistical processes in place and the MM model is well-established, understood and effective which allows us to replicate and scale up accordingly. In 2014, 60% of MMM’s budget was covered by restricted income, and estimates for 2015/2016 are at around the same level, meaning that 40% of the £5.4m Malawi budget is fundable. As of yet, there has been no restricted income for Zambia, with the total 2015/2016 country budget available for funding.If appeal income is less than anticipated, both programmes could be scaled down. However both programmes form part of MM’s carefully thought out strategic plan for 2016 with initial scoping and planning work already in place and if at all possible MMI would endeavour to increase its own contribution to the programmes to meet a critical need. |
|

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION 4: PROJECT RISKS AND MITIGATION  |
| **4.1** | How does your organisation approach the identification and management of risks associated with the delivery of a project? What systems and processes do you have in place? Please also include with your application a separate **risk register/matrix** showing the risks associated with your proposed project and how you will mitigate them, for which you should use your own format. |
| MM has a proven track record of success in delivering SFPs and as a result has clear sight of perceived risks across all SFPs, as well as a successful track record of standard internal control procedures and mitigating actions to safeguard the organisation against risk. The global MM network has a strong organisational risk management process, which draws on a central risk register to identify, mitigate and effectively manage risk. Our risk management framework, which is reviewed and updated on a regular basis, is employed across all departments, projects and country offices. There are a number of organisational processes and policies which specifically work to minimise risk as well as help inform the risk management process, including security policy and procedures, child protection policy and training, internal review and financial control measures, annual external auditing and annual tendering for all large scale suppliers across our country programmes. Risk is managed centrally by MMI, with an organisation-wide risk register encompassing top line affiliate organisation and departmental risks. Departmental risk registers are completed in response to need and risk registers are developed for each programme, highlighting specific risks within any given project or context. Risks are identified by examining each overarching risk area, for example national and local country context, supplier risks, security risks and capacity. Each risk identified within a given risk area is scored on the basis of Likelihood x Impact, with impacts placed on a scale ranging from insignificant to extreme/catastrophic. Mitigating actions are then placed alongside each risk, with a new updated risk score achieved on the basis of the mitigating action. Mitigating actions directly reflect ongoing regular programme activities such as routine monitoring, stock control and financial management, as well as acknowledging extraordinary circumstances such as conflict, adverse weather, corruption and government support. The attached risk matrix details the individual risks and mitigating actions highlighted for this project.  |
| **4.2** | ENVIRONMENT AND CLIMATE CHANGEWhat are the opportunities and the risks of the project in relation to environmental sustainability and climate change? Please specify what overall impact (positive, neutral or negative) the project is likely to have on the environment and climate change. Where relevant, please also specify what impact the environment and climate change are likely to have on the project. In each case, what steps have you taken to assess any potential impact?  Please note the severity of the impacts and how the project will mitigate any potentially negative impacts, as well as how it will make use of opportunities to increase the positive impacts. |
| We anticipate that the project is likely to have a neutral impact on the environment and climate change.Opportunities: As a positive response to the adverse impacts of climate change on food security, the SFP provides a safety net to communities. The targeted districts in this project are prone to high levels of food insecurity, which is partly due to adverse weather conditions and a dependence on rain-fed agriculture. These districts are therefore vulnerable to irregular rain patterns caused by climate variability. As the MM centralised delivery model involves procurement of a year’s supply of food from secure districts, the project provides a reliable net in-flow of food throughout the year, thereby guaranteeing a dependable source of food in lean periods, which will reduce the incidence of hunger among children. An integral component of the project is the establishment of woodlots at the schools which will eventually provide a sustainable source of firewood for use in cooking the school meals. Native trees that can be harvested after four years from planting will be used. These regenerate quickly to provide a sustainable source of fuel in the long term. Woodlots will be directly managed and maintained by the community.MMM and MMZ will provide training to community volunteers to improve skills and raise awareness of environmental issues and of the importance of ensuring a sustainable source of fuel. This will help to minimise the impact on natural forests. School volunteers and pupils will be directly involved in managing the woodlots through involvement with wildlife clubs, thereby promoting awareness of the importance of sustainable and carbon neutral fuel sources.Risks: While it is acknowledged that firewood is the primary source of household fuel in both Malawi and rural Zambia[[15]](#footnote-15), the project will mitigate the environmental impact of deforestation by introducing the use of fuel-efficient stoves for cooking school meals. These will be an integral part of the kitchen shelters that will be constructed at each school. The kitchens enhance the delivery of the SFP and provide a secure storage space for food, improve health and safety standards and facilitate the safe, hygienic preparation of the food. The shelters also provide secure storage space which has improved stock control for the raw ingredients of the meals. The implementation of the project may also have a potentially negative impact on climate change through the fuel used to transport the food and use of international flights. Fuel used for transport will be kept to a minimum through streamlined distribution, ensuring that vehicles deliver to as many schools as possible within each journey. International flights will also be well planned to ensure maximum benefit to the programme. |

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION 5: MONITORING, EVALUATION, LESSON LEARNING This section should clearly relate to the project logframe and the relevant sections of the budget.  |
| **5.1** | How will the performance of the project be monitored? Who will be involved? What tools and approaches are you intending to use? What training is required for partners to monitor and evaluate the project? |
| Indicators relating to daily attendance and delivery rate, enrolment, progression and completion rates will be routinely tracked by each individual school, as is standard across MMM and MMZ programmes. Each school will provide written information to its respective School Feeding Officer (SFO) on a weekly basis. This information will be verified and spot-checked by SFOs during bi-weekly visits and submitted to MMM and MMZ MEL Officers for collation and analysis on a monthly basis. MMM and MMZ MEL staff will also check data against district education authority statistics on a monthly basis and data will be routinely verified and spot-checked by senior MMM and MMZ programme staff and MMI staff (local and UK based) during field visits. This information will then be submitted to MMI for input into Mary’s Meals global MEL MS Access database for wider detailed analysis. Data for indicators gathered by survey will be collected by MEL Field Officers (MELFM) who are also responsible for data entry. Initial household surveys have been conducted by MELFMs in each District to gather most recent numbers on children out of school (format independently reviewed and approved by INTRAC). This information will be recollected prior to projects commencing and gathered at the end of each academic year in the respective programme countries.MMI is conducting five year longitudinal quasi-experimental impact assessments (IA) within both MMM and MMZ programmes which involves programme, control and long-term existing groups of schools. This research, relating to hunger, enrolment, attendance, attainment, happiness and play, work and aspirations, as well as community involvement and support for education, began with children, teachers, volunteers and Government staff in September 2014 (Malawi) and January 2015 (Zambia). Both IAs have been designed, project managed and delivered by MM MEL staff and are being independently assessed and verified by INTRAC, who conducted an in-country evaluation in February 2015. All 15 sample schools for the two IA control groups are within proposed project schools, providing a wealth of longer-term baseline data. Data relating to these IAs will continue to be gathered throughout the term of the projects, providing information and learning across our MMM and MMZ programmes. INTRAC’s most recent field report on MMI’s IA work in Malawi and Zambia stated: “The overall conclusion of the INTRAC consultant visit to observe Mary’s Meals Impact assessment data collection process is very positive. The methodology for selecting schools, the participant sampling processes employed and the interview techniques are suitably robust and reflect the reality on the ground. INTRAC is happy to endorse the data collection processes as observed in both Malawi and Zambia.”In addition to this, data for indicators 2.3, 3.2 and 4.3 will be gathered at periodic intervals with a representative sample of children, teachers and volunteers via specific survey and participatory focus group research, using tools previously designed for the IAs. Independent consultant reviews will be conducted at intervals throughout the project period with an external in-country evaluation conducted at the end.All survey work will be carried out by MMM and MMZ MELFMs who are experienced enumerators. The majority of MELFMs were promoted from SFO positions and all have a strong understanding of MM programmes and sensitivity to challenges facing MEL work with vulnerable children. All MELFMs have received extensive in-house training. INTRAC’s finding was that: “Clearly the overall standard of enumerators for Mary’s Meals is high”. Focus group work will be conducted by MMM and MMI staff who have also been trained in this area. |
| **5.2** | Please use this section to explain the budget allocated to M&E. Please ensure there is provision for baseline and on-going data collection and an end of project review. If you think there is a case for undertaking an independent mid term review of the project, or a final independent evaluation (eg. if the project is testing a new approach, or working in a particularly difficult or sensitive context, or is high value), please include costs for this in your budget.  |
| A significant proportion of the budget is allocated to MEL, via both MEL and staff costs, with ongoing monitoring of programme delivery, a key aspect of our work. In order to support baseline and on-going data collection, the budget includes salary, stationery, equipment, travel and field accommodation costs for SFOs gathering routine data, MELFMs (MMM 4, MMZ 2) gathering survey data, MEL Officers in country offices and MMM/MMZ/MMI staff working on focus groups and data analysis and interpretation. MM is highly experienced in conducting sophisticated, impact focussed, programme MEL and has based these costs on current knowledge of regular expenditure in this area. In addition to this, the budget includes consultancy costs for ongoing review of programme data and findings, as well as a final independent evaluation. As MMI has engaged INTRAC in review of ongoing IA work during 2014/15, INTRAC would continue to be involved in ongoing reviews as part of the IA process. However, the final independent evaluation will be conducted by a different external supplier to ensure continued external objectivity. It is not felt that an additional mid-term review would be needed as detailed IA work will be ongoing throughout the project period. |
| **5.3** | Please explain how the learning from this project will be incorporated into your organisation and disseminated, and to whom this information will be targeted (e.g. project stakeholders and others outside of the project). If you have specific ideas for key learning questions to be answered through the implementation of this project, please state them here.  |
| MM places high importance on promoting learning among our global staff, stakeholders and partners. Learning is a continual process and is facilitated through our daily communication and regular staff team meetings, workshops, presentations, strategic planning processes, regular meetings with stakeholders, and annual reviews. MM places great importance on gaining feedback from children, our principle stakeholders, and this will be facilitated through the participatory, child-sensitive focus groups, working with children of all ages. This learning, supported by impact survey statistics, will be disseminated across MMM, MMZ and MMI and factored into learning to influence programme design, supported by the Head of Programmes, Policy and Development.In addition to this: SFOs provide continual advice and training to volunteers and teachers during bi-weekly school visits; annual training sessions held for key stakeholders at school level (head teacher, feeding committee, community chiefs, DEM) to allow refresher training and peer learning; quarterly training workshops for all MMM and MMZ staff (included within MMM/MMZ central costs – not represented in this project budget); SFOs/School Feeding Managers hold community workshops to respond to any concerns and facilitate participatory feedback process. Learning from M&E will also be a key factor in ongoing work with district and national level Government staff, providing compelling evidence of development and change. Key findings will also be disseminated to external stakeholders and interested parties (Governments, partners, NGO’s, donors) through meetings and impact reports. Finally, as part of the IA learning process, the M&E will also explore new or adapted methods of evidencing community support for education and will continue MMI’s work on impact in relation to early pregnancy and marriage.  |

|  |
| --- |
| SECTION 6: EXPERIENCE/TRACK RECORD  |
| **6.1** | What is the value added of your organisation in delivering the proposed intervention? What is your organisation’s track record in delivering similar interventions in similar contexts for a similar cost? Please include the details of the development results achieved. If your organisation has not delivered this type of intervention before, what learning/evidence underpins your proposal?  |
| MM has over 12 years of experience in delivering SFPs and is recognised as a world leader in the delivery of community based SFPs and is now feeding 1,035, 637 children every day at school. We have continuously developed and refined our approach so that we reach as many children as we can, in the most efficient, effective and sustainable way. Our work has developed directly in response to the needs of communities, who are our equal partners. We have been working in school feeding in Malawi since 2002 and have developed a highly sophisticated, effective delivery model, which we have replicated in Zambia based on our complex knowledge and understanding in this area. MM’s delivery model is replicable, efficient, and effective with a proven track record of success. MMM maintains an annual feeding rate of over 90% in Malawi, which evidences the efficiency and strength of logistic systems and community partnerships. MMM average feeding rate to date for 2015 is 92%, MMZ is 96%.MM’s added value is its highly developed approach to school feeding and contextual understanding, which has been able to develop over time, with the advantage of being our key organisational focus. Every aspect of our simple, yet not simplistic, model and approach has been carefully considered and designed according to feedback and learning and as a result both MMM and MMZ are highly respected by the communities we work with, local, district and national authorities and the wider population. All of our large staff team have become experts in school feeding, through our strong training programme and have been well supported by clearly thought out management processes, procedures and structures throughout every aspect of our organisational operation.Recent feedback from INTRAC’s external review of our programme stated: “The Mary’s Meals’ Model of community sensitisation, mobilisation and engagement was observed over and over as a model that is appropriate for helping to keep children in school and improving their nutrition levels. Parents, community and local officials continually approached us either thanking Mary’s Meals for the help they were giving their children, or asking for Mary’s Meals to move into other areas where children are hungry. Observing the volunteers’ engagement with the children and community members also highlighted the focus on this being a community managed programme.” MMM also has strong experience of operating community woodlots and has been supporting the running of community woodlots across schools since 2013. Again, our approach to this has been refined through feedback and learning with initial expert guidance and training and ongoing expert consultation where necessary.MMI MEL systems used by MMM and MMZ have been developed based on MMI’s long-established understanding of working on SFPs, specifically in the sub-Saharan African context. We have developed a system which balances quantitative and qualitative data collection, facilitating triangulation, through a tried and tested understanding of what data is feasibly collectable and verifiable, working within complex, context specific education systems facing varied challenges at every level (for example paper-based school record systems, potentially corrupt exam systems). Our system, which minimises the influence of external causal factors in assessing programme impact, has been highly praised by MEL experts as being culturally sensitive and appropriate, yet robust, with an advanced focus on impact. |

 |
| SECTION 7: PROJECT MANAGEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION  |
| **7.1** | PROJECT MANAGEMENTPlease outline the management arrangements for this project. This should include:* A clear description of the roles and responsibilities of each of the partners. This should refer to the separate project organogram, which is required as part of your proposal documentation.
* An explanation of the human resources required (number of full-time equivalents, type, skills).
* An explanation of how your organisation will manage the delivery of the project, including arrangements for managing delivery partners and how they will report to your organisation.
 |
| The success of the project relies heavily on the active participation of members of each local community in the design, management and implementation of the project. A school feeding committee (SFC) will be established at every school, which will take responsibility for the management of the project at local level. The SFC will work in close partnership with school staff, the parent-teacher associations at each school, community leaders and with MMM/MMZ. Each SFC will have a minimum of 5 members who will recruit and manage teams of volunteers to prepare and serve the meals. The SFC will influence the design of the project by providing valuable feedback and will take a lead role in resolving any local issues that may arise in partnership with MMM/MMZ. The project will be managed across MMUK, MMl, MMM and MMZ offices. **MMUK** will be ultimately responsible for managing and reporting on the project, leading on communications and fundraising, as well as liasing directly with DFID, MMI, MMM and MMZ.**MMI** will play a central role in overseeing and monitoring all project activities, including programme delivery, MEL and financial reporting. MMI will also co-ordinate all reporting; collating MEL data, progress and finance reports directly from MMM and MMZ in order to submit timely reports and updates to DFID. The Programmes Officer (PO) based in Scotland will work closely with the Programme Development Officer, Head of School Feeding (HoSF) and Country Director in Malawi as well as Country Representative in Zambia to develop progress reports, supervised by the Head of East and Southern Africa and the Head of Programmes Policy and Development (HPPD). MMI will undertake regular visits to Malawi and Zambia field offices to offer support, maintain cohesion and co-operation across partners as well as promote shared learning. MMI lead the organisational MEL strategy which will feed directly into this project. More complex MEL impact data collection will be supported by the HPPD, working closely with the PPIO (Glasgow-based) and PDO (Malawi-based). Monitoring visits to both projects will be undertaken by the PO, PPIO, HPPD and Head of Overseas Finance (HOF) based in Scotland - over the course of the project period. MMI will compile and review all monthly financial reports from MMM and MMZ as well as review and approve all requests for financial transfers on a monthly basis as standard. MMI management accountants for MMM and MMZ will take a lead role in this, supervised by the Head of Finance and Logistics (Malawi based, covering MMM and MMZ programmes) and supported by the HOF. **MMM and MMZ** will be key in the day to day running of the respective projects in Malawi and Zambia, from inception and set up to completion. MMM/MMZ responsibilities include ongoing project delivery, monitoring and collation of all data directly from projects through school feeding officers and school feeding managers. The MEL team, based in Malawi will be key in the collection and analysis of data, to be disseminated to MMI and feeding in regular reporting and progress updates to DFID.MMM/MMZ will be responsible for implementing all activities within the log frame, and will take a key role in coordinating all standard programme activity, in addition to holding key relationships essential to the success of this project, including participation and engagement with national level stakeholders, such as the GoM/GRZ, WFP, GIZ and other implementers of school feeding. MMM/Z will be responsible for supporting the GoM/GRZ in the long term adoption of school feeding, including facilitating visits, training and drafting policy. The HoSF and Country Director (Malawi) and Country Representative (Zambia) will assume responsibility for these activities, supported by school feeding managers and SFOs as well as the Head of Operations and Finance. All of these stakeholders will receive ongoing support from MMI through the PFM, HPPD, PPIO and PO in Scotland as well as the Head of East and Southern Africa, based in Malawi allowing closer mentoring and strategic support. In country spending, including costs associated with project delivery, staffing and travel will be monitored and tracked in country, compiled into monthly reports to be sent to MMI. The Head of Finance and Operations will be responsible for all financial reporting, supported by Malawi Finance Manager.The overall responsibility of project management will be held with MMI, who will work closely with MMM and MMZ to co-ordinate and collaborate work across both partners. As programme affiliates of MMI, there are close working links across all partners, with regular contact and support visits as well as systems in place such as monthly MEL reporting, programme updates, financial reporting and cash transfer systems in place.  |
| **7.2** | NEW SYSTEMS, INFRASTRUCTURE, AND/OR STAFFINGPlease outline any new systems, infrastructure, and/or staffing that would be required to implement this project. Note that these need to be considered when discussing sustainability and project timeframes.  |
| The project will be implemented within existing well-established systems, infrastructure and staffing in Malawi and Zambia as well as Glasgow (MMI), with new staff recruited within existing role descriptions and HR structures and training systems. New kitchens will be established at each school as required, providing a sustainable structure to deliver SFPs in the long term. New District Field Monitors will be recruited in Malawi to support close working at district level and district capacity and knowledge in delivering effective SFPs. New School Feeding Officers (12 Malawi, 3 Zambia) will be recruited to conduct bi-weekly monitoring visits, check records, food storage and hygiene and stock levels and ensure meals are being served as agreed. New School Feeding Managers will also be recruited to supervise each SFO and provide oversight at a local level. A new MEL Field Officer (MELFO) will be recruited to support MEL in Zambia in line with MELFOs already in position in Malawi. |
| **7.3** | COLLABORATION AND COORDINATION WITH OTHER DEVELOPMENT ACTORSHow will you coordinate project implementation with other development actors and ensure no duplication of effort (including with other DFID funded activities)? How will you work with local/national government and private sector providers?  |
| Malawi: Mary’s Meals works very closely with other development actors implementing school feeding programmes in Malawi and has been a key contributor to the SHN Development Partners meeting which is a working group including WFP, GIZ, ADRA, FISD, World Vision, DFID, EU and USAID, ensuring that there is clear collaboration between organisations implementing school feeding programmes in Malawi.At national level MMM has a long standing MOU with the GoM as a key implementer of the USMP and SHN partner. MMM is an active member of the SHN ‘Cross-cutting Technical Working Group’ (TWG) through which all SFP activities are reported and coordinated. This group is also tasked with the coordination of all school based initiatives involving child health, water, sanitation and hygiene, de-worming, HIV prevention and promotion of gender equity in education. MMM is a founder and pro-active contributor to the School Meals Development Partners committee (SMDPC) which is a community of practice and coordinating group for all of the key school feeding partners (e.g. WFP, GIZ etc) with donors also invited (DFID, USAID, EU). This new committee is already providing technical support to GoM and ensuring that there is clear collaboration between organisations implementing school feeding programmes in Malawi. From the inception of each expansion of the programme, MMM works within the respective District Executive Committees (DEC) which are intended to coordinate all developmental initiatives and organisations operating in the districts. MMM facilitates five district SHN TWGs and at community level, Mary’s Meals Malawi works in direct partnership with all relevant partners and structures to promote capacity building, programme ownership and sustainability. MMM conducts competitive tenders each year for the supply of Super Cereal - Corn Soya Blend (CSB).Zambia: MMZ has submitted a draft MOU to the MOE and has the formal support of the Permanent Secretary for Basic Education to operate in the Eastern Province. Coordination meetings have also been held with the GoM’s School Feeding Programme Coordinator and with the WFP team. The GoM in partnership with WFP delivers a SFP in 22 districts but does not cover the districts targeted by MMZ. MMZ continues to meet regularly with WFP. The targeting for MMZ is also undertaken in consultation with the Provincial Education Office and the District Education Office to avoid duplication. The strategic plan for Mambwe District Council has a specific objective on establishing a school feeding programme.Through close links with GRZ’s provincial and district education offices, we collaborate with other organizations implementing activities in schools. For example, we are currently working with Care and FHI 360 funded by USAID, who are involved in improving sanitation in schools and provision of clean water. In addition, the food provided by Mary’s Meals give children energy to participate in other school-based projects such as, Room to Read, Read to Succeed and Time to Learn. MMZ is also collaborating with Total Land Care in environmental management.Due to the size and influence of our programmes, both MMZ and WFP participate in committees at both district and provincial levels that consider SHN issues. The permanent members of these committees are government workers in the PEO and DEBS office, including the Senior Education Planning Officer (provincial SHN coordinator) and the statistician for the PEO. MMZ has facilitated visits by GRZ officials to the schools where Mary’s Meals are being served. By working in close collaboration with other development actors in Malawi and Zambia, MMM and MMZ both facilitate the sharing of information on the elements of the Mary’s Meals delivery model. This is helping to influence ongoing discussions at a national level on the optimal modalities for SGPs in Malawi and Zambia, with Mary’s Meals providing a model of best practice in terms of consistency (high feeding rate), community engagement, scalability and low cost approach. All meeting/workshop participation in both countries will be in line with Daily Subsistence Allowance guidelines. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 8:** CAPACITY OF APPLICANT ORGANISATION AND ALL IMPLEMENTING PARTNER ORGANISATIONS **(Max 3 pages each)** Please copy and fill in this section for your organisation **AND for each implementation partner**  |
| **8.1** | **Name of Organisation** | Mary’s Meals UK |
| **8.2** | **Address** | Craig Lodge, Dalmally, Argyll, Scotland, UK, PA33 1AR |
| **8.3** | **Web Site** | www.marysmeals.org.uk |
| **8.4** | **Registration or charity number (if applicable)** | SCO22140 |
| **8.5** | **Annual Income** | Income (original currency):  £ 15,436,649Income (£ equivalent):  £ 15,436,649Exchange rate: 1:1 ***Start/end date of accounts (dd/mm/yyyy***)From: 01/01/2014To: 31/12/2014 |
| **8.6** | **Number of existing staff**  | 25 |
| **8.7** | **Proposed project staffing staff to be employed under this project (specify the total full-time equivalents - FTE)** | Existing staff | 0 |
| New staff | 0.5 FTE (separately grant funded) |
| **8.8** | **Organisation category** (Select a maximum of two categories) |
| Non-Government Org. (NGO)  | X | Local Government |  |
| Trade Union |  | National Government |  |
| Faith-based Organisation (FBO) |  | Ethnic Minority Group or Organisation |  |
| Disabled Peoples’ Organisation (DPO) |  | Diaspora Group or Organisation |  |
| Orgs. Working with Disabled People |  | Academic Institution |  |
| Other... (please specify) |  |  |
| **8.9** | A) Summary of expected roles and responsibilities, ANDB) Amount (and percentage) of project budget which this partner will directly manage. |
| **A):** The key positions responsible will be:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Responsibility** |
| Executive Director, Mary’s Meals UK | Responsible for Mary’s Meals’ relationship with DFID and the overall management of the project, including ensuring availability of funds throughout the project, relationship management of communications partners, the implementation of the campaign, and all accounting and reporting. |
| Head of Fundraising | All fundraising activities during and after the campaign and management of the fundraising team. |
| Head of Communications | Managing the relationship with communications partners and directing the implementation of the campaign. |
| Head of Finance and Operations | All accounting and reporting, including income from all sources that form part of the project and coordinating and collating reports from communications and implementation partners and management of the Finance, Administration and Operations teams. |

In addition to these roles, Mary’s Meals has also secured funding from The Golden Jubilee Trust - John Lewis Partnership for a six-month Fundraising Campaigns Officer internship who will be directly involved in supporting MMUK’s work on the fundraising appeal alongside MMUK communications and fundraising staff.Note – none of the staff mentioned above have been included in the project budget. **B):** £3,154,600 -100%. |
| **8.10** | EXPERIENCE: Please outline this organisation's experience and track record in relation to its roles and responsibilities on this project (including technical issues and relevant geographical coverage). What development results has this organisation achieved which are relevant to this proposal (ie. for similar interventions in similar contexts for a similar cost)? Please include details of any external evaluations of this organisation’s work (relevant to the proposed project) which have been completed and whether they are available.  |
| MMUK was responsible for all programme delivery for Mary’s Meals global school feeding programmes from 2002 – 2014 (feeding 989,816 children in 14 countries as at December 2014). During 2014, MMUK Board approved the decision to create MMI to take universal responsibility for delivery of the feeding programmes, growing the global movement and international finance and operations.  The creation of MMI, and transfer of relevant staff and resources, took place in response to the global growth of Mary’s Meals National Affiliates. Strengthening the organisational structure has provided greater clarity of responsibility and ensures a strong platform for further growth of Mary’s Meals across the world. MMUK will continue to raise funds in the UK and Ireland towards MMI’s global SFPs. MMUK financial statements are audited by PWC and the 2014 Directors’ Report and Financial Statements are to be published in June 2015. |
| **8.11** | FUND MANAGEMENT: Please provide a brief summary of this organisation's recent fund management history. Please include source of funds, purpose, amount and time period covered. |
| MMUK is an independently constituted body and is a National Affiliate organisation within the Mary’s Meals Network. MMUK has entered into a Covenant of Participation in order to fulfil the vision and mission of MM. MMUK has extensive experience in managing relationships with a wide variety of funders in the UK including foundations, trusts, corporate donors, and governmental funding agencies. The fund management of major awards received in the UK is undertaken by MMUK in collaboration with MMI. The primary source of funding received in the UK is through grassroots support. The total received from grassroots supporters in 2013 for MMUK was £6,492,249 through 89,347 individual gifts. The experienced staff team within MMUK administers all donations effectively using professional IT resources. For brevity, fund management history is provided below only for a small sample of current funders:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of funds** | **Purpose** | **Amount** | **Time period** |
| Scottish Government Malawi Development Programme  | Expansion of the Mary’s Meals’ School Feeding Programme in Neno and Balaka in Southern Malawi | Total award (over 3 years) £399,846 | May 2013 to March 2016 |
| Scottish Government Malawi Development Programme  | Expansion of the Mary’s Meals’ School Feeding Programme in the Machinga district of Southern Malawi | Total award (over 3 years) £584,038 | April 2015 to March 2018 |
| Maitri Trust  | Expansion of the Mary’s Meals’ School Feeding Programme in Liberia | Total award (over 3 years) £1,300,000 | September 2012 to August 2015 |

 |
| **8.12** | CHILD PROTECTION (for projects working with children and youth (0-18 years) only)How does this organisation ensure that children and young people are kept safe? Please describe any plans to improve the organisation's child protection policies and procedures for the implementation of this project.  |
| MM is fully committed to the rights of the child and we recognise our responsibility to ensure that those rights are upheld. We also recognise the particular vulnerability of children in the contexts in which we work. As part of the Mary’s Meals network, MMUK has, and adheres to, a comprehensive Child Protection Policy (CPP) which applies to all staff and operations. The CPP includes guidance on awareness raising, prevention measures and raising and responding to concerns. All MMUK staff have received full Child Protection training and have signed a corresponding code of conduct. MM CPP includes clear guidance on communications and the use of images, which is consistently applied as standard. |
| **8.13** | FRAUD: Has there been any incidence of any fraudulent activity in this organisation within the last 5 years? How was the fraud detected? What action did your organisation take in response? How will you minimise the risk of fraudulent activity occurring? |
| No. |
| **8.14** | DUE DILIGENCE: How has your organisation assessed the capacity and competence of this organisation to deliver the proposed intervention and to manage project funds accountably? What is your assessment of their capacity and what is the evidence to support this? How will your organisation manage the risks of under-performance and financial mis-management by this organisation throughout the lifetime of the project?  |
| MMUK is closely linked with MMI, MMM and MMZ and will maintain close collaboration with all implementing partners throughout the length of grant. MMUK will oversee the delivery and management of the project to ensure that it is implemented efficiently and effectively in accordance with the project logframe. MMUK has supported the delivery of projects by MMI, MMM and MMZ since their respective inceptions and operates under the same strict procedures, processes, and financial and risk management structures. The capacity of MMM, MMZ and MMI is strong and well-developed and this will be continually reviewed throughout the project lifetime, minimising risk of under-performance or mis-management.MMUK has a long track record of effectively managing relationships with a wide variety of donors in the UK. We demonstrate high capacity and competence in communicating with a wide variety of donors, and will be extremely efficient in conveying information on the achievements and progress of the project.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 8:** CAPACITY OF APPLICANT ORGANISATION AND ALL IMPLEMENTING PARTNER ORGANISATIONS **(Max 3 pages each)** Please copy and fill in this section for your organisation **AND for each implementation partner**  |
| **8.1** | **Name of Organisation** | Mary’s Meals International Organisation |
| **8.2** | **Address** | Craig Lodge, Dalmally, Argyll, Scotland, UK, PA33 1AR |
| **8.3** | **Web Site** | www.marysmeals.org |
| **8.4** | **Registration or charity number (if applicable)** | SCO45223 |
| **8.5** | **Annual Income** | Income (original currency): £16,949,000 EstimateIncome (£ equivalent): £16,949,000 EstimateExchange rate:  ***Start/end date of accounts (dd/mm/yyyy***)From: 01/01/2015 NB Note estimate for current yearTo: 31/12/2015 |
| **8.6** | **Number of existing staff**  | 39 (note this includes 4 MMI staff working in MMM programme and 2 MMI staff working in MMZ programme who are not in MMM/MMZ sections) |
| **8.7** | **Proposed project staffing staff to be employed under this project (specify the total full-time equivalents - FTE)** | Existing staff | 1.51 (FTE) |
| New staff | 0 |
| **8.8** | **Organisation category** (Select a maximum of two categories) |
| Non-Government Org. (NGO)  | x | Local Government |  |
| Trade Union |  | National Government |  |
| Faith-based Organisation (FBO) |  | Ethnic Minority Group or Organisation |  |
| Disabled Peoples’ Organisation (DPO) |  | Diaspora Group or Organisation |  |
| Orgs. Working with Disabled People |  | Academic Institution |  |
| Other... (please specify) |  |  |
| **8.9** | A) Summary of expected roles and responsibilities, ANDB) Amount (and percentage) of project budget which this partner will directly manage. |
| A): While ultimate responsibility will rest with MMUK, MMI will be responsible for oversight of the management and financial accounting of the project in both Malawi and Zambia, through the MMI Programmes Directorate and Finance and Operations Directorate based in Glasgow. The key positions responsible will be:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Responsibility** |
| Chief Operating Officer | Management of MMI and all affiliates through MM network, reporting to MMI Board. |
| Director of Programmes | Overall management of MM Programmes, Programmes Policy and MEL. |
| Head of Programmes Policy and Development | Management of MMI MEL systems, Programmes Policy and Governmental funding, liasing with staff across programme and partner affiliates. |
| Head of Programmes, East Africa | Overall management of MM programmes in Malawi, Zambia and Eastern Africa.  |
| Head of Overseas Finance | Management of budgets and finances of overseas programmes. |

**B):** £3,154,600 -100% of the funds will be remitted from MMUK. Note MMI direct costs represent £176,957 (6%). |
| **8.10** | EXPERIENCE: Please outline this organisation's experience and track record in relation to its roles and responsibilities on this project (including technical issues and relevant geographical coverage). What development results has this organisation achieved which are relevant to this proposal (ie. for similar interventions in similar contexts for a similar cost)? Please include details of any external evaluations of this organisation’s work (relevant to the proposed project) which have been completed and whether they are available.  |
| MMI incorporated on 7 October 2014 (Company Number 488380) and was registered with the Office of the Scottish Charity Regulator on 10 November 2014 (Charity Number SC045223).  MMI and MMUK signed a Transfer Agreement, effective from 1 January 2015, which transferred relevant staff resources and expertise from MMUK to MMI.MMI acts as a central hub for collecting and managing funds from all geographies, including transfers from MMUK, and for central direction and management of the feeding programmes.  All MMI Programmes and Finance and Operations staff were previously employed by MMUK and have lengthy experience of managing MM SFP in countries around the world. MMI financial statements will be audited by PWC. The 2014 Directors’ Report and Financial Statements of MMUK (published June 2015) include the activities now managed and delivered by MMI following their transfer on 1st January 2015. |
| **8.11** | FUND MANAGEMENT: Please provide a brief summary of this organisation's recent fund management history. Please include source of funds, purpose, amount and time period covered. |
| MMI undertakes fund management for a wide range of major donors including foundations, trusts, corporate donors, and governmental funding agencies on behalf of the Mary’s Meals network. The requirements of each major grant funder are met in full through the collaboration of senior managers in our Programmes, Communications & Fundraising, and Finance & Operations teams. These key staff are supported in this role by our specialist Grants & Partnerships Officer who also facilitates a fund management service to Mary’s Meals National Affiliate organisations, including MMUK. All incoming resources are included in MMI’s statement of financial activities. For interests of brevity, fund management history is provided below only for a small sample of current funders:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of funds** | **Purpose** | **Amount** | **Time period** |
| MMUK | Grassroots donations towards Mary’s Meals School Feeding Programmes | £5,645,000 | January to April 2015 |
| Robertson Foundation | Expansion of the Mary’s Meals School Feeding programme in Malawi, Liberia and Zambia. Operating support for Mary’s Meals’ strategic global growth plan | Total (over 3 years) $1,000,000 | April 2014 to March 2017 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Maitri Trust (via Mary’s Meals UK) | Expansion of the Mary’s Meals’ School Feeding Programme in Liberia | Total (over 3 years) £1,300,000 | September 2012 to August 2015 |
| Band Aid Charitable Trust (via Mary’s Meals UK) | Mary’s Meals School Feeding Programme in South Sudan plus emergency responses in South Sudan and Liberia.  | Total (over 4 years) £213,774 | 2011 to 2015 |
| Fondation Eagle | Construction of kitchen shelters to support Mary’s Meals School Feeding Programme in Malawi and Kenya | Total (over 4 years) £244,882 | 2011 to 2015 |

The funding listed above has specific, detailed grant management requirements and time-bound outcomes and milestones. Mary’s Meals International complies with all requirements in full and maintains a standard of excellence in the quality of information provided in all reporting documents.  |
| **8.12** | CHILD PROTECTION (for projects working with children and youth (0-18 years) only)How does this organisation ensure that children and young people are kept safe? Please describe any plans to improve the organisation's child protection policies and procedures for the implementation of this project.  |
| MMI is fully committed to the rights of the child and we recognise our responsibility to ensure that those rights are upheld. As part of the Mary’s Meals network, MMI has, and adheres to, a comprehensive Child Protection Policy (CPP) which applies to all staff and operations. The CPP includes guidance on awareness raising, prevention measures and raising and responding to concerns. All MMI staff have received full Child Protection training and have signed a corresponding code of conduct. All MMI staff travelling abroad are also subject to a disclosure process. |
| **8.13** | FRAUD: Has there been any incidence of any fraudulent activity in this organisation within the last 5 years? How was the fraud detected? What action did your organisation take in response? How will you minimise the risk of fraudulent activity occurring? |
| No. |
| **8.14** | DUE DILIGENCE: How has your organisation assessed the capacity and competence of this organisation to deliver the proposed intervention and to manage project funds accountably? What is your assessment of their capacity and what is the evidence to support this? How will your organisation manage the risks of under-performance and financial mis-management by this organisation throughout the lifetime of the project?  |
| MMI demonstrates a high degree of capacity and competence and will deliver and manage a project of this scale very effectively. MMI (and MMUK prior to transfer) has developed a strong, sophisticated delivery model that maintains a standard of excellence in programme design, management and delivery in Malawi and Zambia. It also promotes high standards in project monitoring, evaluation and learning. Mary’s Meals has a proven track record of delivering highly efficient, inclusive, quality school feeding programmes that represent excellent value for money. MMI’s staff team are highly trained and experienced specialists in international development and are experts on school feeding. The team in Scotland have in-depth contextual and practical knowledge of Malawi and Zambia. They conduct regular visits and work placements to engage with colleagues in each country team and support continuous improvement and development through monitoring, training and collaborative working.MMI employs a team of qualified chartered accountants who provided dedicated support to MMM and MMZ. The MMI finance team maintain the highest standards in financial management through detailed monthly reviews of financial reports, mentoring and coaching of country staff teams, conducting internal audit visits, supporting continual development of financial systems, and overseeing major procurement exercises. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 8:** CAPACITY OF APPLICANT ORGANISATION AND ALL IMPLEMENTING PARTNER ORGANISATIONS **(Max 3 pages each)** Please copy and fill in this section for your organisation **AND for each implementation partner**  |
| **8.1** | **Name of Organisation** | Mary’s Meals Malawi |
| **8.2** | **Address** | Salim Armour Road, Plot number BE 187, Opposite Agriquip, Ginnery Corner, Blantyre, Malawi. |
| **8.3** | **Web Site** | www.marysmeals.org |
| **8.4** | **Registration or charity number (if applicable)** |  C265/2005 |
| **8.5** | **Annual Income** | Income (original currency): MWK 3,168,850,000.Income (£ equivalent): £4,681,720.Exchange rate: 676.856:1 (MWK:GBP, average exchange rate during 2014 per [www.oanda.com](http://www.oanda.com)). ***Start/end date of accounts (dd/mm/yyyy***)From: 01/01/2014To: 31/12/2014 |
|  | **Number of existing staff**  | 77 |
| **8.7** | **Proposed project staffing staff to be employed under this project (specify the total full-time equivalents - FTE)** | Existing staff | 6.2 |
| New staff | 10 |
| **8.8** | **Organisation category** (Select a maximum of two categories) |
| Non-Government Org. (NGO)  | x | Local Government |  |
| Trade Union |  | National Government |  |
| Faith-based Organisation (FBO) |  | Ethnic Minority Group or Organisation |  |
| Disabled Peoples’ Organisation (DPO) |  | Diaspora Group or Organisation |  |
| Orgs. Working with Disabled People |  | Academic Institution |  |
| Other... (please specify) |  |  |
| **8.9** | A) Summary of expected roles and responsibilities, ANDB) Amount (and percentage) of project budget which this partner will directly manage. |
| A): The key roles responsible will be:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Responsibility** |
| Country Director (Note: MMI employee) | Overall management of the MMM project and line management of all MMM staff. |
| School Feeding Manager | Project management and line management of SFOs. |
| Logistics Manager (MMI employee) | Oversight and management of all logistical processes and procedures. |
| Finance Manager (MMI employee) | Responsible for financial management of project, liaising with MMI. |

**B):** £2,256,064 - 72% |
| **8.10** | EXPERIENCE: Please outline this organisation's experience and track record in relation to its roles and responsibilities on this project (including technical issues and relevant geographical coverage). What development results has this organisation achieved which are relevant to this proposal (ie. for similar interventions in similar contexts for a similar cost)? Please include details of any external evaluations of this organisation’s work (relevant to the proposed project) which have been completed and whether they are available.  |
| MMM has been delivering a high quality cost effective SFP in Malawi since 2002 and now covers 600 schools in 20 districts, reaching over 770,000 children with a meal each school day. MMM has a proven methodology that achieves a consistent feeding rate of over 90% each month. In the 13 years of the development of MMM’s SFP, there have been no closures or gaps in programme delivery. MMM has a highly skilled and experienced national team of 77 staff. MMM Programme staff are all trained in MM’s internal training programme which covers all key aspects of the MM model and the technical aspects of school feeding programmes (hygienic dietary practice, safety in food preparation, community mobilisation, establishing SFCs, stock management, working with government) as well as cross cutting issues such as child protection, environmental sustainability, gender and disability. MMM is led by a Country Director who has been in position for 18 months, following two years as Country Director in Liberia for MM delivering a large SFP. |
| **8.11** | FUND MANAGEMENT: Please provide a brief summary of this organisation's recent fund management history. Please include source of funds, purpose, amount and time period covered. |
| MMM is an independently constituted trust, registered in Malawi, whose main function is to implement Mary’s Meals’ school feeding programme in Malawi. MMI is represented on the board of MMM and employees the key personnel required to effectively manage MMM operations. MMM receives funding for its activities through MMI, who receives funds from Mary’s Meals National Affiliates throughout the world. It shares the vision and mission of Mary’s Meals and its work complies with MMI’s procurement and operational guidelines.MMM has extensive experience of complying with the fund management requirements of donors. This includes managing restricted funds, meeting donor terms and conditions of funding, and supplying information for donor reports. MMM works in close partnership with MMI and examples of recent collaboration in fund management for a small sample of donors are given below.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Source of funds** | **Purpose** | **Amount** | **Time period** |
| Scottish Government Malawi Development Programme  | Expansion of the Mary’s Meals’ School Feeding Programme in Neno and Balaka in Southern Malawi | Total (over 3 years) £399,846 | May 2013 to March 2016 |
| Scottish Government Malawi Development Programme  | Expansion of the Mary’s Meals’ School Feeding Programme in the Machinga district of Southern Malawi | Total (over 3 years) £584,038 | April 2015 to March 2018 |
| Robertson Foundation | Expansion of the Mary’s Meals School Feeding programme in Malawi, Liberia and Zambia. Operating support for MMI strategic global growth plan | Total (over 3 years) $1,000,000 | April 2014 to March 2017 |

 |
| **8.12** | CHILD PROTECTION (for projects working with children and youth (0-18 years) only)How does this organisation ensure that children and young people are kept safe? Please describe any plans to improve the organisation's child protection policies and procedures for the implementation of this project.  |
| MM is fully committed to the rights of the child and we recognise our responsibility to ensure that those rights are upheld. We also recognise the particular vulnerability of children in the contexts in which we work. MM also believes that it is fundamentally essential that the children we seek to support are protected from harm and are able to benefit from our programmes in a safe, healthy and relaxed environment. As part of the Mary’s Meals network, MMM has, and adheres to, a comprehensive Child Protection Policy (CPP) which applies to all staff and operations. The CPP includes guidance on awareness raising, prevention measures and raising and responding to concerns. All MMM staff have received full Child Protection training and have signed a corresponding code of conduct. Whilst the protection of children at school in Malawi falls under the responsibility of Malawian authorities, MMM places great importance in minimising risk of harm to any child within our programmes. This is understood within our relationships with local, district and national authorities. Pre-feeding community and volunteer training includes discussing and establish procedures to ensure the protection of the child and child protection features strongly in our MOU, signed with every school. MMM treats any child protection concern raised at any school very seriously and responds accordingly.  |
| **8.13** | FRAUD: Has there been any incidence of any fraudulent activity in this organisation within the last 5 years? How was the fraud detected? What action did your organisation take in response? How will you minimise the risk of fraudulent activity occurring? |
| No. |
| **8.14** | DUE DILIGENCE: How has your organisation assessed the capacity and competence of this organisation to deliver the proposed intervention and to manage project funds accountably? What is your assessment of their capacity and what is the evidence to support this? How will your organisation manage the risks of under-performance and financial mis-management by this organisation throughout the lifetime of the project?  |
| MMM has successfully delivered a school feeding programme in Malawi since 2002, growing from year to year with no gaps in service provision. Over this period expertise and systems have been developed to manage each aspect of programme delivery and to ensure that all financial controls meet the highest standards. MMM has a stable organisational structure led by an experienced Country Director supported by Department Heads in Programmes and Finance and Operations. MMM also has a well-established Internal Procurement Committee (IPC) which is held monthly and involves senior MMM staff and the Head of Overseas Finance and Programme Officer of MMI. MMM has a procurement policy in place which ensures best practice in achieving value for money and minimising the risk of fraud. There are two dedicated procurement officers who action decisions made within the IPC. MMM receives support and supervision from the MMI finance team which monitors MMM’s financial controls and reporting mechanisms. MMM complies with all relevant Malawian legislation and is subject to an independent audit of its statutory annual accounts. MMM has a close working relationship with all relevant ministries, including the Ministry of Finance and the Malawi Revenue Authority who grant MMM duty free privileges on the basis of MMM being recognised as a key government partner. As the cost of procuring CSB is the major cost item in the MMM annual budget, an integrated information management system is in place to ensure precise and accurate stock management and control. Monthly orders of CSB are made on the basis of existing stock and the previous month’s enrolment figures. Orders are made with delivery notes in triplicate to verify delivery in each school. All schools are issued with MM Stock Management documents to to record receipts and usage of CSB. School Feeding Officers (SFOs) visit each school at least two unannounced times per week to check stock balances and usage. School Feeding Managers (SFMs) complete a ‘Weekly Stock Tracker’ from information received from the SFO. These are collated by the MEL team to produce a food order which is signed off by the Head of School Feeding (HOSF) and Finance Manager (FM). Once approved, the food order is sent to Procurement to generate the Purchase Order. The suppliers are given a specific date by which all deliveries must be completed, and arrange distribution with the SFP. Orders are tracked by the Distribution Officer to ensure all food has been delivered. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 8:** CAPACITY OF APPLICANT ORGANISATION AND ALL IMPLEMENTING PARTNER ORGANISATIONS **(Max 3 pages each)** Please copy and fill in this section for your organisation **AND for each implementation partner**  |
| **8.1** | **Name of Organisation** | Mary’s Meals Zambia |
| **8.2** | **Address** | Plot Number 2761/2762, Nasser Street, P.O. Box 510302, Chipata, Zambia. |
| **8.3** | **Web Site** | [www.marysmeals.org](http://www.marysmeals.org) |
| **8.4** | **Registration or charity number (if applicable)** | LCO No. 122443 |
| **8.5** | **Annual Income** | Income (original currency): £132,897Income (£ equivalent): £132,897Exchange rate: 1:1 (Funds remitted from MMUK in 2014, in 2015 all funding will come from MMI) ***Start/end date of accounts (dd/mm/yyyy***)From: 01/01/2014To: 31/12/2014 |
| **8.6** | **Number of existing staff**  | 4  |
| **8.7** | **Proposed project staffing staff to be employed under this project (specify the total full-time equivalents - FTE)** | Existing staff | 0 |
| New staff | 5 |
| **8.8** | **Organisation category** (Select a maximum of two categories) |
| Non-Government Org. (NGO)  | x | Local Government |  |
| Trade Union |  | National Government |  |
| Faith-based Organisation (FBO) |  | Ethnic Minority Group or Organisation |  |
| Disabled Peoples’ Organisation (DPO) |  | Diaspora Group or Organisation |  |
| Orgs. Working with Disabled People |  | Academic Institution |  |
| Other... (please specify) |  |  |
| **8.9** | A) Summary of expected roles and responsibilities, ANDB) Amount (and percentage) of project budget which this partner will directly manage. |
| A): The key positions responsible will be:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Role** | **Responsibility** |
| Country Representative (Note: MMI employee) | Overall management of the MMZ project and line management of all MMZ staff. |
| School Feeding Manager | Project management and line management of SFOs. |
| Logistics Manager | Oversight and management of all logistical processes and procedures. |
| Finance Manager | Responsible for MMZ finance and cash management liaising with MMI. |

**B):** £721,580 – 23% |
| **8.10** | EXPERIENCE: Please outline this organisation's experience and track record in relation to its roles and responsibilities on this project (including technical issues and relevant geographical coverage). What development results has this organisation achieved which are relevant to this proposal (ie. for similar interventions in similar contexts for a similar cost)? Please include details of any external evaluations of this organisation’s work (relevant to the proposed project) which have been completed and whether they are available.  |
| MMZ is led by a Country Representative who was previously Head of Programmes in MMM and who has the skills, knowledge and experience to transfer best practice to the new Zambia programme. MMZ has been in existence since May 2014 and has been implementing a school feeding programme in 25 schools since October 2014. MMZ is part of the MM network which has many years of experience implementing school feeding programmes in many countries. The nearest to Zambia is Malawi (also the largest MM country programme) currently reaching over 770,000 children. MMZ was set up with support from MMM and continues to enjoy cross-border support. In terms of leadership, MMZ operates in a similar environment as Malawi responding to challenges in the education sector. MMZ currently works very closely with government structures at national, provincial, district, zonal and school levels. This helps MMZ to utilize the various technical capacities to supplement the internal capacity in school feeding which MMZ has. As part of strengthening the management capacity, MMZ is supported by MMI staff who lead the strategic direction and oversee implementation. The Zambia programme has already demonstrated positive changes in the short time it has run. For instance, schools in the programme have increased their enrolment by 8.4% since feeding began. Teachers have also reported that attendance has improved which has eased the task of teaching.  |
| **8.11** | FUND MANAGEMENT: Please provide a brief summary of this organisation's recent fund management history. Please include source of funds, purpose, amount and time period covered. |
| MMZ is an independently constituted body, registered in Zambia, whose main function is to implement Mary’s Meals’ school feeding programme in Zambia. MMZ is a subsidiary of MMI. MMI is represented on the board of MMZ. MMZ receives funding for its activities through MMI, who receives funds from Mary’s Meals National Affiliates throughout the world. It shares the vision and mission of Mary’s Meals and its work complies with MMI’s procurement and operational guidelines.MMZ has experience of complying with the fund management requirements of donors. This includes managing restricted funds, meeting donor terms and conditions of funding, and in supplying information for donor reports.  |
| **8.12** | CHILD PROTECTION (for projects working with children and youth (0-18 years) only)How does this organisation ensure that children and young people are kept safe? Please describe any plans to improve the organisation's child protection policies and procedures for the implementation of this project.  |
| MM is fully committed to the rights of the child and we recognise our responsibility to ensure that those rights are upheld. We also recognise the particular vulnerability of children in the contexts in which we work. MM also believes that it is fundamentally essential that the children that we seek to support are protected from harm and are able to benefit from our programmes in a safe, healthy and relaxed environment. As part of the Mary’s Meals network, MMZ has, and adheres to, a comprehensive Child Protection Policy (CPP) which applies to all staff and operations. The CPP includes guidance on awareness raising, prevention measures and raising and responding to concerns. All MMZ staff have received full Child Protection training and have signed a corresponding code of conduct. Whilst the protection of children at school in Zambia, falls under the responsibility of Zambian authorities, MMZ places great importance in minimising risk of harm to any child within our programmes. This is understood within our relationships with local, district and national authorities. Pre-feeding community and volunteer training includes discussing and establish procedures to ensure the protection of every child and child protection features strongly in our MOUs, signed with every school. MMZ treats any child protection concern raised at any school very seriously and responds accordingly. |
| **8.13** | FRAUD: Has there been any incidence of any fraudulent activity in this organisation within the last 5 years? How was the fraud detected? What action did your organisation take in response? How will you minimise the risk of fraudulent activity occurring? |
| No. |
| **8.14** | DUE DILIGENCE: How has your organisation assessed the capacity and competence of this organisation to deliver the proposed intervention and to manage project funds accountably? What is your assessment of their capacity and what is the evidence to support this? How will your organisation manage the risks of under-performance and financial mis-management by this organisation throughout the lifetime of the project?  |
| MMZ’s School Feeding Programme was launched in 2014, led by a Country Representative who was previously Head of Programmes and Depute Country Director in MMM. The programme management is overseen by MMI staff based in Glasgow and Malawi, who have significant experience both in the field at Country Director level for Mary’s Meals and in the head office providing essential support for implementation and grant management. Expertise and well established financial and information management systems from MMM have been adapted for MMZ. MMZ has a stable organisational structure with all monitoring and information management systems fully operational. MMZ also has an Internal Procurement Committee (IPC) which is held jointly with the Head of Overseas Finance and Programme Officer in MMI on a monthly basis. MMZ has a procurement policy in place which follows best practice in achieving value for money and minimising the risk of fraud. MMZ receives support and supervision from the MMI finance team which monitors MMZ’s financial controls and reporting mechanisms. MMZ complies with all relevant Zambian legislation and is subject to an independent audit of its statutory annual accounts. As the cost of procuring CSB is the major cost item in the MMZ annual budget, an integrated information management system is in place to ensure precise and accurate stock management and control. Monthly orders of CSB are made on the basis of existing stock and the previous month’s enrolment figures. Orders are made with delivery notes in triplicate to verify delivery in each school. All schools are issued with MM Stock Management documents to record receipts and usage of CSB. School Feeding Officers (SFOs) visit each school unannounced at least twice per week to check stock balances and usage. The MEL team complete a ‘Weekly Stock Tracker’ from information received from the SFO. This information is then used to food order which is signed off by the Country Representative. Once approved, the food order is sent to procurement to generate the Purchase Order. The suppliers are given a specific date by which all deliveries must be completed, and organize distribution with the SFP. Orders are tracked to ensure all food has been delivered. |

|  |
| --- |
| **SECTION 9: CHECKLIST OF PROPOSAL DOCUMENTATION**  |
|  | Please check boxes for each of the documents you are submitting with this form.All documents must be submitted **by e-mail to:** **ukaidmatch@dfid.gov.uk** |
| **Mandatory Items** | **Check****Y/N** |
| Proposal form (sections 1-7) | Y |
| Proposal form (section 8 - for applicant organisation and each partner or consortium member) | Y |
| Project Logframe | Y |
| Project Budget (with detailed budget notes) | Y |
| Risk register/matrix | Y |
| Project organisational chart / organogram | Y |
| Project bar or Gantt chart to show scheduling of activities | Y |
| Communications Plan - 2 documents: C1 (communication plan form) and C2 (communications activity timetable) | Y |
|  | Written evidence of **confirmed** appeal communications partnership(s), e.g. an email or letter | Y |
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