

APPROVED BY:



L. Grafa,
Head of Managing Authority of
Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived

Date: 26. 03. 2018



Co-funded by
the European Union



FUND FOR EUROPEAN
AID TO THE MOST DEPRIVED



Ministry of Welfare of the
Republic of Latvia

**FEAD STRUCTURED SURVEY OF END
RECIPIENTS OF OP I IN 2017:
*REPORT OF AGGREGATED RESULTS***

Author:

Ministry of Welfare of the Republic of Latvia,
Managing Authority of
Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived

CONTENTS

GENERAL INFORMATION	3
A. QUESTIONS ON THE SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO END RECIPIENTS BY THE PARTNER ORGANISATION	7
B. QUESTIONS FOR THE END RECIPIENT	9

GENERAL INFORMATION

Country: LATVIA

Period when the structured survey was carried out: 01/2017-12/2017

Sample size and method used for a calculation of the sample:

- **Number of end recipients sampled:** 1440 persons, incl. 1135 recipients of packages and 305 recipients of meals. As end recipients can receive packages and meals for themselves and for the family members, the 1440 recipients sampled actually represented totally 2907 persons, incl. 2515 recipients of packages and 392 recipients of meals (direct recipients and represented recipients).
- **Methodology used for calculating the sample size:** calculation of the sample size of the recipients of packages was taken from Guidance note - by computing the minimum sample size necessary for accuracy level required. The minimal sample size of the recipients of packages was set 1068 units. The recipients of meals were added to the basic sample of package receivers. The minimal sample size required for the addition was set 250 units allowing to analyze this group also separately with standard error 0.061 and confidence level 95%. In this document all the information is calculated by summing both groups in the proportions existing in the population (where meal receivers are 3.69% of total population represented by the sample). The actual number of interviews exceeded the minimal level required.
- **Explanation how non responses and incomplete answers were dealt with:** Non responses and incomplete answers were not included in the final sample size. To avoid eventual impact of the possibility the persons not interviewed had a different situation in the questions measured weights were used for correcting proportions.

Name of the partner organization and number of surveys carried out:

- NGO Latvian Red Cross (Latvijas Sarkanais krusts) – 921 surveys
- NGO Salvation Army (Pestīšanas armija) – 69 surveys
- NGO Johanniter (Svētā Jāņa Palīdzība) – 60 surveys
- NGO Open Doors (Atvērtās durvis) – 55 surveys
- Social Service Centre of Rēzekne municipality (Rēzeknes pilsētas Sociālais dienests) – 53 surveys
- NGO Food for Life (Dzīvības ēdiens) – 45 surveys
- Evangelical Lutheran congregation of Old St. Gertrude of Riga City (Rīgas Vecā Svētās Ģertrūdes evaņģēliski luteriskā draudze) – 41 surveys
- NGO First Aid Unit of Latvia (Latvijas Pirmās palīdzības vienība) – 23 surveys
- NGO The Samaritan Association of Latvia (Latvijas Samariešu apvienība) – 22 surveys
- NGO Samaritan Foundation (Samāriešu fonds) – 21 surveys
- NGO Adult Development Project (Pieaugušo attīstības projekts) – 19 surveys
- Social Service Centre of Talsi municipality (Talsu novada sociālais dienests) – 16 surveys
- NGO Christian Charity Center (Kristīgais žēlsirdības centrs) – 16 surveys
- NGO Union of Persons with Disabilities of Dagda City "NEMA" (Dagdas invalīdu brālība "NEMA") – 15 surveys
- Social Service Centre of Jelgava municipality (Jelgavas novada sociālais dienests) – 15 surveys
- Baptist Parish of Ciana of Liepāja City (Liepājas baptistu Ciānas draudze) – 15 surveys
- Social Service Centre of Olaine municipality (Olaines sociālais dienests) – 13 surveys
- Municipality of Aknīste (Aknīstes novada pašvaldība) – 11 surveys
- Welfare Administration of Preiļi Municipality (Preiļu novada Labklājības pārvalde) – 10 surveys

TOTAL number of survey forms aggregated: 1440 surveys

Description of the structured survey process and selection of end recipients:

- **Who carried out the survey:** the survey was carried out by the external evaluator after public procurement procedure – “Aptauju Centrs”, Ltd. within the agreement on the evaluation of added value and effectiveness of FEAD implementation in Latvia 2015 – 2019.
- **How the end recipients have been selected:**
 - The number of recipients of packages sampled was split into similar parts through 11 months. The number of recipients of meals sampled were split into similar parts on January, February, March, November and December during cold season.
 - The selection was made in proportion to the frequency of receiving packages in the regions according to the data of the previous year, randomly selecting specific storages of partner organizations (henceforth – PO) in these regions, as well as in all soup kitchens. A sample of recipients of packages is considered to be representative of the total number of recipients, while it is problematic to assure a representative sample of recipients of meals because the service providers themselves do not impose formal conditions to the end recipients (compliance with needy status, frequency of receiving meals etc.) - the meals are received by everyone who need them.
 - In situations where it was difficult to conduct surveys in the areas with a small number of end recipients, ad-hoc solutions were found, which involved the participation of the PO. For example, the PO collected the contact information of end recipients in the long run with the consent of them, then handed over to the interviewer, but the interview was conducted on a telephone basis.
- **In case when some questions were prefilled, please provide list and a sources of evidence instead:**
 - Latvia evaluates FEAD implementation, including interviews of the end recipients, yearly - since 2015. Interviewers use the questionnaire form comparable to the one included in the Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/594 of 18 April 2016 establishing a template for the structured survey on end recipients of food and/or basic material assistance operational programmes of the Fund for European Aid to the Most Deprived. To compare both questionnaires, one can see that the form Latvia is using since 2015 is wider in order to gain more detailed and specific information on the FEAD implementation processes locally.
 - In order to avoid the administrative burden of end recipients, we have used our questionnaire which included all the questions set in the annex of Implementing Regulation (EU) 2016/594 of 18 April 2016. No questions were prefilled from a different source.
- **In cases when some questions were not asked, please provide list and justification:**
 - The questions on the scope of assistance provided to the end recipients by the partner organization (part A) were answered by Managing Authority as there are national rules set for the types and frequency of FEAD assistance, incl. packages distributed and accompanying measures offered to end recipients. To gain additional information on the results and conclusions of the survey at the level of POs, incl. question on provision of material assistance to end recipients that is not co-financed by the FEAD, Intermediate Body (henceforth – IB) conducted additional survey, involving all the 29 POs (71 representatives of POs participated in the additional survey, incl., 46% volunteers and persons responsible for the delivery of FEAD packages, 19% persons involved in the soup kitchens and 35% persons involved in the PO administration).
 - All the questions for the end recipient (part B) were asked.
- **Difficulties and lessons learned on the survey process:**
 - Since the survey procedure required a small number of interviews each month, it involved a small specializing of interviewers – that is, interviews were carried out by a smaller number of interviewers than normally in studies of comparable size. Therefore a minor impact of an

interviewer factor on the result was observed. Hence the research team decided to increase the number of interviewers involved in the 2018 survey and reduce the number of interviews carried out by one interviewer.

- The dynamics of the results for meal recipients are significantly affected by the fact that the target group is defined quite roughly – in fact they are those for which these meals are required in areas where the service is available – thus comparability of results to meal recipients with other years of service delivery is burdened. However, this has little impact on the overall results shown, because the sample segment of meal recipients constitutes less than 4% of all the service beneficiaries.

Main results and conclusions:

• Results and conclusions of the survey at the level of partner organisations:

- the supply plans and reporting procedures are proportional and POs support them, do not think there is necessity for significant improvements;
- cooperation with the suppliers of FEAD packages has improved, however, there are still some improvements needed, for example, to inform PO's contact persons of storage places as accurately as possible - at least one day before the additional supply;
- the exchange of information with IB on the delays of deliveries within the supply plan is basically ensured; however, it would be advisable to improve the efficiency/rapidity of the exchange of information;
- the procedure for tracking of supplied FEAD packages is appropriate enough;
- the provision of distribution of FEAD packages for children up to 2 basically is without problems; however some problems have been noticed: it is relatively difficult to predict the exact number of necessary amount of packages; for some of the food products have short realisation date (in this case POs are speaking about the ecological baby rusks / biscuits which had shorter realisation date than other food products in the package. At the moment, the product has already been replaced with the baby rusks / biscuits with extended realisation date);
- in order to have the knowledge on client's needs for accompanying measures, POs get the information from clients at the distribution places, conduct the individual surveys, or, if necessary, arrange separate meetings with clients;
- the clients are informed on accompanying measures by placing information at the distribution points and also informing them orally by handing out the FEAD packages;
- POs are motivating clients to engage in accompanying measures by arranging events at the most convenient time and place for the client or by offering the possibility to receive individual consultations. There are also cases when PO offers to the client to take home with him/her the meal or materials made during the accompanying measure (when the accompanying measure was about the training of cooking skills or other practical skills). In addition POs mentioned that they very often offer the coffee, tea and/or snacks, etc. during accompanying measures in order to motivate the clients to participate in the measures;
- in order to organise the accompanying measures, POs mainly use FEAD funding and volunteering, sometimes also slightly their own financing and funding from municipalities;
- to characterise the administrative burden while organising and implementing the accompanying measures, mostly POs face a moderate administrative burden when preparing the supporting documents and reports of accompanying measures. In turn, the involvement of specialists and the provision of premises do not create an administrative burden.

• Profile and characteristics of end recipients:

- In general, the end recipients are characterized by the fact that the percentage of children and elderly are higher than in the society as a whole. There are few people in working age. This is due to the fact that FEAD in Latvia is specifically targeted to the families with children (there are several packages only for children in age 0 – 18) and also due to the

growing economic situation in the country, when amongst the most deprived persons is more of those who are not able to improve their social situation on their own (children, elderly, persons with disabilities etc.).

- Among the end recipients, Latgale region is predominantly represented, which is associated with a significantly higher level of persons under the poverty in this region.
- The recipients of meals are a structurally very different category of people from other end recipients - they are 16 years older, with twice as many men as the total population represented by the sample, while the proportion of recipients of packages is similar to the total population represented by the sample. Significantly more frequent meals are received by pensioners and unemployed.
- **Assessment of the interventions by category of assistance (food/material/accompanying measures) and by target group:**
 - Generally the end recipients are satisfied with the support received.
 - In the case of hygiene and household goods as well as school items frustration was expressed by insignificant number of people.
 - In the case of food packages, satisfaction is less unambiguous. Dissatisfaction mostly relates to the quality of certain products (mainly unrefined rapeseed oil) and insufficient amount of several goods (mainly canned meat). The content of food packages is created based on healthy eating principles which is not always supported by end recipients (eating habits of the end recipients differ from these healthy eating principles). Therefore, achieving complete satisfaction in this case is not a goal.
 - It should also be noted that the end recipients have expressed a desire to increase the amount or frequency of FEAD support, but it is important to keep balance so that the assistance does not fully cover all the needs of the most deprived people, leaving the recipients partly to take care of themselves. Therefore in this case the goal is not full satisfaction, too.
- **Improvement areas identified by the survey and how they are intended to be addresses:**
 - As the satisfaction with FEAD support has been evaluated since 2015, recommendations have been expressed by end recipients each year and taken into account by managing Authority and Intermediate Body already (amendments in the internal and national regulations have been made each year and also amendments in public procurement procedures have been made). Respectively the content of packages (type and amount of items) have been improved, the frequency of the receiving packages and the eligibility of the recipients (more eligible persons who will receive FEAD support) have been changed. Therefore at the moment we can conclude that certain balance between the possible and desirable FEAD support has already been found.
 - Based on previously mentioned, significant improvements in the content of the FEAD support packages are no longer foreseen at the moment.
 - A key challenge is to provide FEAD support in a context where the amount of the target group is rapidly declining. The decline of the number of deprived persons does not always fully reflect the actual assistance needed. Consequently, it is expected that the number of the end recipients will be raising because of the amendments in national FEAD regulations - the income threshold from which FEAD assistance is available has been raised from April 1st, 2018.
- **Overall conclusion:** The results of a structured survey indicate a high level of satisfaction with FEAD support. It can be concluded that the FEAD support has relieved the end recipient's family budget and helped the most deprived people in Latvia not to fall into the deeper poverty. FEAD support has been first step towards their social inclusion.

A. QUESTIONS ON THE SCOPE OF ASSISTANCE PROVIDED TO END RECIPIENTS BY THE PARTNER ORGANISATION¹

A1. What type of FEAD assistance is distributed to end recipients and how often is it distributed?				
	Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Other
Food packages ²	X*	X*		
Meals	X**			
Goods distributed to children	X*	X*		Yearly***
Goods distributed to the homeless				
Other (to be specified)				

* *The frequency depends from the amount of end recipients in the concrete territory.*

** *Meals are distributed mainly in winter, spring and autumn season.*

*** *One type of goods - school items - are distributed once a year*

A2. What are the types of accompanying measures offered to end recipients when they receive FEAD assistance?	
Advice on food preparation and storage, cooking workshops, educational activities to promote healthy nutrition, or advice on how to reduce food waste	X
Personal cleanliness advice	X
Redirection to competent services (e.g. social/administrative)	X
Individual coaching and workshops	X
Psychological and therapeutic support	X
Advice on managing a household budget	X
Other (to be specified)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Development of practical skills – house insulation, knitting the gloves and socks, the correct use of hygiene and household items, the ways of inheritance, the rights of persons with disabilities, help with the settlement of housing issues etc. ○ Educational information on flu and virus prevention, healthy lifestyle, disease prevention, diabetes, HIV / AIDS, first aid, contraception etc.
None	

¹ Questions concern assistance provided at distribution point where interviews take place.

² The definition of what is to be understood as a food package can be provided at the level of the partner organisation/operation/managing authority. Packages do not need to be standardised in size or content.

A3. Does the partner organisation also provide material assistance to end recipients that is not co-financed by the FEAD?	
Yes	No
X	

A3a. If yes, which kind of assistance does the partner organisation provide beyond the FEAD?	
Food packages	X
Meals	X
Goods distributed to children	X
Goods distributed to the homeless	
Other goods	

B. QUESTIONS FOR THE END RECIPIENT

B1. Are you male or female?	
Male	Female
40.6%	59.4%

B2. Could you please tell me how old you are?						
15 or less	16-24	25-49	50-64	65 or above	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
0.1%	2.2%	39.2%	41.8%	16.7%	0%	0%

B3. Could you please tell me whether you are a single parent?			
Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
14.9%	85.1%	0%	0%

B4. Could you please tell me what type of assistance you received just now (or you will receive now)?				
	Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
Food packages	95.4%	4.6%	0%	0%
Meals	3.7%	96.3%	0%	0%
Layette (baby essentials)	3.9%	96.1	0%	0%
School bags	1.6%	98.4%	0%	0%
Stationery, exercise books, pens, painting equipment and other equipment required in school (non-clothes)	3.1%	96.9%	0%	0%
Sports equipment (sport shoes, leotard, swimsuit, etc.)	0%	100%	0%	0%
Clothes (winter coat, footwear, school uniform, etc.)	0%	100%	0%	0%
Sleeping bags/blankets	0%	100%	0%	0%
Kitchen equipment (pots, pans, cutlery, etc.)	0%	100%	0%	0%
Household linen (towels, bedclothes)	0%	100%	0%	0%
Hygiene articles (first aid kit, soap, toothbrush, disposable razor, etc.)	20.1%	79.9%	0%	0%
Other categories of goods	[Baby food packages – 4.4%]			

B5. Could you please tell me who is receiving this assistance? <i>[multiple answers]</i>			
Yourself	Other people in your household	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
100%	43.5%	0%	0%

B6. Could you please tell me whether other people will also benefit from this assistance? And if so, could you say how many (not including yourself), and what is their age and their gender? <i>[total percentages of all the other people]</i>		
	Male	Female
5 or less	8.2%	8.5%
6-15	16.1%	15.5%
16-24	8.7%	5.5%
25-49	12.7%	5.6%
50-64	7.4%	5.1%
65 or above	2.9%	3.8%
Does not wish to answer	0%	0%
Does not know or does not understand the question	0%	0%

B7. Could you please tell me whether this is the first time that you have come to get this assistance?			
Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
4.1%	95.6%	0.3%	0%

B8. Could you please tell me how often you come to get this assistance? <i>[percentage from „No” in B7]</i>					
Daily	Weekly	Monthly	Other	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
2.0%	0.8%	0.5%	96.7%	0%	0.1%

B9. Do you know when you will need the same assistance again?					
Tomorrow	Within next week	Within next month	Other	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
0.4%	12.4%	61.5%	18.2%	0%	7.5%

B10. Could you please tell me whether you faced any difficulties in getting this assistance?			
Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
7.6%	89.8%	1.1%	1.5%

B10a. If yes, please tell me which kind of difficulties you faced? <i>[percentage of all; multiple answers allowed]</i>	
Need to get some papers from some national, regional or local office	2.8%
Need to travel a long distance	1.2%
Psychological hurdles	1.7%
Other (to be specified)	1.7% - long waiting time in the line; financial expenses to get paperwork done etc.
Does not wish to answer	0%
Does not know or does not understand the question	1.9%

B11. Could you tell me whether the assistance provided by the FEAD has made a difference to you or to the members of your household? <i>[percentage of those who have received the assistance before]</i>				
Yes	Partially	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
82.8%	13.5%	0.9%	0%	2.8%

B11a. If 'No' or 'Partially', could you please tell me why? <i>[percentage of those who have received the assistance before; multiple answers allowed]</i>	
Insufficient quantity of food/goods	4.7%
Insufficient frequency of food/goods distribution	9.3%
Insufficient quality of food/goods	2.3%
Other type of assistance required (to be specified)	2.2% - different sort of products needed (most frequently hygiene articles for adults mentioned); job or money needed instead
Does not wish to answer	0%
Does not know or does not understand the question	0.2%

B12. A year ago, could you or your household afford to purchase the food/goods you just received?			
Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
21.3%	73.9%	3.2%	1.5%

B13. Could you please tell me whether you and/or other members of your household are receiving assistance from other organisations?			
Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
42.2%	55.5%	0.2%	2.1%

B13a. If yes, could you please tell me what type of assistance you receive from other organisations? <i>[percentage of all]</i>			
	Yes	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
Food packages	4.2%	0%	0%
Meals	3.7%	0%	0%
Layette (baby essentials)	0.3%	0%	0%
School bags	1.0%	0%	0%
Stationery, exercise books, pens, painting equipment and other equipment required in school (non-clothes);	2.4%	0%	0%
Sports equipment (sport shoes, leotard, swimsuit, etc.)	1.0%	0%	0%
Clothes (winter coat, footwear, school uniform, etc.)	11.0%	0%	0%
Sleeping bags/blankets	0.6%	0%	0%
Kitchen equipment (pots, pans, cutlery, etc.)	0.6%	0%	0%
Household linen (towels, bedclothes)	1.0%	0%	0%
Hygiene articles (first aid kit, soap, toothbrush, disposable razor, etc.)	1.2%	0%	0%
Other	Assistance from municipality covering some expenses – 37.8%; Other – 0.8% (medicine, gifts, washing mashine, computer, bag, toys for children etc.)		

B14. If you have received (now or in the past) advice or guidance through this organisation, please could you tell me what it was about? <i>[percentage of those who have received the assistance before; multiple answers allowed]</i>	
Advice on food preparation and storage, cooking workshops, educational activities to promote healthy nutrition, or advice on how to reduce food waste	3.3%
Personal cleanliness advice	0.3%
Redirection to competent services (e.g. social/administrative)	1.6%
Individual coaching and workshops	10.9%

Psychological and therapeutic support	1.6%
Advice on managing a household budget	0.9%
Other (to be specified)	0%
Does not wish to answer	0.2%
Does not know or does not understand the question	0%

B15. Could you please tell me whether you found this advice or guidance useful or not?

[percentage of participants – 11.3% of all]

Very useful	Somewhat useful	Not very useful	Not useful at all	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
66.9%	14.2%	3.1%	0%	1.2%	14.6%

B16. Could you please tell me whether you have any income from work?

Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
12.4%	87.6%	0%	0%

B17. Could you please tell me whether you get any other income or benefits?

Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
81.2%	18.8%	0%	0%

B18. Could you please tell me whether any members of your household have any income from work?

[percentage of those who have other members of household]

Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
15.3%	84.7%	0%	0%

B19. Could you please tell me whether any members of your household get any other income or benefit?

[percentage of those who have other members of household]

Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
50.3%	49.7%	0%	0%

B20. Could you please tell me whether you have the nationality of this country?			
Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
77.9%	22.1%	0%	0%

B21. If no, could you please tell me whether you have the nationality of another EU country?			
Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
1.6%	98.4%	0%	0%

B22. Could you please tell me if you are an asylum seeker or a refugee?			
Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
0%	100%	0%	0%

B23. Could you please tell me whether you have a place to live?			
Yes	No	Does not wish to answer	Does not know or does not understand the question
99.5%	0.5%	0%	0%

B23a. If you do have a place to live, could you please tell me what type of place this is? <i>[percentage of those having a place to live]</i>	
Owned or rented dwelling or house, either alone or with the family	87.8%
Shared dwelling with friends and other people	2.4%
Institutional long-term home (home for elderly, single mothers, asylum seekers)	5.7%
Sheltered housing	2.9%
Ruined house or slum	0%
Mobile home/caravan	0%
Refugee camp	0%
Other (to be specified)	0.6% (garden houses; non-residential buildings; stationary living wagons etc.)
Does not wish to answer	0%
Does not know or does not understand the question	0.5%