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Message from the Chairman

The United Nations World Food Summit defines food security as existing “when all people at all times have access to sufficient, safe, nutritious food to maintain a healthy and active life”.

It is a sad fact that some two million people in this ‘lucky country’ do not satisfy this definition. On their behalf I present Foodbank Australia’s first End Hunger report to shine a light on this often hidden problem and to look at ways to accelerate the elimination of what is an untenable situation.

This report highlights key statistics but it is only when one sees the faces of fellow Australians impacted by hunger that the real meaning of these numbers becomes evident. Foodbank has seen those faces in the 20 years that it has been addressing the problem with the help of the food and grocery industry and the government at both federal and state levels.

This report is a call to action. It acknowledges achievements to date but highlights the need to do more. We must heed this message with urgency because access to food is not discretionary but every person’s right and chronic hunger is one of life’s most miserable afflictions.

What do we at Foodbank believe it will take to make the step change necessary to double our volumes by 2015?

– First and foremost we need more funds. We approached the Federal Government for financial assistance for our collaborative supply program in 2010 providing a business case for $4.5m annually over 5 years to proactively source and manufacture the key staples we need to guarantee adequate and consistent supply. We are grateful for the $1m per annum support which we currently receive from the Department of Families, Housing, Community Services and Indigenous Affairs but serious change is reliant on our initial funding request being realised. We need to work with other areas of government as food delivers not just welfare but also health and education outcomes.

– Secondly, we need to develop an even stronger partnership with the transport industry. Moving food and groceries from where they originate to where they are needed is one of the single biggest challenges, and costs, in Foodbank’s operations. Assistance in how to do this efficiently and effectively is vital.

– Thirdly, we seek to amend the tax laws to provide companies with an incentive to donate to Foodbank. While we have strong support from the food industry with $170m value of goods donated last year, the current tough commercial environment means the provision of surplus food to Foodbank has plateaued. A change in the tax laws favouring the donation of food is something that has been adopted in the United States of America with great success. Such a change could replicate the impact that the Good Samaritan Laws provided ten years ago.

I wish to acknowledge the support of Deloitte Access Economics in undertaking the analysis for this report – having a professional organisation of its stature provides us with confidence in the veracity of the data on such an important topic.

I would like to thank all the welfare agencies who gave their time to submit responses to the End Hunger survey and commit to them that Foodbank will leave no stone unturned in attempting to meet their needs.

Enzo Allara AM
Chairman, Foodbank Australia
An ‘Australia without Hunger’ is an audacious goal and one that can only be achieved with the help of the broader community.

In this regard Foodbank is a simple conduit between the desperate need of so many in our community and the wonderful support of our friends in the food and grocery industry. Making matters more difficult is the fact that both sides of this story are largely untold – the problem of hunger is largely hidden from the general population and the generosity of the food and grocery industry is forthcoming without fanfare and often without recognition.

Our first End Hunger report highlights the challenges faced – there are no surprises to Foodbank and no surprises to the 2,500 charities we support who do the magnificent work of assisting those in need on a daily basis.

The growth in demand for hunger relief indicated in the report is reflected also in the 12% increase in the number of welfare agencies seeking food from Foodbank over the last 12 months.

To help address this demand, Foodbank recorded a 23% increase in the volume of food and grocery items it made available in the 2011 calendar year. However, the food and grocery sector is also facing tremendous commercial challenges and the traditional Foodbank model of collecting surplus manufactured food has peaked. New solutions are necessary to achieve this growth such as arranging the manufacture of key staple foods through our collaborative supply program and collecting more fresh food and ingredients at the farm gate level.

In 2011 over 4 million kilograms of key staple foods were manufactured for Foodbank – where many of the ingredients were donated – including milk, breakfast cereal, pasta, pasta sauce, canned fruit and vegetables and prepared meals. Likewise we collected over 4 million kilograms of fresh fruit and vegetables from individual farmers, companies and the central markets in each state.

Supplying the food to end hunger is a huge task and Foodbank’s current target is to reach 50 million kilograms by 2015. We cannot do this without maintaining the strong support from food producers, manufacturers and retailers across Australia and receiving increased support from the federal and state governments.

This End Hunger report provides the evidence that more needs to be done. Foodbank looks forward to working with the farming community, food and grocery industry and the government to ensure the basic human need for nourishment is met for all in our community.

John Webster
CEO, Foodbank Australia
Executive Summary

This is the first End Hunger report produced by Foodbank based on analysis by Deloitte Access Economics. It presents the results of a survey of welfare agencies sourcing food from Foodbank undertaken in 2011, and highlights the food needs of those agencies in addressing food insecurity among individuals and families in Australia.

This report gives an overview of the Australian economy and then looks at five main themes:

1. **Demand for food relief is rising.** An increase in the number of individuals seeking food assistance is being experienced in almost 70% of agencies and across all welfare groups. More than 1 in 4 agencies reported an increase in excess of 15% over a twelve month period with 1 in 10 agencies experiencing an increase greater than 30%.

2. **It’s not who you think.** More agencies are now providing food relief services to low income households than unemployed households, while the percentage providing assistance to single parent families is also high. Some households with an income are still seeking help with their basic food requirements.

3. **Food relief agencies are not able to meet demand.** Nearly 90% of agencies reported not having enough food to meet total demand. 6 in 10 agencies require at least 25% more food with almost 3 in 10 agencies requiring double the food.

4. **Food is often the key first step towards a longer term solution.** Most agencies agree that food is a significant reason why people seek their services, and the provision of food builds trust, enabling the agency to offer other services such as housing or education.

5. **Foodbank is providing a valuable service to hunger relief agencies.** Some 95% of agencies were satisfied or neutral in their evaluation of Foodbank’s service provision. However, there is more that Foodbank can do.
Sarah
Food parcel recipient
Economic issues affecting hunger in Australia

There has been little change in total net wealth for those in low economic resource households over the period 2003–04 to 2009–10 (up 4%), while the average Australian net wealth has increased 28%. In effect, Australia has become a wealthier country but this wealth has not translated to those that require food assistance most.

1.1 Economic climate

The Foodbank 2011 Survey highlighted that, throughout Australia demand for food relief is rising.

Australia has enjoyed two decades of economic growth, with the average net wealth of a household increasing 28% since 2003-04 (ABS, 2011a).

However, this increase in wealth has not been felt across the whole population. For the poorest 20% of households, net wealth only increased 4% (Chart 1.1). This group accounted for 1% of total household wealth in 2003–04 and they still only accounted for 1% of the total household wealth in 2009-10.

Further, the poorest 20% of households have the highest debt to asset ratio, at 43% (ABS, 2011b). Only one in 25 own their own home and 90% owe money on that home (with the average value of the house being offset by a similar average value of mortgage). In effect, Australia may be prosperous, but the most disadvantaged remain challenged.

It is important to look at groups with both low wealth and low incomes. It is this group that is more likely to experience hardship or experience financial stress and require assistance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chart 1.1</th>
<th>Change in net wealth (index: 2003-04 = 100)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003-04</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004-05</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-06</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006-07</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007-08</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008-09</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low economic resource

All persons
People in low economic resource households earn around half of the disposable income of the average Australian and have around 13% of the net worth of the average. Spending on goods and services by this group is around 65% of the Australian average, indicating much lower consumption. People in this group are less likely to be able to raise emergency money from their own savings and more likely to require help from family and friends. While their weekly household income has increased relatively closely to the average Australian, so too has their expenditure. Chart 1.2 shows that this group’s expenditure continues to outstrip their income, though the rise of family benefits and other transfer payments in recent years has assisted with a modest closing of that gap, as has the generally good job growth recorded over the past decade.

Even so, the net effect is that there has been little change in total net wealth for those in low economic resource households over the period 2003-04 to 2009-10 (up 4%), while the average Australian net wealth has increased 30%. The estimated proportion of the total population in this area of disadvantage has remained constant at 22%. Not surprisingly, this group also feels greater financial pressure than the average Australian, with more than a third reporting that their finances were worse than two years ago.

In effect, Australia has become a wealthier country but this wealth has not translated to those that require food assistance most.

Food prices have still risen rather faster than prices in general. This is important, because food makes up a relatively larger share of spending for the needy – they have less and concentrate their spending on staples such as food and shelter.
The greater financial pressure felt by these households is partly due to the rising cost of food in Australia. Food expenditure makes up a much greater proportion of disposable income for low economic resource households than for the average Australian household.

Food prices are rising for a variety of reasons, including rising prosperity in developing nations (leading to an increasing demand for food and, in particular, protein) as well as the rise of bio-diesel as a new source of demand for grains and oils. Supply issues have also affected prices, from cyclones to floods and drought both here and around the world.

For Australian consumers the increase in the $A has provided a degree of protection from the increase in food prices, with imported food now relatively cheaper. However, food prices have still risen rather faster than prices in general with the majority of that pain evident since the mid-1990s. This is important, because food makes up a relatively larger share of spending for the needy – they have less and concentrate their spending on staples such as food and shelter. As a related point, as Chart 1.3 shows, the prices of both shelter and warmth have also risen faster than the average income for low resource households for some years, adding to the pressures

The Wheelies have been bringing joy to adults and children with disabilities since 1996 by giving them rides on our specially adapted motorcycles. We saw an additional need in our area and felt we need to respond so every second Thursday we distribute groceries to people in the neighbourhood who are struggling. Without Foodbank we wouldn’t be able to offer this service which is a godsend to some of the folk around here.

Richard ‘Highway Man’ Bassett
Wednesday Wheelie Warriors
1.1 Economic climate cont.

felt by the least well off. Indeed over the period 2003-04 to 2009-10, the price of electricity has risen by 54%, rent 33% and food 24%, while disposable incomes of low economic resource households have risen by just over 20%.

To note some simple examples, lamb prices have tripled over the past two decades, while prices for fruit, vegetables and eggs have more than doubled.

Price pressures on food are likely to remain for a while, as China and India continue to become more prosperous (and so consume more food, particularly more protein-intensive food) and as climatic changes produce ever more volatile weather patterns. However, the greatest pressure on food prices in coming years may be driven by a fall in the Australian dollar. This will see the price of food imports rise, placing increasing pressure on low income households.

“We are seeing a huge increase in working families who are struggling to meet the costs of living. This impacts greatly on the children who are in turn going to school without breakfast and/or lunch.”

Pastor Della Matthews
Gospel Lighthouse
Foodbank provided around 24 million kilograms of food to welfare agencies in 2011, showing remarkable growth from the 5 million kilograms provided in 2003/04. This growth has come at a time when pressure is being placed on the source of Foodbank’s donations from the food and grocery industry, for various reasons, including:

- More efficient inventory control has limited a key natural supply source namely surplus inventory among the nation’s food and grocery manufacturers and retailers. Across the last two decades better planning methods and the rise of information technology has reduced the percentage share of surplus product made by Australia’s food and grocery manufacturers.

- Increased product specialisation has narrowed the scope of products donated. Globalisation trends in food production have seen manufacturers increasingly focus on areas in which they have a comparative advantage. As a result, some food and grocery lines which were produced domestically are now the sole preserve of imports, while other locally produced lines previously directed only at the domestic market, now sell to the wider world. This trend has narrowed the potential sources of supply for Foodbank.

- Increased industry concentration has narrowed the donor companies. Companies are increasingly exploiting the available economies of scale in food and grocery manufacturing. As a result, the number of large players in the sector’s various niches has tended to narrow over time leading to a long term decline in the company and product base of traditional suppliers to Foodbank.

- Fewer failed product launches. Another large source of traditional supply to Foodbank Australia has been unsuccessful product launches – where a manufacturer seeks to establish a new product line (such as a new cereal) but the product fails to take off. This often formed an important part of the donation base to Foodbank. However, over the past two decades the targeting in market research underlying new product launches has become much more sophisticated. Due to this trend, the proportion of new product launches that result in excess product has fallen substantially over time.

The impact of these factors has lead to a plateau in donations of ‘surplus to need’ manufactured food and grocery items in the last 2 years. Despite these difficulties, and at a time when the relative price of food has been increasing, Foodbank has continued to increase the volume of food provided to welfare agencies, through new initiatives which include arranging the manufacture of key staple foods (where Foodbank seeks to have the inputs donated) and collecting surplus fresh fruit and vegetables.

The demand for food by low income households is likely to increase over the next couple of years, as both food prices and the unemployment rate continue to rise, indicating that the demand for increasing volumes of food from Foodbank is likely.

“

We assist numerous homeless and couch surfing clients and it’s no surprise that the number is rising due to the financial strain people are under. We are seeing a number of new clients present who have ‘slipped into situational poverty’ which is a real concern.

”

Kristy Young
UnitingCare, Hobart Benevolent Society
Bob
Prepared meal recipient
Demand for food relief

Demand for food relief is rising and it’s not who you think. The numbers asking for food assistance are increasing, and demand is greater from low income and single parent households than from the unemployed. More than 1 in 10 agencies reported an increase in demand in excess of 30% over a twelve month period. Food parcels comprise a large part of food assistance, with demand for staples and long life products greatest.

2.1 Who welfare agencies help

In an average month the number of people assisted by each welfare agency was 219, while the number of people approaching agencies was 316 representing a significant gap between demand and supply.

The majority of agencies provide assistance to low income families, the unemployed, and single parent families (see Chart 2.1), with over 65% of agencies providing services to these groups.

**Chart 2.1 Types of client groups assisted**

(\% of agencies providing service)

Common responses in the ‘other’ category included students/school children, and women and children dealing with domestic violence.
In the past year over a quarter of agencies reported increases in the number of individuals approaching them for help of between 6–15%. Around 15% reported increases in demand of 16–30%, while 13% reported increases of more than 30% over the past year. The weighted average growth was 11%.\(^1\)

The demand for services has been increasing in general across the board. Chart 2.2 shows the change in client demand for services with at least half the welfare agencies reporting increasing demand across all groups. However, close to a third are reporting that demand is constant, indicating that there may be increasing demand in certain locations or among different client types.

"We have experienced a consistent increase of approximately 30% especially in the last 6 months; both new and regular clients who just don’t have enough money to survive on each fortnight. In particular the number of single men presenting for assistance has increased."

Carol Davis
Emergency Relief Co-ordinator – Knox Infolink

---

\(^1\)The weighted average increase was calculated using mid-points of the ranges, multiplied by the average number of people the agency assisted.
2.2 Who welfare agencies help with food

Around 80% of agencies assisted low income families with food provision, followed closely by the unemployed and single parent families.

In comparison to those provided with any assistance the trends were very similar. However, there were often slight changes between the rankings. For example, more agencies provide food assistance to single parent families than unemployed, however for all assistance the rankings were the opposite. This is a recurring theme throughout the data.

Chart 2.3 Types of client groups assisted with food
(% of agencies providing service)
The most common type of food assistance provided was food parcels, followed by meals consumed on site, as shown in Chart 2.4. The high percentage providing food parcels reflects the most common groups assisted by welfare agencies. Low income, unemployed and single parent households do not usually need assistance with food preparation, but with the supply of basic ingredients with which to make meals. However those with a mental illness and the homeless are more likely to require prepared meals consumed on site.

Those people who received food from agencies were likely to do so several times a week. Chart 2.5 shows that nearly a quarter of recipients receive some food every day of the week, with a further 42% of clients assisted with food for several days of the week.

The most common response in the ‘other’ category was food vouchers (representing nearly a third of the category), followed by bread only and gift cards.
"We are feeding a rising number of people, many with disabilities, the elderly (lots of pensioners) and a heap of budget-stretched young families. We need an increase in the amount of staple foods – basic everyday items like bread and cereal. We never have enough and we need them on a more regular basis."

Pastor David Patch
Reach Out Family and Community Care
The types of food demanded tended to be staples such as bread, milk, grains, fruit and vegetables. Demand for staples and 'long life' food is significantly higher than for frozen meals and confectionery.

Average agency demand for all products was positive, as can be expected when averaging data, around the middle of the range of 1 (lowest demand) to 5 (highest demand). However the relative need was substantially different, with milk (the highest ranked product) being ranked at almost 3.8, while soft drinks and confectionery were ranked at just 2.1. This reinforces the message that it is staples which are in greatest demand – milk, breakfast cereal, bread, fruit and vegetables.

Chart 2.7 shows the type of emergency relief services provided by the welfare agencies. The most common service provided is food parcels, with nearly 80% of all respondents providing this service. Some 49% of respondents provide meals for their clients, while nearly 18% run a school breakfast program.

The dots in Chart 2.7 show how important welfare agencies regard the service – the higher the rank, the more important welfare agencies regard the service overall. Most emergency services were broadly regarded as equally important, with food parcels ranking slightly higher, and furniture and cash ranking slightly lower.

In addition to emergency relief, over 69% of respondents also provide information and referral services, shown in Chart 2.8. Over 54% provide counselling services, and over 43% provide budgeting and advocacy services. Low interest loan schemes and toy shop services were not regarded as being as important as other services.

---

2 Note this question asked 'what is your organisation’s demand for all the following products (1 being lowest demand, 5 being highest demand)'

---
Chart 2.7 Emergency relief services provided
(% of agencies providing service)

Chart 2.8 Other welfare services provided
(% of agencies providing service)
Ngoc Linh and Jessica
School breakfast program recipients
Meeting the demand

Food relief agencies are not able to meet demand. Nearly 90% of agencies reported not having enough food to meet total demand. 6 in 10 agencies require at least 25% more food with almost 3 in 10 agencies requiring double the food.

3.1 Food requirements

Foodbank is a major source of supply for agencies, providing around 55% of the food required every month. Donations from other sources accounted for 15% of food required, while agencies purchased, on average, 25% of their food.

One third of agencies obtain food from Foodbank at least once a week and another 50% of agencies obtained food either every couple of weeks or once a month, as shown in Chart 3.1.

---

Chart 3.1 Frequency of food obtained from Foodbank

- More than once a week: 25%
- Once a week: 25%
- Once every couple of weeks: 20%
- Once a month: 15%
- A few times a year: 10%
- Once a year: 5%
- Not in the last year: 0%
3.1 Food requirements cont.

For those agencies purchasing food to fill the gap above donated food, the proportion of food purchased was mostly dry goods at 42%, with fresh fruit and vegetables and meat and poultry both around 17%.

“The ministry of helping is not confined to giving food. I also become their friend, and we give them a psalm that changes from week to week for them to reflect on. It’s about changing their lives. We used to take the food outside and they picked it up from there until I questioned why we weren’t bringing them in. Since we’ve started bringing them in to collect their food, I have learnt their names and they have learnt mine. Caring must be about more than words. It must be matched with an action. They really love the food we provide them with – the fresh milk, coffee, jam and cereal. Doing the work is great, but it’s really about HOW you do it. It has to be done with respect and dignity.”

Colin J Llewellyn
CEO of Presbyterian Social Services

Chart 3.2 Proportion of food purchased

Responses in the ‘other’ category consisted mostly of personal hygiene products and pet food.
3.2 Increasing demand

The number of individuals that approach agencies for food assistance in the past year has risen strongly with 70% of agencies facing increased demand. Less than a third reported constant demand, while around 3% reported falling demand for services. Significantly, over 10% of agencies reported that the number of individuals seeking food assistance from their organisation had risen by more than 30% (see Chart 3.3).

Chart 3.3 Change in number of individuals that approach for food assistance
(% of respondents)
3.2 Increasing demand cont.

Given the number of agencies reporting significant increases in demand for food provision, it is no surprise that there was a matching need for increasing resources to meet potential client needs – nearly 90% of agencies reported not having enough food to meet total demand and nearly a quarter of respondents said that they would need more than twice their current resources to meet total demand (as shown in Chart 3.4).

However, around 10% of respondents reported needing more than twice their current resources just to meet current client needs, showing that there are a large number of clients who need more assistance than that currently being provided to them.

Agencies overwhelmingly agreed that food is a significant reason that people seek the services offered and it helps to build trust to offer other assistance (Chart 3.5).

“We offer a care package at the time of crisis that brings the client to us, which gives us time to explore the real needs of the individual. At the time of review it is our hope that we have built enough trust currency for the client to be open to explore other areas of need whether they be physical, emotional or spiritual.”

Jennifer Farmer
Syndal Syndal Baptist Church

Note: ‘Other’ responses in this question varied from unknown to over 10 times, however the most common response was ‘5 times’.
Jason and Peita came to the Food Barn approximately 12 months ago in desperation as Jason had been retrenched from a local mine, they had lost one of their five children to SIDS and they’d been evicted from their home as they had no income – they were just normal people doing it tough. They were living on the beach using a box trailer for the kids to sleep in and a truck tarp to live under. At the Food Barn they received food and assistance which enabled them to get back on their feet. Peita now volunteers in the Food Barn doing reception work in the office. Jason has found work and they have a house for their family to live in. Jason is also active in our men’s shed program to give back to the community. They have both also become members of our church.

Pastor Jeff Dakers
House of Hope Recovery Centre
Matthew
Prepared meal recipient
Foodbank’s contribution

Foodbank is providing a valuable service to hunger relief agencies. Some 95% of agencies were satisfied or neutral in their evaluation of Foodbank’s service provision. However, there is more that Foodbank can do.

Foodbank is the largest hunger relief charity in Australia. It is a national organisation with distribution centres in all state capitals, the Northern Territory and eight regional centres. It is endorsed by the Australian Food and Grocery Council as the food industry’s preferred means of disposal of surplus product, and is relied upon by Australian charities as the ‘pantry of the welfare sector’.

Foodbank increases the efficient operation of the Australian economy by directing to the needy some of the food and groceries that would otherwise end up as the commercial surplus of the nation’s food and grocery manufacturers and retailers.

– Foodbank distributed 24 million kilograms of food and groceries in 2011, receiving regular donations from 50 national companies and over 650 smaller ones. Donors receive brand protection and assurance that their donations will not be sold, exchanged or bartered. Product integrity is assured with professional transport, warehousing and distribution systems in place.

The food and groceries Foodbank distributes annually represent a $170 million saving (retail price) to the charities and community groups it serves as well as government agencies. This is money which can be spent on other activities such as counselling and support to address the root causes of the food insecurity.

– The volume of food and groceries distributed by Foodbank represents remarkable compound growth of 25% a year on the 5 million kilograms which Foodbank distributed in 2003/04. That growth has occurred despite several trends which have acted to reduce the traditional supply of surplus product to Foodbank including the steady adoption of more efficient inventory controls, increased product specialisation (which has narrowed the scope of products donated) and fewer less than successful product launches.

– Moreover, that growth has occurred despite the rising relative cost of food, which has also added notably to the relative value of the Foodbank food going to Australia’s needy.

– That growth in Foodbank food volumes has also occurred despite the rising cost of fuel, which has added to the costs of services provided to and by Foodbank.

– Some 2,500 charities and community groups and 640 schools use Foodbank to stretch their dollar further, with food for 32 million meals being distributed annually to Australians in need.

So Foodbank is highly efficient, converting surplus into charitable donations, and doing so in increasing volumes despite the various factors eating into Foodbank’s natural sources of supply.

Foodbank boosts fairness by directly helping the needy – all the more so given the rising relative cost of food – as well as reducing pressure on government services and the services provided by charity workers (allowing the latter to concentrate more on their core task of care-giving).
4.1 Who Foodbank provides a service to

As Chart 4.1 shows, over a third of respondents of the survey were religious organisations, followed by charities and welfare organisations. Together, these three types of organisations accounted for almost three quarters of survey respondents. The most common responses in the ‘other’ category were schools, followed by NGOs, refuges and rehabilitation services.

Nearly a third of welfare agencies surveyed provided services over several municipalities, while 50% provided services in their immediate neighbourhood or municipality. The median number of staff employed is two, while the median number of volunteers per agency is 10.

“A significant proportion of the food used to cook meals at Parramatta Mission’s crisis and transitional services comes from Foodbank. The savings are significant and drive our dollar so much further, enabling us to help more people than we otherwise could.”

Michael Wright
Parramatta Mission
4.2 The Foodbank experience

Overall, welfare agencies indicated that they were satisfied with the service provided by Foodbank. Chart 4.2 shows that more than 95% agencies were either satisfied or neutral with the service provision.

The categories with the greatest opportunity for improvement were the availability and range of product, and the quality of fruit and vegetables, with 12% and 13% of respondents reporting dissatisfaction with these aspects of service respectively.

Chart 4.2 Agency satisfaction with Foodbank
Foodbank Australia conducted the survey late in 2011. The survey sought responses across a range of questions from welfare agencies which receive food and groceries from Foodbank. The questions followed five broad themes:

**Section 1:**
Asked questions regarding the organisation, for example size, location and types of services provided.

**Section 2:**
Asked respondents to identify the different types of people they assist, and how often that assistance is provided.

**Section 3:**
Focused on food provision by the organisation, including how many people are assisted with food provision, and how many people the organisation is unable to provide food to due to insufficient provisions.

**Section 4:**
Aimed to identify the food requirements of the organisation, including where food is sourced from, types of food required and whether the demand for their food is currently greater than they can presently meet.

**Section 5:**
Focused on the organisation’s satisfaction with Foodbank, and explored different areas in which Foodbank is doing well in service provisions, as well as areas which could be improved.

**Survey representation**
The Foodbank survey received 1009 responses of which 668 were valid. 331 responses were ruled to be from providers that did not provide food relief; 7 were considered to be duplicates and 3 were invalid. Table 4.1 shows the total percentage of welfare organisations Foodbank provides with food by State, compared to the breakdown by respondents. The table shows that the survey over-represents those from NSW/ACT and Victoria, while Western Australia is under represented in the survey responses.

It is anticipated that next year’s survey will be more representative as the intention is for the survey to become integrated into the annual registration with Foodbank.

### Table 4.1 State breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Number of agencies as % of total agencies</th>
<th>Number of respondents as % of State agencies</th>
<th>Number of respondents as % of survey respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NSW/ACT</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIC</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QLD</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WA</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAS</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey cleaning

The survey data was cleaned to ensure the analysis was as robust as possible. This included:

– Removing double counting of duplicate entries from the same organisation (7 responses).
– Removing counting from organisations that are involved in food work but do not provide food relief. The start of section 3 “Your food provision” was used to delete the majority of non food provider responses. It should be noted that this includes a large number of responses that were invalid for other reasons (e.g. only completing the first page of the survey and nothing further). However, before all responses were discarded, question 3.6 (the provision of food) and sections 4 (the sourcing of food) were also checked to ensure that only non-valid responses were discarded (as it is possible that a respondent may provide food relief but not answer every question related to food relief). A total of 331 invalid responses were discarded.
– Standardising responses, which involved correcting all values that were tangible values but entered incorrectly, and discarding all values that were not tangible. If any assumptions were made to standardise the response beyond simple conversions they have been stated below for each question cleaned:
  – 1.12: Standardised responses – answers given in percentages were converted to numbers.
  – 1.9: Standardised responses – part time workers were assumed to be 0.5 of an FTE.
  – 1.10: Standardised responses.
  – 2.3: Standardised responses – family counted as 3 people, non-material answers e.g. “sometimes, yes, no” which could not be deduced from previous responses were discounted.³
  – 3.1: Standardised responses – families in one question were tripled and then broken down between adults and children (only 3 responses to this effect). In this question zero responses were removed as this was the default response if the question was not answered.
  – 3.8: Standardised responses – zero responses were also removed as this was the default response if the question was not answered.
  – 4.1: Standardised responses – responses across categories unable to be compared due to differences in question interpretation.
  – 4.4: Standardised responses.
  – 5.12: Standardised responses – where a conversion could not be found for square metres the responses were discounted.

³ Note: Third and fourth section of this question each had between 35-50 contextual response e.g. “yes, no” instead of a quantifiable response.
I know for a fact that some of the families we are assisting have been experiencing borderline starvation. One mum in particular springs to mind, who said to me that her priority was to feed her babies and that there was often no food left in the house for herself. Foodbank has changed this and has also kept her supplied with nappies. The joy and excitement that is generated each day of pick up is great to see, and the way the women band together to help ensure that they all receive food is terrific.

Tempest Waters
Delvena Women’s Refuge
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