

More Milk in Tanzania (MoreMilkiT) Project Review and MLE  
Framework Development Workshop  
Morogoro, Tanzania, 24-26 September 2013

Compiled by James Rao, Isabelle Baltenweck and Amos Omoro






[www.livestockfish.cgiar.org](http://www.livestockfish.cgiar.org)

CGIAR is a global partnership that unites organizations engaged in research for a food secure future. The CGIAR Research Program on Livestock and Fish aims to increase the productivity of small-scale livestock and fish systems in sustainable ways, making meat, milk and fish more available and affordable across the developing world. The Program brings together four CGIAR Centers: the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) with a mandate on livestock; WorldFish with a mandate on aquaculture; the International Center for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT), which works on forages; and the International Center for Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA), which works on small ruminants. <http://livestockfish.cgiar.org>

© 2013



This publication is licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 3.0 Unported Licence. To view this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/>. Unless otherwise noted, you are free to copy, duplicate, or reproduce and distribute, display, or transmit any part of this publication or portions thereof without permission, and to make translations, adaptations, or other derivative works under the following conditions:

-  **ATTRIBUTION.** The work must be attributed, but not in any way that suggests endorsement by the publisher or the author(s).
-  **NON-COMMERCIAL.** This work may not be used for commercial purposes.
-  **SHARE ALIKE.** If this work is altered, transformed, or built upon, the resulting work must be distributed only under the same or similar license to this one.

ilri.org  
*better lives through livestock*  
ILRI is a member of the CGIAR Consortium

Box 30709, Nairobi 00100, Kenya  
Phone: +254 20 422 3000  
Fax: +254 20 422 3001  
Email: [ILRI-Kenya@cgiar.org](mailto:ILRI-Kenya@cgiar.org)

Box 5689, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia  
Phone: +251 11 617 2000  
Fax: +251 11 617 2001  
Email: [ILRI-Ethiopia@cgiar.org](mailto:ILRI-Ethiopia@cgiar.org)

## Workshop objectives

A workshop was held 24-26 September at Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Morogoro, Tanzania to: a) review progress on project implementation and b) further develop the Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation (MLE) framework of the More Milk in Tanzania (MoreMilkIT) project that runs from 2013-16. Representatives of the following organizations involved in project implementation participated: SUA, Heifer, TDB and ILRI/CIAT. This workshop follows on from one held on 9-10 May at Kunduchi Beach Hotel & Resort in Dar es Salaam to initiate the process.

## Review of progress made by partners

Progress - Heifer	Pending/Issue/action
Heifer project assistant (Emmanuel Mihayo) has been recruited	Next stage is facilitate emergence of groups Need to know available groups + traders, BDS providers
Awareness created in all the 30 villages	
Feeds assessments done by MilkIT and opened door for MoreMilkIT to follow	
Progress - TDB	Pending/Issue/action
Meetings conducted with councils management committees and in villages	Deo to circulate Moshi proceedings for comments before publishing
Publication of the Moshi proceedings	Need to note differences between groups, hubs and platforms. Groups can identify persons to participate in IPs. One could catalyze the other
Reference to innovation platforms	Inventory traders not yet properly identified, particularly small scale traders. It is recommended that the identification starts with retailers and work backwards
Progress - MilkIT	Pending/Issue/action
Facilitation for IPs ongoing but there is concern that there is insufficient expert input into the process	Mr Bwana of Rural Livelihoods Development Company (RLDC; <a href="http://www.rldp.org/">http://www.rldp.org/</a> ) to be contacted to train IP facilitators – Prof Lusato Kurwijila
Challenges: Some potential actors not available at village level; there are also ownership problems	NB: Mr Bwana has successfully trained facilitators to conduct IPs working in 7 of 19 projects under EPINAV (A SUA led project)
The process is facilitated by MilkIT team. Village facilitators/ champions who will be closely following up on the process will still need technical assistance for proper guidance	Village-level IPs more likely to work at district-level for critical. Also check literature of optimal size (research question)
Progress – SNV Netherland Development	Pending/Issue/action

Organization	
A consultancy contract for Maria of SNV was drawn but not agreed upon because SNV can no longer afford to let her make the 3-months input envisaged. SNV has however agreed to let Maria contribute up to 3 weeks pro bono.	Need a consultant who could be co-supervised with Maria of SNV

Remarks/other action points:

- Though mobilization was conducted as a group, Heifer and TDB to report with respect to the objectives that they are addressing in their respective work plans.
- May need to work at ward or district-level for innovation platforms. Village may be too small
- If it won't work, walk out of the village
- Do 'Maziwa Zaidi' logo – Amos; Swahili version by Deo.

Updated work plans for both Heifer- and TDB-led activities are in Annexes 2 and 3.

The meeting discussed the need to adopt a uniform outline for reporting field trips.

## Outline of trip report

Report authors	
Date of trip start	
Date of trip end	
Destination	
Purpose of trip	
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Introduction <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.1. Details of the purpose of visit/trip, staff involved, people/institutions/group met</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Achievements – make reference to work plans and indicators</li> <li>3. Challenges</li> <li>4. Lessons learnt</li> <li>5. Way forward – link to work plans and challenges</li> </ol>	

## Issues arising from review of work plans

- How to fill SNV role on strengthening entrepreneurship, developing business plans and building B-to-B linkages based on the training needs that will have emerged from assessment. It was agreed that a consultant be engaged to fill the gap:
  - Ask Maria (SNV) to recommend/co-supervise the consultant to carry out this activity. Action: **Amos** by end Sept 13. Maria has recommended the engagement of FAIDA MaLi ([www.faidamarketlink.or.tz](http://www.faidamarketlink.or.tz)).
  - Explore with local NGO (e.g., Himwa) to fill gap - **Fred Wassena** to talk to Sarah to gauge interest and send feedback by end Sept 13
  - Check with Mr Bwana of RLDC who could also assist with agribusiness besides IPs. Action: **Prof Kurwijila**.
  - Whether TechnoServe (TNS; [www.technoserve.org](http://www.technoserve.org)) that will be a partner in EADD2 could fill the agribusiness gap was raised concerns expressed regarding their high costs. However, TNS (Rebecca) will be updated by **Henry Njakoi** by 15 Oct 13

## Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation (MLE) Framework

MoreMilkiT is a research in development project, whereby the focus is about understanding how to enable and/or accelerate development outcome. The project objectives are not only to reach some development outcomes (in this case increase in dairy income, more gender equity) but also to understand the process followed to reach those outcomes. A combination of partners is required as no single partner has the expertise to perform the various tasks. By working together, research organizations, NGOs, public and private sector are also more likely to 'own' the lessons and therefore to apply them in other projects.



The Monitoring, Learning and Evaluation (MLE) framework is the mechanism to collect data and evidence, analyse them and reflect for lessons learning.

## Suggested MLE Framework principles

The following principles were introduced at the May 2013 workshop.

- 'Usual' monitoring
  - Monitoring of activities and outputs
  - For fund accountability purpose (direct relationship between fund use and activities)
  - As an input into the other components (learning and evaluation)
  
- Strong emphasis on 'learning'
  - Regular and systematic collection and analysis of evidence on key outcomes and some impact indicators
  - At various levels of the value chain: farmers, hubs, VC actors
  - Both qualitative and quantitative
  - Will allow evidence based and timely feedback loops into project and hub activities
  - An input into the other component (monitoring and evaluation)
  
- Less on 'evaluation'
  - Mainly qualitative to understand the 'why' (why do things happen this way)
  - Use evidence from M&L,
  - Done externally for objectivity purpose
  - Mid term evaluation is an input into the other component (monitoring and learning)

## MLE Summary table

Type of assessment	Main objective	Indicators	Approach	Lead partner	Frequency	Status of completion
Value chain assessment	To identify constraints and opportunities for 1 <sup>st</sup> best bet identification		Qualitative	ILRI	Done once	Done, August and September 2012
Baseline survey, household level	To measure level of outcome and impact indicators at project start		Quantitative	ILRI	Done once	Done, November 2012 to January 2013
Monitoring of activities	To assess implementation of activities, also for accountability purposes		Workplan will be used	All partners	Reporting done bi-annually	On going
Monitoring of outputs (at farmers, groups and business providers level)	To assess how the activities delivered the expected results at farmers, groups and business providers levels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- # farmers who have joined groups, by age and gender</li> <li>- # farmers groups formed, membership structure and leadership structure</li> <li>- # individuals trained, by type of training, age and gender</li> <li>- # BDS providers linked to hub</li> </ul>	Template- draft here  <b>MLE for MoreMilkIT templates 1.xlsx</b> Draft protocol  <b>MLE protocol draft 0.docx</b>	All partners	Done bi-annually	Draft template, need revision and testing; protocols to be completed
Monitoring of trends of outcomes and impact-	To assess farmers uptake of technologies and dairy income		Quantitative, panel survey of cattle keepers Structured survey done annually. Main sources of data for farm level research	ILRI	Done annually	Tools & protocol to be developed (draft in embedde

farm level	To assess farmers use of hub services					d doc)
Monitoring of trends of outcomes and impact-hub and community levels	To assess DMH status in terms of organization, business entity and providers of inputs & services		Qualitative (MSC?) and quantitative Use the EADD stage gate tool as starting point Conducted annually Main sources of data for hub level research	ILRI	Done annually	Tools & protocol to be developed (draft in embedded doc)
Monitoring of trends of outcomes and impact-regional/country level	To assess change in policy and mindsets of key decision makers		Qualitative, KII	ILRI	Done annually	Tools & protocol to be developed (draft in embedded doc)
Mid term evaluation	To review progress to date and allow wider range of stakeholders to provide feedbacks		Qualitative, relying on monitoring data	External	Done once	
Final evaluation	To assess quantitatively impact of the interventions on key outcome and impact indicators		Quantitative	External	Done once	

NB. This MLE summary table reflects the project Results Framework (See Annex 1)



# Learning cycle



# Discussions

The following points were discussed on the last day (Friday), with each person being encouraged to air the areas they are unclear about. We were not always able to provide solutions but the discussions raised interesting points that are summarized below. Some questions were sub questions in the discussions but were separated in this document if they seem crucial to build a common understanding of the project activities.

1. What to do in case of mistrust between producers and processors (low price, arbitrary milk rejections, delayed payments according to farmers)?

Depending on the challenges faced by the farmers or farmers group, a key intervention will be a discussion with the processor or transporters to better understand the problems and identify possible solutions. TBD will actively participate in this process given their arbitration mandate.

2. What process do we follow to facilitate farmers groups creation and when do we know a group has been formed (what is the indicator)?

There are different situations. There are existing groups in about 5 villages (out of 30), 3 of which are cooperatives (so larger groups and more organized). If a group is existing but focusing on another commodity (e.g poultry) and some farmers are interested in cattle, it is up to the members to decide to form another group or do the activities through the existing group. If the group members are not interested in cattle, another group would have to be formed. It depends on the circumstances.

With existing groups or once groups have been set up, we may need to facilitate the writing of a 5 year strategic plan, which will be reviewed every year (the stage gate tool is one mechanism to review progress). We first need to assess their needs: capacity building (not only training) needs assessment. The sequence is therefore: 1. Stimulating group formation (on going through mobilisation), 2. Capacity needs assessment and 3. Group may need support in writing their strategic plan (depending on their needs).

How to facilitate development of a 5 year strategic plan? Business plan would focus too much on the financial aspects and does not show the long term vision.

When there are no groups (or no group working on cattle), the steps are:

- Sensitization and mobilization, already done
- Facilitation of writing of a constitution (or by laws), including training on group dynamics. Heifer facilitates the district community development officers to meet the emerging group
- Election of an interim leadership
- Registration at district level is the project indicator for group formation

3. Indicator of a hub (when do we know there's a hub at village/ ward level)

We need to have more than 1 definition for a hub, depending on the hub approach.

- In the case of hub approach A (direct relationship between farmer and buyer (either milk or cattle trader), so no milk bulking at farmer group level), there's a hub once farmers are able to access inputs & services on check off system

- In the case of hub approach B (milk bulking at farmer group level), there's a hub once the farmers group has at least 1 link with a trader/ buyer and at least 1 link with an input & services provider.

4. When farmers trade directly with milk (or cattle) sellers, what benefits do farmers derive from their group?

Farmers join groups for other reasons, including social capital. They may access services, for example training. Additionally, when farmers sell milk individually to traders, the group constitutes the fall back position in case things go wrong between the farmer, milk trader and the input& service providers.

5. What are the reporting dates?

As per the contract with Irish Aid, 2 narrative reports are due every year: end July ('semi-annual' report) and end Oct (annual report), so all partners need to send the reports to ILRI by end June and end Sept every year. Also, three financial reports at the same time as the narrative and another one end Dec.

6. Farmers groups and village innovation platforms- Complementarity and sequence.

Phrased differently, how to link the village innovation platforms and the emerging hubs? It is possible that the hubs will evolve faster in the villages where IPs exist- this is a research question that we may be able to answer in this project. However, it is important to clarify that farmers group and IP have different functions, one does not replace the other. The IP is about bringing various VC actors together while the farmers group is about organizing the farmers. So it is important that farmers groups are facilitated even in villages where there are IPs.

As mentioned above, the question still remains whether the level of the innovation platforms at village level is adequate? Would they aggregate to ward or district level so that to include more VC actors types, or more actors? Phrased differently, should IPs be promoted at village or higher level (e.g. ward)? This is another research question.

7. The monitoring of outcomes, especially at farm level, will require staff, who will conduct these surveys? And how to motivate these people?

In EADD, we used the producers' organization extension officers to conduct the cost of production and milk monitoring surveys. In this project, the village (or ward) livestock extension officers have time allocated to this project, so they will be able to assist. Additional (wo)man power may be needed.

What incentives or motivation for the ward livestock officers to participate in the project activities? We came up with 3 main types: 1. Capacity building activities; 2. Participation in project activities beyond their geographical area, for example before we finalise the 'do's and don'ts' document of the project; 3. Run meetings near the field so that the village livestock officers from that district or region can attend the project meetings and project staff can do a field visit.

8. Other points

- Visits from Irish Aid: they had requested to visit 'a hub' this year. We need to prepare the visit: 1 existing group and 1 site where a group is emerging. The communities will be informed of the visit but all activities remain the same as planned (managing expectations).
- Amos will follow on business support: how to involve Maria (SNV) and who could take over the field work, possibly under Maria's guidance and co-supervision?

- Financial support of DDF: only 1 workshop per year was budgeted but there are more planned. How to meet the cost? One solution would be to have the next meeting held back-to-back with the BMGF genetics workshop to save costs and the difference would be paid for by ILRI
- Establishment of the Morogoro regional platform (the Tanga one is operational)? This could be facilitated by DDF with help from SNV.
- Frequency of review meetings: at Kunduchi, we had agreed that we meet quarterly. We now agree that semi-annual is sufficient and more efficient. The semi-annual meetings should be planned well in advance. Amos to ensure that MilkIt is represented
- To better share information, we will create a MoreMilkIT wiki which will be a depository of documents including project proposal, M&E templates, workplans, Calendar of activities workshop reports, meeting minutes, trip reports etc. Isabelle will follow up with Dorine.
- Steering Committee: it is suggested to conduct review meetings back to back with the SC meeting to save costs. The SC is composed of representatives of the 2 regions secretariats, SUA, TDB, ILRI, Heifer, Irish Embassy representative; district executive directors or their representatives (2 for Lushoto). Prof will contact the district and regional authorities. Draft SC ToRs were circulated by Prof for comments (see revised ToR)

Next meeting: Week of 17<sup>th</sup> to 21<sup>st</sup> March 2014. Put the dates in your calendar!

New acronyms

CMT: Council Management Team at district level, represents the technical units

## Next steps

- Activity 1.4 In Heifer-led work plan. Support training needs assessments for all interest groups and individual BDS (identify constraints, activities to engage, financial needs, market info needs, technical needs).
- Activity 1.6 In Heifer-led work plan. Facilitate group formation / engage & strengthen existing groups (include dynamics, governance, constitution and registration)
- Aim to conduct the first round of outcome surveys at farm level by end of 2013. Isabelle: who should do the surveys? Seconded staff (Henry's suggestion). See proposed steps in Box 1 below

### Box 1. Considerations/Steps in Monitoring of Outputs

We present the monitoring templates and some adjustments are required		
-	The group/ hub form should capture existing relationships with traders/ processors/ BDS providers and issues related to that relationship [it would be the basis for discussions with processors, including TDB that has the mandate to improve the relationship amongst VC actors]	
-	Isabelle and James to finalise the templates	
-	The Tanzanian team will then translate them in Kiswahili	
-	The ILRI team will then accompany the field team to pre- test the monitoring tool and make final adjustments. If possible, the pre testing is done in a village where there's an existing group and in a village without group. Dates to be finalized.	
After this exercise, the forms are finalized and printed for use in the field		

## Summary of key action points

Action	Who	When
Initiate process of recruiting new business consultant in consultation with Maria (SNV)	Amos	Immediately
Trip report of recent field activities	Salim/Agnes/Emmanuel	7 Oct 2013
Explore local NGO (e.g., Himwa) capacity to fill business gaps	Fred to talk to Sarah	13 Oct 2013
Maziwa Zaidi logo	Amos	13 Oct 2013
Contact potential local facilitator (Mr Bwana of RLDC) for IPs/capacity building for B2B linkages	Prof	Immediately
Outcome monitoring survey tools	Isabelle/James	Dec 2013
Outcome monitoring survey implementation	Heifer	Dec 2013
Workshop report compilation	Amos/James/Isabelle	
Next DDF (possible with BMGF Genetics)	TDB	Starting Oct 2013
Next meeting	ILRI to organise	17th to 21st March 2014

# MoreMilkiT Do's and Don'ts

The following Dos and Don'ts will guide our interactions and engagement with partners and clients in the field (these are complementary to the "Principles of engagement" agreed during the last workshop held on 9-10 May at Kunduchi Beach Hotel & Resort in Dar es Salaam)

## What we will do:

- Work with to identify your needs as cattle producers
- Work with you to identify the emerging challenges in cattle production especially to improve access to inputs, services and milk markets
- Work with you to identify opportunities for improving access to inputs, services and milk markets
- Work with you to develop a road map to achieving these aims
- Work with you to improve efficiency in cattle production through collective action
- Work with you to improve your capacity to do cattle production as a business
- Work with you to engage with other stakeholders/institutions to improve the policy environment around cattle production
- Work with you to improve access to information and knowledge about cattle production and marketing
- Work with you to encourage cattle production & marketing approaches that do not harm natural environment
  - In all these initiatives, work with you to ensure that gender issues are taken into consideration

## What we will not do:

- We will not provide cattle including heifers, cows or bulls
- We will not provide equipment, input and services
- We will not pay allowances for attendance of meetings
- We are not promoting specific service provider or market outlets e.g., milk processors
- We are not affiliated with any political/religious/ethnic grouping
- We will not provide land or water facilities
- We will not divulge sensitive information regarding your group, business etc.

# Workshop participants

List of MoreMilkiT workshop participants 24-26 September 2013

Name	Organization	Email
1. Henry Njakoi	Heifer	<a href="mailto:henry.njakoi@heifer.org">henry.njakoi@heifer.org</a>
2. Agnes Assenga	Heifer	<a href="mailto:Agness.assenga@heifer.org">Agness.assenga@heifer.org</a>
3. Deogratious G. Mlay	Tanzania Dairy Board	<a href="mailto:deomlay@gmail.com">deomlay@gmail.com</a>
4. Salim W. Nandonde	SUA	<a href="mailto:snandonde@yahoo.com">snandonde@yahoo.com</a>
5. James Rao	ILRI	<a href="mailto:j.rao@cgiar.org">j.rao@cgiar.org</a>
6. Lusato Kurwijila (Prof)	SUA	<a href="mailto:Kurwijila_2000@yahoo.com">Kurwijila_2000@yahoo.com</a>
7. Isabelle Baltenweck	ILRI	<a href="mailto:i.baltenweck@cgiar.org">i.baltenweck@cgiar.org</a>
8. Amos Omore	ILRI	<a href="mailto:a.omore@cgiar.org">a.omore@cgiar.org</a>
9. Freddy Wassena	CIAT	<a href="mailto:f.j.wassena@cgiar.org">f.j.wassena@cgiar.org</a>
10. Emmanuel Mihayo	Heifer	





