

International Livestock Research Institute

Stakeholder engagement strategy workshop for the MoreMilk project

17–18 May 2018




© 2018 International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI)

ILRI thanks all donors and organizations which globally support its work through their contributions to the [CGIAR Trust Fund](#).



This publication is copyrighted by the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI). It is licensed for use under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International Licence. To view this licence, visit <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>. Unless otherwise noted, you are free to share (copy and redistribute the material in any medium or format), adapt (remix, transform, and build upon the material) for any purpose, even commercially, under the following condition:

 **ATTRIBUTION.** The work must be attributed, but not in any way that suggests endorsement by ILRI or the author(s).

NOTICE:

For any reuse or distribution, the license terms of this work must be made clear to others.

Any of the above conditions can be waived if permission is obtained from the copyright holder.

Nothing in this license impairs or restricts the author's moral rights.

Fair dealing and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

The parts used must not misrepresent the meaning of the publication. ILRI would appreciate being sent a copy of any materials in which text, photos etc. have been used.

Written by Erastus Kang'ethe and Silvia Alonso

Citation

Kang'ethe, E. and Alonso, S. 2018. *Stakeholder engagement strategy workshop for the MoreMilk project*. Nairobi, Kenya: ILRI.

Patron: Professor Peter C Doherty AC, FAA, FRS

Animal scientist, Nobel Prize Laureate for Physiology or Medicine–1996

Box 30709, Nairobi 00100 Kenya
Phone +254 20 422 3000
Fax +254 20 422 3001
Email ilri-kenya@cgiar.org

ilri.org
better lives through livestock

ILRI is a CGIAR research centre

Box 5689, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
Phone +251 11 617 2000
Fax +251 11 667 6923
Email ilri-ethiopia@cgiar.org

ILRI has offices in East Africa • South Asia • Southeast and East Asia • Southern Africa • West Africa

Contents

Tables.....	iii
Figure.....	iii
Acknowledgements	iv
Executive summary.....	v
Introduction.....	1
Purpose of stakeholder engagement	1
Operational definitions.....	2
Stakeholder analysis	3
Stakeholder interests.....	3
Assessing stakeholder power	3
Assessing stakeholder influence.....	5
Stakeholders’ interest, influence and power.....	7
Stakeholder engagement	8
Methods of engagement	8
Information disclosure.....	10
Managing stakeholder conflicts.....	12
Bibliography.....	13
Appendix 1: Power/influence/interest matrices	14
Appendix 2: Workshop program	15
Appendix 3: List of participants	16

Tables

Table 1: Mapping of stakeholders' interest and power.....	4
Table 2: Assessment of stakeholders' influence.....	6
Table 3: Methods best suited for stakeholder engagement under inform, consult, involve and collaboration categories	9
Table 4: Stakeholder, engagement method and when to engage	11

Figure

Figure 1: A two-by-two matrix comparing influence and interests of stakeholders.	7
---	---

Acknowledgements

The project is grateful to the management of the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) for the enabling environment to carry out the projects. The project thanks the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the United Kingdom government for the funding to support the *MoreMilk: Making the most of milk* project. We are grateful to local and international partners who have been and are important in the execution of the project.

Executive summary

Developing a stakeholder engagement strategy involves stakeholder identification, analysis and engagement approaches. The strategy that we have developed looks at each boundary partner or stakeholder in the 'involve' and 'collaborate' categories of the influence/interest matrix and identifies the best method of engagement and stage of the project which they will be engaged. The project will assign the roles which each of its members will execute during the engagement.

To confirm the validity of the stakeholder engagement process, we have included arguments and evidence that show that the process meets the threshold of credibility, relevance and legitimacy.

Introduction

The *MoreMilk: making the most of milk* project is a five-year initiative, funded by the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation and the United Kingdom government, that works to upgrade the standards of milk hygiene and quality in the informal dairy value chain in Kenya and maximize the economic, health and nutrition benefits, especially for the low-income households in Nairobi.

The project will carry out a randomized control trial targeting informal milk traders to train, certify and give them marketing skills to help deliver safe milk to households living in densely populated areas of Nairobi. The success of this will be measured by improved consumption of milk in low-income households or changes in household allocation of milk consumption to benefit the children under five years of age, improving their nutritional and health outcomes, and increased market opportunities for the informal milk traders.

Stakeholder engagement is a means of describing, in broad terms, an inclusive and continuous process of participation between the project team and those the project activities and outcomes will impact (that is, stakeholders).

The benefits that stakeholder engagement brings to a project vary depending on the level of engagement that stakeholders will have with the project. There are four levels that are, in increasing order of depth of engagement: inform, consult, involve and collaborate. Broadly, the project will benefit from the new knowledge (social learning), be able to manage risks before they occur, increase chances of greater achievements and better outcomes. There is greater chance that project outcomes will be adopted and applied by the stakeholders beyond the lifespan of the project, reaping benefits for all (project and stakeholders). The stakeholders benefit from new knowledge and trust between stakeholders. The process of developing a stakeholder engagement strategy involves stakeholder analysis, information disclosure, and stakeholder involvement and risk management.

Purpose of stakeholder engagement

The main project outcomes identified during the workshop were to:

- improve informal dairy markets to deliver safer/higher quality milk (for example, less adulteration);
- contribute to nutrition security (that is, to have more children drinking more and safer milk); and
- influence policymakers to see informal markets as opportunities for job creation and providing livelihoods and not as a threat (shame, unfair competition) to the formal dairy sector.

To realize these broad outcomes, the project will engage the traders in the informal sector in peri-urban Nairobi by training them to increase their knowledge on milk safety, improve their hygiene and handling practices and develop their business and marketing skills to promote better milk consumption practices in the consumer households. The training materials will be developed through a participatory collaborative process with the traders and other stakeholders, including members of the Kenya Dairy Traders Association and representatives from the Kenya Dairy Board, so that the materials are agreeable to all parties and relevant to the end users. The Kenya Dairy Traders Association will actively participate in the project, to own the scheme and facilitate its scalability.

The project will further engage policymakers to build capacity and disseminate knowledge by sharing project outputs, address concerns that arise from other market players (for example, dairy actors in the formal sector, consumer groups) by organizing trainings on market segmentation and food safety, among others. Such engagements will also give an opportunity to identify other areas where the project could further support these actors. These objectives have been considered in developing an engagement strategy for each stakeholder or group.

Operational definitions

Stakeholder engagement is the active involvement and participation *of others* in some form of research project. There are four levels of engagement, the highest is *collaboration* and the lowest *inform*. In the middle are *consult* and *involve*. The level a project chooses to engage the stakeholders is dependent on the ultimate aims of engagement and the project objectives.

A **stakeholder** is an individual, group or community whose interests and or activities will be affected by the project outcomes either positively or negatively. Stakeholders are important to projects because they hold information and resources and their participation is crucial to the project realizing its outcomes.

Developing a stakeholder engagement strategy involves **stakeholder analysis**, which helps understand the stakeholder and **stakeholder engagement**, in which the project identifies relevant techniques for involving the stakeholders, deciding when and how to involve them.

Stakeholder analysis

Stakeholder analysis allows identification of the **interests** of different groups and find **ways of harnessing the support** of those in favour of the activity, while **managing the risks** posed by stakeholders who are against it. This is achieved by identifying stakeholders and map their relative power, influence and interests. It is important to realize that stakeholders could be external to the project. The project team listed 22 stakeholders (Table 1).

Stakeholder interests

Interest is what each stakeholder wants. This is represented by needs, desires, concerns and fears. Some are tangible (for example, health or better prices) and others are intangible (for example, they feel they are important to the project). The project staff wrote what they consider to be the interests of each stakeholder to the project and gauged if the interest is positive or negative from their expert opinion in relation to the sought project outcomes. If a stakeholder interests are positive, he/she supports the goals of the project and if negative may oppose the project outcomes. They rated each interest as 'low' or 'high' (Table 1).

Assessing stakeholder power

The source of a stakeholder's power is his or her **resources** and **ability to use** them. Resource is defined as source of support or aid. It can be financial, social, technological, political, etc. In assessing the power of stakeholders, we determine the quantity of resources they have or can access and their ability to mobilize it.

The quantity of the resources was graded on a scale of 1 to 3, where 1 = 'few', 2 = 'some' and 3 = 'many'. The ability to mobilize resources is also graded on a scale of 1 to 3, where 1 = 'stakeholder has no decisional power on the use of the resource', 2 = 'stakeholder is one among many who can make decisions' and 3 = 'the stakeholder has all decisional power on the use of the resource'. The overall score per stakeholder was obtained by adding up the individual scores (resource + mobilization) and dividing by 2. An overall score above 1.5 was considered indicative of 'high' power and less than 1.5 was considered 'low' (Table 1).

Table 1: Mapping of stakeholders' interest and power

Stakeholder	INTEREST			POWER		
	Interests of stakeholder in the project	Positive or negative	High or low	Resources	Mobilize	Average score (low or high)
Kenya Dairy Board or individual members	Safer milk available in the market, Expansion of dairy markets Revenues/Levies Expansion of the formal sector	-	H	3	2	2.5 (H)
Kenya Dairy Processors Association or individual members	Expansion of the formal sector Increase profit Accessing higher quality milk Scoping for new business opportunities within the informal markets	-	L	3	3	3 (H)
Kenya Dairy Traders Association	Expansion informal sector Create markets Legitimization of sub-sector Revenue generation Improving milk quality/safety	+	H	1	1	1 (L)
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	Value for money – positive impact of intervention on nutrition and health	+	H	3	3	3 (H)
Investment partners in the dairy sector (World Bank, SNV Netherlands Development Organisation, European Union)	Increase market access for producers Strong interest in supporting and expanding formal dairy markets (international trade) Health and nutrition	+	L	2	1	1.5 (L)
Market development practitioners (GIZ, TechnoServe, SITE Enterprise Promotion)	Business opportunity for themselves Business opportunities and improved livelihoods for their beneficiaries	+	L	2	1	1.5 (L)
Business development partners	Revenue generation/profit making/business opportunity Competition	+	L	1	1	1 (L)
Unassociated informal dairy traders	Revenue generation/profit making/business opportunity Competition Legitimacy/legal	+	H	1	1	1 (L)
ILRI	Generating evidence on links between dairy markets and health and nutrition Demonstrate impact (health, nutrition, livelihoods) Accountability to donors	+	H	1	1	1 (L)
Consumer associations	Consumption of safe and affordable milk Healthy and informed consumers	+	L	1	1	1 (L)
International dairy companies	Strategies for safer milk create demand for their technologies Strengthening local markets decreases their capacity to penetrate new markets in Kenya and beyond	+	L	3	1	2 (H)
Ministry of Health	Wholesome milk (public good) Healthy and informed citizens Reducing cost of illness (FB)	+	H	2	3	2.5 (H)
Ministry of Interior	Their role in overseeing security of citizens	+	L	1	2	1.5 (L)
Nairobi County Government	Safe milk in the markets Healthy and informed citizens Reducing cost of foodborne illness	+	H	2	3	2.5 (H)
Kenya Livestock Producers Association	Market access for their higher quality and safer milk (livelihoods)	+	L	1	1	1 (L)
Kenya Bureau of Standards	Quality assurance Higher quality of milk in the markets	-	L	1	2	1.5 (L)
Ministry of Trade	Stronger dairy markets Increase revenues Increase business/market opportunities	+	L	2	2	2 (H)
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	Expansion of formal sector Reliable/regulated dairy markets	+	L	2	2	2 (H)
Research institutes/academia working on dairy in Kenya	Want the evidence Alignment with the missions/visions	+	L	1	1	1 (L)
Kenyan consumers	Access to affordable and safe milk Increased consumer choices Healthier families	+	H	1	1	1 (L)
Formal dairy retailers (middle/large supermarkets)	Expansion of the formal sector	-	L	2	1	1.5 (L)
East African Community/African Union	Development of appropriate dairy standards Strategies to support the improvement of milk safety in the region International pressure to align the dairy markets in Africa to the standards of high-income countries	+	L	1	1	1 (L)

GIZ: Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit; ILRI: International Livestock Research Institute

Assessing stakeholder influence

This is the power of the stakeholder to influence the project negatively or positively. The workshop participants used the following questions to guide the assessment of the influence that a stakeholder has:

- Is the stakeholder in a position to reward those who have the power to change the project in their favour?
- Does the stakeholder have legitimate authority to influence the project?
- Does the stakeholder hold power to punish those who can change project (coerce)?
- Does the stakeholder hold expert knowledge related to the project?
- Does the stakeholder hold critical information to influence the project?
- Is the stakeholder in a position to use any of the above power sources (commitment)?

Each criterion was rated, 4 for highest and 1 for lowest. The average of the six scores was calculated to obtain the overall influence score. If this overall score was above 2, the influence was regarded as 'high' and below 2 as 'low' (Table 2).

Table 2: Assessment of stakeholders' influence

Stakeholder	Interests in the project	Influence criteria							
		Reward ability	Legitimate authority	Coerciveness	Holds expert knowledge	Holds critical information about project	Commitment	Total Score	Average score (high or low)
Kenya Dairy Board or individual members	Safer milk available in the market; Expansion of dairy markets; Revenues/Levies; Expansion of the formal sector	1	4	3	4	4	3	3.2	H
Kenya Dairy Processors Association or individual members	Expansion of the formal sector Increase profit Accessing higher quality milk Scoping for new business opportunities within the IM	4	2	4	2	3	4	3.2	H
Kenya Dairy Traders Association	Expansion informal sector Create markets Legitimization of sub-sector Revenue generation Improving milk quality/safety	1	3	1	2	2	4	2.2	H
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	Value for money – positive impact of intervention on nutrition and health	1	3	1	2	2	4	2.2	L
Investment partners in the dairy sector (World Bank, SNV, European Union)	Increase market access for producers Strong interest in supporting and expanding formal dairy markets (international trade) Health and nutrition	1	1	2	2	2	1	1.5	L
Market development practitioners (GIZ, TechnoServe, SITE Enterprise Promotion)	Business opportunity for themselves Business opportunities/improved livelihoods for their beneficiaries	1	1	1	2	1	1	1.2	L
Business development Partners	Revenue generation/profit making/business opportunity; Competition	2	2	1	2	1	1	1.4	L
Unassociated informal dairy traders	Revenue generation/profit making/business opportunity Competition Legitimacy/legal	1	1	1	2	1	1	1.2	L
ILRI	Generating evidence on links between dairy markets and health and nutrition Demonstrate impact (health, nutrition, livelihoods) Accountability to donors	1	3	1	4	1	2	2.0	L
Consumer associations	Consumption of safe and affordable milk Healthy and informed consumers	1	3	1	2	1	2	1.7	L
International dairy companies	Strategies for safer milk create demand for their technologies Strengthening local markets decreases their capacity to penetrate new markets in Kenya and beyond	1	1	1	3	1	1	1.3	L
Ministry of Health	Wholesome milk (public good) Healthy and informed citizens Reducing cost of foodborne illness	2	4	3	2	4	2	2.8	H
Ministry of interior	Their role in overseeing security of citizens	1	2	1	1	1	1	1.2	L
Nairobi County Government	Safe milk in the markets Healthy and informed citizens Reducing cost of foodborne illness	1	4	3	2	4	3	2.8	H
Kenya Livestock Producers Association	Market access for their higher quality and safer milk (livelihoods)	1	1	1	2	2	1	1.3	L
Kenya Bureau of Standards	Quality assurance Higher quality of milk in the markets	1	3	1	2	1	1	1.5	L
Ministry of Trade	Stronger dairy markets Increase revenues Increase business/market opportunities	1	3	1	1	3	1	1.7	L
Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries	Expansion of formal sector Reliable/regulated dairy markets	1	4	1	3	4	2	2.5	H
Research institutes and academia working on dairy in Kenya	Want the evidence Alignment with the missions/visions	1	1	1	3	2	1	1.5	L
Kenyan consumers	Access to affordable and safe milk Increased consumer choices Healthier families	1	2	1	1	1	1	1.2	L
Formal dairy retailers (middle/large supermarket)	Expansion of the formal sector	1	1	2	1	1	1	1.2	L
East African Community/African Union	Development of appropriate dairy standards Strategies to support the improvement of milk safety in the region International pressure to align the dairy markets in Africa to the standards of high-income countries	1	4	2	2	4	1	2.3	H

GIZ: Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit; ILRI: International Livestock Research Institute

Stakeholders' interest, influence and power

Two-by-two matrix tables comparing power and influence, power and interest and interest and influence were created. Stakeholders falling in the respective boxes were entered. The influence and interest matrix is shown in Figure 1. Other matrices on power/interest/influence are presented in Appendix 1.

Figure 1: A two-by-two matrix comparing influence and interests of stakeholders.

		A	B
HIGH	I N F L U E N C E	Kenya Dairy Processors Association Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries East African Community/African Union	Kenya Dairy Board Ministry of Health Nairobi County Government
LOW		C	D
		Kenya Livestock Producers Association Investment partners Market development partners Business development service providers Academia/research Consumer association International dairy companies Formal retailers Ministry of Interior Kenya Bureau of Standards	Kenya Dairy Traders Association Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Informal traders ILRI Consumers
		LOW	HIGH
		INTEREST	

Box A has stakeholders with low interest but high Influence. These are the stakeholders whom the project needs to involve in the project activities especially if their influence is negative. They can cause the project not to achieve its outcomes. It is important to find out at what stages of the project they have influence on. Decide what messages benefit them.

Box B has stakeholders with both high interest and influence. The project should consider collaborating with them. They need to be kept aware of how the project is achieving the outcomes.

Box C has stakeholders with low interest and influence. These need to be informed only of the outcomes being achieved.

Box D has stakeholders who have high interest but low influence. These are stakeholders the project needs to consult with to realize its outcomes.

Stakeholder engagement

For the data obtained through this process to be valid and valuable, the engagement must be credible, relevant and legitimate.

Credibility refers to the validity and quality of the process. Have the right stakeholders been involved? Has the process been inclusive, in that it has involved those with differing views? In respect to MoreMilk, the outcome mapping and stakeholder analysis has identified the same group of stakeholders to be involved in the project. The Kenya Dairy Board, although having strong views on the project, is a key boundary partner. Equally, the Kenya Dairy Traders Association, whose activities the project is targeting to deliver favourable outcomes to households consuming informally marketed milk, has opposing views to the Kenya Dairy Board, has been included as a boundary partner.

Relevance refers to the usefulness of the process, and its outcomes to the stakeholders and the research. The project has purposively selected the key stakeholders (boundary and strategic) early in the planning phase to continually keep engaged with the stakeholders throughout the project. This will allow the stakeholders, in the 'involve' and 'collaborate' categories (see Table 3) to be kept engaged in the project activities and dissemination of the results.

Legitimacy is the balance and fairness of the process. The project has agreed on the engagement process, the inclusion of multi-stakeholder group comprising of the informal milk traders, traders' association, household consuming informally marketed milk, the Kenya Dairy Board and Nairobi County Government as boundary and strategic partners and it therefore offers the process legitimacy.

Methods of engagement

There are four main engagement methods, inform, consult, involve and collaborate. According to the power influence matrix, project's stakeholders fall in these four categories.

Inform is a one-way mode of engagement involving primarily the passing of information and messages to the stakeholder. This can include sending leaflets, policy beliefs, announcements, press releases, position statements or other forms of passing information without any feedback expected from the stakeholders. It is best applied at the start of the project. Messages need to be tailored to meet the stakeholders' interests to show they are being considered.

In **consultation**, the project shares the project proposal and activities to the stakeholders, who provide feedback that is incorporated in planning. Decision making, power and control remains completely with the agency leadership (project leader). Consultation is most commonly done through focus group discussions, individual interviews or surveys.

Involving engages influential stakeholders who take part in generating options for the project and carrying out actions that emerge from their input, but their participation does not imply any decisional making authority on the project.

In **collaboration** form of engagement, the stakeholders work with the project team because they have shared goals and make decisions together. The stakeholders who are involved in this form of engagement are those with high power, interest and influence. They have resources, information and perhaps permissions and can be impacted highly by the project outcomes.

The project will use *involve* and *collaborative* modes of engagement because its key stakeholders identified under the Outcome Mapping process fall under these two categories (Outcome Mapping report available at <http://hdl.handle.net/10568/97699>). What is important is early involvement of the stakeholders. The project has already met with the key stakeholders (Kenya Dairy Board and Kenya Dairy Traders Association) and the two have expressed their interest to work with the project, despite their opposing views on informal marketing of milk. Further engagement is planned during the review of the training curriculum and the training

of the informal milk traders. The project hopes the research will meet the needs of the stakeholders and consequently they will feel ownership of the research outcomes. Engagement methods vary within the broad engagement categories. Table 3 is a modified summary from Durham et al. (2014) that shows the various methods that can be used.

Table 3: Methods best suited for stakeholder engagement under inform, consult, involve and collaboration categories

Methods	Engagement categories			
	Inform	Consult	Involve	Collaborate
Website	+	+		
Social Media	+	+		
Lectures	+	+		
Questionnaires		+		
Workshops		+	+	+
Surveys				
Multi-stakeholder forums			+	
One to one meetings			+	
Practical demonstrations			+	+
Steering committees				+

Source: Modified from Durham et al. (2014)

Information disclosure

This is making information accessible to interested parties (stakeholders) whose interests will be affected by project activities and outcomes. Information disclosure allows the stakeholders to engage in an informed manner. The information must be tailored to local context and type of stakeholder. There is some information of certain stakeholders held by the project that may not be disclosed because such disclosure may result in a risk if the said information is discussed elsewhere. Anticipating the risks to the project is an essential activity that must be carried out by the project team. The project team will decide the type of information that will be disclosed based on the activities planned and the level of engagement with each stakeholder. For instance, the Kenya Dairy Traders Association and the individual traders would benefit from the course content and the test results of the milk quality they sell to improve the milk quality. Such information (if the test results are negative) would not be appropriate for consumers or the Kenya Dairy Board as they could be misinterpreted and negatively influence the outcomes of the project.

The project will not only engage those in the *involve* and *collaborate* categories but will also need to engage those of its large stakeholders in the *inform* and *consult* categories. This is important to make sure that their views are listened to and the results are widely disseminated and received. Table 4 shows the recommended methods of engagement for each stakeholder in *involve* and *collaborate* (boundary and strategic partners) categories, while those stakeholders in *consult* and *inform* categories there will be no segregation of the stakeholders.

Table 4: Stakeholder, engagement method and when to engage

Stakeholder	Boundary/ strategic partner	Category of engagement	Method of engagement	When to engage (project stage)
Kenya Dairy Traders Association	Boundary	Involve	Face-to-face meeting Face-to-face meeting Workshop Multi-stakeholder workshop	Pre-planning (November) Curriculum review, planning intervention (November; January) Training of trainers; training of traders (February) Dissemination of results
Individual informal dairy traders	Boundary	Involve	One-on-one visits Face to Face meeting Workshop Face-to-face meeting Multi-stakeholder workshop	Recruitment Data collection (questionnaire, outcome and strategy maps) Training Discussion of individual test results Dissemination
Consumers of informally marketed milk	Boundary	Involve	Face to Face interview Baraza meeting	Data collection (Questionnaire structured) Dissemination results
Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation	Strategic	Involve	Verbal/written reports Multi-stakeholder workshop	Email; Skype; written reports Results dissemination workshop
International Livestock Research Institute	Strategic	Involve	Reports/outputs	At all stages of the project (implementing Agency)
Kenya Dairy Board	Boundary	Collaborate	Face-to-face meeting Face-to-face meeting Workshop Multi-stakeholder workshop	Pre-planning (November; March) Curriculum review (November) Training of trainers Dissemination of results
Ministry of Health	Strategic	Collaborate	Face-to-face meeting Workshop Multi-stakeholder workshop	Review of curriculum (November) Training of trainers Dissemination
Nairobi County Government	Strategic	Collaborate	Face-to-face meeting Multi-stakeholder workshop	Brief on launch of activities in the field Dissemination
High interest /low influence	Strategic	Consult	Focus group discussion Face to face Multi-stakeholder workshop Surveys	Pre-planning Mid-term Dissemination
Low interest/ low Influence	Strategic	Inform	Website Newsletters Multi-stakeholder workshop Media releases	Project life Start of activities Dissemination Dissemination

Managing stakeholder conflicts

Conflicts can arise anytime when the actions of one party interferes with the performance of another party and make their actions less efficient. A conflict is not necessarily negative. It provides opportunity for consultations. Conflicts are either functional or dysfunctional. A functional conflict is a disagreement between two people or parties who support the same broad goals. A dysfunctional conflict on the other hand is usually unhealthy with hostilities. A functional conflict if managed properly can lead to new thinking and innovations. The resolution produces winners and allows change to be made through compromises.

Dysfunctional conflicts occur when two parties have needs or opinions that are opposing and leads to breakdown in communication. This is can occur in MoreMilk because of the opposing opinions held by Kenya Dairy Board and the Kenya Dairy Traders Association on marketing of unpasteurized milk by informal traders. Effective way to solving a conflict is to regard it as a problem that needs solving than a conflict. In a conflict there is hostility between the parties while in a problem both parties should look as providing solutions.

There are many ways to categorize conflicts, some with well-known facts (open) and others no facts in the open (latent). The causes could be cognitive (differing assessment of facts); normative (differing views about values); relational (behaviour of stakeholders); objectives (when needs, interests are at opposing ends) and process (differing opinions on the approaches to address a common problem). Whatever the cause, it is good to know that conflicts are dynamic, and stakes are always high.

There are many methods to manage conflicts. Key is understanding the conflict from the parties if mediation and negotiation is the method of resolution. A conflict timeline is a tool that can be used to get historical underlying events and understanding how each party frames the conflict. In this process, both parties are willing to consider the other views. Decisions are the domain of the parties not the mediator. There are no winners or losers, but all are winners as compromise and shifting of perceptions takes place to arrive to a settlement where both parties agree and commit to the agreements.

MoreMilk project should consider this as their role to get an amicable way to deal with the thorny informal marketing of raw milk, by creating the atmosphere where both parties can agree on their shared value (making safe milk accessible to all); develop a time frame of transformational of the informal sector with support of the regulators, donors (to be sourced) to be agreed upon and be implemented by the two parties.

Bibliography

- ACT Academy. *Online library of quality, service improvement and redesign tools*.
<https://improvement.nhs.uk/documents/2169/stakeholder-analysis.pdf>
- Australian Government. 2015. Department of Health, Stakeholder engagement framework.
<http://www.health.gov.au/internet/main/publishing.nsf/Content/stake-frame>
- Durham E., Baker, H., Smith, M., Moore, E. and Morgan, V. 2014. *The BiodivERsA stakeholder engagement handbook*. Paris, France: BiodivERsA. 108 pp.
- Engel, A. and Korf, B. 2005. *Negotiation and mediation techniques for natural resource management*. Rome, Italy: Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.
<http://www.fao.org/docrep/008/a0032e/a0032e00.htm#Contents>
- Hunjan, R. and Pettit, J. 2011. *Power: A practical guide for facilitating social change*.
<https://www.carnegieuktrust.org.uk/publications/power-a-practical-guide-for-facilitating-social-change/>
- International Finance Corporation. 2007. *Stakeholder engagement: A good practice handbook for companies doing business in emerging markets*. <https://www.ifc.org/hb-stakeholderengagement>
- Morris, J. and Baddache, F. 2012. *Back to basics: How to make stakeholder engagement meaningful for your company*. <https://www.bsr.org/en/our-insights/blog-view/back-to-the-basics-how-to-make-stakeholder-engagement-meaningful-for-your-c>
- Pokhare, J.C. 1999. Manual on guidelines for stakeholder analysis.
- Schmeer, K.K. 2000. *Stakeholder analysis guidelines*.
https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265021546_Stakeholder_Analysis_Guidelines

Appendix 1: Power/influence/interest matrices

Power/influence matrix

H I G H	I N F L U E N C E	East African Community/African Union	Kenya Dairy Board Kenya Dairy Processors Association Ministry of Health Nairobi Country Government Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
		Kenya Livestock Producers Association Kenya Dairy Traders Association Consumers Market development practitioners Business development service providers Informal traders ILRI/academia/research Consumer association Ministry of Interior Kenya Bureau of Standards Formal retailers (supermarkets)	Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Investment partners International dairy companies Ministry of Trade
		LOW	HIGH
		POWER	

Power/interest matrix

H I G H	I N T E R E S T	Kenya Dairy Traders Association ILRI Consumers Unassociated informal traders	Kenya Dairy Board Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation Ministry of Health Nairobi County Government
		Formal retailers (supermarkets) Market development practitioner Business development service providers Consumer associations Ministry of Interior Kenya Livestock Producers Association Kenya Bureau of Standards Academia/Research East African Community/African Union	Kenya Dairy Processors Association Investment partners International dairy companies Ministry of Trade Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
		LOW	HIGH
		POWER	

Appendix 2: Workshop program

Thursday 17 May 2018		
0900–1000	Presentation of Outcome Mapping outcomes	Erastus Kang'ethe
1000–1030	Introduction to stakeholder analysis	Erastus Kang'ethe
1030–1100	TEA BREAK	
1100–1130	Stakeholder identification	Erastus Kang'ethe
1130–1300	Stakeholder interest analysis	Erastus Kang'ethe
1300–1400	LUNCH	
1400–1500	Stakeholder power analysis	Erastus Kang'ethe
1500–1600	Stakeholder influence analysis	Erastus Kang'ethe
1600–1630	TEA BREAK	
1630–1700	Analysis of stakeholder information	Erastus Kang'ethe
Friday 18 May 2018		
0900–1000	Recap from previous day	Erastus Kang'ethe
1000–1030	TEA BREAK	
1030–1130	Stakeholder engagement	Erastus Kang'ethe
1130–1300	Stakeholder conflict management	Erastus Kang'ethe
1300–1400	LUNCH	
1400–1500	Risk communication strategy	Silvia Alonso/Kristina Roesel
1500–1600	Recap (Outcome Mapping, stakeholder analysis) and next steps	Erastus Kang'ethe

Appendix 3: List of participants

Name	Designation	Institution	Email
Silvia Alonso	Epidemiologist	ILRI	s.alonso@cgiar.org
Kristina Roesel	Postdoctoral scientist	ILRI	k.roesel@cgiar.org
Erastus Kangethe	Professor (Retired)	Consultant	mburijudith@gmail.com
Emmanuel Muunda	Research assistant	ILRI	e.muunda@cgiar.org
Charity Kinyua	PhD student	ILRI/University of Nairobi	c.kinyua@cgiar.org
Hannah Vernel	PhD student	North Carolina State University	hlvarnell@ncsu.edu
Delia Grace Randolph	Program leader (joint), Animal and Human Health	ILRI	d.grace@cgiar.org
Emma Blackmore	Research Associate	International Institute for Environment and Development	emma.blackmore@iied.org
Tezira Lore	Communication Specialist	ILRI	t.lore@cgiar.org