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1. Introduction
Southern Africa’s smallholder cattle production, especially in dryland grazing areas, is currently dominated by low productivity, with sales occasioned by household cash needs rather than planned delivery to the market. On both supply and demand sides of the cattle market, new opportunities are appearing. Irrigated areas offer opportunities for livestock production from fodder crops and crop residues, but capital remains a constraint on smallholder crop producers’ ability to purchase animals and associated equipment. In addition, limited sales and widespread informal slaughter contribute to low and irregular incomes for smallholder cattle producers and traders.

Few comprehensive attempts have been made to analyze Swaziland’s value chains for key aspects of linking supply and demand via smallholder production, and the current proposal includes such analysis as advocacy for selected upgrading options. The proposed project engages with existing projects to establish grass-based fattening systems adding value to by-products of the sugar industry (i.e. molasses), crop by-products and residues, and on available pastures. It promotes innovative and comprehensive models facilitating the access to financial and marketing services to beef value chain stakeholders.

As this project has many components that require behavioral change of the various value chain actors the project management considered using outcome mapping as an additional approach to the monitoring and evaluation required by the donor.

2. Methodology
Outcome Mapping (OM)\(^1\) is a methodology for planning, monitoring and evaluating targeted behaviors, actions and relationships within a project’s sphere of influence, and for learning how to increase effectiveness in relation to the project’s ultimate goals.

It was developed by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) in 2001. Rather than focusing on the attribution of impact to a particular actor in development, OM focuses on more immediate results within the sphere of influence of that actor. Those within the sphere of influence, the individuals, groups and organisations that a development actor is trying to influence are called boundary partners in outcome mapping. OM focuses on one specific type of result; changes in the behavior (broadly defined to include changes in actions, activities and relationships) of boundary partners.

OM is....
- **Flexible**: modular to encourage adaptation to use & context
- **Complementary**: can be combined with other methodologies
- **Participatory**: seeks dialogue and collaboration with partners
- **Evaluative thinking**: culture of reflection, results oriented thinking, promotes social & organizational learning

---

\(^1\) Please see [www.outcomemapping.ca](http://www.outcomemapping.ca)

We are also thankful for the materials shared by Ann Braun as part of the imGoats project
It aims to influence boundary partners to do things differently to attain the project vision. Through defining the mission, the project team clearly indicates what it will do to contribute to the vision. Outcome statements are developed for each boundary partner that explains their contribution to the overall vision. In order to measure progress throughout the project duration, progress markers are defined. These describe changes in actions, activities and relationships leading to the desired outcome.

There are 3 levels of achievement:

- **Expect** – what you expect to see happening as a direct result of project actions/interventions. This is where you have the greatest opportunity for influence.
- **Like** – further change that you would like to see evolving out of the changes that occurred at the like level.
- **Love** – the changes that you would love to see evolving if the project were very successful, probably not within project timeframe.

### 3. Workshop

The workshop was conducted in Manzini, at the conference room of the Veterinary Services – Ministry of Agriculture. The list of participants is included in Annex 1 and included, farmers, traders, research (university and ILRI), the Micro Finance Unit and SWADE staff. The outline of the workshop is given in Annex 2.

The workshop objectives were:

1. Identify the priority areas for the application of OM
2. Create a framework for an M&E system that focuses on these priorities

The expected outcomes of the workshop were:

1. M&E Framework focused on priority areas where behaviour change is the key type of change that the project seeks to contribute towards
2. Revised Logframe

Following an introduction to the project by Ronnie Mkhombe, the national project manager, Saskia Hendrickx, the project manager, introduced outcome mapping as an approach to monitoring and evaluation. Experiences from the participants regarding M&E were discussed.

The main concepts of OM were discussed. Please see annex 3

The participants were asked to review the project logframe and identify the areas that could potentially benefit from outcome mapping as they require behavioral changes from persons or a different interaction between actors. The following indicators were found that could be assessed using OM:

- Smallholders producing cattle to market specifications
- Value chain finance products in use
- Products and materials in use
- 100 Loans disbursed and recovered in each fattening cycle
The last point was interesting as this really was a concern for the participants given past experiences with agricultural loans in Swaziland that farmers ended up not repaying.

To identify the various boundary partners present the participants were asked to line up illustrating the beef cattle value chain. By doing so, the participants identified that beef cattle value chain actors in Swaziland can be categorized in 4 types of boundary partners: production actors, post-production actors, input and service providers and enabling actors. Please see table 1 for the actors that are part of the various boundary partners.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production Actors</th>
<th>Post-Production Actors</th>
<th>Input and Service Providers</th>
<th>Enabling Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Livestock producers</td>
<td>• Aggregator</td>
<td>• Veterinary services</td>
<td>• Chiefs, local leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Traders</td>
<td>• Veterinary pharmacies</td>
<td>• SWADE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Abattoir</td>
<td>• Feed companies</td>
<td>• University of Swaziland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Butchers</td>
<td>• Commercial banks and/or Micro Finance Institutions</td>
<td>• MINAG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The group then proceeded to develop a vision statement for the project. Various issues were brought up that should be included in the vision. Saskia offered to finalize the vision statement and present to the participants on the 2nd day of the workshop.

On the second day, Saskia started with a short summary of the previous day especially as there were colleagues from MFU and SNAU that had not attended the first day. The developed vision statement was reviewed and some minor adjustments made.

Saskia also shared with the participants the mission statement she had developed as this refers to what the project team will do to contribute to the vision statement.

Subsequently the participants developed outcome statements for each boundary partners and a set of progress markers. This proved to be a bit challenging as it required the participants to think what success looked like based on their understanding of the project and will need to be finalized by the project staff.

All this information is given below.

On the second day, David Myeni and Sicelo Dlamini from the Micro Finance Unit (MFU) addressed some of the concerns of the producers and traders regarding the loan that will be made available. Most of the questions were related to collaterals. It was agreed that another informative session will be conducted by MFU to address project beneficiaries.
4. Next steps
It was agreed that Saskia will finalize the progress markers and prepare the report of the workshop. The report will be shared via email and in hard copy. The group will meet every 4 to 6 months to assess progress made.
Outcome Mapping Framework

**Vision:**

In irrigated areas of Swaziland, actors related to the beef cattle value chain are meeting, exchanging information and updating knowledge to improve the functioning of the chain especially regarding market demands and possible supply of cattle. **Producers** are more commercially oriented, fattening animals before sale according to market specifications, feeding balanced rations based on fodder crops and grasses produced on irrigated areas either by themselves or purchased from someone else. **Traders** are accessing loans at affordable rates to purchase more cattle for fattening and placing some of them with fatteners who will fatten the animals for them according to specifications outlined in written contracts. They supply animals that meet market specifications to those processors that pay the best price through organized channels ensuring traceability of the animals.

The **commercial banks and/or microfinance institutions** are supporting the livestock sector by developing financial instruments that are accessible to traders and farmers.

The **research sector** is producing research outputs that are demand-driven, needs-based and relevant to the beef cattle industry in Swaziland. They also share results and project learnings at national and international level especially in Southern Africa so that the used approach can benefit more smallholders in the region.

The **Ministry of Agriculture** is supporting producers with relevant technical information to improve productivity and adequate animal health services. **Policy makers** are using evidence from research in decision-making and actively promoting small holder grass based fattening as an alternative source of income for rural families in irrigated areas in Swaziland.

**Consumers** are purchasing more locally produced beef because it meets their specifications in terms of quality, affordability and availability.

All actors are contributing to a more sustainable livestock sector in Swaziland resulting in higher household income for smallholder farmers with higher off-take rates and less burden on grazing areas.

**Mission:**

In support of the vision and in order to address constraints in the value chain, **the project** will facilitate the information exchange among the various value chain actors.

It will work with partners in the finance sector to develop a financial instrument suitable to the needs of the traders and producers.

The **project** will work to strengthen capacity of value chain actors through training in areas such as grass based fattening but also entrepreneurial skills for traders. It will identify knowledge gaps document and disseminate research findings, good practices and learning to value chain actors, development agencies, policy makers, research community and donors.

In order to foster our own relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, **the project** will promote participatory decision-making and engage in participatory M&E.

**The project** will foster internal and external communication oriented to promote reflection, learning and adaptive management.
**Outcome Statements for Boundary Partners**

**Production Actors:**
Production actors produce beef cattle in a more commercially oriented manner maximizing the use of irrigated land to grow fodder to fatten the animals before sale according to market specifications.

**Post-Production Actors:**
Post – production actors communicate market specifications to production actors in order to synchronize production with demand by supplying quality, quantity and consistent supply. They are accessing affordable loans and repaying them to expand their business and identify new market opportunities.

**Input & Service Providers:**
Input & Service Providers link and coordinate with other value chain actors. They provide services regarding feeding, health, breeding and fiancé that are accessible, timely and affordable, and continuously improve their quality.

**Enabling Agencies:**
Enabling agencies recognize the importance of the beef cattle sector as an alternative source of household income in irrigated areas of Swaziland. They are accessible, pro-active and facilitate systematic documentation of experiences and dialogue between Research and Development actors, policy makers and field practitioners. They also lobby with policymakers to ensure adoption of evidence-based policies that are favorable to the strengthening of the small holder grass based fattening.
### Progress Markers for each Boundary Partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Production Actors</th>
<th>Post-Production Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Expect** | ● More producers interested in fattening animals  
● Producers are growing fodder crops to fatten animals for sale  
● Producers are producing more animals  
● Producers are selling more animals to ensure consistent supply to traders and increasing off-take rates.  
● Producers have regular meeting with other VC actors. | ● Traders getting better margins from animals sold*  
● Traders have sufficient animals to meet market demands*  
● Traders pay producers on time  
● Traders access loans to expand business  
● Traders are meeting with other processors and supermarkets to understand market demands  
● Traders paying back loans in time |
| **Like** | ● Producers get into contractual agreements with traders to provide fattening services.  
● Producer groups acting on decisions taken at meetings.  
● Producers are ensuring consistent supply cattle according to market specifications.  
● Producers entering into contractual agreements with buyers (to ensure supply of animal).  
● Producers are organized in groups | ● Butchers are slaughtering animals at slaughter slabs.  
● Carrying out market surveys to identify new markets and opportunities for expanding existing markets |
| **Love** | ● Producers are producing their own animals (weaners) for fattening | ● Traders establish an abattoir in project area.  
● Traders supplying to hospitality sector.  
● Consumers purchasing certified meat. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Input and Service Providers</th>
<th>Enabling Agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Expect** | ● Meeting with other VC actors  
● MFU develops a financial instrument  
● MFU disburses loans to traders | ● MINAG has a clear understanding of cattle numbers in the project area.  
● Local authorities allow irrigated land to be used for fodder production. |
| **Like** | ● MFU is collecting and disseminating market information to others in the VC.  
● Traders are repaying loans**  
● MFU seeks feedback from traders on loan  
● Veterinary services seek input from producers to improve service delivery | ● SWADE facilitates MOUs between farmer companies and processors regarding supplying animals.  
● Public sector developing infrastructure & other facilities for private sector use (slaughter slabs)  
● Enabling agencies facilitating documentation of diverse experiences and dialogue amongst policy makers, researchers |
- Feed companies start selling green fodder and
- More loans granted to traders (beyond those under the pilot)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Love</th>
<th>Improvement services based on client feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Starting new services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ISPs beyond the project geography are using the financial instrument as a model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Banks are adopting and improving the financial product.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|       | Policy makers adapt or develop more livestock friendly policies based on evidence. |

* To be assessed based on sales records – not a behavioural change.
** 100% payback would be a high level of achievement – we will use this to assess progress.
## Annex 1 – List of participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organisation/Category</th>
<th>Telephone contact</th>
<th>Email address</th>
<th>26/11/2013</th>
<th>27/11/2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ronnie Mkhombe</td>
<td>SWADE</td>
<td>7602 0004</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mkhomber@swade.co.sz">mkhomber@swade.co.sz</a></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Maxwell Tfwała</td>
<td>SWADE</td>
<td>7605 2711</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maxwell@swade.co.sz">maxwell@swade.co.sz</a></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Mhlonishwa Cindzi</td>
<td>SWADE</td>
<td>7694 1114</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mhlonishwa@swade.co.sz">mhlonishwa@swade.co.sz</a></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mbongeni Sihlongonyane</td>
<td>SWADE</td>
<td>7622 7869</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mbongeni@swade.co.sz">mbongeni@swade.co.sz</a></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Johnson Mabuza</td>
<td>Swaziland National Agricultural Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nathi Thwala</td>
<td>Fattener</td>
<td>7628 5079</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Spring Mahlalela</td>
<td>Fattener</td>
<td>7618 7787</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Zanele Shongwe</td>
<td>Trader</td>
<td>7608 0178</td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>David Myeni</td>
<td>Micro Finance Unit</td>
<td>7606 3061</td>
<td><a href="mailto:davidmyeni@mfu.org.sz">davidmyeni@mfu.org.sz</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Sicelo Dlamini</td>
<td>Micro Finance Unit</td>
<td>76121943</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sicelodlamini@mfu.org.sz">sicelodlamini@mfu.org.sz</a></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dr BJ Dlamini</td>
<td>University of Swaziland</td>
<td>7631 5009</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bjdlamin@uniswa.sz">bjdlamin@uniswa.sz</a></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tengetile Mamba</td>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>7618 5593</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mamba.tenge@gmail.com">mamba.tenge@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Saskia Hendrickx</td>
<td>ILRI</td>
<td>00 258 820896645</td>
<td><a href="mailto:s.hendrickx@cgiar.org">s.hendrickx@cgiar.org</a></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td>✔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 2 – Agenda

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Day</th>
<th>Desired outputs &amp; outcomes</th>
<th>Activities</th>
<th>Roles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Day 1 morning | Participants oriented and prepared to develop the M&E framework | • Short welcome & orientation (SH)  
• Introduction to the project and information needs (RM)  
• Rationale for logframe/OM integration (SH)  
• Intro to OM (SH)  
• Commence identification of boundary partners; develop vision and mission statements (SH) | Lead: SH  
Support: RM |
| Day 1 afternoon | OM-based M&E framework developed                                 | • Develop outcome statements for each boundary partner  
• Develop progress markers for each boundary partners | Lead: SH  
Support: RM |
| Day 2 morning | OM-based M&E framework integrated with logframe                  | • Quick review of day 1  
• Identify other levels of change; what success would look like at each level and appropriate measures | Lead: SH  
Support: RM |
| Day 2 afternoon | OM-based M&E framework integrated with logframe                  | • Review and adjust overall framework  
• Feedback on process  
• Identify next steps | Lead: SH  
Support: RM |
| Follow up   | Brief workshop report with M&E framework and revised logframe    |                                                                           |                            |
### Annex 3 – Definitions used in facilitating the Outcome Mapping Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vision</th>
<th>Mission</th>
<th>Boundary Partners</th>
<th>Outcome Statement</th>
<th>Progress Markers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>A description of the large scale development changes (economic, political social, environmental) to which a program hopes to contribute</td>
<td>An ideal description of how a program intends to support the achievement of its vision. It states with whom a program will work, and the areas in which it will work but does not list all the activities in which the program will engage</td>
<td>Those individuals, groups and organisations with whom a program interacts and with whom a program can anticipate some opportunities for influence</td>
<td>A description of the ideal changes in the behaviour, relationships, activities and/or actions of a boundary partner. It is a program’s challenge to help bring about these changes.</td>
<td>A set of graduated indicators of changed behaviours for a boundary partner that focus on the depth or quality of change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further information</td>
<td>In OM a program is not considered to be accountable for achieving the vision.</td>
<td>The mission is that “bite” of the vision statement on which the program intends to focus. It describes… • the priority areas in which the project will work • how project will support the achievement of outcomes by its BPs • how project will keep itself effective, efficient &amp; relevant</td>
<td>BPs are a subset of your stakeholders; they are the people you want to work with to contribute to the vision. OM does not intend that the project becomes like a “big brother’ telling people how their behaviours will change. Agreement is needed between project &amp; BPs about desired changes. BPs have their own BPs.</td>
<td>The OS describes the changed behaviours (relationships, activities, and/or actions) of a boundary partner. It tells us how they could contribute ideally to the vision</td>
<td>PMs are a set of statements (max 15) describing a progression of changed behaviours in the BP. The progression is from more to less easily achieved. PMs describe the changes in actions, activities and relationships leading to the ideal outcome statement and articulate the complexity of the change process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>