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THE CAUSES

1. Low productivity
   - Poor disease control programs
   - Low capacity to extend technical knowledge and information
   - Low use inputs (e.g., health, breeding) & services
   - Inconsistent access to water/seasonality
   - Low genetic potential
   - Poor quality feeds/feeding practices

2. Poor access to production and market inputs and services
   - small-scale nature of the production systems
   - Lack of appropriate organizational approaches
   - few and poorly linked BDS providers

THE EFFECTS

1. Cattle keepers’ have low capacity to innovate, manage risk, reduce vulnerability, increase incomes, and ensure food security.
2. The sector is starved of appropriate credit facilities that can finance acquisition of basic inputs and services.
3. Low investment in productivity improving innovations has perpetuated a low-input low-output vicious cycle.

THE IMPACT

- Poverty
- Poor nutrition
- Food insecurity/hidden hunger

INTERVENTION AREAS

WHOLE VALUE CHAIN WITH DOWNSTREAM EMPHASIS

INPUTS & SERVICES  PRODUCTION  MARKETING  PROCESSING

More milk, income, assets and better health & nutrition for smallholders and milk consumers
Access & use of inputs and services leads to higher productivity and trebles household income!
There has been underinvestment!

Tanzania livestock and its economy

• Many animals but low productivity
• Cattle population: 25 million
• Improved dairy cattle: 720,000 kept by 220,000 households
• Livestock contribute 13% to ag GDP
• Dairy contributes 30% of the livestock contribution to ag GDP
• 2 billion litres per yr
• Dairy contributes 1.5% of total GDP

Comparison with elsewhere

• Globally, the livestock sector makes up about 40% of ag GDP
• Kenya examples:
  – 18 m cattle that (including 3.8m improved dairy) contribute 42% to ag GDP
  – 5 billion litres per yr
  – Dairy cattle (kept by >1 m households) contribute 8% of total GDP
  – Long history of private and public investments (e.g., AI subsidy for 10 years)
Entry points to grow the smallholder dairy value chain: key factors

- Investments upstream in capital-intensive processing plants to **pull** production are underutilized (<30% capacity utilization)

- Investments downstream in inputs and services to **push** production have been inadequate (only 20% of livestock keepers access and use extension services; earn >3 times than those who don’t!)

- Therefore, MZ partners chose to **strengthen the weak middle**, comprising small milk businesses, as an entry point to **push** and **pull** production: **hubs** around milk traders

Adapted dairy market hub for provision of inputs and services without collective bulking and marketing
Addressing the whole value chain with downstream emphasis to increase supply

**Intervention with development partner**

**Value chain development team + research partners**

**Strategic Cross-cutting Platforms**
- Technology Generation (Feed, genetics, health)
- Market Innovation
- Targeting & Impact (includes gender)

**Cross-cutting**: M&E, communications, capacity building

**Monitoring & learning**

**Tailor made trainings conducted by MoreMilkiT to date**
- 30 farmer groups legally registered (514 farmers (276 men, 238 women)
- 649 farmers (214 men, 335 women) on dairy technology
- 641 farmers (203 men, 341 women) on dairy business management
- 414 farmers (236 men, 278 women) on gross energy collaboration
- 29 groups consisting of 1,707 farmers (647 men, 1,060 women) on Group Development
- Linking farmer groups with service providers and link with AGs efforts underway

**Inputs & Services**
- Production
- Marketing by small traders
- Processing
- Consumers
Pilot sites selected to target the poor and marginalized

Aim to prove the concept that poor and marginalized (pre-commercial cattle keepers in extensive areas) can be targeted successfully.

Current dairy cattle distribution

- **R-to-R** = Rural production milk sales mostly to rural consumers (pre-commercial)
- **R-to-U** = Rural production milk sales mostly to urban consumers (more commercial)

- **R-to-R** selected to extend the frontiers of commercial dairying
Aim to gradually change map of dairy cattle distribution

- Dairy cattle are concentrated in the cool highland regions of Kilimanjaro and Arusha, Tanga and Kagera and Southern Highlands (Mbeya and Iringa).
- Can this be extended to places like Morogoro by promoting commercialization?

Source: Kurwijila, 2010
**Long term goals**

**Vision**: an inclusive and sustainable development of the dairy value chain by 2023.

Three principle goals:

- Smallholder farmers have reliable and consistent access to **quality inputs and services** in order to efficiently achieve high milk productivity.

- Smallholder farmers have access to reliable, well-coordinated, and efficient dairy products **marketing arrangements** with resultant improvement in household income and livelihoods.

- Poor consumers have **improved access** to quality, safe, and nutritious dairy products at **affordable prices** to increase per capita consumption of the dairy products.

- Goals were derived from ASDP I
- They will address ASDP II aims of rural commercialization and enhancing productivity
Higher level sector GOALS as per ASDS-2: Contribute to the national economic growth, reduced rural poverty and improved food and nutrition security in Tanzania (in line with TDV 2025)

ASDP2 DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVE: Transform the agricultural sector (crops, livestock & fisheries) towards higher productivity, commercialization level and smallholder farmer income for improved livelihood, food security and nutrition (priority commodity value chains in selected districts/clusters)

OUTCOMES at sector level: Increased productivity, marketing level, value addition, farmer income, food security and nutrition

Component 3: RURAL COMMERCIALIZATION and VALUE ADDITION (BUILDING COMPETITIVE CVC)
- S/c 3.1: Stakeholder empowerment & organization
- S/c 3.2: Value addition & agro-processing
- S/c 3.3: Rural marketing
- S/c 3.4: Access to rural finance (+ DADG -local value chain investments)

Component 2: ENHANCED AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTIVITY AND PROFITABILITY
- S/c 2.1: Agric. research for development -AR4D
- S/c 2.2: Extension, training & info. services
- S/c 2.3: Access to agricultural inputs
- S/c 2.4: Access to mechanisation services

Comp. 1: SUSTAINABLE WATER and LAND USE MANAGEMENT (NRM)
- S/c 1.1: Integrated water use & management for crops/irrigation & livestock/fishery development
- S/c 1.2: Land use planning and sustainable watershed & soil management
- S/c 1.3: Mainstreaming resilience for climate variability/change and natural disasters

Comp. 4: STRENGTHENING SECTOR ENABLERS AND COORDINATION (national, regional & local)
- S/c 4.1: Policy and regulatory framework
- S/c 4.2 Institutional capacity strengthening, communication and knowledge management and ICT
- S/c 4.3: Food security and nutrition
- S/c 4.4 ASDP-2 sector coordination (planning & implementation at national, regional and LGA levels)
- S/c 4.5 Monitoring & evaluation (incl. Agricultural statistics)

Cross-cutting issues: Gender, Youth, HIV/AIDS, Environment and Governance.
Cross sectoral issues: managing links between agriculture and other sectors including rural infrastructure, energy, LGA reform, Land Acts’ implementation, Water resource management, etc

Financing
- NATIONAL level (20-25%)
- Regional (5%)
- LOCAL level (65-75%)
Key elements of the context that we factored in at the time

Amos I am guessing here, but can you say something about:

• Government
• Policy environment
• Global trends
• Actors and partners (you have this slide)
• Technology
• Attitudes (Uswahili)
Maziwa Zaidi key partnerships and engagements

1. Strategic Research Partnerships
   - SUA
   - TALIRI
     ➢ Reinforced by CGIAR & ARIs

2. Development Partnerships
   - Servicing the system: Heifer and SNV
   - From the system: TDB, FAIDA MaLi

3. Private sector
   - Milk traders, inputs suppliers, farmers
   - Milk processors

4. Multi-stakeholder processes (MSPs) for strengthening relationships, coordination, co-learning and co-innovation
   - DDF and local area platforms foster engagement of many more partners
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.

[livestockfish.cgiar.org](http://livestockfish.cgiar.org)
Commentary and response from Dr Aichi Kitalyi
Work in small groups with your facilitator

• Read and discuss the content of the presentations

• Identify elements of the context that have changed over the year (this could come from one or both presentations or from your own knowledge and experience).

• Prioritise what you consider to be the five most significant changes in context for the programme

• Record your answers on prepared flip charts
Plenary
INTRODUCING THE OVERALL THEORY OF CHANGE FOR THE PROGRAMME AND THE AREAS OF CHANGE WE HOPED TO INFLUENCE
Maybe we should build a boat instead...
Maziwa Zaidi Theory of Change

What we do

- Build collaboration among value chain actors
- Develop best practices
- Collaborate on gender-sensitive research
- Build capacity
- Engage with policy makers

With whom

- NGOs
- Business service providers, traders, and milk processors
- Smallholder farmers (SFM)
- NARES, Universities, LRI, and other COs
- L&R flagship projects and business development services (BDS)
- Extension agents
- Tanzanian dairy board (TDB)
- DDF partners at national and regional level (SNY, TALIP, Horizon International Research Training institutes, Private Sector)
- Regional/local governments

So that: Short term changes

1. Maziwa Zaidi partners build evidence through publications, briefs, and other media
2. Maziwa Zaidi partners generate and share feedback to catalyse action
3. Researchers and development partners contextualize approaches to meet men and women local needs
4. NGOs involve second level stakeholders in participatory hub activities
5. Producers, service providers, and traders respond to business opportunity created in the hub
6. Participating value chain actors collaborate effectively in a business alliance to respond to business benefits
7. Maziwa Zaidi partners pilot gender-sensitive and relevant innovations with all value chain actors e.g. milk federation
8. Smallholder farmers assess and experiment with gender-sensitive and relevant innovations including groups
9. Research partners and collaborators include programme issues into their budgets and planning
10. DDF secretariat engages and mobilizes stakeholders effectively
11. DDF members are aware of funding opportunities for investment
12. Local government includes the project and becomes a partner
13. DDF brokers access, link, use, scale, regulate new products and potential production innovation platform
14. DDF prioritizes innovations that help hubs to grow
15. DDF responds to farmers' needs

So that: Medium term changes for whom

16. Innovation platforms are visible and functional at all levels of the value chain
17. Extension agents provide programs in dairy value chain management
18. Farmers adopt technologies that work and manage dairy production as businesses
19. Farmers produce and sell milk and invest in hub
20. Partners and service providers enter into contractual arrangements to increase access to inputs and services
21. Donors' networks form
22. Farmer-producers and service providers and professional organizations (e.g. TechnoServe) are organized into a pool of concept and proven concept
23. Farmers gain visibility to the hubs as a way to enhance gender equity
24. Farmers and their partners are able to articulate their demands from the various partners (including extension) to support their enterprises
25. Maziwa Zaidi consolidates evidence on the effectiveness of hubs
26. Maziwa Zaidi consolidates evidence on the effectiveness of hubs
27. Maziwa Zaidi consolidates evidence on the effectiveness of hubs

Long term change

- Donors' network group in Tanzania accept the evidence that hub approach is good and invest in hub
- Build private sector actors respond to business opportunities for growing the dairy development
- Education and training institutions provide programs in dairy milk business and technology skills
- Maziwa Zaidi provides programs in dairy milk business and technology skills
- Maziwa Zaidi provides programs in dairy milk business and technology skills
- Maziwa Zaidi provides programs in dairy milk business and technology skills
Critical change areas for the success of the program and their start point statuses
### Key Actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. 3: <strong>Research and development partners contextualize approaches to meet needs of local men and women</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Research partners, development partners (SUA, ILRI, TALIRI, CIAT, Emory, Wageningen)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Government agencies and departments (TDB, LGAs, MLFD)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Membership organizations (TAMPA, TAMPRODA, MVIWATA)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-Government Organizations (HIT, Faida Mali, SNV, LoL)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Private sector actors</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Status at start

| **Reputable legacy record of high level research in livestock** |
| **Wide spread across different agro-ecological zones** |
| **Representation on the DDF** |
| **Past dairy systems research experience** |
| **Ready to scale business models of that lead to inclusiveness** |
| **Grass root community reach** |
| **Active producer organizations** |
| **Low certification of many milk traders** |

### Extent of alignment of activities

- Their mandates and objectives reflect program goals but extent of inclusivity and sustainability is not clear
- Lack of mechanisms for coordination
- Site specific plans were in place
- Logistical constraints for local government partners
- Site plans not reflected in local government planning and local government planning largely happening at district level
- Low allocation of funds to the sector by local governments
- Low integration of gender in local government activities

### Barriers and challenges

| **Research: Limited funding compromising continued support to communities** |
| **Public Sector: low prioritization of the contribution of agriculture; disconnect between extension and line ministries** |
| **Development: few and small in size; even large ones are spread thin** |
| **Membership organisations: some are weak with no clear strategy for serving members** |
| **Private sector: few, weak linkages among themselves, and weakly integrated in dairy value chain** |

### Potential drivers of change

| **Research: national network** |
| **Public sector: willingness to collaborate with other actors in the value chain** |
| **Development partners: greater experience to draw from** |

### Assumptions

<p>| <strong>Promoted technologies and approaches are appropriate for smallholder farmers</strong> |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Status at start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| No.5: Processors, traders and service providers respond to business opportunities created in the hub | • Producers  
• Traders  
• Service providers | • No innovation platform and less than 5 cooperatives  
• Limited and weak linkages among value chain actors |
| Barriers and challenges | • Low capacity utilization by milk collection centers  
• High seasonality of milk production hindering investment  
• Poor infrastructures  
• High competition between milk processors and traders |
| Potential drivers of change | • Ever increasing demand for milk and other dairy products  
• Available evidence about the potential of the sector |
<p>| Assumptions | • There are no significant information asymmetries between and among value chain agents. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Status at start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| No. 8: Smallholder farmers access and experiment with gender-sensitive and relevant innovations including groups | • Small holder farmers  
• Research partners  
• Development partners | • No visible effort towards targeting women participation in milk production  
• Household participation in collection action stood at 47% and men constituting the bigger proportion |

**Barriers and challenges**

- Cultural norms dictating the extent of women participation and experimentation with innovations
- Limited women access and control of land
- Capacity of partners to ensure continuity of activities

**Potential drivers of change**

- Availability of ready to scale technologies
- Existence of some women entrepreneurs.

**Assumptions**

- Farmers are willing to experiment with innovations whether or not they participated in developing them.
- The infrastructure needed to support practical application of innovations to be tested exists.
- Criteria for assessing innovations exist and are acceptable to experimenting farmers.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Key Actors</th>
<th>Status at start</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No.10: Dairy Development Forum (DDF)</strong></td>
<td>• DDF</td>
<td>• DDF was nonexistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Membership includes participants at regional and district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Barriers and challenges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Active member participation is still minimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Forum’s secretariat is still constrained in terms of resource mobilization and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Potential drivers of change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The government is part of the DDF which should help influence policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The private sector is has keen interest in the DDF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assumptions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The informal nature of the DDF is appropriate for advancing policy advocacy for the dairy industry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change</td>
<td>Key Actors</td>
<td>Status at start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| No.11: DDF members are aware of evolving opportunities for investment | • DDF | • DDF has pointed the government to priorities for public investment in the dairy industry  
• The DDF has made actors aware of available services |
| Barriers and challenges | • Limited budget has constrained communication and planning |
| Potential drivers of change | • Stakeholders has demonstrated increased willingness to share information  
• Innovations in communication and information technology have dramatically reduced costs of searching for and sharing information |
| Assumptions | • The DDF communication strategy is able to fully engage the recipients and is adaptable to changes in their contexts. |
LUNCH!
SESSION 3

ANALYSIS AND SHARING OF RESULTS OF PLANNED CHANGES
Why we are doing this session

To analyse and report on specific planned changes

– What actually changed
– Who/what contributed to making these changes happen?
– Could we have made changes happen in better/more effective ways?
– What were our assumptions and to what extent did they prove true or false?
What you’ll be doing in this session and the next...

• Working on 3 sets of questions with your facilitators using three flip chart presentations:
  
  – FLIP CHART 1: ASSESSING CHANGES THAT HAVE TAKEN PLACE SINCE THE START OF THE PROGRAMME
  – FLIP CHART 2: ASSESSING CONTRIBUTIONS MADE BY THE PROGRAMME

• BREAK
  
  – FLIP CHART 3: TESTING ASSUMPTIONS

• We will then do a peer review...
We need a sense of the extent to which this change has taken place in order to know what to prioritise next year.

Last job today:

- Review what you have said and where your change area fits in the change pathway. Then please score the level of success of this change area:

1. Early stages – little or no change noted
2. Emerging change - more work to be done but things are going to plan
3. Changes in this area firmly established and enabling next level changes to take place
4. Very significant changes have taken place – far beyond expectations

Write a number on a post it and put it on your flip chart...
DAY 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.30</td>
<td>Review of yesterday and plan for the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45</td>
<td>Testing assumptions that we made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>Report and comment findings from Day 1: Peer Reviews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- For participants to share and comment on each others’ findings from</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>BREAK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Critical reflection of results and recommendations for adapting pathway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for upcoming year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Purpose:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- To reflect on current strengths and weaknesses of programme to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and make adjustments to ensure that efforts in the next twelve months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>are as effective as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>Brief evaluation of the workshop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>CLOSE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Testing Assumptions

Please review the assumptions that were made for the area of change you are working on and discuss:

• why it was/important to test this assumption
• To what extent it proved valid or false (and give reasons and examples where possible)

15 minutes

AND THEN PREPARE FOR THE PEER REVIEW – WHO WILL LEAD?

EACH GROUP HAS 15 MINS ONLY TO SHARE AND GET FEEDBACK – SELECT HIGHLIGHTS YOU WANT TO SHARE AND DISCUSS
Peer review sessions - 2 rounds

Your group will pair up with one other group:

• First group will have **15 minutes** each to present the findings and receive feedback

• **Second group** will have **15 minutes** each to present the findings and receive feedback

• 30 mins total

• Facilitators make sure that you add notes on post its on the flip charts
BREAK
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.00</td>
<td>Visit other change areas and make notes. Focus especially on scores and “other better ways of working”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.30</td>
<td><strong>New groups</strong> discuss and make very brief notes for selves on the three questions key questions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.00</td>
<td>Plenary focussing on question 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.45</td>
<td>What next in terms of this ToC process?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>Close</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions we will be addressing in the final session – think about these as you visit the other groups

Overall:

1. Where is the Maziwa Zaidi programme making the most effective contributions to change:
   – At what levels?
   – Why?

2. Where is the programme failing to make progress as planned:
   – At what levels?
   – Why?

3. Thinking about changing contexts and progress to date, what should the programme prioritise for next year?
   – What changes does it want to achieve?
   – How best to do this?
WHAT NEXT FOR THIS TOC?
Don’t forget...

ToC - the helicopter view

Log frames - the road view
Overall objectives for this workshop

• To think together about the real progress that the programme is making against planned changes over the last 12 months:
  – changing contexts
  – Changes that have actually taken place
  – Contribution analysis
  – Testing assumptions that you make

• To adapt change pathways and plans in the light of this: