



## **2<sup>nd</sup> AgriDiet Workshop Report**

**Sokoine University, Morogoro, Tanzania**

**20-22 November 2013**



### **Present**

Prof Amon Mattee – Sokoine University

Prof Joyce Kinabo – Sokoine University

Goodluck Massawe – Sokoine University

Happiness Muhimbula – Sokoine University

Dr Thadeus Mkamwa – St Augustines University

Achilana Mtingele – St Augustine's University

Dr Tassew Woldehanna – Ethiopian Research Development Institute

Dr Jemal Yousuf Hassen – Haramaya University

Chanyalew Seyoum Aweke – Haramaya University

Kedir Teja Robi – Haramaya University

Zenebe Abraha Kahsay – Mekelle University

Jessica Meeker – Institute of Development Studies

Dr Jim Kinsella – University College Dublin

Dr Aifric O'Sullivan – University College Dublin

Dr Nick Chisholm - University College Cork

Dr Edward Lahiff – University College Cork

Dr Kathy Glavanis-Grantham – University College Cork

Dr Tom O'Connor – University College Cork

Prof Nora O'Brien – University College Cork

Stephen Thornhill – University College Cork

## **Apologies**

Dr Girmay Tesfay – Mekelle University

Dr Deirdre O'Connor – University College Dublin

### **Day 1 - 20 November 2013**

#### **1. Opening Remarks**

Professor Mattee welcomed the team to Morogoro and to Sokoine University.

#### **2. Progress Report**

Nick reviewed the Annual Progress Report recently submitted to Irish Aid (IA) and the Higher Education Authority of Ireland (HEA).

The report monitors progress against the objectives, outcomes and outputs listed in the project Performance Measurement Framework.

It was noted that the start-up process in the first year had taken longer than anticipated, particularly the drawing up of research contracts, funding transfers and PhD admissions.

In the discussion of the report it was noted that “teaching and learning” is not a specific output but an outcome of the project; hence, there are opportunities to highlight the outcomes of the PhD process for capacity building.

The point was also made that due to the delayed start we are now trying to squeeze everything into a 2.5 year period rather than 3 years which could endanger the quality of output, and whether Irish Aid would help to accommodate this? The possibility of a no-cost extension was discussed.

#### **3. Work Package 3 - Methodology Guidelines**

Edward summarised the key points of the Conceptual Framework and Guidelines for Methodology document, first circulated at the beginning of the year and now at version 4 circulated July 2103. The Guidelines should be seen as a starting point for the detailed methodology in each of the work packages. The objectives, three research questions and conceptual framework were reviewed in relation to the work packages being undertaken.

Joyce raised the point that the various outputs could be included as a review paper or a series of articles for a special edition of a journal. Overview publications might include all AgriDiet researchers as co-authors.

Aifric raised the point that a collaborative agreement should be prepared for AgriDiet partners regarding joint publication. It was agreed that all such publications must mention the AgriDiet project and that any journal abstracts should be sent to everyone in the project. If PhD students are involved then they should be lead authors. For research outputs from specific Work Packages,

generally those most involved in the WP would be authors, but others might also be included as co-authors depending on their level of involvement.

It was noted that PhDs can be completed by publications rather than the traditional report/chapter structure, with the literature review as a review paper. Also PhD work needs to be protected so that project outputs do not pre-empt their study.

There need to be clear agreements/protocols for data sharing and data management, including issues relating to restrictions on access to nutrition data, policy for data at end-of-project, etc. The PhD students should have access to all data, but will use specific elements in their thesis work.

It was agreed that we need a brief clear document on joint publication and data management, sharing and security for the project.

***Action – Aifric to circulate a sample draft of a collaborative publication and data management agreement***

*Note that partners should also check sections 5 to 7 of their individual research collaboration agreements with UCC, particularly regarding publication and dissemination (section 7), which would need to be taken into account when drawing up any joint publication collaboration agreements*

#### **4. Work Package 1, 7 and 8**

##### **i) Work Package 1 – State of the art review of agriculture-nutrition linkages**

Jessica briefly outlined the state of the art review of agriculture-nutrition linkages, highlighting the need for investment in nutrition-sensitive agriculture, research gaps and guidance for the methodology of the project.

There was a discussion on how best to disseminate the report? Currently it is available as a publication and has been distributed to stakeholders in Ethiopia and Tanzania, is on the AgriDiet website, on Eldis and now needs to be placed on other partner websites. It has also been submitted to the UN Standing Committee for Nutrition (UN SCN news) newsletter and has been mentioned in the FAO food security and nutrition forum. We should also ensure it is placed in partner libraries and distributed to other networks and platforms and to ask Irish Aid to help with the dissemination in Ethiopia and Tanzania

***Action – Jessica, Mattee and Tassew to coordinate with Irish Aid on the dissemination of the global and country reviews through their country networks.***

***Action - Jessica to draft a flyer/letter to attach to the global and country reports sent to key stakeholders***

***Action - All partner PIs to ensure that global and country reviews are posted on their websites and hard copies placed in their libraries***

***Action – Review of budget on completion of country studies. If feasible, Joyce and Tassew to produce 2-4 page brief on their respective country studies for use with key policymakers and for newsletter and website.***

The WP1 report makes recommendations in section 5 of the report on the methodology for the project; understanding the framing of agriculture as a force for nutrition, understanding the incentives and barriers at farm level and decision makers, extension agents etc. It was noted that barriers / incentives should be incorporated into the HH survey questionnaire and/or focus groups.

***Action – All researchers and supervisors involved in work packages 4, 5 and 6 to assess how to incorporate methodology recommendations from the WP1 report into their work***

## **ii) Work Package 7 – Stakeholder workshops**

Jessica reviewed the initial workshops, including the mapping of stakeholders, stakeholder reports, indicators used and the survey of knowledge, attitudes and practices.

The second Tanzanian stakeholder workshop had a lower than expected turnout, as many who had confirmed attendance failed to show. So the group questioned what incentivises people to attend the stakeholder workshops and how can we engage them better? A key question is do they need the AgriDiet stakeholder workshop? The answer from the initial stakeholder workshops was a resounding “yes”, as there was a lack of a research platform specifically linking agriculture and nutrition in both countries.

A number of reasons for low turnout this time in Tanzania were put forward, including roadworks and congestion in Dar and the fact that the agenda for the second workshop seemed to be quite similar to the first.

So the group asked the question “what should we do next?” One of the issues to arise from both sets of workshops was how well the links between agriculture extension and health/nutrition agents were working at local level. It was therefore suggested that we hold the next stakeholder workshops at regional or local level

The reason for establishing the stakeholder workshops was to influence policy level and to find out what stakeholders need. The rationale was to create a space to bring policymakers and researchers together and to ensure more policy is evidence-based. So we need more of our own evidence now to disseminate out at regional and local level. In the meantime we can talk to senior policy people separately and attend other meetings. The point was made that we know the policy at national level through the stakeholder workshops and country policy studies, but if we do workshops at regional level and find things are not happening as planned, we can feed back to national level.

***Action – Jessica to work with Tassew and Mattee/Joyce on the feasibility of regional/local stakeholder workshops over the remainder of the project.***

*Note - The budgets held by EDRI and Sokoine allow for two more workshops in each country, but there may also be carryover of underspend from the first two workshops which were budgeted for in year 1.*

Other successes in the stakeholder workshops so far include Care International and CIP working together through their involvement in AgriDiet (CIP also being invited onto the national micronutrient panel) and engaging a wide range of Ministry departments at senior level. The initial stakeholder workshops also led to collaboration between NGOs, with Care International Ethiopia and Helen Keller International now working together on projects. The first Tanzanian workshop had attendance from the President's and Prime Minister's Office, the second from the P.M.'s office; and there was also attendance from Zanzibar.

***Action – Jessica to develop a 1-2 page summary sheet of successes for circulation and use in the AgriDiet newsletter***

### **iii) Work Package 8 – Knowledge Dissemination**

Jessica noted that this package is about arming policy and practitioners with the evidence they need to bring about effective change. The project's knowledge strategy has already been developed and is available on the website.

In the knowledge, attitudes and practices survey under work package 7, stakeholders reported they preferred conferences, seminars, briefs (no more than 4 pages) multimedia outputs – visualisations, radio, video etc, media, social media (eg conference) for accessing information.

The website structure is largely completed and will be developed as more material becomes available. It is hoped that partners will be able to add material to the website and instructions are being developed on accessing the site externally.

The second newsletter is due to go out soon, so any ideas or contributions 1-2 page articles on related issues or summaries of work (eg country reports) would be gratefully accepted.

***Actions – Each work package leader to produce a 2-4 page brief on any final drafts of outputs, focussing on the key findings of the reports. These will be circulated for feedback from all partners using a template provided by IDS and used to provide stakeholders and policymakers with clear, brief messages (also in the newsletter).***

## **5. Work Package 2 – Country Policy Studies**

### **i) Tanzania Policy Review**

Joyce summarised the zero draft version of the country policy study so far.

- Population growth and structure are well-known, so we can calculate nutrient requirements into the future. FAO focusses on calories only, so Joyce is doing a micronutrient requirement analysis for the final draft of the report to assess future needs in the light of the population and dietary diversification challenges.
- It was noted that Tanzania food poverty reduction has been less pronounced than poverty reduction.

- Official statistics and prices of foods such as fruit and vegetables are reported to be unreliable so it is important that the project captures reliable data at different levels of the value chain.
- There is a commercial agricultural sector (eg flowers, sisal), with Tanzania focussing attention on the SAGCOT growth corridor - maize horticulture etc. So there are questions of whether this is primarily for export or home market or both, and how this fits into national policies aimed at improving food security?
- Joyce's policy inventory and analysis identified gaps in the nutrition focus of many Tanzanian government policies, some of which were formulated many years ago.

In the discussion of the Tanzanian zero draft report it was noted that there was scope for more critical review of, and opinion on, the policies outlined in the next draft. More information was also sought on the coherence of policies, including the current focus on commercialisation of agriculture in key growth corridors of Tanzania with the focus on supporting smallholders and the overall food security of the nation.

## **ii) Ethiopia Policy Review**

Tassew reviewed progress so far on the zero draft of the report.

### Review

- ADLI – agricultural production up 9%/yr so doubling of ag GDP between 2000 and 2011.
- Much of ag growth is cereal based
- Calorie growth is very high in Ethiopia; from 1,954 calories/cap/day average in mid 90s to 2,928 today. Then using income distribution data can calculate food poverty headcount (est) – 50% in mid 90s to 33% currently
- HICE – 58% of expenditure on food was for cereals
- 2011 - 10% children wasted (13% in 2000), stunted 44% (58%) underweight 29% (42%).
- DHS 2011 – 44% children <5 anaemic (from 54% in 2005)
- Iodine deficiency disorder 2005 – 39% in school children.

Dietary diversity (DD) – Proxy of access to food at household level, proxy of micronutrient adequacy at individual level.

WHO says children need at least 4 food groups for a better quality diet. ENI 2010 survey found 29% of breastfeeding young children (6-24 months) consumed 4 groups and 38% of non-breastfeeding young children.

Young lives survey. 17 food items based on FAO dietary diversity recommendations. No big changes 2006 and 2009 – 73% to 80% fruit and veg was the biggest change; animal source foods 34-35% both years, oils fats, butter 77-78% both years. Also not much difference rural and urban for meat consumption, but there was a big difference in fruit and vegetable consumption at 70% rural and 85% urban, and similarly for oil fat consumption at 73% rural and 85% urban. Most common was households consuming 3 food groups. MHH consume more animal-source foods than FHH.

Determinants of DD were mainly income/wealth. Family size also appears to increase DD! Children in urban areas have higher DD than rural. Not just income factor but also ownership of livestock,

area of land and diversification crops. Prices affect diversification. To improve DD – reduce poverty, economic growth and education.

### Policies

- PIF (Ag Sector Policy and Investment Framework) – based on middle income aspiration for Ethiopia by 2020 from 2010. No mention on nutrition but there is on productivity, rural incomes and food security.
- GTP (Growth and Transformation Plan – third generation of the PRSP- Poverty Reduction Strategy Programme) – commercial agriculture, massive projects, improve nutritional status of children and reduction of poverty and inequality, but no mention of nutrition specific agricultural interventions.
- FSP (Food Security Programme) – 2005 addresses underlying sources of chronic food security through 4 main interventions; PSNP (95% of the programme activities), voluntary resettlement and household asset building programs, complementary community investment program (linked to PSNP). Not nutrition-specific, no mention of micro-nutrients.
- Health Sector Development Program, including National Health Extension Program providing services to all areas, including nutrition as one of 16 packages covered – under MoH
- Nutrition policy and strategy – Previously food=biased approach focussed on food security. Nutrition policy developed from situational analysis 2005/6, from which government developed PASDEP – then Nutrition Strategy 2008 1<sup>st</sup> phase to 2012 to ensure all have adequate nutrition on a sustainable basis. MoH developed strategy and implementation plan, but co-ordination problems. New strategy launched June 2013 focussing on women and children, with more food fortification, etc, increased fruit and veg consumption and potable water consumption, more de-worming in schools, more training for the health development army ... signed by many Ministries, some of whom will assign nutrition focal persons, so very cross-sectoral, plus all regions will establish a regional nutrition coordination body and technical committee.
- Current Ag strategy in GTP is productivity rather than nutrition based. New Ag strategy draft is mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture and an additional mandate of increasing the nutritional quality of food, including increased consumption of diversified diets, and improved access to and utilisation of animal-source foods. It includes the proposed establishment of a new Nutrition unit within the MoA. So far there has been no practical implementation.

### Implications for AgriDiet

- Identify policy gaps in addressing micronutrient deficiency ... eg value chain issues? (meso-research)
- Proposals on how to improve links based on concrete evidence (eg from HH research) that will have a positive impact on nutrition.
- Proposals on changing the pattern of consumption toward higher nutrient foods, through education and market demand – consumption influencing production.

In the discussion of the Ethiopian report it was noted that the challenges outlined in section 3 of work package 1 should also be addressed in the country policy studies in relation to nutrition;

climate change, population pressure and dietary change, governance of the food system and competition for key resources, which could have a damaging impact on nutritional outcomes; but to what extent are they accounted for in current policy?

It was also noted that food price inflation is affecting food access in Ethiopia in recent years and this needed to be accounted for in policy.

One policy suggestion was to focus more on meat consumption, as current consumption rates were so low. This would resolve many micronutrient deficiencies, but the implications for crop production and consumption, land and water use and other factors would need to be carefully considered.

***Actions – Final drafts of country policy studies by Tassew and Joyce by mid-January, feedback by end-January, and finalisation by mid-February. Need proposal of how to disseminate to key target audience. Each study should be accompanied by a brief 2-4 page report or executive summary with key recommendations.***

## **6. Work Package 6 – Pro-Nutrition Agricultural Interventions**

### **i) Ethiopian pro-nutrition agricultural interventions – Jemal**

A first stage of this work package is the mapping of recent agricultural interventions in each region and to see what indicators are there, and what they tell us about the nutritional outcomes of these projects. A quick-scan review of projects was conducted in the Oromia region.

Government interventions - mostly focus on productivity of key foods - eg legumes, poultry, orange flesh sweet potato (OFSP), with other interventions looking at seed access, market issues and microcredit for women.

NGO interventions-CARE-Ethiopia Oromia has an acute malnutrition project looking at BCC strategies, targeting 12,000 HHs. Mercy Corps also has an OFSP pro-nutrition project.

- CARE case study – provision of seed legume, poultry, BCC and access to potable water. Target >40k HHs, also receiving WASH support. They take HH with SAM affected individuals and target for different interventions – eg provision of vegetable seed.
- CISP recently completed their project – promotion of OFSP
- Haramaya – CASCAPE looking at OFSP, cassava and high-protein maize but assessment on HH income is not evident.
- Menchen fur Menchen – relevant project.

Main conclusion is that nutritional assessments of interventions are lacking so that we may have to look at other food security measures.

It was proposed that a quick review of interventions should be done on a national rather than regional basis, focussing on chronic rather than acute hunger interventions. There are a lot of projects looking at productivity, plus evidence from Cascade, GAIN, UNICEF, Feed the Future, Millennium Village for horticulture projects (plus projects mentioned at previous stakeholder workshop).

## **ii) Tanzanian pro-nutrition agricultural interventions - Mattee**

In order to map projects in the Morogoro area, a checklist has been developed including explicit nutrition objectives to help identify some example interventions

- implementing agency
- objectives
- who are target groups (gender and young children)
- geography coverage
- how were beneficiaries involved?
- planning process for project
- specific interventions implemented
- how are they coordinated with water, health etc sectors
- what does intervention do for nutrition specifically?
- value chain type
- likely impact on nutritional groups within targeted population
- will impact be direct or indirect
- what evidence (direct and indirect)
- what cost?
- responsible person?
- any existing reports?

It was noted that there are a number of projects in nearby districts, but need more work on how to synthesise the information and choose projects. It was decided that the first mapping should be kept flexible and the indicators would be developed from that.

It was also agreed that the best projects would be those recently completed and that had been successful in the desired nutritional outcomes. On-going projects would also be included. For public works we are looking for projects that can be scaled up. Exclusion criteria would include regular national programmes as we are looking more for those that scale up within a defined boundary, and within 2 years completion.

***Action – Mattee to continue to develop framework of questions, with the possibility to use the same/similar in Ethiopia. Mattee, Jemal and Girmay to complete inventory of projects by end-December and provide inventory for both countries by mid-January, synthesis and fieldwork during January and February and then first complete draft by end-March (feedback by end-April, final draft end-May).***

## **Day 2 - 21 November 2013**

### **7. Work Package 4 – Meso-level Research**

#### **i) Overview**

Nick provided an overview of developments under WP4 so far

It was noted that the value chain component of work package 4 TOR had yet to be fully developed. UCC had reviewed the Methodology Guidelines for WP4 and discussed the key components to address under the meso-level research, so now 4 issues are being proposed as key underlying influences;

1. Gender issues and women's empowerment
2. Land tenure
3. Institutional arrangements at local level
4. Value chains

Jim expressed concern over the scope of the work package 4 modules given the resources available. An alternative proposal would be to integrate the WP4 research within the bigger household survey rather than as separate studies within the work package; hence, the importance of the proposed topics is not debated but the scope is.

It will be important to note where the resources will come from, as some people may be putting more time in than budgeted for (eg where people are putting their own time into the work).

Thadeus put forward the idea of developing a framework for work package 4 based on the overall meso agri-food system around the survey sites, as that had been the initial reference within the methodology guidelines document. This would help to identify the major issues affecting nutrition in the local value chains first before we start to choose the specific underlying issues to work on (eg water might be a key factor in a particular area).

## **ii) Proposed Meso-level Issues**

Three of the proposed issues under the meso-level research were then summarised;

### **1. Gender issues, including women's empowerment – Kathy**

Decision-making is influenced by gender at the material level and cultural/ideological level. How do gender relations impact on the agriculture-nutrition nexus? Methods will include focus groups and interviews and development of life stories and will draw on the household survey and other work packages.

The literature on agriculture-nutrition linkages constantly raises gender issues, so it's important to address this. Also gender is relational, so need to address male issues too.

Joyce noted that focus groups work better in Tanzania when men and women are together. Also important to show different age categories. Also point raised about the nutritional survey (WP5) focus on women and children rather than whole household.

Tassew noted the importance of a meso level discussion here – local women's group, woreda level approach to gender, etc.

### **2. Land Issues - Edward**

Edward has incorporated key land questions within the household survey. Some interviews have taken place already in Tigray Ethiopia.

Mattee agreed about incorporating the land issue. It was suggested that this issue be scoped around the survey sites – at village or district level rather than too broadly. Tassew noted that gender issues encroach on land so some overlap.

### **3. Institutional Arrangements - Nick**

A key issue in promoting improved nutritional outcomes is the institutional structure which supports the necessary cross-sector collaboration. This proposed activity in WP4 addresses objectives 1 and 2 of AgriDiet and links with WP2 and WP7.

It would comprise an initial mapping of institutions and interviews with key personnel. Issues to be addressed include; perceptions of underlying causes of undernutrition, extent of cross-sector collaboration, incentives and barriers to collaboration, perceptions on capacity-building requirements and linkages national level strategy.

An example project - the Nepal POSHAN study, looked at sector coordination and delivery levels, sector mapping and perceptions of underlying causes.

In the discussion of these 3 proposed issues (plus value chain) it was asked whether it might be possible to integrate these issues into 1 or 2 studies? They are all major underlying causes identified in the literature but can they be integrated?

It was noted that the project was about capturing the linkages between agriculture and nutrition rather than separate agriculture and nutrition studies. The linkages need to be addressed in all the outputs, so should we focus more on integrative studies and integrative analysis throughout?

It was noted again that the scope has widened from the methodology guidelines, which have a reasonably clear structure. Now we have 4 key issues, the inclusion of which is not debated, but which now seem to be 4 separate studies under WP4.

It was suggested that market studies could be conducted from availability and access perspectives, (is the supply there? If so, why is it not getting to vulnerable people?), local market prices (part of work package 5 too?). We should also try to address knowledge systems around farmers decision-making, such as extension and market information systems, which are all part of the value chain approach.

It was agreed that decisions on the scope of WP4 work in each country must be based on resources available in each country and should take into consideration the need for an understanding of the meso-level food system in which the survey sites are located, preferably with some value chain focus.

***Action – TOR to be finalised by year-end for each country approach to WP4. Thus, Nick, Girmay and Jemal need to finalise the TOR approach for the Ethiopian research under WP4 and Jim, Mattee and Thadeus need to finalise the approach for Tanzania. Jim to lead drafting of ToR specifically relating to market studies/value chains – draft by mid-December.***

## **8. Work Package 5 – Local Surveys**

### **i) Ethiopia General Survey - Edward**

#### **1. Site Selection**

Two sites selected;

Zenebe- Tigray has 6 zones – SE zone is most food insecure and includes 4 districts/woredas and selected 2 of these based on food insecurity. Within these woredas selected 2 sites and within this 4 kebeles taking into account livestock dominance, proximity to city, watershed, cash-based cropping area – irrigated indicators

Chanyalew – eastern part of Ethiopia one of food insecure zones of Oromia – lowland area. 19 districts so 5 are lowland and selected Babile district which has 21 kebeles so selected 4 kebeles with mixed farming systems. Subject to drought.

#### **2. Sampling**

400 HH in each region from 4 kebeles, so approx 100 HHs in each kebele, but each will be in proportion to population – quota sampling. So 400 in total and nutritional sub-sample of 100 in each for detailed nutritional study. Stratified sub-sample from list of HHs, but considering whether they can do random sampling.

#### **3. Questionnaire**

Edward went through the draft questionnaire. 5 modules: demographics, household economy, consumption, diet diversity/food security/coping, and health.

#### **4. Comments**

- How many months of storage and stocks should be added to the questionnaire
- Diet diversity, food categories – 30 days too long? For recall for usefulness, many foods will be consumed within 30 days so it only shows extreme cases if any? Also it's not usual practice to do this, most dietary diversity surveys are 24 hours (or 7 days for some). 30 day recall is food frequency measure. Alternative could be food consumption score (WFS). Detailed survey is providing 24 hour diversity recall for mother and child. What should we do for general survey?
- Access to market – distance and means is another important factor
- Shocks and responses may be another to elaborate on – what are major causes of shocks?

### **ii) Ethiopia Detailed Nutritional Survey – Nora and Kedir**

100 households will be surveyed in each region. Ethical approval from UCC June based on local approval. Kedir recently obtained local approval from Haramaya and it is now submitted to national review committee. Communicated with EHNRI

Enderta and Hintalo-Wajerat woreda in Tigray – Babile woreda in Oromia

Questionnaires have been translated into the local language

Mother and child measurements on

- 24 hour recall, using food composition database
- DDS 24hr recall
- Anthropometric
- Micronutrient measurements (iron, zinc, iodisation (salt) retinol and haemoglobin)
- Qualitative

### **iii) Tanzania Local Survey - Jim**

It was decided that the work package 5 work should be incorporated into one collective research plan document.

Site selection – 1 in the Morogoro region, 1 in northern region Shinyanga where there is a high level of malnutrition. The selection was also based on on Ag systems – Shinyanga more toward livestock systems, Morogoro more crop-based.

Sampling – Powering the sample within budget was a big problem. So now the Tanzania team has chosen a 250 household limit in each area within budget. In the joint meeting in Tanzania in August the team looked at all options and UNICEF was approached. So looking at 250 max now but might go higher if resources available.

General survey – determined food security as key issue on which to base sample numbers and accepted higher error. Then looked at detailed nutrition survey and stunting prevalence and calculation came out at 200, but only 100 possible within resources.

Questionnaire – meeting in UCC and UCD helped to develop questionnaire to pre pilot test. Scope is still too big. Also using team of 4 enumerators in Shinyanga.

### **iv) Tanzania Detailed Survey - Aifric**

The nutritional survey is a sub-set of general HH survey. Methods include 24 hr detailed dietary recall, infant and young child feeding practices (driven by WHO indicators)

Knowledge, attitudes and beliefs about feeding practices and health care practices, anthropometrics, urine sample and finger prick. Has secured additional funding to look at urine – metabolic measures / metabolite profile. Will involve a minimum 20 samples per study area. Ethical approval has been requested from the relevant national body.

### **v) PhD Study plans**

#### Goodluck

Looking at the contribution of farming practices on nutrition in selected sites; so create knowledge about farming practices and decision-making processes.

Ag and nutrition issues are treated as isolates. So agriculturalists tend to look at productivity and profitability; nutritionists look at reducing mortality resulting in bias. Study looks at missing link between agriculture and nutrition.

Specific objectives: (i) identify framing practices & risk factors; (ii) determine factors influencing HH choice; (iii) impact of farm practices on HH food security; (iv) strategies to achieve food security; (v) options for improvement.

Model developed from literature. Decision making in HH and farming system resulting is influenced by many factors.

Based on premise of strong relationship between farming decisions and food security. HH has little control over institutional factors such as access to credit services information, markets, policies, land systems, technology. Also natural factors - no control but can affect decision-making, as can institutional – eg markets for certain goods. Decision making also influenced by HH structure, socio-economic factors, ideology, etc....

Schedule – Starting survey in Feb, so pilot testing now and Jan. Planning first FGD pre-household survey, other FGDs after 2<sup>nd</sup> HH survey. 2 study areas – Mvomero District (Morogoro) and Kishapu District (Shinyanga).

### Achilana

Looking at linkages between local food economies and nutrition.

Policies don't specifically mention / focus on nutrition. NSGRP and Kilimo Kwanza, Big Results Now, TZ Development Vision 2025.

Linking value chains to nutrition - Hawkes and Ruel 2006. Traditionally value chains are based on economic values not nutrition.

4 objectives –

- Identify different market structures in local food economies
- fluctuations of food prices within local food economies during year
- analyse impact of price change on consumption in HH
- identify policies & interventions that can have a positive impact on nutrition

Theoretical framework – adapts WFP emergency food security analysis – looking at storage and alternative foods in addition to shocks etc

Methods; rapid market survey, focus group, value chain analysis, HH survey, key interviews.

### Happiness

Looking at dietary intake and feeding practices and nutritional status of mother and child in rural areas.

Children < 5yrs 42% stunting, underweight 16%.

Using UNICEF framework

Objectives: Explore early infant feeding practices, explore period when complementary foods introduced, dietary intake for older infants, patterns in maternal dietary intake and looking at key micronutrients within diet.

#### Chanyalew

Objectives: Looking at relationship between agricultural production and food and nutrition security. Livelihood strategies, food security and nutritional status, determinants of food security, women's contribution and level of engagement in tackling nutrition security

#### Zenebe

Objectives: Looking at a study of agricultural development and natural resource management interventions on nutritional security. Examining agricultural production systems on nutrition security, analysing climate change adaptation strategies.

### **vi) Discussion**

Importance of FGDs before and after HH surveys.

Tassew made the point that in the analysis there will be quantitative and qualitative issues. How will this work? Need careful planning especially qualitative interviews focus groups etc and how to analyse. Different results so how will you analyse? How will you link quantitative and qualitative analysis? Seasonality issues not mentioned. Also what's happened in past affects what happens now – mediating analysis.

Household demography important – HH knowledge/human capital not clearly included. Several confounding factors are present when trying to link agriculture and nutrition outcomes – will be unable to make the link if not taking account of confounding factors, e.g. different levels of knowledge, other human capital factors. Also, food shortage of mothers in past will affect child's current nutritional status.

Need to be sure what we are measuring, what is the terminology and why we are using the methodology we use – is it cutting edge or just another study? Nutritional status is through indicators - anthropometric, biomarkers, food security (HFIAS, HDDS etc), but it would be difficult to measure nutritional security for a community or region. What indicators are we using?

Also important to take anthropometric measures from women and children under age 5 in main sample.

The point was made that we need to determine where the outputs may be published ... which debate and is it current and cutting-edge? It was noted that we need to position the PhD studies within the literature and within the project but to define a unique and clear conceptual approach, need to identify the literature informing that ...and to assess the gaps and the novel approach. So need to define a unique position. PhDs need to be clear on what they are going to measure?

It was noted that we are not looking at causality and determinants as in a randomised control trial. We can only look at associations – is there a strong association? If so you can perhaps say there is a determinant in a way but it's not causality but correlation. Causality can be criticised as being too

blinkered as a statistical technique and over-positivist. So there is a strong qualitative element to the project, but this hasn't been elaborated on sufficiently. It will be important to plan qualitative analysis in advance, e.g. how many people? Which people? – should use same people in 2 data collection rounds.

We need to consider how to use qualitative studies – need “voices” – qualitative data will give better understanding of what quantitative data actually means.

***Action – All PhD plans and survey instruments need to be finalised by year-end (ahead of the fieldwork in early 2014) by PhD researchers and supervisors. The qualitative elements of the research projects need to be defined more clearly within the plans and survey instruments***

## **9. Wrap Up of Key Issues**

Key issues and action points arising from the workshop;

1. Collaboration agreements for publications and data management. ***Aifric to circulate draft example of publication collaboration agreement.***
2. Dissemination decisions for work package 1 report and subsequent outputs. ***Jessica, Tassew and Mattee to liaise with embassy contacts on disseminating the global and country reports***
3. Feasibility of regional stakeholder workshops, with the possibility of NGO partners. ***Jessica, Tassew and Mattee to assess feasibility of regional workshops***
4. Decisions on how to target key national policymakers. ***Jessica, Tassew and Mattee to assess options for interviewing key policymakers***
5. Development of 2-4 page briefs on each work package. ***Each leader to provide a 2-4 page exec summary brief for their final draft report.***
6. Feasibility of multimedia outputs on website. ***Steve and Jessica to assess potential for production of multimedia output***
7. Revised draft reports of country policy studies by mid-January and final draft by mid-February including a 2-4-page executive summary brief. ***Tassew and Joyce to finalise country policy studies***
8. Project inventories for WP6 by mid-January and first drafts by end-March. ***Mattee, Girmay and Jemal to produce project inventories and draft reports***
9. UCD to circulate value chain proposal and decision on WP4 approach(es) by year-end. ***Jim to circulate value chain proposal. Nick to facilitate agreed approach for WP4 in each country***
10. Finalise survey instruments for WP5 by year-end, including qualitative methods and how to link with quantitative. ***Researchers and supervisors to finalise survey instruments and plans ahead of fieldwork in early 2014***

## **10. Project Management Issues**

Given the slippage this year the timeframe is looking increasingly challenging in 2014/15, with key output targets including;

- Policy briefs produced
- 4 in-depth studies of meso-level food economy issues
- 2 reports of pro-nutrition agricultural interventions
- Jointly-authored papers in journals
- 6 PhD research reports at draft stage
- Conference to disseminate all research findings [N.B. PhDs will not be finished then, but each researcher could present one paper/chapter at June 2015 conference; also N.B. African Nutritionists Conference May 2015].

In view of this we should be cautious to increase the scope from current plans.

Current schedules will be adjusted to the outcome of the workshop and further changes or adjustments should be resisted as we have very little scope for further slippage.

The first transfers for Year 2 (half the 2014 budget) will be completed as soon as we have clearance from Irish Aid and the HEA and the following transfers are due in April/May 2014.

Note that for Year 3, part of the budget will be retained by Irish Aid until the end of the project, and only released following completion and a satisfactory final progress report including an evaluation against agreed targets and performance indicators. It was noted that this could cause some problems for partners in delivering outputs at the end of the project without the required resources. It was therefore suggested that UCC contact Irish Aid and HEA in order to clarify the potential amount retained and whether this might be restricted to potential expenditure after the end of the project (eg PhD travel and stipends)

***Action – Steve to update work package schedules and circulate to all***

***Action - Partners should check existing budgets and commitments for Years 2 and 3 with the revised work schedules to flag-up any potential problems.***

***Action – UCC to contact Irish Aid about the first transfers for Year 2 and the clarification of transfer procedures for Year 3.***