

AgriDiet 3rd Annual Workshop

UCC, Cork – 3rd and 4th November 2014

Workshop Report



Day 1 – Monday 3rd November, 0830-1800

1. Objectives of Workshop

Nick outlined the key objectives of the project but made the point that at this stage of the project we also need to look beyond the work packages and focus on core messages.

1. Are we broadly on track? If not why not?
2. Are there any gaps?
3. Is the output of a sufficiently high quality?
4. What have we learned?
5. What are we producing?
6. What outputs?
7. Longer term outcomes and influence?
8. Interest in a longer term partnership?

Edward re-emphasised the need to highlight what new breaking ground the project has made and clearly communicate that.

We have struggled with some packages to get them off the ground, so we need to fast-track these. We need to focus on the quality and timely completion of publishable outputs and we need to integrate different aspects of the project.

2. Work Package 2 - Country Policy Reports

In presenting the Ethiopian situation, Tassew made the point that the New 2013 Nutrition Strategy is generally seen as the response to the problem of an insufficient nutrition focus of agriculture, as there was little clarity before then. Agriculture has been given a new mandate of improving the quality of food and mainstreaming nutrition into agriculture. So there is a willingness of policymakers to address this issue, but practical implementation is still lagging. However a Nutrition Unit has been established in the Ministry of Agriculture.

Many still argue that the Ministry of Health (MoH) is not the best coordinator. MoH remains the coordinator at local level and a new unit has been established to coordinate at local level between ag extension and health workers.

How can AgriDiet complement this issue? It was felt that the project might identify policy gaps in the ag sector and propose ways to have better links with nutrition based on our research evidence. There is also a need for educating consumers in order to create demand for healthy foods – need demand to encourage supply, but with safety nets for the poor where markets fail. There is potential for AgriDiet to forward new ideas for the new Growth and Transformation Programme (GTP 2) which will be developed in 2015.

In the discussion on the Ethiopian country report, the point was made that we need to focus on the production of nutritious food and cooking education, as people often over-cooked food reducing the nutritious content.

From the Tanzania side it was noted that traditionally nutrition has been associated with health, but that Tanzania is trying to move away from this.

Tassew asked the question of whether it matters if the MoH remains the coordinator in Ethiopia, as it's the way the policy is implemented that matters and how it's coordinated with other departments and stakeholders.

Joyce noted that coordination between Ministerial departments has also been weak in Tanzania because the MoH focusses on treatment rather than prevention. Also most major investment plans involving agriculture, including CAADP and NEPAD, were made in the early 2000s before there was even a nutrition focus.

It was noted that the new Ethiopian Nutrition strategy came after the latest national investment plan. But the new PASDEP will include a nutrition focus, especially on micronutrients and will provide cash transfers and direct supplementation for more severe cases of undernutrition. The latest evidence from WFP is for a combination of cash transfers and direct supplementation measures being better than just one or the other.

A unique insight from AgriDiet can be the focus on what is happening at micro-level – structural factors influencing household nutrition.

Jessica noted the idea of improving education around cooking and nutrition to help improve demand and therefore supply. But the question is how can this be achieved? What are the mechanics at local

level? Can WP5 guide us on this? All the WP4 outputs should also guide. We need to consider what the key policy message is.

Nora noted the iodine problem in Tassew's presentation (the only micronutrient issue getting worse), aggravated by soil erosion and iodine loss. So what can be done about this? Is iodised salt the best solution? If so, how to get to rural areas? Also behaviour change is required – ie put salt on after it's cooked, otherwise iodine is lost in cooking.

The idea of ag practices to increase iodine in soil was raised? Conservation tillage is one way to help improve the micronutrient content of soils, as well as micronutrient-rich fertilisers. There is also the possibility of better breeding of cereals and other varieties for nutritional content and nitrogen-fixing properties.

In presenting the Tanzania paper, Joyce noted that areas of high food self-sufficiency in Tanzania often have high stunting prevalence. One reason could be the high workloads of rural farming areas, requiring greater food intakes than in other regions to meet nutritional requirements. Also access to health and sanitation and knowledge of care and health are likely to be other key reasons. Clearly, food availability by itself doesn't result in good nutrition.

Recommendations from the Tanzania paper are for better provision of improved water facilities, better planning of food production for nutrients, better coordination of nutrition in community development policies, education, with more nutrition courses, and better finance to focus on nutrition issues, as well as an improved capacity in local councils, health services and CSOs.

There is a need for a multi-sectoral approach. It was noted that there is now a separate budget line for nutrition within each Ministry; but a lack of capacity within Ministries. There is a need to provide more support to Nutrition Officers.

It is anticipated that the Policy Briefs will develop the working paper material and sharpen the messages for key stakeholders. For Tanzania, there should be a focus on the current monotonous diet against the potential for Tanzania to have much better diets. At present the focus is on cereals and calories as to whether a country is self-sufficient or not. Breaking the cultural barriers re fruit and veg consumption is also important. There is also difficulty in getting good data on fruit and veg.

Jim re-asserted that capacity building at institutional level is a key area to focus on, not just policy gaps but implementation gaps. There is also a bigger policy framework – Big Results Now has no mention of nutrition and focus and is on two crops maize and rice. There is an economic drive to commercial farming high up on the political agenda – eg SAGCOT drive – which is a divergent policy from most of the Ministry-driven policies to some extent. The same appears to be happening in Ethiopia – a mixed policy approach of supporting commercial and smallholder farmers.

Mattee noted that self-sufficiency rates are based on cereal or largely calorie-based measures, whereas stunting is partly affected by micronutrients, so this may be part of the reason why apparently self-sufficient areas have high stunting levels.

Edward noted Joyce's point that "Agriculture should be driven by nutritional needs". But what are the practical steps?

The market should play a role in providing micronutrient needs; but how? Again the market is part of solution, so WP4 research is important: we need to interrogate the linkage of households to the economy and to markets.

It was noted that the focus is on traditional crops in research, extension and breeding etc, so there is a need to focus on other nutritionally more important crops. So how can we be more inclusive on research with other crops?

Tom felt that there was a greater need for education to incentivise the market or creating demand through education. In some ways the problem can be perceived as education versus the market – currently less nutritious food is cheaper to eat in the market.

Demand for maize and other staples is unlikely to change unless consumer behaviour, and hence demand, changes. Education about diet and nutrition is important to make it change. Biofortification could also help, but, more importantly, we need people to eat more fruit and veg in Ethiopia and Tanzania. Much is due to poverty – with the money available for many poor families, calories and satiation must be the focus. Interestingly it was pointed out that fruit and veg consumption was better under old customs which are less used these days, so how can we recapture them?

Action – It was noted that the working papers were now posted on the website. The next stage is to finalise the Policy Brief drafts by the end of the month and get them printed and circulated by the end of the year. Jessica will work with Joyce and Tassew in producing final drafts for feedback by UCC and other partners and final printed versions by the end of the year.

3. Work Package 5 – PhD Research at micro-level

a. Chanyalew

Focus is on how agriculture contributes to household (HH) food security and nutrition, plus off-farm activities and what do HHs consume?

The household survey was conducted in East Hararghe – Babile district, in Jan-Feb 2014 and Jul-Sep 2014, with both husbands and wives responding for each HH. HHs were stratified to identify those with children <2yrs from which 100 HHs were selected and then 300 HH from others.

The challenges included bureaucracy, resistance from gatekeepers, a bulky questionnaire and the boredom of the interviewees.

Ag production strategies in the region are mainly sorghum as the major crop (it was noted that farmers preferred the longer variety which yielded more straw for animals but was lower-yielding than the newer short-straw varieties), then groundnut for cash – also maize and khat, then mango, potato, cabbage. Farmers are mainly influenced by variable rainfall and husbandry knowledge in their ag production plans.

Initial findings suggest that 38% HHs have 2-3 months food shortage, 29% no food shortage, 17% 1 month shortage and 17% more than 3 months shortage. HFIAS1 and HFIAS2 also show inadequate food access for many HHs. 51% of farms had off-farm activities (1st round), 61% (2nd round).

Priority in food consumption was to staple crops and high energy crops, with very little meat and fruit and veg (much of the fruit and veg were designated for market – eg mango).

How much is actually recorded in terms of fruit and veg production and consumption in the national and local statistics? There are some cultural beliefs that mangos and fruit are not good for pregnant women, and generally there has been little change in diets over the years.

An interesting outcome of the analysis would be the proportion of home produced fruit and veg consumed versus sale.

Coping strategies include livestock sales, firewood/charcoal, trading, and reduced food consumption.

Measurement instruments are consistent (actual foods, HFIAS, dietary diversity, 24 hour), with a lot of participant observations.

There was a need to stress the pre and post-harvest results – eg HFIAS results and diet diversity. Also how do food security measures fit with anthropometric measures?

Does it come down to a knowledge gap? Poor rural people don't understand the nutritional value of key fruit and veg foods, but focus more on their monetary value. Richer urban people do have the knowledge and purchase these foods from rural areas.

Data on household decision-making and coping mechanisms were also briefly presented.

b. Zenebe

Focus is on local ag practices and their implications for the nutritional status of vulnerable HHs. Are there dietary differences? How do ag practices affect nutrition? Differences in production, consumption and coping strategies of male and female-headed HHs.

The HH survey was conducted in Enderta and Hintalo-Wejirat – 4 districts, covering 400 HHs. Focus group discussions were held 1 in each district, plus 8 in-depth interviews.

The challenges include calibrating the many different types of local measure and verifying why low production was reported by farm households.

Diet diversity is limited. No marked difference in diversity between HHs with high and low food availability – also between seasons. But quantities were different – much higher in post-harvest. More diet diversity in female HHs - also due to them being involved in petty trading fruit and veg. 50% experienced a shortage of food and the average is 3 months.

Coping mechanisms included consuming seed stock, the restriction of consumption by adults, and borrowing.

c. Kedir

Focus is on assessing the nutritional security of HHs with mothers and infants, involving a sample of 200 child-mother pairs.

Problems faced – difficult to collect vein blood, shortage of transport, language barriers and slow rate of data collection.

Initial findings show 40% HHs with stunting prevalence and 54% anaemic. Only 22% of children receive min dietary diversity (4 types).

Children's consumption of fruit and veg showed that many never get either

Zinc deficiency is very high at over two-thirds and iodine in urine showed over one third were deficient

Concerning maternal nutrition, (21.8% were anaemic in the post-harvest season and 41.7% in pre-harvest anaemia, chronic protein energy malnutrition as expressed by $BMI < 18.5 \text{ kg/m}^2$, increased from 41.7% to 54.5% in post-harvest.

c. Happiness

Aifric stood in for Happiness who was unable to attend due to family illness

The survey was undertaken in Shinyanga (mixed some livestock) and Morogoro (mainly crop) where child stunting rates were high (43% in Shinyanga, 44% in Morogoro).

250 HHs were sampled in each region for the overall survey, from which 100 mother/child HHs were selected for the nutrition survey. Total households covered in the overall survey were 255 in Kishapu and 251 in Mvomero.

Pre and post-harvest surveys were conducted from Feb-Mar 2014 and Aug-Sep 2014

Outcomes were generally better than the national averages in terms of z-score severity. All mothers were breastfeeding but few fed exclusively. Dietary diversity in Kishapu was >50%, but very few children were not anaemic - 7% Kishapu and 11% Mvomero

The importance of feeding information back to HHs once analysed was stressed.

d. Goodluck

Focus is on factors affecting farm HH decision-making about farming practices for HH food security.

Tanzania has had 7%pa growth recently but poverty dropped only 2% - and it's now 104 out of 109 in EIU GFSI.

Decisions about farming and HH food security with a farming systems approach

1. What strategies do farm HHs use to achieve FS?
2. What factors influence their choices?
3. Do the decisions affect FS?
4. How can they be supported?

In Kishapu HHs grow cotton as cash crop and also keep and sell livestock. In Mvomero more do casual labour to earn money to achieve food security.

In terms of the food insecurity experience, the Kishapu HFIAS figures were much worse (80%) than Mvomero (c. 50%).

Visits by government extension agents were the preferred choice of advice. Ag extension is inadequate however.

e. Achilana

Focus is on examining linkages between local food economies and HH nutrition. How does operation of local economy impact on HH nutrition?

Methodology has included rapid appraisal, local market analysis and value chain analysis for two commodities, plus a market price survey.

What are the channels through which HHs buy and sell food; mainly traders visiting villages for selling crops and mainly buy food from local shops. Low prices are a common complaint for sales and high prices for buying. Coping is mainly through reducing amounts bought. One part of the analysis could be how price changes affect consumption patterns?

In Kishapu 89% reported a food shortage in last 12 months and 62% in Mvomero, mainly due to drought and poor harvests. The main shortage period is Nov-Feb.

Value chain analysis has not yet been conducted.

f. Other issues

Nora noted that UCC required a written student evaluation and supervisor's evaluation at this stage, whilst UCD have already performed their evaluation process earlier in the year.

In terms of conference paper possibilities, on 10-11 Dec 2014 UCD has its 43rd Annual Food Research Conference, but this was deemed too early for AgriDiet contributions. The Federation of African Nutrition Societies meet in May 2015 in Tanzania, whilst the Ethiopian Economics Association host their conference in mid-June, and then of course the AgriDiet conference, probably in July.

In the discussion on potential publications it was agreed that the PhD researcher would be principal author, as noted in the AgriDiet publication guidelines that were circulated earlier in the year.

In terms of WP5 outputs there was a need to prioritise on the 2 major deadlines – the end-project conference in Addis in July 2015 and PhD 2016, with the potential of academic publications in between.

It should also be noted at this stage that we should apply for extension of funding for the PhDs to be finished after the project has formally ended next year. The issue of vivas was also raised in view of the lack of funding for return travel. The possibility of vivas by skype was suggested.

On data sharing it was noted that researchers would need to exchange data soon. So we need to be clear which dataset can be used by each? It was agreed that the focus should be on finalising the datasets so they are clean and ready for use, and can then be used by other members of the team, but with no overlapping analyses.

Action – The PhD researchers will focus on analysing their results over the coming months and each will submit a draft conference paper to supervisors by end-May. Supervisors will feedback in time for final papers to be developed by mid to end-June (the EEA conference in mid-June would be another target for researchers to meet). The best two papers will then be chosen for presentations at the AgriDiet conference in July.

4. Work Package 6 – Reviews of pro-nutrition interventions

Mattee noted there had been limited progress in Tanzania since the mapping of projects and interventions and were now looking for input on a framework for analysis and level of detail.

Jim noted that we can move ahead now based on the project mapping by identifying the different levels of nutrition linkages and then identifying a few projects with a view to getting 2 or 3 with evaluations and then looking at lessons.

Girmay noted that if we are using Masset et al as a frame, then all Ethiopian projects would be excluded as having direct linkages.

Inclusion/exclusion criteria were discussed. Girmay noted that the literature on ag-nutrition linkages lacks recognition of integrated/synergistic approaches – this can be the niche for AgriDiet.

A conceptual framework categorising ag interventions and linkages was put forward;

Category 1 interventions focus on ag technology.

Category 2 interventions focus on ag diversification

Category 3 interventions focus on ag postharvest issues – processing etc wastage of food, storage

The ag intervention type then affects the different impact pathways in different ways.- food source, income source, food price, non-food spending, women's resource control, women's time and carrying practice, women's own nutrition and health. Then we can analyse the effectiveness of each approach according to nutritional indicators – anthropometric, dietary diversity and micronutrients, etc

Projects in Tigray include CIP (OFSP), World Vision (Micronutrient programme promoting Vitamin A-rich foods), FAO (Improving nutrition and food security in N.Shoa and S. Tigray), and Government Programmes.

Nutritional indicators were identified – mostly diet diversity, micronutrient status, anthropometric indicators.

Lessons:

- Nutrition versus diversification of production – most projects aim to diversify production & availability – not clear after that.
- Awareness creation & education of household members is not well documented

- Initiatives for women & children – mostly in health sector, and design usually from a health perspective
- integrated approaches are less practised
- Scale issue – what potential for scaling-up?
- Few considerations of trade-offs or synergies
- lack of reliable impact assessment
- little evidence to draw strong conclusions.

Jemal reported he had 3 projects chosen. MUSKOKA, PRIME, Nutrition Mercy Corps, Milk matters.

Initial findings are that agricultural projects with a combination of pathways have potential to impact on nutrition status.

What's the best way to present this research? Need to look at integrated approaches and what appears to work qualitatively? It was felt the Project Briefs would be a good vehicle for conveying the results of the working papers under this work package. Jessica noted that there could be some practical lessons in particular that could be conveyed through the Project Briefs.

Tassew noted that the Farm Africa Goats project has been widely cited, as are the USAID HIV agriculture projects, including urban agriculture. PSNP also has an intervention programme and there is an impact assessment. Subsidy on imported wheat – imported \$500/t and sold \$350/t but benefits went to rich. Programmes are often not evaluated for efficiency – do they provide value for money compared to cost?

It was also noted that there is a major weakness in choosing indicators for evaluation. Could AgriDiet suggest some? Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is looking at how to evaluate nutrition projects and there are also innovative method papers from LCIRAH and DFID.

Action – Girmay and Jemal will complete draft papers and circulate them by end-December, so partners need to feedback by end-January and final working papers can then be completed posted on the website by end-February. Mattee and Thadeus will complete draft papers by end-January and circulate for feedback by end-February and then complete final papers by end-March. Project briefs will then be developed for Ethiopia and Tanzania (or even a combined brief) in April/May ready for the conference at which the researchers will make presentations.

Day 2 – Tuesday 4th November, 0830-1800

5. Work Package 4 – Meso-level research

Jemal noted that the Haramaya team had decided to focus on the groundnut value chain and have conducted research at primary villages (eg 8 assemblers), secondary woreda, wholesalers and tertiary retailers. At each level they obtained info on channels, tonnages, prices, as well as profiles of market operators, etc. They have also built a value chain of costs and selling prices and marketing margins and also defined the roles of marketing agencies etc in improving the value chain? eg cooperatives.

Groundnuts are nutritionally important in terms of protein, home use (eg as nuts and home peanut butter) and income. Also there is a food safety aflatoxin issue.

Girmay is researching ag systems, value chains and nutrition in Enderta and Hintalo-wajirat, Tigray, using data from Tampa in 2011 on horticulture and dairy value chains. The study will include characterising the demographic and socioeconomic profiles, compiling and understanding ag systems and identifying community and institutional factors.

There have been many interventions in the region – infrastructure, diversification, home gardens including school gardens, improved dairy cows and poultry, etc

They are using meal frequency, diversity of diet, and number of months in which HH faces food gap as indicators.

Development of markets and value addition is limited, mainly to promote economic value rather than nutrition, e.g. promotion of high-value cash crops at the expense of diversification. Value chains are promoted to support producers: implications for consumers are not well considered.

TAMPA study of fruit and veg consumed at home, 12% wasted and 80% marketed. Horticulture development – irrigation has been key, credit for water pumps etc. Less than 20% of land to horticulture on average.

Also very limited fresh milk – some selling when excess by coops. Coops in Hintalo-wajirat state HHs have right to retain 1 litre and rest taken. In Enderta HHs must take all milk to coop. Key health issue with milk is TB for unpasteurised milk.

Groundnuts, milk and fruit and veg are all cash crops, so the role of market in nutrition is important. Increased production should lead to increased home consumption?

Nick is researching the institutional arrangements at meso level – eg Benson 2008 – inadequate institutions to implement. Information being collected in 12 kebele sites in 3 woredas in each zone. Simple checklist.- 6 questions qualitative. Interviews completed, analysis next.

Impressionistic findings; cross-sectional collaboration starting to happen but mainly at acute undernutrition rather than chronic. New cadres of home economist at woreda level, but not much focus on nutrition at ag level – mostly at enhancing food production. Data transcription Nov 2014 then draft report.

Edward's focus is on land policy. Objectives – critical review of current land policy and review of empirical studies – overall view from secondary sources, to be followed by joint analysis of survey data (mainly national picture). Through the nationalisation of land 1975, every HH has right to plot – use or lose. Prohibition of permanent transfers. High proportion of 0.5 ha plots and over the years there has been strengthening of occupier rights.

Some donors are pushing for privatisation – eg USAID. Allocative efficiency – those who could use it best are not getting access – so primary market for land or secondary – rental market. So transfer from very poor to those better off – gender dimensions. Lavers 2014 etc argue that gov't depends on peasant support and stability. Free market would be socially unacceptable - eg crisis sales.

Dominant issue is small size of plots. Gov't has adopted leasing of land to investors – local and foreign. Compensation remains controversial. So promotion of primary and secondary markets will do little for female and poor households.

Tenure efficiency – if HH secure with bundle of rights will invest more up to a certain point, but allocative efficiency?

Kathy reviewed some of the background literature on gender issues. Naila Kabeer's 1999 gender and empowerment framework is a useful framework for analysis. The field research included 40 field interviews and observations. Lot of literature on gender in Ethiopia, plus many organisations – Women's Development Army, Tigray Women's Association, One in Five groups. etc

Initial findings include; there is clear commitment at institutional level to address gender inequality, and many structures to include women in development processes. Land ploughed by men but women play important role in farming. Renting out of land by women. Women keep small animals (eg goats and poultry) – keep one third and sell two thirds. Grow and sell fruit and veg. Sales of produce often mediated by men. There are important issues in relation to income generation and use of income, education, care labour and other constraints.

Thadeus has conducted a rapid appraisal of the rural economy at meso-level around Kishapu, but notes the lack of consistent information. 49% of population are children under 15 years old. Poor HHs higher dependency ratio. Electricity 1% - Agriculture 77%.

Mattee noted that in Mvomero – only 45% of land is cultivated. Only 25% of irrigatable land irrigated, 82% farmers / pastoralists. 18% other occupations and idle land attracting outsiders.

There are 3 zones in the Mvomero area – highland – good for fruit and veg, miombo woodland – cereals and livestock – big chunk, savannah river basin – paddy rice and irrigation – sugar cane and fruit and veg. They have chosen to study maize and paddy value chains.

District is food self-sufficient by about 50% for grain. Irrigation could double food production – only 112 extension workers – 1 for every 2,343 farmers. Energy use – electricity only available to 5% of HHs.

It was noted that the studies need to say something and be publishable. All need to link back to household food and nutrition security. The question was also raised as to what aspects of the 2 country programs of work should we be aiming to compare if any? Each study has to be methodologically robust, interesting, can stand alone and be publishable.

Action – There are 7 outputs planned for WP4 – by Nick, Edward, Kathy, Girmay, Jemal in Ethiopia and 2 papers from the Tanzanian team of Mattee, Thadeus, Jim and Deirdre. The draft papers need to be completed and circulated by end-February 2015 and partners should provide feedback by end-March so that final papers can be developed by end-April. Project briefs may then be developed for all or some of the papers in time for the conference where presentations would be made by the researchers.

6. Work Package 7 – Stakeholder workshops

Local workshops worked really well in Mekelle and Mwanza. +40 stakeholders in both excluding AgriDiet staff. Tanzanian TV interviewed team members and participants at the workshop and noted that they would focus more on nutrition in their regular agriculture programmes.

Participant presentations showed a lack of guidance for nutrition and ag extension staff at local level, lack of resources and the fact that planning tends to happen in isolation rather than coordinated between ag and nutrition and health.

Ethiopia – it was felt that coordination was good between food security and health but not nutrition. Major problem is implementation of policies due to capacity issues.

What needs to be done to improve coordination? – Media could be used for policy advocacy, decision makers must be involved, attendees said they would advocate, clear guidelines on HOW, common indicators or targets, regular training of staff.

Tanzania – Meagre budget and inaccessible, lack of political will, lack of clarity in who district officers are accountable to. Ag extension looking mainly at productivity, nutritionists at wider health dimensions, ineffective District Nutrition Steering Committee and policies are generally market oriented rather than nutrition-oriented.

What could be done – district facilitation meetings could do more to coordinate, budget poorly coordinated, community fora at district level

It was agreed that the final workshops should be held at regional level again – Harar and Morogoro. Timing – mid-June? tbc.

Action – Jessica, Tassew and Jemal to organise the final Ethiopian stakeholder workshop in Harar or nearby in early to mid-June. Jessica, Mattee and Joyce to organise the final Tanzanian stakeholder workshop in Morogoro in early to mid June.

7. Work Package 8 – Communications and Knowledge Strategy

The knowledge mobilisation objective of AgriDiet is to engage research users, policy influencers and decision makers with the evidence needed to help them prioritise the strategies and actions to bring about effective change.

What did stakeholders tell us in terms of preferred communication?

1st workshop – clear winner on info was conferences and workshops. Then 2nd was project briefs, then multi-media outputs, dissemination thru existing networks, and media (newspaper – eg conference)

Year 2 we did the dissemination of the AgriDiet global review of ag-nutrition linkages under WP1 later featured in UN SCN News and cited in the AgNut network, plus newsletters and website.

So the focus of our output dissemination for Year 3 should be the conference, last stakeholder workshops and 4-page project briefs.

Our key stakeholder targets for the briefs are those involved in key programmes and policymakers, but we should also target to each specific stakeholder. Sensitisation meetings were suggested for influential policy makers. Thadeus recommended that the Permanent secretary should also be targeted.

Academic papers, Phd theses and blogs/other media output were also put forward as other communication methods. The papers and theses would be up to the individual researchers or research teams to develop. As an alternative to blogs, it was felt that a thought piece for a newspaper or agency - eg AllAfrica news agency – could be developed by researchers.

We also need to think at this stage about what have we got to say at the end of the project; how do we bring it all together with a clear narrative and message – even a one-liner? What are the key messages?

On the website it was reported that UCC recorded some 19,500 hits on the AgriDiet site in the month September 2014. UCC was currently investigating how this translated into numbers of actual visitors to the website.

For the conference in Addis Ababa in mid-2015 we need to be clear about our aims objectives? Do we want a wider conference with external speakers or mainly on the AgriDiet research with mostly internal speakers? It was generally felt that we mainly need to present our research findings, through PhD papers (it was generally agreed that two of six PhD papers submitted would be selected), and syntheses of other work package research findings with key messages and implications for policy and practice. Everyone should have a conference paper to present and this would take up most of programme.

We also need to have the right audience. Key policymakers from Ethiopia and Tanzania should be invited to attend and, possibly, speak. CAADP and African Union reps were also suggested. Tom Arnold and/or other high profile people would also be invited. Irish Aid would also be asked to support in approaching key policymakers.

It was agreed to hold a 1 or 1.5 day conference – with poster presentations at breaks, at a time in late June or early to mid-July. The availability of key personnel at this time was noted. In particular, Tassew would be in the UK from 21st June to 8th July whilst Jessica Meeker, as PI for this work package 8 would not be available from 7th July for the remainder of that month.

A Conference Committee was established comprising the Steering Committee, plus Edward Lahiff, to discuss the conference issues on a regular basis in the lead-up.

An additional item to the Work Plan was proposed – that of an Irish dissemination event in early June. This would need to be discussed further in terms of objectives, target audience, involvement of partners and available resources, as this is not within the current budget or Work Plan for Year 3.

Action – Conference Committee established to meet by skype on 5th December at 1200 GMT and 1500 Ethiopia and Tanzania time. In the meantime UCC to finalise date and EDRI and Sokoine to draft a provisional list of stakeholders and EDRI to propose venues.

Jessica to work with work package leaders on potential Project Briefs in year 3 following the completion of the WP2 Policy Briefs.

8. Work Package 9 – Project Management

Final budgets for Year 2 were signed off by each partner and Year 3 budgets for each organisation distributed.

It was noted that the proposal by HEA to retain 10% of the overall budget had been rescinded. However, it was not yet known how or when the Year 3 funds would be disbursed and this would be relayed to partners as soon as information became available.

On the schedules the following actions were agreed;

1. Work Package 2 – Policy brief final drafts to be completed by the end of November by Joyce and Tassew working with Jessica, with any feedback from UCC and other partners, and then edited, composed and printed by the end of December.
2. Work Package 4 – Drafts of the 7 papers to be finished and circulated to all partners by end-February 2015. Feedback would then be required by end-March before final reports are produced at end-April 2015.
3. Work Package 5 – PhD researchers to produce draft conference papers by end-May 2015. Feedback from supervisors by mid-June 2015 to allow for final papers to be produced in time for the conference in July.
4. Work Package 6 – Girmay and Jemal to complete the first WP6 draft reports by end-December and circulate to partners who should feedback by end-January so that final reports can be produced by end-February. Mattee and Thadeus to produce the first draft for Tanzania by end-January, with feedback by end-February and final report by end-March.
5. Work Package 7 – Final stakeholder workshops to be held around mid-June 2015, as regional workshops in or around Harar in Ethiopia and Morogoro in Tanzania.
6. Work Package 8 – the end-year conference is the key output of this work package, so a Conference Committee was established to meet on 5th December at which stage it was hoped to have a date set for the conference.

Action – PM to send revised GANTT schedules for WPs 2,4,5,6,7 and 8 to all by end-November, plus table in report (see end of this report). UCC to send annual progress report and financial statement to Irish Aid and HEA by 7 November deadline. UCC to also request feedback on Year 3 funding disbursement by Irish Aid and HEA and to feedback to partners once information becomes available.

9. Other Business

1. Pre-Evaluation Exercise meetings by IA and HEA team in Tanzania

Mattee reported that they were asked about the broader Irish Aid programme, who initiated the project, their involvement in the proposal and their happiness with programme? They were also asked about capacity building.

The IA and HEA team also interviewed the student researchers and how were they identified? Plus they were asked about connections with other southern partners, and also whether they had a sense of ownership or were mainly being pulled by northern members? They were also questioned about any challenges with fieldwork.

Regarding the PhD research, Goodluck and Happiness were interviewed for 1.5 hours – plus Achilana separately, particularly on the full sense of recruitment, application process and interviews and whether they felt part of a research project team? Other concerns were how it was working with Irish supervisors and fieldwork in-country? Also was their concept note of research interests the same as actual research? Plus the evaluators were also looking for information on whether the researchers will stay in country after their PhDs are completed?

2. Continuity

It was noted that there was likely to be a significant period after the end of the project as the evaluation process for the IA and HEA programme was completed. It was also noted that IA has in-country research budgets which might be available for a continuation of AgriDiet in some form? The focus of IA now was on “research into use”. They seem to be mainly partnering with NGOs on action research with NGOs or operational research. There was also a possible opportunity for funding next year through the Gates Foundation.

Action – All partners to monitor funding opportunities for potential continuation of AgriDiet project.

AgriDiet – Schedules and Responsibilities									
	Dec 2014	Jan 2015	Feb 2015	Mar 2015	Apr 2015	May 2015	Jun 2015	Jul 2015	Aug 2015
WP2 Policy Reports	<i>TW, JK & JM</i> complete Policy Briefs by end-Dec (feedback from partners end-Nov)	Policy briefs printed in Ethiopia & Tanzania and disseminated							
WP4 Meso-Research			Drafts of 5 papers by <i>NC, EL, KG, GT, JH</i> , + 2 papers by <i>AM & TM with JK and DO</i>	Feedback on WP4 papers by <i>partners</i>	Final WP4 papers completed by authors & posted on web by <i>ST</i>	Project brief drafts for WP4 by mid-May and feedback from partners by end-May	Completed project briefs for WP4, printed and disseminated in Ethiopia & Tanzania		
WP5 Micro-Research						<i>ZK, KR, CA, GM, HM & AM</i> to draft conference papers	<i>Supervisors</i> to feedback by mid-Jun & papers complete end-Jun	2 papers for presentations + 6 poster papers	
WP6 Pro-nutrition Interv'ns	<i>GT & JM</i> to complete Ethiopian draft papers and circulate to partners	<i>AM & TM</i> to complete draft papers and circulate. <i>Partners</i> to feedback on Ethiopian papers	<i>GT & JM</i> complete papers and draft Ethiopia Brief. <i>Partners</i> to feedback on Tanzanian papers	<i>AM & TM</i> complete papers & draft Brief. Feedback on Ethiopia Brief by <i>all</i>	<i>GT and JM</i> to finalise Ethiopia Brief with <i>JM & UCC</i> Feedback on Tanzania Brief by <i>partners</i>	<i>AM and TM</i> to finalise Brief with <i>JM and UCC</i> Editing & layout of briefs completed	WP6 Project Briefs printed and circulated in Ethiopia & Tanzania		
WP7 Stakeholder workshops					Stake Workshop planning <i>JM, AM, TW & JH</i>	Stakeholder workshop planning by <i>JM, AM, TW and JH</i>	Stakeholder workshops staged in Harar & Morogoro		Report on stakeholder workshops by <i>JM</i>
WP8 Knowledge mobilisation	Conference Committee meets 5 Dec 1200 GMT – <i>NC, JK, ST, EL, TW, GT, JH, JK, TM, JM</i>	AgriDiet Newsletter	Conference Committee meets Feb 1200 GMT – <i>NC, JK, ST, EL, TW, GT, JH, JK, TM, JM</i>		Conference Committee meets Apr 1200 GMT – <i>NC, JK, ST, EL, TW, GT, JH, JK, TM, JM</i>	AgriDiet Newsletter	Conference Committee meets Apr 1200 GMT – <i>NC, JK, ST, EL, TW, GT, JH, JK, TM, JM</i>	AgriDiet conference staged in Addis Ababa	Conference report <i>JM</i> and AgriDiet Newsletter (Sep) <i>ST</i>
WP9 Project Management	Transfer Year 3 funds to partners - <i>ST</i>				Progress and Financial Reports to HEA - <i>ST</i>				Progress and Financial Reports to HEA/ IA (Sep)
Key – <i>NC</i> =Nick Chisholm, <i>EL</i> =Edward Lahiff, <i>ST</i> =Stephen Thornhill, <i>KG</i> =Kathy Glavanis, <i>JK</i> =Jim Kinsella, <i>DO</i> =Deirdre O'Connor, <i>GT</i> =Girmay Tesfay, <i>AM</i> =Amon Mattee, <i>JK</i> =Joyce Kinabo, <i>JH</i> =Jemal Hassen, <i>TM</i> =Thadeus Mkamwa, <i>JM</i> =Jessica Meeke, <i>TW</i> =Tassew Woldehanna									