

## 1.1 Introduction

The Maisha Bora (MB) Programme is funded by the Belgian Fund for Food Security for the period January 2015 to December 2019 with a budget of Euro 13.8 million. It aims to improve food security in 15 villages in Longido and Simanjiro districts in the north of Tanzania. It is implemented by five international partners Vétérinaires Sans Frontières Belgium (VsF-B), Iles De Paix (IDP), Trias, World Food Programme (WFP) and the Belgian Development Agency (BTC) and ten local partners working closely with the village, district and regional government administrations. BTC has a specific role in coordinating the overall programme and there is a national level steering committee co-chaired by the prime minister's office and the Belgian Embassy.

The intervention area is drought-prone rangeland occupied by pastoralists and agro-pastoralists who are predominantly Maasai. Household economies have been undermined by drought and loss of traditional grazing areas to agriculture and wildlife tourism. Income sources lack diversity and are focussed on livestock sales which are used for food and other necessities. Communities are organised around scattered villages with limited infrastructure (typically water point, school, health post and village office), with most of the population living in even more scattered extended family homesteads (Bomas) loosely clustered in sub-villages.

The MB programme has a specific objective of *'higher and more secured income used for nutrition and improved local availability of food for 9.000 households in 15 villages in Simanjiro and Longido districts and in particular for 40% of impoverished households, women and youth'*. This is expected to be delivered through four results:

**Result 1:** Households have livestock resources secured and can benefit more from different livestock products (Livestock / pastoralism component (VSF-B)), with a major sub-result being sustainable access to adequate water for livestock is improved (Water component (IDP))

**Result 2:** Women, youth and households' income are more diversified, secured and used to increase the quantity of food intake (Business development component (Trias))

**Result 3:** More households, and in particular more pregnant and lactating women and children under 5, consume more diversified foods, use cleaner water, prevent and treat diarrhoea effectively and have increased awareness of HIV prevention (Nutrition component (WFP))

**Result 4:** Effective coordination of the Programme assures external and internal coherence, induced cooperation and increases implementation efficiency (Coordination component (BTC)).

## 1.2 Evaluation Questions and Methodology

The objective of the review was to support learning, steering and accountability. To achieve this, it is expected to:

1. Assess the **relevance** of the activities and strategies put in place to achieve results
2. Identify the **positive and negative factors** influencing the achievement of the project

3. Assess **coherence** in the context of the joint partnership programme
4. Formulate **recommendations** for the remainder of the project
5. Prepare for the **final programme evaluation**.

In addition, the reviewers were asked to assess whether the recommendations of previous BFFS programmes in Tanzania have been taken into account and what could be learnt from other 'one programme, multiple partner' approaches in comparison with MB.

A participatory mixed method review approach was designed which involved collecting information from programme monitoring, narrative reports, key informants, beneficiaries, implementing partners, government officers and through direct observation, with triangulating between them. In particular, a significant amount of time was spent in a sample of seven intervention villages, including interviewing those not directly involved in programme activities, to understand barriers to entry and indirect outcomes of MB. An outcome tracking methodology was used in focus group discussions with Village and MB committees. Preliminary findings and recommendations were shared back with partners and key informants as an additional opportunity for triangulation and participation.

### 1.3 Result 1: Secure livestock access and benefits

Main interventions are land use planning (LUP), water rehabilitation/development, introduction of chicken, distribution of improved goats, breed improvement through quality bulls, pastoralist field schools (PFS) and community animal health workers (CAHWs).

The LUP and water components are relevant, effective and should contribute well to overall objectives. LUP outcomes can be improved through wider advocacy and deeper discussions on environmental management, including on livestock numbers. Continuing effort is needed to ensure sustainable management of the water infrastructure.

The implementation of the chicken, goat and bull procurement and/or distribution was poor for various reasons. Technical aspects of chicken introduction need improvement, particularly in relation to the more remote villages. Goats need to be better targeted at the poorest, and there are traditional ways of doing this (*Ewoloto*) that could be built on. If better implemented, bull improvement should be effective. PFS need clearer technical focus and CAHWs need further coaching in technical and business skills.

### 1.4 Result 2: Diversified and secure income

Main interventions include support to forming saving and loan groups (VICOBAs), district business strategies, support services, advocacy and training for business development, vocational training for youth and the provision of four different levels of loan product delivered through a variety of local partners.

The VICOBAs have achieved significant scale with over 3,000 members, involving perhaps 20-30% of target households; they deliver saving opportunities, stimulate micro-business activity (mainly petty-trading) and provide a wide range of other social benefits. It is important to ensure the VICOBA groups include the poorer households and that the poor get access to the capital injection benefits. It should also be possible to make VICOBA mentoring more sustainable. Overall VICOBAs are likely to make a significant contribution to the MB objective.

The other income supporting activities of Maisha Bora have been insufficiently focused on the key livestock and staple food value chains that underpin the programme logic: higher and resilient livestock production → increased income → more nutrition and health expenditure → better health. The lack of value chain analysis was noted in the previous Trias/BFFS programme in the same area. Only recently has the programme started to focus on existing individual livestock traders. The four finance products are just being rolled-out after significant delays; they need increased focus to support the above programme logic. The scope of other small income generating initiatives, while often beneficial to the participants, will have limited influence on programme level food security objectives. If strategically targeted, district business strategies and cross-border market advocacy will contribute to the overall MB objective.

### **1.5 Result 3: Intervention – Diversified diet, WASH and HIV behaviour change**

Learning on nutrition, WASH and HIV is delivered by 156 community based outreach workers, who receive a small stipend to visit and train neighbours and support other learning opportunities, like an annual nutrition survey. There is support to school WASH facilities, vegetable/fruit gardening, school nutrition/WASH clubs, inter-school competitions and use of vegetables in school feeding. There is also support for community kitchen gardens, although these are constrained by water availability.

It is clear that that some diet/WASH learning is happening in the community and in schools with some behaviour change adoption, particularly in relation to vegetable cooking and feeding eggs to children. However, it is difficult to judge whether the learning and adoption coverage is at sufficient scale to achieve the MB objective. This requires a clear, culturally attuned, focus on priority behaviour changes expected and monitoring of the scale of learning coverage and level of adoption. Overall the work in schools appears successful.

### **1.6 Result 4: Coordination and implementation efficiency**

The 'one programme - many partner' design of MB is considered appropriate for a complex, multi discipline programme. The added value of different local and international partners varies from excellent to adequate (with one poor). The contracting model used, with individual contracts between international partners and BFFS, combined with the additional complexity of the 15% partner contributions, does severely limit the overall programme flexibility, including the opportunity to change component expenditure in relation to findings from the MTR. It may also increase management costs.

Overall, coordination was considered good. There is good collaboration between different MB partners and there is room for this synergy to develop further. Steering committee meetings are clearly documented and appear effective. Relationships with district councils are good and deliver positive outcomes, and the role of the focal points has developed very effectively, with them playing a useful communication, monitoring and problem-solving role. Village level coordination is variable, with good involvement of VEOs and village council chairpersons, but mixed involvement of MB committees.

Some of the interventions are being implemented in ways that fail to maximise their contribution to the MB programme level objectives Increased focus and coherence is needed to align outputs with a more explicit programme logic or ToC The role of BTC needs to evolve to drive this focus.

## 1.7 Cross-cutting issues

**Gender and inclusivity** – women’s involvement in MB activities is high. However, there is limited knowledge about strategic gender priorities which could help inform a transformative gender strategy. More thought is needed about mainstreaming youth into the programme.

**Targeting the poorer 40%** - this needs to be made a more integral part of the implementation of some of MB interventions.

**Environment** – there are opportunities for more explicit environmental protection measures and mainstreaming ‘sustainable intensification’ opportunities with synergy across interventions.

**Drought Risk Reduction Planning** – although implicit in many activities, there are opportunities for making it more explicit and mainstreamed.

**Monitoring** – there is a good baseline and considerable data is being collected, with opportunities for simplifying and SMARTening the monitoring matrix with a focus on outcomes.

## 1.8 Conclusions

Despite a slow start, significant progress is now being made across all four result areas in what is an innovative and complex programme. Achieving the programme objectives in the two years will need improved focus, scale and coherence. Interventions like goats, chickens and VICOBAs need to be focussed on the less food secure households to deliver the food security objectives. There needs to be a focus on the crucial livestock and food value chains to increase food purchasing power. Nutrition education needs focus and scale to deliver behaviour change at the level needed to deliver the expected health objectives. Major recommendations to achieve this are:

1. The ‘multi-partner, one programme’ approach, with potential for synergy between various components, is appropriate to achieving the overall objective. If the recommendations in this review are implemented, the overall impact should be satisfactory. The limited time remaining is a major challenge and an extension beyond 2020 would increase impact<sup>1</sup>. To drive the increased focus, scale and coherence needed to deliver maximum results, BTC needs a challenge and leadership function, in addition to their coordination role.
2. Although wealth differentiation was identified in the baseline survey and in the logframe objectives, this was not brought forward into strategic decisions about who to target in critical wealth building components (especially when forming groups). This needs to be addressed in the final two years in relation to livestock distribution, VICOBAs inclusivity and targeting of microfinance product one.
3. Several components need to become much more specific about the priority behaviour change/adoption they are trying to encourage. This needs to be based on their understanding of existing Maasai culture and practice, combined with a technical analysis of priority behaviour change objectives. This includes the nutrition/WASH/HIV messaging, the PFS messaging in relation to chickens, goats and improved bulls, and possible interventions across components on sustainable

---

<sup>1</sup> MB was conceived as a two phase intervention, its current cut-back to a single 5 year phase will limit its impact

intensification of livestock. There also needs to be focus on, and real-time monitoring of the scale of adoption needed to achieve the MB objectives.

4. There are various interesting existing strands of work, such as, business development and microfinance support, business advocacy and district business strategies which should be more clearly clear focussed on the role of business in achieving food and livelihood security for the poorest 40%. While diversification will have a role, the food security driver for the vast majority of households will be livestock sales and the terms of this trade with food/maize purchase. This should be linked to DRR planning to prevent these terms of trade deteriorating excessively in times of drought.
5. Although the implementation has been through international and local NGOs, there has been extremely positive involvement and contribution to problem solving by different levels of the Tanzanian Government. This relationship can be built on further in the next two years and serve as a model for other programmes.

## 1.9 Main Recommendations

Responsible	Recommendation
SC, BTC	Increase the focus and coherence of various MB interventions in line with the recommendations in this review. This may involve developing a more explicit ToC (or other tool), and, in agreement with other partners, developing the BTC coordination role to have a stronger challenge and focussing role.
VsF-B, Heifer	Target poorer households (poorer 25-40%) for future goat and chicken <sup>2</sup> distribution, including the 'passing on the gift' recipients.
Trias	Ensure VICOBAs are accessible to the poorer and target them for microfinance product 1 once their financial management capacity is proven.
WFP, Childreach	Prioritise a small number of achievable and culturally attuned nutrition/WASH/HIV behaviour changes that build on existing knowledge, attitude and practice. Ensure outreach workers focus on these priorities and monitor coverage and adoption to ensure targets are reached
Trias	Increase the strategic focus of the income component on improving the efficiency and resilience of the livestock and food value chains. Monitor the terms and volume of trade between livestock sales and food purchase.

<sup>2</sup> Only when an appropriate model for individual chicken ownership by the poor is proven