



International Crop Research Institute for the Semi-Arid Tropics
Patancheru 502324, Hyderabad, Telangana, India
Kenya, Mozambique, Ethiopia, Zimbabwe

Improved Livelihoods through sustainable intensification and diversification of market oriented crop-livestock systems in southern Malawi – FIDP II



3rd Innovation platform meeting

Report

Balaka District

Zuc Lodge

29 October 2019

Introduction

29 October 2019 at Zuc lodge

Participants included 9 goat farmers (4 men, 5 women) from the CLIMM project as well as 3 representatives from the local care groups. Also present were private sector (2 goat traders and 5 butchers), and 10 government support services from crops, livestock, agri-business and nutrition committee. Present were also the DAHLDO, ABO and AEDC from Thyolo district.

Feedback from goat sale demonstration – Ken Gunsalu

Steps

1. Invite farmers and buyers of goats to express their lessons from the demonstration sale. How does goat quality help to improve the market system?

Results

Farmers and buyers explained as follows:

- When farmers brought quality goats, more traders were bidding. This translates to good quality determines higher prices (trader).
- The scale worked to our advantage, as we knew the weight of the live goat. The explanation given on live weight and carcass weight, helped to determine prices (farmer).
- We were also able to know the weight and calculate the amount of money we can have after slaughter – we knew the live weight and calculated the amount of money from the meat (butcher).
- There is need to educate farmers on the weights, so that they can calculate live weight against carcass weight, as they charge prices for live weight. Mostly yesterday, if their goat weighed 23 kg, they priced the goat at 22 k MK. From both sides, the scale is advantageous (butcher).
- Farmers and butchers need to understand each other on live weight and carcass weight (farmer).
- We need practical demonstrations of butchers to weigh the live and carcass weight of the goats (farmer).

The discussions contributed to building good relations between farmers and buyers. The auction sales with a scale help to get to a win-win situation for farmers and buyers. We had identified the lack of quality based payment as a knowledge gap. When introducing the scale, we saw that there is need for farmers understanding live weight and dressed weight.

Plenary: Recap CLIM project progress, implications for project implementation – Ken Gunsalu

Steps

1. Ask everyone to write down own perceptions on the questions below, three cards for each
2. Facilitator and team collect cards and cluster them.

3. Add the key points and how they influence market and technology uptake to the diagram – at the begin of the afternoon session

Questions

- Where has CLIM² contributed to improved your situation?
- Where has your situation not yet been sufficiently improved, hindering your progress?

Results

Table 1. Achievements and areas for improvement as prioritized by IP meeting participants.

ACHIEVEMENTS	n	WHERE TO IMPROVE	n
Access to quality goat win-win/trust/open market	12	Education on livestock pricing vs scales and market knowledge	13
Access to knowledge and equipment provided to butcher man's/traders/farmers business operation dynamics	8	Provide goat feeding and management education for quality meat	11
Connecting farmers/buyers and sellers	5	Access to weighing scales in remote local trading centers	9
Access to knowledge of locally available feed	5	Increase covering area of impact/participants	7
Access to improved legume crop seed/chicken	3	Slow progress on CLIMM goat market/containers	6
Farmers increased income from auction sales	2	Access to improved goat breed	5
Access to quality meat food	1	Improve frequency of goat IP training per year	5
Access to livestock manure	1	Access to loan for trades/butcher man to increase capital	3
Improved daily livelihood	1	Encourage livestock eating at household level	1
Farmers voicing out platform	1	Timely crop seed distribution	

Group 1. Income and nutrition outcomes - Claire

Participants: Important to have farmer group and care group members

Objective: To illustrate current dietary patterns for different types of consumers, what influences their dietary choices, how do goats contribute to nutrition outcomes, and what would need to change for goats to contribute more substantially to rural diets, indicators that inform about impacts of market oriented crop livestock integration on income and nutrition synergies or trade-offs

Steps:

1. Distinguish farmers according to having more or fewer goats and care group membership – all along to find out if there are differences in farmer groups on delivery of nutrition and income outcomes, how we can incorporate that in our out reach
2. What is a good healthy diet for you?
3. Has the production of goats improved your diet? How
4. Has the income from goat sales improved your diet? How
5. Has your access to nutrition related information changed? How
6. Synergies income - nutrition:
 - a. Will you chose to increase your income from milk sales more than consuming more milk, or will you consider consuming more milk rather than increasing your income from milk? Yes/No - Explain. TRANSCRIBING FARMERS RESPONSES IS IMPORTANT
 - b. Will increasing income from other sources lead you to consume more milk? Yes/No - Explain. TRANSCRIBING FARMERS RESPONSES IS IMPORTANT
7. How does crop livestock integration support income and nutrition outcomes – individual assessment of farmers perceptions on crop livestock linkages, nutrition and income outcomes

Results

What is a good healthy diet for you?

Both groups had similar understanding of a healthy diet; and both facing challenges to access adequate fruits and protein foods.

Group: Goat farmers

- 50% Starch - maize, sweet potatoe, rice, cassava
- 15% Vegetables – various indigenous, rape, black jack, pumpkin leaves
- 15% Oil –cooking oil, groundnuts, milk
- 10% Legumes – pigeon pea, cowpea, beans, Bambara nuts
- 5% Protein – eggs, fish, grasshopper, meat, mice
- 5% Fruits - bananas, mangoes, baobab, indigenous, massawu

Manage per day: We eat starch, oils, vegetables, legumes. Scarce are meat and fruits.

Group: Care group

- 60% Starch, sweet potatoe, cassava, maize
- 15% Legumes – indigenous, pigeon pea, cowpea
- 10% Vegetables – black jack, rape, indigenous
- 5% Protein – grass hopper, mice, crickets, eggs
- 5% Oil – cooking oil, groundnuts, sunflower
- 5% Fruits –mango, guava, massawu

Manage per day: Mostly starch, cooking oil, legumes self-cultivated, vegetables from home gardens, seasonal fruits, most scarce are meat products.

Meat requires money, this is scarce. People don't keep small stock, we rarely slaughter them. We prefer to sell the animals to buy other foods or items. We eat may meat may be once a month. We rather sell the animals to buy staples if we are short of them.

Milk is available. But we end up not drinking it. The costs attached to it are high. Farmers have cows and goats, but don't milk. We would need to feed them to produce extra feed; they only have enough milk for the calves.

Has the production of goat meat improved your diet? Has the income from goat sales improved your diet? How?

Goat production improves nutrition and food security. Due to scarcity of fertilizer, we mix manure and apply to crops. The availability of goats has increased and that increases crop production. About 60% of farmers don't use manure, those who use manure can harvest something, as it captured soil moisture. Everyone can use manure.

We also increase vegetables production through manure. We also keep the goats for sale and can buy other food items. Livestock keeping is not seasonal, you can sell it any time, as compared to crop production that is seasonal.

Has your access to nutrition related information changed? How?

Generally we have better access to nutrition information. We get most information from extension and NGOs. UP, World Vision, Find your feet.

Synergies income - nutrition:

We chose to sell the goat to buy a kg of meat, and use the other income to buy other items. With higher income, we will eat more goat meat, as affordability is our main constraint. It also depends on availability of butcher men. If they are far we cannot access the meat.

How does crop livestock integration support income and nutrition outcomes

Table 2.a Farmer perceived links between crop livestock integration and nutrition and income outcomes (n=3)

	Expansion of legumes	Improved soil fertility	More biomass for feed	Better quality feed	More manure	Higher consumption of high	Higher consumption of high	More income to
--	----------------------	-------------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	-------------	----------------------------	----------------------------	----------------

of high value protein from crops		
Higher consumption of high value protein from livestock		1
More income that can be reinvested in the farm		

Farmers and CARE group members both responded that there is an important linkage between the production of more legumes and improvement in soil fertility. In terms of livestock feeding, they saw a relationship between production of more legumes, improved soil fertility, more biomass for livestock feeding, better quality feed and more manure. Farmers understood that legumes contribute to the fixation of nitrogen in the soil which leads to more yields for their crops. They also understood that more biomass from legumes provide good quality feed for livestock which in return provides more quality manure for their crop fields which results in improved crop yields. They did not see a relation between nutrition and income. Goat farmers prioritised income over slaughtering goats for home consumption. They mentioned that income from the sale of their goats can be used to purchase other affordable sources of protein for example small dry fish or eggs and the rest of the money used to carter for other household needs, also crop or livestock or inputs.

Group 2. Value addition analyses – Madalitso Mgombe

Participants: Important to have private sector representatives – plus farmers and extension

Facilitator appoints documenter, who also takes notes

Objective: Value addition and distribution of margin analyses, for the most relevant channels, considering quality, quantity and timing requirements, to determine cost effective interventions that support smallholder farmers to benefit in the value chain.

Steps:

1. Which channels would create favourable conditions for farmers and other actors (minimizing transaction costs, implying higher prices for farmers, lower prices for consumers)
 - a. What are the barriers for farmers to participate in these particular channels?
2. What are the revenues and activities and how can they be costed, and what are the product prices at which they can be supplied to consumers? Making the product cheaper to consumers might encourage higher purchases...
3. What cooperation would be helpful to reduce those costs (aggregation, price negotiation upfront, e.g. farmers and consumers agree on prices better for them and organize themselves to transport costs) – Highlight that the consumer has the funds to keep the value chain functional
4. Visualize important costs and value added for the main channels, current and improved, in a diagram (cost/unit). Show by adding real figures.

5. Derive clear messages what channels and options are most cost effective, profitable and realistic, comparing farmer and consumer prices.
6. How does seasonality influence this?

Results

Through all gross margin calculations the different actors arrived at the conclusion that the auction system brings out higher gross margins to them, win-win situation.

- GM at farmgate: Farmers 170,000 MK, trader 48,000 MK.
- GM at auction: Farmers 458,000 MK, trader 144,000 MK.

Farmers, by taking improved goats to the auction, would sell at higher price, with small increase in feed and other costs. The goat that is being taken to the auction must be a healthy and well grown goat.

Traders, when changing from farm gate to auction get 96,000 MK more income per year.

When butchers switch from farmgate and trader to auction they increase their gross margins by 32,000 MK per year, as they would buy quality goats at the auction, with more meat per goat, as when buying from farm gate or traders. They would buy quality goats, at reduced transport costs, and reduced time and money as if they would collect the goats from the farm gates. There would also be less theft, as permits can be concentrated. Farmers would move less, first they would have to get letter from chief, and those buyers moving the goats also would need a permit.

For this market to work, all actors need to buy in. The demonstrations and gross margins illustrate the potential for win-win situations. We need to work with the local government committees, to be aware of this development.

Table 3. Gross margin analyses for value addition in goat value chains

Farmgate sales					Auction sales				
Farmer	Item	N Per year	Unit price (MK)	Total cost (MK)	Farmer	Item	N Per year	Unit price (MK)	Total cost (MK)
Revenue	Live goats (large)	12	20,000	240,000	Revenue	Live goats (large)	24	30,000.00	720,000
	Live goats (small)	12	12,000	144,000					
Total revenue				384,000	Total revenue				
Costs	Herdsman	1		57,000	Costs	Herdsman	1		57,000
	Drugs	8,000	200	28,000		Drugs	8,000	200	28,000
	Supplementary feed	24		108,000		Supplementary feed	24		116,000
	Salt	24		3,000		Salt	24		3,000
	Khola maintenance	1		8,000		Khola maintenance	1		8,000
	Paying fines	1		10,000		Paying fines	1		10,000
Total costs				214,000	Total costs				262,000
Gross margin				170,000	Gross margin				458,000
Trader	Item	N Per year	Unit price (MK)	Total cost (MK)	Trader	Item	N Per year	Unit price (MK)	Total cost (MK)
Revenue	Live goats (large)	24	24,000	576,000	Revenue	Live goats (large)	24	28,000	672,000
Costs	Goat purchases	24	20,000	480,000	Costs	Goat purchases	24	20,000	480,000
	Transport	24	1,000	24,000		Transport	24	1,000	24,000
	Livestock travel permits	24	500	12,000		Livestock travel permits	24	500	12,000
	Supplementary feed	24	500	12,000		Supplementary feed	24	500	12,000
Total costs				528,000	Total costs				528,000
Gross margin				48,000	Gross margin				144,000
Butcher	Item	N per year	Unit price (MK)	Total cost (MK)					
Revenue	Goat meat sales	96	24,000	2,304,000					
	Off-fall	96	3,600	345,600					
	Head	96	1,000	96,000					
	Skin	96	200	19,200					
Total revenue				2,764,800					
Costs	Goat purchases	96	20,000	1,920,000					
	Transport	96	1,500	144,000					
	Yearly tax sheikh	1		2,000					
	sheikh	96	100	9,600					
	Dressing	96	1,000	96,000					
	Plastic bags	96	200	19,200					
	Council Fee	96	500	48,000					
Total costs				2,238,800					
Gross margin				526,000					

Group 3. Marketing strategy – Chamuka Thebulo

Participants: Important to have farmers and private sector representatives, women and youth

Facilitator appoints documenter, who also takes notes

Objective: Marketing strategy for smallholder farmer inclusion in livestock-based agri-food value chains – Structured sales around most promising channels (include preferential agreements, feed and livestock outputs)

Steps:

1. Agree on a goal on dairy for income and nutrition – How many dairy to sell/eat by what time
2. What are the 2 most relevant channels for dairy each, by type of products and requirements, end market (rural/urban), and type of production system (individual farmer, SME, commercial/local inputs) – check with channels identified by gross value addition analyses group
 - Advantages
 - Disadvantages
3. What do farmers need to do to fulfil requirements in these channels (Volumes, quality, timing)
 - Market requirements, social and quality standards
 - Coordination of production and marketing, relationships among farmers and with other actors, potential for value addition
 - Aggregation to reduce transport costs, mobilizing more farmers for volume, building relations among actors
 - Price mechanisms (time of payments, quality grades, deal with losses)
 - Financial support
4. Why are those items not being implemented? Discuss 3 major issues
5. What type of support services are required – who has capacity to provide that (vaccination, credit, insurance)
6. Mechanisms for accountability, feedback, gender inclusion

Results

Goal

- To identify marketing strategy for smallholder farmer inclusion in livestock-based agri-food value chains-structured sales around most promising channels.

The group had three actors in the goat value chain namely

- Farmer, 2 (1M, 1F)
- Trader, 1M
- Butcher, 1 M

The actors agreed that their goal is to sell live goats and goat meat and each actor stipulated their vision as follows:

- Farmers' vision is to sell 15 goats in a year per farmer

- Traders vision is to sell 1040 goats in a year per trader
- Butchers vision is to sell 728 goats in a year per butcher

It was emphasized to farmers that by looking at the vision of the traders and butcher men, it shows that there is a great demand for goats and what farmers need to do is to produce quality goats which can fetch a higher prices.

The group discussed 7 channels which move goat products from producers to end user. The group selected the 2 most relevant channels.

1. **Farmer-----trader-----butcher-----end user**
2. **Farmer-----butcher-----end user**
3. Farmer-----vendor-----end user
4. Farmer-----trader-----farmer
5. Farmer-----farmer
6. Farmer-----NGO-----farmer
7. Farmer-----end user

The group then identified advantages and disadvantages of these 2 most relevant channels; what farmers need doing, why not implemented, what support required and mechanism of accountability, feedback and gender inclusion (Table 4a).

Members agreed that the trader should not be eliminated in the auction market model, as it presents a parallel market, in which the trader will also participate only that farmers will have a choice in selling to different buyers, as farmers and buyers will sell quality meat, for which the consumer will pay.

We saw that tethered goats were of less quality than the free ranging goats. Farmers have different harvesting periods, when maize is harvested, pigeon peas are still in the field. Bylaws on movement and grazing are set in villages to protect crops and boreholes. The best way is to have a herder for livestock. This is based on village consensus. All farmers must ensure that livestock is well looked after.

Table 4.a Characterizing channel 1: Farmer-trader-butcherman-end user

Advantages	Disadvantages	What needs doing	Why not implemented	What support required	Accountability, feedback, gender?
Reliable and readily available market	Goats sold at low price coz trader has no competitor	Establish goat markets	Lack of organization/linkage between farmers, buyers, govt extension	Organization and linkages	Govt
Time saving	Promotes theft of goats	Community policing	Lack of self-organization	Commitment	Farmers, buyers
Discount is easy	Trader has no wide choice of quality goats	Farmers to follow good management practices	Laws and regulations that inhibit goat farming	Creating value chain enabling laws	Local govt, chiefs
Source of employment	Searching for goats is time consuming	Establish markets	Unavailability of feed/fodder	Feed/fodder preservation	Farmers
Cash basis	End user buys at high price coz of length of channel	Shorten the channel	Diseases	Provision of drug boxes in groups or households.	Group leaders
			Lack of markets	Establish markets	Farmer organizations, government and project staff

Table 4.b Characterizing channel 2: Farmer-butcherman-end user

Advantages	Disadvantages	What needs doing	Why not implemented	What support required	Accountability, feedback, gender?
Butcher man and farmer gain more income.	Eliminates trader	Establish goat markets	Lack of organization/linkage between farmers, buyers, govt extension	Organization and linkages	Govt
Quality control, butcher man buys quality goats	Promotes theft of goats	Community policing	Lack of self-organization	commitment	Farmers, buyers
Reliable and readily available market	Butcher has no wide choice of quality goats	Farmers to follow good management practices	Laws and regulations that inhibit goat farming	Creating value chain enabling laws	Local govt, chiefs
Time saving	Searching for goats is time consuming		Unavailability of feed/fodder	Feed/fodder preservation	Farmers
Money saving	End user buys at high price coz of length of channel		Diseases	Provision of drug boxes in groups or households.	Group leaders
Cash basis			Lack of markets	Establish markets	Farmer organizations, government and project staff

Group 4. Policy analyses – Thabani Dube

Participants: Important to private sector and extension

Objective: Policy gaps (constraining vs facilitating policies) and power structures that need to be addressed to support smallholder farmer based dairy value chains, income and nutrition outcomes

Steps:

1. Do you see unfair competition (favouring large scale commercial), exclusion (allocation of funds to other commodities) of smallholder farmers from dairy value chains ?
 - a. If yes, explain.
2. To increase farmers inclusion and competitiveness in dairy value chains, list what policies / rules in terms of production, food safety, storage and processing, transport, marketing and gender inclusion are
 - a. enabling,
 - b. barriers,
 - c. existing but not implemented
 - d. missing
3. What policy measures need to be in place to change towards enhancing smallholder inclusion and competitiveness?
 - a. improved market access
 - b. improved value addition/competitiveness
4. What activities do you need to engage in to influence those policy changes and what capacity do you require to implement that?
5. What levels to engage to address that, how?

Results

Do you see unfair competition (favouring large scale commercial), exclusion (allocation of funds to other commodities) of smallholder farmers from goat value chain? If yes, explain.

- Goat production is almost exclusively in the smallholder sector, and do not yet have competition through large scale commercial farmers. Commercial producers of goat tend to be involved in breeding programmes and supply high end markets. High-end markets seem not a threat to smallholder farmers. Goats are important for smallholder farmers to generate income, and the demand for goat meat is high.
- Goats while they are high priority for Balaka district, they fall lowest on the priority list in terms of government support, relative to other commodities in the agricultural sector. Crops such as maize and tobacco and other livestock commodities such as poultry and dairy received relatively higher levels of support from government.
- Government support in some instances is not direct but through development agencies, who design intervention based on government priorities.
- For example, the Nutrition Policy, is implementing the Integrated Homestead Farming (IHF) programme in which small livestock production is being promoted. Under the IHF, poultry seems to be the livestock that is being widely promoted. This is an

opportunity for promoting goats under well-structured running government programme.

- The schemes, targeting goat production include the goat pass-on scheme, which is aimed broadening the ownership of goats in the country.
- As a result, smallholders don't benefit adequately from the value chain, one of the main causes is their lack of knowledge.

To increase farmers inclusion and competitiveness in goat value chains, list what policies / rules in terms of production, food safety, storage and processing, transport, marketing and gender inclusion are:

- a. enabling,
 - b. barriers,
 - c. existing but not implemented
 - d. missing
- Smallholder farmers are participating in the production of goats and no other value addition activities such as processing, transport and storage.
 - There is no policy that restricts farmers from being involved in goat meat processing and marketing.
 - The failure of smallholder farmers to be involved in other activities post-farm, is largely due to the fact that, unlike other livestock producers, goat farmers are not organised. For them to take advantage of any program is difficult. Interventions must provide incentives for farmers to organize themselves, e.g. around market events.
 - The policy instruments in the livestock are on paper good, but not followed or implemented on the ground. It is the desire of government to increase household goat holding in the country to enhance their resilience, income and nutrition.
 - For example, some measures meant to curb stock theft are through the livestock movement permit. Despite the ever presence of police on the road, these are often not enforced.
 - The Malawi Bureau of Standards is involved at higher levels of the value chain. Their role is not only regulatory but also capacity building. The department of livestock and the health environment department are responsible for supervising the slaughter of goats at local level, and as institution involved to support organised farmers once they decide to venture into processing.
 - There exists a strong economic relationship between crop production and goat production. Goat production supports crop production, through provision of financial resources for the purchase of the crop inputs such as fertiliser. In addition, income from goat sales is used to pay for school fees, transport, buy food and other household emergencies. Goats are therefore an important sub-sector needs special attention.
 - The release of fertiliser coupons in the market is associated with the flooding of the goat market, which leads to depressed prices of the goats. In a way, because of both lack of planning on the part of the farmers, there is need for government to protect the farmers from low prices induced by a government programme.
 - Because, there is no goat marketing policy in the country, the trading of goats is not monitored, with farmers interacting with traders. This exposes farmers to

unfair terms of trade as most of the transaction occur at household level, where there is no arbiter and power dynamic favour the trader.

- Pricing guidelines for livestock, including goats, said to exist but not implemented.

What policy measures need to be in place to change towards enhancing smallholder inclusion and competitiveness?

- a. improved market access
 - b. improved value addition/competitiveness
- The market for goat meat is large, with goat meat consumption popular both within local markets and distant urban centres.
 - However, farmers are not aware of the extent of the market as they are restricted to dealing with traders. Farmers are mainly selling through their goats through one channel, that is through the trader. As a result, their understanding of the market is what they get from the trader.
 - To open up new market channels, market infrastructure will need to be developed with many buyers allowed to interface with producers. A conducive environment will need to be created that will attract even the high-end market.
 - The role of government in this regard will be two fold, to facilitate interactions
 - i. Build appropriate market infrastructure or provide incentives to private sector players to build, operate the market – in a way that it attracts multiple buyers.
 - ii. Support farmers to understand quality criteria and produce quality animals, and subsidise inputs for goats (feed and veterinary drugs).
 - With a well operating market system, government role could be provision of information and guideline on pricing of different grades.
 - To promote the formation of organised groups of farmers, government can provide incentives that are only accessible to farmers in organised grouping
 - Control of imports of goat, particularly by end market through promoting buy-in-Malawi initiatives.

What activities do you need to engage in to influence those policy changes and what capacity do you require to implement that?

- Platforms for other livestock, such as dairy (bulk groups), poultry prices (large scale) exist, through which they lobby government for favourable policies, such as subsidised stock feed.
- Goat stakeholders will need to be organised first to influence any policy changes.

Closure and final words

Buyer

We achieved most of what we had planned for this meeting. The project now bearing the fruits that we were expecting. The facilities, the markets established, are not for the project, but for the farmers, to fully participate.

Agri-Business officer

According to how we moved from yesterday, some activities need to be done by different people, government, farmers project. We also looked at policies that need to support the value chain.

Synthesis

1. Farmers cannot afford to eat goats, even though they are aware of the benefits.
2. In comparison to other livestock commodities, goat farmers are less organized. They are not aware of the demand for goats and meat quality at domestic markets.
3. A mechanism is required that supports farmers to organize the aggregation of quality goats.
4. Creating parallel channels through the auction model can translate quality meat to consumers, with benefits along the entire value chain

Table 5. Entry points for the CLIMM project

Nutrition	Value addition / market linkages	Policy
Promote messages on goat feeding and meat for nutrition through DEC, DAEC, DNCC and care groups	Outreach for goat quality meat markets at DAEC, DEC, DC councillor – brief about quality goat market options, seek support, also for higher level dialogue	Prioritize goat production and marketing in policy setting and implementation
	Capacity development for farmers and buyers on meat quality and prices through practical demonstrations	Facilitating policies that encourage farmers to organize around goats markets
	Goat auction as new decentralized market model for quality goat meat, at about 2 sites per EPA, all project sites, during peak market periods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Launch and facilitate setting up the market points (demonstrations, scale, documentation) • Role of the auctioneer 	Include goats in nutrition policies
	Complete the goat business model for prototyping, mentoring	Propose the goat quality market demonstration as new extension tool

Annex 1. Programs

Monday, 27.10.2019

Goat sale demonstration

Time	Action items	Lead
8.00 - 8.30	Official opening and introductions Objectives of goat sales demonstration CLIM ² contribution to the district Experience with CLIM ²	DADO Sabine Homann-Kee Tui DPD Butcher association
8.30 – 9.00	Goat quality demonstrations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Farmer perceptions (n=2) ○ Buyer requirements (n=2) 	DAHEDO/AVO
9.00-9.30	Health break	
9.30- 12.00	Goat sales: Farmer expectations, buyers willingness to pay <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Facilitate negotiations between buyer and seller – how can they get to win-win ○ Capacitate participants in the process, on discussion, negotiation, trust building, build relationships 	DAHEDO/AVO Temwa Mvula
12.00 -14.00	Observations and feedback, by sellers, buyers and observers <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Buyers – purpose of buying? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quality vs other criteria ○ Sellers – purpose of selling? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Food, inputs, school, etc ○ How satisfied were buyers and sellers with what they got? ○ How useful is the market model to support those purposes? ○ How can this inform refinement of goat sales model, and link to other activities ○ What are social dynamics, power in negotiation we need to consider? ○ How will this inform CLIM² interventions, and how markets are to be structured to support buyers and sellers/ needs? 	Chamuka Thebulo Temwa Mvula
14.00	Closure of the demonstration Lunch	

Tuesday, 28.10.2019

Balaka IP- meeting

Time	Action items	Lead
9.00 - 9.30	Official opening Opening and agenda	District official Sabine Homann-Kee Tui
9.30 – 10.00	Recap on CLIM project progress, implications for project implementation	Chamuka Thebulo Claire Mwamadi
10.00-10.30	Health break	
10.30- 13.00	Group work – with mixed disciplines 1. Marketing strategy 2. Value chain analyses 3. Income and nutrition outcomes 4. Policy analyses	Chamuka Thebulo ABO Sabine Homann-Kee Tui Thabani Dube
13.00 -14.00	Lunch	
14.00 - 16.00	Plenary – 30 minutes per group 1. Gap filling 2. Next steps: networking, operations	Chamuka Thebulo Claire Mwamdi
16.00	Closure of the meeting Works of thanks	District official

Annex 2. Participants list

Balaka goat sales demonstration

No	Name	Gender	Organization	Telephone	Email
1	Gilbert Freza	M	Phalula	0999385625	-
2	Milias Kawozela	M	Phimbi	0996513157	-
3	Chikondi Timothy	M	Phalula	0992703042	-
4	Foster Chauluka	M	Phalula	0995243338	-
5	Ronard Duwa	M	Phalula	0884030069	-
6	Wilisoni Kachere	M	Phalula	099211271	-
7	Wile Tchukambi	M	Phalula	-	-
8	Fanuel Moyo	M	Phalula	0998276626	-
9	Samuel Banda	M	Phalula	0997798363	-
10	Flossy Chimenya	F	Goat farmer	0998113734	-
11	Tiwonge Katelera	F	Nutrition promoter	0992259483	-
12	Ireen Chaoneka	F	Goat farmer	099590026	-
13	Anne Masiku	F	Nutrition promoter	0880153946	-
14	Sofia Harry	F	Farmer	-	-
15	Hilda Jimu	F	Goat farmer	0995779935	-
16	Mary Mathuwa	F	Farmer	0882940261	-
17	Ali Masaka	F	Farmer	-	-
18	Dolesi Thembakoko	F	Farmer	0886023049	-
19	Mikayele Sambani	F	Farmer	-	-
20	Brenda Khaneta	F	Farmer	0993942418	-
21	Cecilia Chilombo	F	Farmer	0993128147	-
22	Emilida Kasiya	F	Farmer	0995514997	-
23	Francis Nthalika	M	Balaka DHO	0881 852 073	Francisnthalika1@gmail.com
24	James Makwito	M	AVO Phalula	0999910851	-
25	Thokozani Luhanga	M	BLK DAO	0884380820	-
26	Thabani Dube	M	ICRISAT-ZIM	+263772514397	T.Dube@cgiar.org
27	Henry Ndemanje	M	Butcherman Thyolo	0888770464	-
28	Willard Bottoman	M	Butcherman Thyolo	0886377996	-
29	Frank Matchado	M	CLIMM -CZ	0884571846	matchadofrank@yahoo.com
30	Ken Gunsalu	M	DFC/CLIMM	0884569980	gunsaluken@yahoo.com
31	Hosea Katete	M	BLK DAO	0885875754	hoseakatete@gmail.com
32	Fraiser Jentala	M	Thyolo DAO	0884542961	fjentala@gmail.com
33	Julius Joseph	M	Balaka DAO	0888760062	juliusjoseph@gmail.com
34	McKinley Gubuduza	M	Thyolo DAO	0888486845	
35	Grevazio Tsirani	M	Balaka Trade	0999602424	hwachiwiri@gmail.com
36	Davie Ziyadi	M	BDC Planning	0884855667	
37	Claire Mwamadi	F	SSLPP	0996970282	claire@smallscalelivestock.org
38	James Chando	M	Trader	0881030457	
39	Eliya Maganga	M	Farmer	0995625211	
40	Patrick Yoyola	M	Farmer	0881678443	

41	Leston Chambo	M	Farmer	09993923409	
42	Mackfale Kasono	M	Butchery	0882992420	
43	Richard Koloko	M	Butchery	0997221429	
44	Charity Chikwiro	F	Farmer	0992245739	
45	Yankho mapeto	F	Farmer	-	-
46	Alesi Fonekesi	F	Farmer	0885962433	-
47	Mavuto	M	Farmer	0992809709	-
48	Anny Maloya	F	farmer	0993473732	-
49	Feston Goliath	M	Farmer	0998851389	-
50	Egily Paulo	F	Farmer	-	-
51	Ethers mapeto	F	Farmer	-	-
52	Eliya paulo	M	Farmer	-	-
53	Tonde sagona	M	Phalula	0884048545	-
54	Lovemore Kachingwe	M	Nyanyala	0997589754	-
55	Lameck Pilingu	M	Nyanyala	0885418882	-
56	Frank Chingwalu	M	Phalula	0995687382	-
57	Thomas Jackson	M	Utale	0882561627	-
58	Enesi Masho	F	Govati	0997902094	-
59	Annie Kamponda	F	Agriculture	0995747612	-
60	Mabvuto Kadyaulimbo	M	Agriculture	09992218078	-
61	Everson John	M	Utale	08887011191	-
62	Zefa Banda	M	Agriculture	0999375709	-
63	Yohane Missi	M	Utale mgomwa	0999323373	-
64	Donald Kaonga	M	Graduate fellow IRLI	0888366712	
65	Temwa Mvula	M	SSLLP	0999695693	temwaland@yahoo.com
66	Sabine Homann Kee Tui	F	ICRISAT-ZW		S.Homann@cgiar.org

Third IP meeting in Balaka

No	Name	Gender	Organization	Telephone	Email
1	James Chando	M	Trader BK	0881030457	-
2	Humphrey Savieri	M	Thyolo DAO	0999715401	Lsiavieri@gmail.com
3	Madalitso Mgombe	M	Balaka DAO	0999100565	mgombem@gmail.com
4	Willard Bottoman	M	Butcherman TO	0882495352	-
5	Mackfale Kasinja	M	Butcherman	0882992420	-
6	Gilbert Freza	M	Butcherman	0999385625	-
7	Frank Chinguluwe	M	Butcherman	0995687382	-
8	James Makwito	M	Phalula AVO	0999910851	-
9	Ireen Chaoneka	F	Farmer	0995960026	-
10	Eness Masho	F	Farmer Phalula	0997902094	-
11	Lameck pilingu	M	Phalula	08854118883	-
12	Evenson John	M	Utale	0886701192	-
13	Claire Mwamadi	F	SSLLP	996970282	claire@smallscalelivestock.org
14	Flossy Chimanya	F	Farmer	0998113734	-
15	Thomas Jakson	M	Care group	0882561627	-
16	Brenda Khaneta	F	Farmer	0993942418	-

17	Eliya Maganag	M	Farmer	0995625211	-
18	Tiwonge Katelera	F	Care group	0992259483	-
19	Annie masiku	F	Care group	0880153946	-
20	Ganizani lapozo	M	Trader	0997852727	-
21	Y Dauda	M	Agriculture	0999690255	-
22	Chamuka Thebulo	M	PM- ICRISAT/ILRI/SSLL P	0995797838	-
23	Henry Ndemanje	M	Butcherman Thyolo	0888770464	-
24	Hosea Katete	M	Balaka DAO	0885875754	hoseakatete@gmail.com
25	Donald Kaonga	M	ILRI graduate fellow	0888366712	ddamkaonga@yahoo.com
26	Lovemore Kachingwe	M	Phalula EPA	0997589754	-
27	Cecilia Chilombo	F	Utale EPA	0993128147	-
28	Temwa Mvuvu	M	DFC-SSLLP	0999695693	temwaland@yahoo.com
29	McKinley Gubuduza	M	Thyolo Agriculture	0888486845	-
30	Thokozani Luhanga	M	Balaka Agriculture	0884380820	-
31	Bexter Soko	M	Balaka Utale Agric	0999698246	-
32	Frank Matchado	M	Chiradzulu DFC	0884671846	matchadofrank@yahoo.com
33	Sarah Njilima	F	Balaka Utale	0995745338	-
34	Fraiser Jentala	M	Thyolo Agric	0884542961	fjentala@gmail.com
35	Francis Nthalika	M	Balaka DHO	0881852073	-
36	Thabani Dube	M	ICRISAT-ZIM	+26377251439 7	T.Dube@cgiar.org
37	Davie Ziyad	M	Balaka D council	0884855667	-
38	Sabine Homann	F	ICRISAT-ZIM	+26371262596 7	s.homann@cgiar.org

