Monitoring, Learning, and Evaluation Community of Practice



AVAVAVA

Sweetpotato Profit and Health Initiative

Meeting Report, ILRI Campus, Nairobi March 3-4, 2015 Compiled by Julius Okello and Norman Kwikiriza

Acronyms

- CHW Community Health workers
- CIP International Potato Center
- CoP Community of Practice
- CRP Community Resource Person
- CSPro Census and Survey Processing System
- DDS Dietary Diversity Score
- DVM Decentralized Vine Multipliers
- FARA Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa
- FCS Food Consumption Score
- FEW Field Extension Workers
- FGD Focus Group Discussion
- GPS Geographic Positioning System
- HKI Helen Keller International
- IFPRI International Food Policy Research Institute
- ILRI International Livestock Research Institute
- M&E Monitoring and Evaluation
- MD Mass Distribution
- MEAL Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning
- ODK Open Data Kit
- OFSP Orange-fleshed Sweetpotato
- SPHI Sweetpotato Profit and Health Initiative

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acronyms1
Background
1.Opening session: brief overview of the objectives of the Community of Practice - Julius Okello (CIP, Uganda)
2. Community of Practice: what it is, what it is not - Julius Okello (CIP, Uganda)
3.Experience in Mozambique with different monitoring tools and systems- Abdul Naico (CIP, Mozambique)
Monitoring experience by HarvestPlus in Uganda – Ignatius Abaijuka (HarvestPlus Uganda)6
5. Tools for vine dissemination – Julius Okello (CIP, Uganda)7
6. Why labelling plots and distributed vines is criticial- Jan Low (CIP, nairobi)8
7. Dietary diversity - Temesgen Bocher (CIP, Nairobi)8
8. Consumption of vitamin A rich foods – Jan Low (CIP, Nairobi)9
9. Household food insecurity access (HFIAS) - Norman Kwikiriza (CIP, Uganda)9
10. Introduction to open data kit – Luka Wanjohi (CIP, Nairobi)10
11. Wrap up of the COP meeting, way forward and closure12
Wrap up of the CoP Meeting – Julius Okello (CIP, Uganda), Temesgen Bocher (CIP, Nairobi), Jan Low (CIP, Nairobi)12
Way forward12
Closure of the meetings13
12. Results from the evaluation of the MEAL CoP meeting13
Annexes
Annex 1: Responses to evaluation questions16
Annex 2: Meeting Agenda17
Annex 3: List of Participants19

Background

The Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEAL) Community of Practice (CoP) met on 3-4 March at the ILRI Campus in Nairobi to share experiences, skills and lessons in monitoring and evaluation, and to identify ways of tackling challenges.

This CoP meeting was held under the umbrella of the Africa-wide Sweetpotato for Profit and Health Initiative (SPHI). SPHI is a 10-year initiative led by the International Potato Centre (CIP), and it is expected to improve the lives of 10 million households by 2020 in 17 target countries. Launched in 2009, the project had already reached over 1 million households by the end of December 2014. One of the key intervention areas is improving the sweetpotato value chain by researching and implementing actions that will remove bottlenecks related to processing, marketing and utilization of sweetpotato products. The overall objective continues to be to develop the essential capacities, products, and methods to reposition sweetpotato in food economies to alleviate poverty and under-nutrition in Africa.

During the different sessions, presentations and discussions aimed at sharing experiences in the way Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is done in different countries, organizations and projects that deal with sweetpotato. Presentations were also made on tools used by different countries and organizations to capture and analyze M&E data and their strengths and weaknesses. Methods for computing indicators of progress required by the projects and donors were discussed and illustrated. At the end of the meeting, participants made proposals and suggested action points to drive the MEAL CoP into the future.

1. Opening session: brief overview of the objectives of the Community of Practice - Julius Okello (CIP, Uganda)

The meeting was opened by Julius Okello, who gave a welcome address and requested participants to introduce themselves. After the introductions, he explained that the meeting would like to take a survey of each participant's background, their expectations of the meeting and their level of involvement in M&E in their organizations. Following the survey, Julius explained the purpose of the meeting and briefly outlined the agenda for the two-day meeting.

2. Community of Practice: what it is, what it is not - Julius Okello (CIP, Uganda)

In this presentation, Julius explained the meaning of a community of practice (CoP) and highlighted its importance. He defined the main purpose of the CoP, which is to share experiences, lessons and skills in monitoring and evaluation and to identify ways of tackling challenges. He emphasized that the MEAL CoP aims to accord its members the opportunity to "get better together" through shared learning and sharing of tacit knowledge, which would in turn enable them to develop innovative solutions to M&E challenges. Giving an example of an active CoP of which he's a member, he highlighted his own experiences of the benefits of belonging to a CoP.

During the discussions, the participants highlighted other existing CoPs. One example given was the Afrik4R, a CoP launched by the Africa Development Bank in 2012 to foster the sharing of information and knowledge on "managing for development results" and making countries more development result-oriented, among others. It was apparent that few participants belonged to CoPs, let alone one on MEAL.

This session ended with Julius posing two questions for further reflections by participants namely:

- 1. "Can we begin a CoP that can help us tackle the everyday issues we face while performing our work as M&E specialists?
- 2. How do we make such CoP relevant to us and what will it take to keep it active?

3. Experience in Mozambique with different monitoring tools and systems- Abdul Naico (CIP, Mozambique)

Naico's presentation centered on the M&E strategies being used in Mozambique for the dissemination of sweetpotato vines to beneficiary households. It highlighted the systems used under different projects (with slightly varying indicators to report on) and the system of vine multiplication and distribution. Naico indicated that they use the Decentralized Vine Multiplication (DVM) and the Mass Distribution (MD) systems to disseminate vines to beneficiary households. The criteria for choosing a DVM include:

- Access to adequate land,
- Sufficient literacy to enable the filling of monitoring forms,
- > Ability to communicate key agronomic information to those who come to pick the vines,
- Being centrally located, and
- Easy access to the DVM by farmers.

Mozambique uses vouchers under the DVM system of vine dissemination. The voucher is used for targeting and collecting information that is relevant to the project(s), including biodata and location details of the DVM, key agronomic information, and essential details of the beneficiary redeeming the coupon. Under the MD system, vines are loaded in trucks and then driven to and distributed to many farmers gathered in a central place.

Naico discussed the pros and cons of the two systems with regard to data capture. He argued that the DVM system was generally better because of the ease of capturing accurate data on "who takes what" through the forms. The MD system on the other hand, presented challenges of tracking the varieties disseminated because the varieties were mixed during the trucking and distribution. With the MD system, it was also difficult to control scrambling by people who came to collect vines, and to prevent more than one person from the same household taking the vines. Having multiple recipients from the same household undermines the MD's goal of reaching as many households as possible.

Following this presentation, reactions from the participants pointed out the following:

- 1. There is a need to choose a DVM who can provide some key basic agronomic information and accurately fill in distribution forms. In Mozambique, some DVMs are extension workers, who are able to provide sweetpotato agronomic information along with the vines. They also know how to fill vine dissemination forms accurately.
- It is important to train DVMs on how to record data. Participants discussed examples of projects where capturing good vine dissemination data was unsuccessful because the DVMs were not properly trained.
- 3. There is need to establish more demonstration plots.
- 4. There is need to motivate the DVMs by providing some essential support that helps make vine multiplication a commercial enterprise.
- 5. Some DVMs tend to have many other commitments in the community. There is need to ensure that the DVMs are not overly engaged in many other projects/activities outside vine multiplication.
- 6. Participants raised concern over double/multiple counting of the beneficiary households, especially where multiple members of a household collect the vines from either the DVM or through mass distribution. The solution to this problem, suggested by the meeting, was to ensure that a list of the beneficiaries was submitted to the project ahead of the mass distribution event. Kirimi Sindi shared experiences in Rwanda with this approach. Specifically, he explained that working with the local leaders and partners had helped to generate a list of eligible households who met well elaborated criteria. Having a printed list of beneficiaries in advance, working with the Community Health Workers (CHW) or government officials to avoid scramble for vines and advising farmers to prepare their plots ahead of the distribution (3 weeks before) further helps avoid problems and increases the chances of collecting good dissemination data and chances of vines being planted.
- 7. The need to standardize the unit of measurement of vines was emphasized. It was noted that some documents reported vine quantities in kilograms, others in bundles and yet others in bags. Participants agreed that, on average, 50 fresh vines make a kilogram while a standard bag has 1,000 vines.
- 8. Qualitative data, which is very important in monitoring, can be gathered through focus group discussions (FGDs)
- 9. It is better to disseminate fewer varieties for ease of tracking than many. It was generally agreed that it is better, where possible, to disseminate no more than two varieties.

4. Monitoring experience by HarvestPlus in Uganda - Ignatius Abaijuka (HarvestPlus, Uganda)

Ignatius presented an elaborate monitoring and evaluation framework used by HarvestPlus, including the approaches used in the monitoring, the M&E objectives and the indicators being tracked.

The indicators include the number of children less than 5 years of age, number of community shows/events, percentage of people with nutritional knowledge, percentage of farmers selling orange-fleshed sweetpotato (OFSP), number of market outlets and the volumes of OFSP roots disseminated. He presented the forms used for vine distribution and for tracking training events. He pointed out that monitoring in HarvestPlus is done by a group comprising the M&E staff at HarvestPlus, different project coordinators, field extension workers and partners. The partners include CIP, International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) and implementing NGOs. The NGOs are responsible for appointing a designated M&E persons known as the Community Resource Persons (CRPs). The CRPs fill distribution forms and the Field Extension Workers (FEWs) compile data from the CRPs and submit to the HarvestPlus-based project coordinator. The project coordinator verifies and compiles/aggregates the data from the FEWS.

The presentation highlighted several constraints and challenges HarvestPlus M&E team encounters. These include:

- The culture of poor record keeping among NGO partners
- ▶ The "cooking" of data by the people entrusted with data collection
- Lack of skills in data and information management
- Inefficient databases for data capture, storage, processing and sharing
- Inadequate technical/computer skills
- Insufficient budget allocations to M&E work

During the discussion participants sought to know how cost-effective it is to validate data; HarvestPlus's experience in monitoring and verifying the number of beneficiary farmers reached, including the spillovers; how selection of DVMs is done and what measures are taken to ensure good quality data.

In response, Ignatius pointed out that the quality of data is routinely checked using a standardized data collection tool, randomly sampling a few completed data collection forms from the villages and revisiting sampled households to validate the data. The M&E office also visits a percentage of beneficiaries to find out if those who received the planting materials actually planted them. He noted that about 95 percent of the beneficiaries of vines plant them, and attributed this success to the sustained promotional campaigns in the targeted communities about the benefits of OFSP by HarvestPlus and partners. Ignatius further explained that the nutritional knowledge was assessed on a small random sample of beneficiaries. Indirect beneficiaries were captured through forms given to the direct beneficiaries to record any of the non-targeted farmers they pass vines to.

He indicated that among the criteria for choosing DVMs was their ability to multiply enough vines to supply targeted beneficiaries round them and to share information with other community members are major requirements. HarvestPlus also tracks the performance of vines and identifies varieties that perform better in particular locations.

5. Tools for vine dissemination – Julius Okello (CIP, Uganda)

Julius presented the different tools that can be used to collect vine distribution data under different contexts. These included forms for vine dissemination with and without a voucher, as well as the forms for vine dissemination when there are few and many varieties. The presentation emphasized issues to take into consideration in using the forms. These are:

- 1. Proper coding of countries and in-country administrative units.
- 2. Ensuring that beneficiary names are complete and as unique as possible for ease of reidentification during monitoring: i.e., collect at least three names of the beneficiary, including any aliases.
- 3. The need to collect contact information including cell phone numbers of the beneficiary or a member of his/her household. The contact information is useful for future monitoring and can be used for random validation of the monitoring data collected by partners.
- 4. Demographic information especially the gender and age (to ascertain the presence of targeted children).
- 5. Collection of information on age as a continuous variable rather than a categorical variable. Age categories can then be created later, if needed.
- 6. Importance of labeling varieties very well, to make it easy to distinguish and track the varieties disseminated.
- 7. It is important to specify the measurement unit and know the conversion factors that will help convert non-standard units to standard units.
- 8. It is good to capture the amount of land allocated to the given vines, if possible. Participants suggested that this can be estimated from the number of planting materials distributed, since the average spacing for the vines is known.
- 9. The participants agreed that vines be distributed at the household level. In some projects in Mozambique, however, both men and women were invited to get the vines. This was done after it was observed that only women turned up during the distribution. Hence a decision was made to invite men to increase the chances of vines being planted because men generally own and control assets.
- 10. It is necessary to keep the form as simple as possible, while ensuring that essential information is captured.

6. Why labelling plots and distributed vines is critical- Jan Low (CIP, Nairobi)

Jan emphasized three important benefits of labeling vines which are highlighted below:

Knowledge: We should <u>know</u> which varieties we distribute now and in the future, and their characteristics.

Reputation: We should report credible information and data.

Assessment: Assessment should help us to compare the performance of the varieties in terms of agronomic, consumption and market attributes.

Jan emphasized the following Do's and Don'ts in labeling:

- 1. Labeling using generic names and naming subsequent varieties developed as 1, 2, 3, and 4 can be misleading. Therefore, labels like NASPOT1, NASPOT2, and NASPOT3 are confusing and farmers end up labeling all these different varieties as NASPOT. It is better to have labels that are not only unique but also that farmers can relate to.
- 2. The vine disseminators should discourage farmers from naming varieties after their names simply because they distributed or promoted the varieties in the community.
- 3. All multiplication plots need to be clearly labeled, and multipliers should be encouraged to keep the labels in the plots at all times.
- 4. A label can be used to disseminate messages about OFSP/variety. For example a brief description of key agronomic practices can be incorporated in the label.

7. Dietary diversity - Temesgen Bocher (CIP, Nairobi)

Temesgen presented two indicators of food consumption diversity namely, dietary diversity score (DDS) and food consumption score (FCS). He explained the importance of the two scores and their differences both in terms of data collection and computation.

The DDS is based on a 24-hour recall of 9-12 food groups consumed, and ranges from 0-12. The higher the score, the more diverse the food consumed is and hence the better the households/individuals. On the other hand, the FCS is based on the number of days a household consumed a given food group in the past 7 days.

During the discussion it was noted that:

- The use of the dietary diversity in computing food diversity has been limited and that there is need to do this more;
- There is need to compute separate indices for different groups, i.e., children, women, men and households;

- The timing of the survey (in terms of the period of the year) is important if reliable data is to be captured. It was especially agreed that the scores should be computed for, the harvest period and the hunger season (period just preceding the next harvest);
- The baseline and end line surveys aimed at tracking these indicators (scores) should be conducted during the same period of the year.

8. Consumption of vitamin A rich foods – Jan Low (CIP, Nairobi)

Jan stressed the importance of vitamin A and highlighted the health problems associated with its deficiency which include, among others, blindness and immune-depression. She explained that Helen Keller International (HKI) developed a method for measuring food consumption frequency and that the method can be used to assess the risk of vitamin A deficiency at the community level. She then illustrated the procedure for computing food consumption frequency scores using excel spreadsheet.

She emphasized the following key considerations when computing indicators related to consumption of vitamin A-rich foods:

- Only vitamin A sources are included in the computations. For example *Tilapia* sold in local markets is not rich in vitamin A because the liver has been removed, while whole *omena* (*dagaa*) with an intact liver is rich in vitamin A;
- Vitamin A is fat soluble so consumption of oils or fat-fried foods is needed for vitamin A absorption;
- Feeding children on OFSP at breakfast can greatly enhance vitamin A intake.

9. Household food insecurity access (HFIAS) - Norman Kwikiriza (CIP, Uganda)

This presentation discussed scale measures and how to compute some of the ratios that can be used to assess household food insecurity status in terms of access to food. The scale was developed by Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) III, a project supported by the United States Agency for International Aid (USAID). The scale relies on a set of 9 questions.

The presentation discussed four measures of household food insecurity that can be computed using this approach. These are:-

- Household food insecurity access related conditions;
- Household food insecurity access related domains, i.e.: anxiety and uncertainty, insufficient quality and insufficient quantity;
- Household food insecurity access scale score. This score ranges from 0-27 reflecting the three scale level questions. A score of 27 means that the household is severely food insecure while a score of 0 implies that the household is very food secure;
- ▶ Household food insecurity access prevalence status.

Norman further emphasized the following considerations in using the scale:

- The respondent should be the person that makes household decisions and is involved in the food preparation and feeding of the household members;
- The questions apply to 30 days period;
- It is advisable to do the study and ask questions at two different times of the year during the harvest period and the period of scarcity of the year;
- If baseline and end line data is to be compared, then the two studies should be done at the same period of the year.

10. Introduction to open data kit – Luka Wanjohi (CIP, Nairobi)

Luka first introduced participants to the various ways that smart phones and tablets can be used in monitoring progress in a project, which include field data capture in conducting surveys, taking pictures during surveys and recording the Geographic Positioning System (GPS). He also explained the advantages and disadvantages of the use of smart phones and tablets in data collection.

He introduced members to the basic operations of a tablet and helped the participants to go through the process of installing and configuring the Open Data Kit (ODK) program on the tablets.

Next, the participants were shown how to design an XLS form, a standard form created to help simplify the writing of forms in Excel, and how to upload the form used in data collection into ODK. To demonstrate the exportation of data to the ODK servers, the Nigeria information was exported to International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) AZIZI server, which was being used by Luka for the Nigeria ODK pilot.

Discussions on the use of ODK were later complemented by Mr. Absalom Kihara who works with the ILRI bioinformatics department. The department has more than six years of experience in designing data collection systems using more convenient, simple and up-to-date software. Absalom discussed the different options for hosting information on the servers. He indicated that the decision on which option to use normally depends on:

- 1. **Cost:** How much one is willing to pay for the hosting arrangement.
- 2. Location: Physical location of the server, which depends on the security requirements. For example the server could be hosted in Nairobi or Lima, depending on the security required for the data. This decision is also dependent on the resolution power required.
- 3. **Open source versus non-open source:** Open source allows one to change or edit the content or build upon an already existing functionality, as opposed to the non-open source.
- 4. **Support need:** This may depend on the needs of the project, but includes the ability and ease of retrieving information if systems collapse (i.e., when there is a problem).
- 5. WILD data: Does the company give options for management of wild data?

6. **Custom visualization.** This is an important functionality but very few companies do it.

Absalom ended his discussion by highlighting the different options available for hosting data. These are:

- ODK: He argued that ODK is the most suitable of all the tools. It includes ODK aggregate, ODK collect, and ODK briefcase. He however explained that the major challenge with ODK is that it is mainly suitable for collecting limited data, and that lengthy questionnaires with variable data needs may not work well in ODK.
- ENKETO smart paper: Allows detailed data collection and has a server where a form can be uploaded. Its major advantage is that it is free. The data collected from its interfaces can be aggregated.
- Formhub: Was built from ODK just like many mobile data collection applications, but it has improved on the interface of ODK.
- Ona: This is the third generation ODK that improves upon Formhub and the newest derivative of ODK. It is more accommodative, and can easily allow 1000 enumerators to send in information at the same time.
- Commcare was developed by Dimagi to provide healthcare solutions to the developing world.
- Azizi data management platform: This is a second generation of ODK developed by ILRI. It has been used by CIP to pilot tablet-based data collection in Nigeria.

Absalom pointed out that there are other options for hosting data including:

- 1. Self-hosting
- 2. cloud
- 3. Institute
- 4. Consultants

Absalom's presentation raised a couple of questions. Participants stated that since ODK data is in excel and yet most analysis is done using SPSS and Stata, variables, especially categorical ones, had to be recoded. This was a disadvantage. Absalom acknowledged that indeed, this was a disadvantage. He explained the background that ODK was designed for collecting data based on fewer questions of a quantitative nature. Other data collection tools such as Census and Survey Processing System (CSPro) are better placed to handle data generated by lengthy tools. CSPro is currently preferred by CIP for large data collection. An Android version of CSPro has been developed and is being used.

The discussion raised other limitations of ODK, such as:

- The quality of data depends on how best the instrument is designed. It does not allow the supervisor to check data before it is sent to the server.
- Creating ODK forms is not easy and may require experienced IT personnel; hence it is not easy to adjust questions later, in case a question needs to be adjusted in the field.
- ▶ Just like CSPro, a server is necessary, which increases the cost of data collection.

However, ODK has some advantages over CSPro. These include:

- Ability to take pictures,
- Allows for GPS readings.

Jan contributed to this discussion by indicating that training on the use of CSPro is planned for May 2015 and encouraged the participants to attend. She also indicated that ODK will mainly be used to collect monitoring information on the vine dissemination.

11. Wrap up of the COP meeting, way forward and closure

Wrap up of the CoP Meeting – Julius Okello (CIP, Uganda), Temesgen Bocher (CIP, Nairobi), Jan Low (CIP, Nairobi)

The wrap up session was led Julius and Temesgen. Temesgen presented results of the analysis of the quick survey completed on first day to assess the participants' backgrounds, needs and expectations of the CoP meeting (see details in Section 13). The results showed that most participants had a background on agricultural economics, had experience in use of SPSS and STATA for data entry and analysis tools, and were in charge of M&E in their projects and/or organizations.

Results further showed that most participants felt that a MEAL CoP is very important for sharing views, experiences, and tacit knowledge, and in adopting standardized approaches to data collection and analysis.

Way forward

- 1. A committee to spearhead the MEAL CoP was appointed. It included Julius Okello, Temesgen Bocher, Luka Wanjohi, Justus Lotade, Sosthenes Mwansa and Ignatius Abaijuka. The committee was given the task of developing and sharing ideas for email discussion on a monthly basis. The mailing list is to be developed. The team will also synthesize information that comes from a discussion topic and provide a summary. The email system was preferred over other channels such as Facebook, LinkedIn, twitter, and Yammer, at least for the start because all the participants use it daily. The core team was advised to meet and map the various activities being undertaken by the participants.
- 2. Participants were encouraged to invite other people involved in monitoring and evaluation in other organizations and projects to join the CoP because the bigger the group, the better for learning and sharing information.
- 3. The following points were suggested as possible areas of discussion:
 - New ways of information capture
 - Standardizing approaches used in the monitoring and evaluation
 - Data analysis support
 - Data quality issues
 - Qualitative data collection methods and designs

- Sharing of success stories
- Advocating for adequate budgetary allocations for M&E in projects
- 4. Have regular physical meetings: Participants were advised to inform project managers early because physical meetings have financial implications so that such trips are included in the activity budgets.

Closure of the meetings

Jan noted that the two day training was very interesting and very useful, and had ended with formalization of a MEAL Community of Practice (CoP). She explained to participants that a similar CoP with breeders had been very useful in sharing ideas and finding solutions, and envisaged that the MEAL CoP will similarly be successful. She thanked everybody for coming and especially the participant from Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA), who had distributed 10 books on "FARA Performance Monitoring Guidance Manual" for free. She appreciated Luka Wanjohi for exposing the participants to the use of smart phones in data collection and its advantages and limitations. She also thanked Emily Ndoho and Chris Kioko for co-organizing the event.

12. Results from the evaluation of the MEAL CoP meeting

The meeting was attended by 16 participants. The mean age group was 39.8 years. The biggest age group category was 30-40 years, implying that most of the members of the MEAL CoP are relatively young. Implication for this is that if a strong MEAL CoP is built, then currently and into the future, the monitoring and evaluation process in the region will be greatly improved.

Out of the 16 participants, there was one female, a clear indication of the need to make efforts to recruit and include more females in the M&E roles in the projects within the region, and to address any other underlying reasons behind the low numbers of women.



Figure 1: Graph showing the age categories

Participants were asked to rate the following five areas of the meeting:

- Whether the CoP meeting met expectations
- Quality and usefulness of the presentations concerning experiences in monitoring
- Quality and usefulness of the presentations on the indicators / forms on dissemination, diet diversity, food frequency and food security
- Quality and usefulness of the training on monitoring using smart phones
- Organization(logistics & communication)

All the responses for the evaluation questions show that the training was very important and met most of the expectations of the participants. Participants reported that the training was very useful. The usefulness of the training on monitoring using smart phones scored highest. Other scores for the presentations on the quality and usefulness of the presentations on the (i) indicators (ii) forms of dissemination (iii) diet diversity (iv) food frequency and (v) food security were generally good. Responses also indicate that the meeting was well organized in terms of logistics and communication. For a more detailed analysis of the evaluation, see Annex 1.



Figure 2: Parts of the meeting that were found most useful to participants

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Community of Practice Meeting – Nairobi, 2015 | 14

The figure below shows the areas that participants felt should be improvement in future meetings and for effective running of the CoP. As can be observed in the diagram, the most important areas mentioned were more emphasis on data analysis and management, questionnaire development, developing monitoring and evaluation networks and the need for more training time/days.



Figure 3: Areas that need to be improved in future meetings and for running of the CoP

Participants further stressed the following points of action for the future CoP and the status quo of the M&E work in the region. These are outlined below:

- Adequate time is needed for this kind of training
- Catering services were adequate and good
- > There is need to learn more on data collection; on production and on measurement of yields
- There are challenges on raising resources for backstopping M&E CoPs
- **b** Good beginning for the CoP and it is our prayer that we continue sharing experience
- Need to work on standardizing M&E tools
- The CoP needs to be done online but it requires moderation
- Very useful meeting and hoped communication could continue using the CoP platform
- Training was very well organized but short; there is need to standardize other common variables in the household/ socio-economic data and analysis
- Sharing experience and tools on market development and value chains

Evaluation Item	Response (%)	
The Cop meeting met expectations		
	Not at all	0
	Somewhat	0
	Most	61.5
	Completely	38.5
Rating of the Quality and usefulness of the presentations concerning		
experiences in monitoring		
	Very poor	0
	Poor	0
	Alright	7.7
	Good	46.2
	Very good	46.2
Rating of the quality and usefulness of the presentations on the	, 0	
indicators/ forms on dissemination, diet diversity, food frequency and		
food security		
,	Very poor	0
	Poor	0
	Alright	0
	Good	76.9
	Very good	23.1
Rating of the quality and usefulness of the training on monitoring using	, 0	
smart phones		
	Very poor	0
	Poor	0
	Alright	0
	Good	30.8
	Very good	69.2
Rating of the meeting in terms of organization(logistics &		
communication)		
	Very poor	0
	Poor	0
	Alright	0
	Good	53.8
	Very good	46.2

Annex 1: Responses to evaluation questions

Annex 2: Meeting Agenda

SASHA Phase 2 Monitoring, Learning & Evaluation Community of Practice

3 - 4 March 2015

Nairobi, Kenya

Time	Tuesday, 3 March 2015	Session Leader		
08:15	Overview of Objectives of the CoP & Introduction of Participants & Understanding Expectations	Julius Okello		
08:45	Experience in Mozambique with different monitoring tools	Abdul Naico		
09:15	Monitoring experience by HarvestPlus in Uganda	Ignatius Abaijuka		
09:45	Tools for Dissemination of sweetpotato vines	Julius Okello		
10:30	Health Break			
11:00	Why labeling plots and distributed vines is critical	Jan Low		
11:30	Practice session with dissemination tools	K. Sindi/J. Okello		
11:45	Diet Diversity	Temesgen Bocher		
12:30	Exercise Calculating Diet Diversity	Temesgen Bocher		
13:00	Lunch at ILRI			
14:00	Consumption of Vitamin A rich foods	Jan Low		
14:30	Household food insecurity access indicator (HFIAS)	Norman Kwikiriza		
14.45	Exercise on computation of frequency of consumption of vitamin A rich foods	J. Low /N. Kwikiriza		
15.45	Tea break			
16:10	Reflections on Day 1	All		
	End of Day 1			

Time	Wednesday, March 03, 2014	Session Leader
08:30	Overview of Smart phone based monitoring system	Luka Wanjohi
09:00	Hands on: How to use a tablet How to install and configure ODK Collect How to download and fill out a form How to send data to the server	Luka Wanjohi
10:00	Hands on: Designing a simple form Upload to server, download to phone, submit data	Luka Wanjohi
	Hands on: Adding some complexity to forms Basic constraints Basic branching	
10:30	Health Break	
11:00	Hands on: Advanced form design Multiple languages, repeats	L. Wanjohi
11:30	Hands on: Advanced form design Media, data preloading, cascading selects	L. Wanjohi
12:00	Hands on: Advanced form design Cascading selects	Luka Wanjohi
12:15	Exercise	L. Wanjohi/K. Sindi
13:00	Lunch	
14:00	How to export and analyze data	Luka Wanjohi
14:30	Hands on: Vine Dissemination mobile scanning	Luka Wanjohi
15:30	Best practices and trade offs	L. Wanjohi/K. Sindi
16:30	Forming a Community of Practice Group: Way Forward	J. Low/ J. Okello

Annex 3: List of Participants

	First Name	Last Name	Title	Institution	Address	Country	Telephone	Mobile	Fax	Email	Email2
1	Wellington	Jogo	Impact Assessment and value chains	International Potato Centre (CIP)	c/o ILRI, PO Box 5689, Addis Ababa	Ethiopia	+251 11 617 2306	+251 938 040881		w.jogo@cgiar.org	frankjogo@yahoo.com
2	Clesensio	Tizikara	M&E Specialist	Forum for Agricultural Research in Africa (FARA)	12 Anmeda Street, Roman Ridge, PMB CT 173, Accra	Ghana	+233 302 774823 / +233 302 773 676	+233 263 578525	+233 203 773 676	<u>ctizikara@fara-africa.org</u>	
3	John Kanburi	Bidzakin	Agricultural Economist/ Socialeconomics	CSIR-SARI	P.O. Box TL 52, NR	Ghana	+233 243 461140	+233 208 489461		bidzakin2@gmail.com	jkbidzakin@csirsari.org
4	Godfrey	Mulongo	M&E Specialist	International Potato Centre (CIP)	Old Naivasha Road, ILRI Campus, P. O. Box 25171 00603, Nairobi	Kenya	+254 020 422 3612	+254 720 616 439	+254 020 422 3001	g.mulongo@cgiar.org	
5	Jan	Low	SPHI Leader/ SASHA Project Manager	International Potato Centre (CIP)	Old Naivasha Road, ILRI Campus, P. O. Box 25171 00603, Nairobi	Kenya	+254 020 422 3601	+254 733 411 010	+254 020 422 3001	j.low@cgiar.org	
6	Luka	Wanjohi	Data Management Specialist	International Potato Centre (CIP)	Old Naivasha Road, ILRI Campus, P. O. Box 25171 00603, Nairobi	Kenya	+254 020 422 3632	+254 722 302 271		L.Wanjohi@cgiar.org	
7	Temesgen	Bocher	M&E	International Potato Centre (CIP)	Old Naivasha Road, ILRI Campus, P. O. Box 25171 00603, Nairobi	Kenya	+254 020 422 3636	+254 788 72 32 74		T.Bocher@cgiar.org	
8	Abdul	Naico	M&E	International Potato Centre (CIP)	P.O. Box 2100, IIAM, Av. FPLM 2698, Maputo	Mozambique	+258 214 61610	+258 829 849 584		A.Naico@cgiar.org	aanaico@yahoo.com.br / a.naico@intra.co.mz
9	Oscar	Chichongue	M&E Assistant	International Potato Centre (CIP)	238 Av Frabacho, Lichinga, Niassa	Mozambique		+258 861 791690/ +258 823 333 560		ochichongue@gmail.com	
10	Justus	Lotade	M&E Specialist	International Potato Centre (CIP)	c/o Lucy Ouidirah (Carolyn House 26 Dingwall Road, Croydon CRA 3EE, UK)	Nigeria		+234 706 2200165		j.lotade@cgiar.org	

Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning Community of Practice Meeting – Nairobi, 2015 | 19

11	Kirimi	Sindi	Impact Assessment Specialist	International Potato Centre (CIP)	CIAT, Concord Buiding, Boulevard de l'Umuganda, PO Box 6801	Rwanda	'+250 788 303 428	+250 788 303428		<u>k.sindi@cgiar.org</u>	
12	Ignatius	Abaijuka	M&E officer	HarvestPlus	C/o IFPRI Kampala, Plot 15, East Naguru Road, Naguru	Uganda	+256 414 287107	+256 704 125 545/ +256 782 395 348		<u>i.abijuka@cgiar.org</u>	<u>iabaijuka@yahoo.com</u>
13	Julius	Okello	Agricultural Economist & Impact Assessment Specialist	International Potato Centre (CIP)	Plot 47, Ntinda II Road P.O. Box 22274, P.O. Box 22274	Uganda	+ 256 312 266250 - 3	+256 756 024 761		<u>i.okello@cgiar.org</u>	
14	Norman	Kwikiriza	M&E	International Potato Centre (CIP)	Plot 47, Ntinda II Road P.O. Box 22274, P.O. Box 22274	Uganda	+ 256 312 266250 - 3	+256 006 782 308031		<u>N.Kwikiriza@cgiar.org</u>	
15	Sosthenes	Mwansa	Marketing and Impact Specialist	International Potato Centre (CIP)	Msekera Regional Research Station, PO Box 511197, Chipata	Zambia	+260 216 223086	+260 977 186 296		s.mwansa@cgiar.org	
16	Emily	Ndoho	SASHA Project Accountant	International Potato Centre (CIP)	Old Naivasha Road, ILRI Campus, P. O. Box 25171 00603, Nairobi	Kenya	+254 020 422 3603	+254 736 544 905	+254 020 422 3601	e.ndoho@cgiar.org	



The **Sweetpotato for Profit and Health Initiative (SPHI)** is a 10-year, multi-donor initiative that seeks to reduce child malnutrition and improve smallholder incomes through the effective production and expanded use of sweetpotato. It aims to build consumer awareness of sweetpotato's nutritional benefits, diversify its use, and increase market opportunities, especially in expanding urban markets of Sub-Saharan Africa. The SPHI is expected to improve the lives of 10 million households by 2020 in 17 target countries.





W W W . S W E E T P O T A T O K N O W L E D G E . O R C