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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background
The Beekeepers Economic Empowerment Tanzania (BEET) project is a 3 year project; funded by Comic relief and Department for International Development of the United Kingdom (DFID). The goal of the project is to reduce poverty amongst men and women beekeepers and their families across the target districts in Tabora (Sikonge, Uyui and Urambo districts) and Pwani region (Rufiji district) of Tanzania. The total cost of the project was £740,895 out of which £509,990 was granted by DFID and £230,905 by Comic Relief.

The BEET project theory of change envisaged to deliver its impacts through accomplishment of four strategic objectives: i) improvement of beekeepers’ skills and knowledge; ii) organizing beekeepers in groups for collective action; iii) linking beekeepers to service providers and market information and lastly was iv) enhance gender equity and environmental conservation as crosscutting issues.

Prior project close out it was necessary to undertake an independent final evaluation. This report presents results on the final evaluation of the project highlighting on key achievements, sustainability and lessons learned.

Methodology
Information/data was collected using both qualitative and quantitative approaches. Qualitative data were collected through five, six and four sessions of FGDs conducted in Rufiji, Sikonge and Uyui districts respectively. The FGDs were, correspondingly, complemented by key informant interviews. Quantitative data were collected using structured questionnaire administered to a random sample of 102 project beneficiaries and 70 non-beneficiaries as well as desk review of relevant project documents. Empowerment framework was used as analytical framework for analysis and interpretation of the collected data. The empowerment framework revolves around three domains: material, cognitive and relational empowerment.

Findings
Seven key achievements are pertinent:

i.) Project reporting was accurate and reliable; data verification revealed congruency between project performance as reported from different progress reports and those verified from existing records at village and district levels.

ii.) The project was relevant and timely; the focus on empowerment approaches, poverty reduction and environmental conservation was coherent with the overall national strategies, and respective top agenda under both beekeeping and forestry sectors.

iii.) Positive change in material empowerment gauged from consistent increase in household incomes, investment in productive assets such as livestock and non-productive assets including bicycles and better houses.

iv.) Positive change in cognitive empowerment, increased knowledge and skills on beekeeping and business practices among project beneficiaries. In each of the three districts, findings revealed that 100% of the respondents declared to have adopted at least one of the improved beekeeping practices.

v.) Positive change in relational empowerment observed as demonstrated in various ways project beneficiaries across districts were organized into self-help groups, and/or associations through which they exercised collective actions to enhance knowledge sharing through trainings and cross-visits; access to microfinance services through VICOBA and market information.

vi.) Through capacity building trainings and financial support, the project succeeded to establish an outstanding functional Rufiji Beekeepers Association (RUBEA), which was highly appreciated by majority of its members.

vii.) Women forum had been established in Rufiji district, and helped women to share knowledge and experiences with their fellow beekeepers within and beyond their locality.
The main project weakness identified was:

- Although the project had taken action to train the beekeepers and link them to the service providers and buyers such linkages are still weak and may need further support.

The project experienced two key problems during its inception stage; withdrawal of the implementing partner for reasons not related to the project, and drop out of project key staff. However, the new project team managed to implement the project successfully, which shows adaptability of the project team.

Recommendations

1) Future support to the beekeepers should focus on value addition including proper packaging in order to increase the market share going to the beekeepers. This should go hand in hand with fostering access to market information and partnerships of the beekeepers with different private sector actors along the value chain.

2) Prior to complete closure of the project, modalities and means should be thought to persuade and encourage the district councils to provide continuous support to beekeepers groups, and/or associations created through the project (e.g. RUBEA) with respect to access to relevant market information, technical expertise and ensuring fair market relations along the beekeeping value chain.

3) Although the original timeframe envisaged during the project design was enough to impart trainings and demonstrate workability of improved beekeeping practices, it was not enough to ensure proper integration of the beekeepers in the value chain. Experiences suggest that proper integration in the value chain requires longer effective project period of about 5 years or more. Thus, to ensure effective completion of key project processes necessary for sustainability and proper integration of the beekeepers into the value chain it is recommended that the project be extended for two years.
1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background
BEET project was a three year project implemented by Traidcraft Exchange in Tabora (Sikonge, Uyui and Urambo districts) and Pwani (Rufiji district) regions of Tanzania. The project aimed at reducing poverty amongst men and women beekeepers and their families across the target districts in Tabora and Pwani regions of Tanzania. The project started officially on 1st January 2013 and run up to December 2015. The project is funded by the Comic Relief and the Department for International Development of the United Kingdom (DFID).

BEET project was designed as a response to poverty existing in most of the rural area of Tanzania whereby most of community’s members in these areas are less linked to market and trade opportunities. BEET project theory of change envisaged to achieve project impacts through accomplishment of three strategic objectives:

(i) **Improvement of beekeepers’ skills and knowledge**: This would ensure increased production of bee products through improved bee keeping practices.
(ii) **Organizing beekeepers in groups for collective action**: Target beekeepers would effectively work collectively and collaboratively in running their beekeeping practices as a business to realize business benefit. This would not only increase bargaining power of beekeepers but also strengthen their partnership capacity with other key value chain actors and ultimately increased profitability and marketing margins of beekeepers.
(iii) **Linking beekeepers to service providers and market information**: Target beekeepers would have improved their access to reliable service providers and market information at all levels (i.e. from the local to international levels). This would also increase honey production as well as its quality leading to increase sales which in turn increases household income
(iv) **Cross-Cutting issues**: Gender equity and environmental awareness of target communities increased.

As the project approaches its end, the need for final evaluation was inevitable in order to fulfill the requirement of evidence-based project monitoring and evaluation, and provide lessons to inform design of future similar projects. Different stakeholders such as project funders, project staff, project beneficiaries, management and staff of Traidcraft, policy makers and other relevant stakeholders will make use of this report in future interventions of this sub-sector. Thus this report serves as a final independent evaluation report of the BEET project in Uyui, Sikonge and Rufiji districts.

1.2 Purpose of the Independent Final Evaluation
The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the impact, effectiveness, efficiency, relevance and sustainability of the project in relation to its goal, objectives and identify key lessons and experiences that have resulted from the project during the three years of implementation.

1.3 Evaluation Objectives
The specific objectives of the evaluation were to:
   1) Identify project achievement impacts and ways they can be sustained
   2) Assess the extent to which the project was good value for money
   3) Draw lessons learnt to contribute to the organizational learning of Traidcraft and other stakeholders
   4) Develop recommendations for further developments of the project or guidance of similar project in the future

1.4 Conceptual framework
Empowerment was the key concept of the “theory of change” used in the design and implementation of the BEET project. According to Kabeer (2011) empowerment processes start from individuals to community levels. Based on this framework, the starting point for empowerment to happen is the mobilization processes that involve awareness creation and capacity building events in order to create motivation for collective actions among the target population.
According to Kabeer (2011), there are three broad domains under which an individual can be empowered: material, cognitive and relational domains. Material domain is concerned with gain in access to material being such as incomes and assets; cognitive domain is about skills imparted to an individual in order to enhance the capacity of asking “why” to the unjust social structures and systems or ability to analyze and act against unfavourable physical situations; and relational domain is about developing networks among individuals and between groups or between community and the outside world. The evaluators used this approach in carrying out the evaluation of the BEET project.

### 2.0 METHODOLOGY

#### 2.1 Evaluation approaches

In order to ensure the ownership of the evaluation results, the entire evaluation approach was participatory and widely consultative with BEET staff, Traidcraft staff, representative of project donor, leaders of the communities and end-beneficiaries (beekeepers). In addition, the evaluation team conducted informal feedback briefings with the management team and some of the project officers to enable compliance to the expectations of the clients and ensure the mission being on track.

Thus, the evaluation was broken into three key interrelated processes/tasks: 1) secondary data review, 2) field surveys, 3) consultation with key beneficiaries and stakeholders through meetings, interviews, mobile, Skype calls and Focus Group Discussions (FGD). Each step was enhanced with appropriate survey tools or instruments.

Prior to implementation a briefing of BEET project (covering implementation, achievements and challenges faced) was done by BEET staff followed by review of project documents. Then data verification was done through two broad steps:

a) Desk review to ascertain project background information like beneficiary numbers, location, stakeholders, actors, type and availability of documentation; and

b) Field work to verify project information including beneficiaries and reported progress.

Data verification was done for the indicator “number of beekeepers organized in groups and implementing improved beekeeping practices”. This indicator was chosen because it is the core indicator for gauging project performance. This was followed by consultation of the key stakeholders and beneficiaries and field survey.

#### 2.1.1 Consultation of the key beneficiaries and stakeholders

Structure of field visit involved courtesy call to Ward/Village Leadership, interaction with District Coordinator and Field Officers on the way to community, general meeting (focus group discussion) with the community representatives, follow up visits led by Service Providers assisted by Field Officers to groups and individuals at their site and lastly were face-to-face and phone/skype interviews with Field Officers/Service Providers, buyers and some of key informants.

#### 2.1.2 Focus group discussion

At least five (5) focus group discussions were carried out in each district. This involved members of different beekeeper groups under BEET project. To get a good mix of target group views selection of beekeeper groups to be involved into focus group discussions was based on their levels of performance. Beekeepers groups were categorized into three categories (i.e. best performers, average performers and poor performers). In each category at least two groups formed focus group discussion, except for the poor performers category in which at least one beekeeper group was involved in focus group discussion. Each focus group discussion comprised fifteen members representing balance proportion of women and men of different ages.
2.1.3 Key informant and in-depth interviews
Project staff, Traidcraft staff, service providers, buyers, beekeeper group’s leaders, beekeepers associations’ leaders and project donor comprised a set of key informants. Different questions were set to guide the interview for each category. In-depth interviews were conducted for successful women and men in the study area which provided the information to document sample project beneficiary success stories.

2.1.4 Household questionnaire survey
This involved follow up visits to 172 beekeepers (both project beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries) lead by service provider at their site. A structured questionnaire and direct observations were the tools which were used to collect information from individual beekeepers in the study area. The two categories of beekeepers (beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries) were involved in this survey to help attribution of the observed changes in terms of annual income generated from beekeeping with the project.

This approach also intended to bridge any missing data in the impact evaluation process; whereby one cannot observe the outcomes of the program participants had they not been beneficiaries. Thus, without such information on the counterfactual, the best alternative was to compare outcomes of treated individual beekeepers with those of a comparison group that has not been treated. In so doing, one attempts to pick a comparison group that is very similar to the treated group such that those who received treatment would have had outcomes similar to those in the comparison group in absence of the treatment/intervention. Thus, this addressed the main question of impact evaluation (i.e. attribution which is isolating the effect of the program from other factors and potential selection bias). The Propensity Score Matching (PSM) approach was used to assess the impact of the project comparing the treated and control group. In this regard the treated group comprises beekeepers who received a number of training on skills and knowledge on beekeeping as well as that organized into groups to enhance linkage to service providers and reliable market access. The judgment of the use of this analytical method was based on how the project was designed as well as on how the baseline survey was conducted.

2.1.4.1 Household sampling and sample size
Recognizing that resources (funds, time and personnel) are limited the study worked with a sample of at least 10% of the total number of beneficiary beekeepers in each district. All beekeepers regardless of their participation in the BEET project formed a sample frame in each respective district. A stratified-random sampling of beekeepers’ households in proportion to the size of the strata using sex criteria was adopted to draw a sample size from the developed sample frame. The sample size for the study based on the heterogeneity of the population and this was drawn from participating and non-participating communities. A total of 172 beekeepers formed a sample size of the study. Out of these 67 were from Rufiji district, 59 from Sikonge district and the remaining 46 were from Uyui district (Table 1).

2.2 Data collection and analysis
The study utilized both primary and secondary quantitative and qualitative data. Quantitative data were collected using structured questionnaire with both closed and open ended questions that were administered to individual beekeepers. Qualitative data were collected using a combination of participatory rural appraisal (PRA) techniques including key informant interviews, focus group discussions and in-depth interviews. The quantitative data provided insights with respect to situations at an individual beekeeper level where as qualitative data captured issues pertinent to the entire group, village or community as a whole. Secondary data were obtained from review of relevant reports such as baseline report, annual progress reports, donor reports, and midterm review report as well as project log frame document.

Table 1: Number of respondents by sex across districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District name</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikonge</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uyui</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufiji</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quantitative data were coded and entered into computer spreadsheet of the Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) and STATA. Both descriptive such as percentages, multiple responses and cross-tabulation were generated. In addition, inferential statistical analysis was carried out to guide decision over acceptance or rejection of the envisaged research hypotheses. Inferential statistical analysis included independent sample t-test. A Propensity score matching technique using Stata version 11.1 was used to estimate the average effect of the interventions (BEET project interventions) on the treated (i.e. benefiting beekeepers) on annual income generated from beekeeping. Propensity score matching uses observed factors to model the propensity (probability) to be in the treatment group and then estimates the treatment effect as the mean difference in differences for pairs of treatment and control individuals with similar propensities (probabilities).

2.3 Problems and issues encountered
There were no major problems encountered during field data collection up to the delivery of this report. However, time scheduled for field data collection overlapped with the general national election calendar in Tanzania which led to delayed data collection as well as final report submission.

3.0 FINDINGS

3.1 Overall Results
The overall results of the project were evaluated in line with the main three domain of empowerment namely material, cognitive and relational. In terms of material domain, result revealed an improvement in income generated from beekeeping among beekeepers across the study area. It was also noted that as a result of increased income some of beekeepers had invested part of the income to acquire assets like livestock, bicycles as well as building good houses.

Beekeepers in the study area have improved their knowledge and skills on improved beekeeping practices. In each of the three districts, result revealed that 100% of the 102 respondents interviewed declared to have adopted at least one of the improved beekeeping practices such as use of improved beehives, protective gears and smokers. This led an increase in honey production with good quality.

Beekeepers in all three districts are organized into groups, which is a necessary step towards collective actions. For instance, in Rufiji district a total of twenty two (22) beekeepers’ groups have been registered by Business Registration and Licensing Agency (BRELA). As a result, beekeepers are working collectively, which enhances overall empowerment. However, it was noted that majority of beekeepers are still selling their produce individually especially for the products obtained from individual owned beehives. There was also a successful establishment of women forum at different levels in Rufiji district which has played a lot to ensure knowledge and experience sharing, exchange of ideas and networking with their fellow beekeepers outside of their locality. However, such development was still at infant stage in Sikonge and Uyui districts because intervention came later. In the two districts in Tabora the bee keepers have organized themselves into 13 groups registered at District and village level as economic groups (Annual Progress Report, 2015).

3.2 Accuracy of reported results
Data verification mainly focused on a single indicator “number of beekeepers organized in groups and implementing improved beekeeping practices”. This indicator was chosen because it was the core indicator for gauging project performance. Also with reference to the log frame it carried more weight. Result of the recounting process across districts is presented in Table 2.
Table 2: Result on the recounting number of project beneficiaries across three districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District name</th>
<th>Name of the group visited</th>
<th>Beneficiaries</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Verified</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Discrepancy</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>T</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sikonge</td>
<td>Ugunda Cooperative Societies</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chabutwa Cooperative societies</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kikungu Beekeepers grp (Sikonge)</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Igunavapina cooperative societies (Kiloleli)</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miyombo Beekeepers grp (Misheni–Sikonge)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vumilia Beekeepers grp (Mlogolo)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uui</td>
<td>Mshikamano Beekeepers grp (Ikongolo)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Katunda Beekeepers grp (Mabama)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kigwa beekeepers cooperative societies</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Itobela Beekeepers Cooperative societies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufiji</td>
<td>Tujikomboe Beekeepers grp (Ndundutawa)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Malikia Beekeepers grp (Nyaminywill)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Muungano Beekeepers grp (Kilimani)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tujikomboe Beekeepers grp (Mloka)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Upendo Beekeepers grp (Muyuyu)</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: M = Male, F = Female, T = Total

Results from the recounting process revealed conformity between the reported and verified figures; this suggests accuracy of the reported data in the annual progress report of the project.

3.3 Relevance

Given the focus of the project on reducing poverty and environmental sustainability, relevance is gauged by answering five basic questions; Is the project relevant? Was the project timely? Does it represent a strategic intervention? Does it promote opportunities to help people move out of poverty? Does it address key threats and critical barriers to conservation? Is the scope of the project appropriate?

The project was very relevant to the national development and environmental sustainability policies and strategies including the National Beekeeping Policy (1998), National Forest Policy (1998) and the Beekeeping Act (2002), and the Forest Act (2002). Although beekeeping is not a new endeavour in Tanzania there has been concern over traditional practices that are known to be unproductive and sustainable. For example, traditional beekeeping causes deforestation through debarking of trees and wild fires; and it is responsible for depopulation of bee colonies. Furthermore, traditional beekeeping practices were characterized by masculine tasks that exclude women from beekeeping. Throughout the implementation of this project there was no evidence of deforestation through debarking and/or wild fires. Also, introduction of proper beekeeping practices significantly reduced workload burdens among household members particularly women. Examples of recommended beekeeping practices introduced by the project included use improved beehives, smokers and protective gears.

In addition to being in line with forest-related policies, the project also fit well within the 2010 Second Generation National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (2010) that encourage sustainable income generating activities for empowerment. Beekeepers participating in the project have established several income generating activities such as small shops, grocery, fishing trade and selling of clothes. Furthermore, the project was coherent with the 1997 National Environmental Policy, which aims to ensure “sustainable and equitable use of resources for meeting the basic needs of the present and future generations without degrading the environment or risking health or safety”, etc.

The choice of the southern and western miombo woodland ecosystem for beekeeping project was excellent and strategic given the potential and long-term experience with traditional beekeeping. Pwani and Tabora...
regions are among the regions covered by substantial coverage of miombo woodlands that has been described as having high potential for beekeeping. Furthermore, the threats posed by traditional beekeeping practices to these have been well-documente.

3.4 Effectiveness  
3.4.1 Annual incomes from beekeeping  
Findings from different focus group discussions (FGDs) across all the three districts revealed an increase of annual household income generated from beekeeping. The magnitude of increase in incomes from beekeeping was about 70%, 80% and 50% for Rufiji, Sikonge and Uyui districts, respectively. This achievement exceeds the target of 25% increase in beekeeping incomes specified in the project document. It was also noted that the current observed nominal value of income accrued from beekeeping was higher compared to the recorded values during the baseline survey in the study area. For instance, during the baseline survey women and men in Rufiji district recorded an average annual income of TZS178,087.50 and TZS85,601.14 from beekeeping, respectively (Baseline survey Report, 2012). These were lower compared to the current one of which women and men had an average income of TZS312,428.57 (£96.43) and TZS600,142.86 (£185.23), respectively. Similar trend was also noted in Tabora region though its record was not disaggregated into respective districts. The increase was greatly contributed by adoption of improved beehives, protective gears and smokers during harvesting, a practice they were introduced to by BEET project. As a result they are now modern beekeepers that have led to increased productivity, production and good quality of honey.

However, the observed increase in annual income from beekeeping revealed some differences between women and men. In all three districts men accrued higher annual income from beekeeping than women (Appendix 7)

It was also further observed that within sex categories, men in Sikonge district had higher annual income (TZS1,189,722.20) compared to their counterparts in Uyui and Rufiji districts. For the case of women, in Rufiji district women regardless of lower honey production compared to other districts, had higher income (TZS312,428.60) than in the rest of the two districts. This might be associated with the high price per litre of honey which was realized in Rufiji district.

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare annual income generated from beekeeping between women and men across the three districts. Result revealed a significant difference in the income generated from beekeeping for men and women in the study area. These differences were significant conditions; t (27) = -2.651, p>0.015 in Sikonge; t (25) = -2.945, p>0.008 in Uyui; and t (40) = -2.04, p>0.048 in Rufiji (Appendix 7). These findings suggest that income accrued from beekeeping varies by gender. Specifically, our results suggest that men are likely to earn more income from beekeeping than women. This might be associated with the fact that men perform most of beekeeping activities on their own whereas women use hired labour to perform some activities such as hanging beehives, harvesting and transporting the products meaning they incur more costs than men leaving them with less income. These circumstances exclude the possibility that women may not be able to supervise their beehives, a scenario that has a negative effect on income accrued by women from beekeeping. In future it may be better to promote beekeeping technologies that allows establishment of bee apiaries close to homesteads. This will assist women to reduce cost of hiring labour to operate some of beekeeping activities such as beehives hanging and regular management as well as transportation of bee products.

Similarly, both men and women declared that use of improved beekeeping practices such as improved beehives, protective gears and smokers during harvesting had a positive effect on production level of bee products with good quality which in turn assured good prices. Incomes from beekeeping were used for various household obligations including children’s education, food and medical care; and investment in other income generating activities (IGAs). Furthermore, a number of beekeeper groups in Rufiji had established Village Community Banks (VICOBA) as one of their financial service institutions. Daudi Athuman Ngea, one of FGD member at Ndundutawa Village in Rufiji district quoted “Income generated from beekeeping has
helped me to engage in small business such as selling fish, poultry keeping as well as goat keeping” during the interview (October 2015)

3.4.2 Mobilizing beekeepers into groups and associations
In addition to traditional beekeepers acquiring improved beekeeping practices that positively affected the quality of honey they produce and thereby income they generate, the project also succeeded to organize 1518 new beekeepers (out of which 605 were female and the remaining 913 were male) into 37 groups, which is a necessary step towards strengthening collective action. In Rufiji district there are twenty two (22) beekeepers’ groups and all of them have been registered with BRELA. As a result, beekeepers are working collectively, which enhances their overall empowerment. In Tabora region there are 1518 new beekeepers groups which were formed by the project (Annual Progress report, 2015). The project had made some effort to ensure registration of these groups in the district councils. At least half of these groups have been registered and efforts are still underway to ensure that all groups are registered. However, it was noted that most of beekeepers are still selling part of their produce individually especially for the products obtained from individually owned beehives. This implies that although they are organized into groups, they could have taken bigger advantage of their organization to enhance their bargaining power. This might be associated with the fact that collection centers established in their locality had not yet started to function and this might be influenced with the current buying system whereby buyers directly buy honey from individual beekeepers. Plate 1 shows one of the collection centres built by the project at Mlogolo village in Sikonge district.

Plate 1: Honey collection centre at Mlogolo village in Sikonge district

It was also noted that collectively owned honey is kept to wait for a period of at least two to three months after harvesting for the boom price, which makes them earn more income than that from individually owned honey. On the other hand, individuals are unable to wait for the boom prices as they are faced with myriad household cash obligations at the time of harvesting. As such individuals end up getting lower prices, and accrued income. For instance, in Rufiji district some of the beekeepers’ groups had managed to sell 1litre of honey at TZS10, 000/= (equivalent to £3.09) against an average of TZS 5,500/= (equivalent to £1.69) that was secured from individual sales. Similar trend was also reported in Sikonge and Uyui districts whereby collective sales of honey secured TZS 5,000 per litre (equivalent to £1.54) compared to TZS 3,000 per litre (equivalent to £0.93) for individual sales. Thus further development of long term relationship with buyers is required. Apart from securing good prices, beekeepers in their groups pointed out a number of benefits acquired by active group members. These include accessing various trainings, knowledge and skills sharing, source of soft loans as well as access to market information.
Furthermore, the project assisted to revive beekeepers associations within the study area. For instance in Rufiji district, RUBEA was supported by the project to run its normal planned activities (such as conducting general meeting, enrollment of new beekeepers and or beekeeper groups and sensitization among beekeepers) which had stopped because of insufficient funding. Capacity building of RUBEA leaders was also undertaken. During the project period RUBEA officials have been hosted in the government building which was hired by the project. For the case of Tabora, the project worked hand in hand with TABECU. However, up to the time of this evaluation TABECU had not shown its readiness to work with the project. This might be due to their untruthful existing between TABECU and beekeepers in Tabora region. Thus, the project initiated process of facilitating district beekeepers association formulation.

3.4.3 Women empowerment

Women empowerment was assessed in its three main domains namely material, cognitive and relational. As discussed above, women in all three districts reported material improvement with respect to both income and assets possession. During the focus group discussion in Rufiji and Sikonge districts, women declared that as a result of increased income they had managed to build good houses, buying goats and cattle. Another woman in a focus group discussion at Kikungu village in Sikonge district quoted that, “I have bought two bicycles from beekeeping which helps me and my family a lot as a means of transport and collection of firewood”.

Cognitive empowerment

Regarding cognitive empowerment, the project has improved women knowledge and skills on beekeeping through various training which were offered. Traditionally beekeeping has been regarded as men’s activity but this notion was changed for women in the project villages through trainings. Women’s cognitive empowerment resulted in changes of their mindsets, which enabled them to begin beekeeping. Apart from beekeeping, women were also trained in leadership and entrepreneurship skills. Consequently, women recounted that their ability to analyze and act against any unjust treatment had been improved as a result of their participation in project supported trainings. These changes have also helped women to participate in developmental activities compared to the period before the project. One of woman in the FGD at Ndundutawa village in Rufiji district said quoted;

“….in these days some of men are looking for some consultation on different aspects of beekeeping husbandry from women”.

A similar finding was also reported in a FGD at Kiloledi village in Sikonge district whereby men admitted that women knowledge and skills on beekeeping has improved a lot. It was interesting to note that men are now beginning to appreciate the role of women in the beekeeping sector and other income generating activities, which were traditionally men’s activities.

Relational empowerment

Furthermore, the project has managed to support positive changes in some aspects on the relational empowerment domain for women. Results showed that in all three districts women had formed their own groups meant for various developmental activities apart from beekeeping. These groups had become a steering tool to achieve their well being and thus reducing their level of poverty. Also in groups comprising both men and women; women were found to hold at least one of the top leadership positions (i.e. chairperson, deputy chair person, secretary or treasurer). Similar finding was also reported by the mid-term review whereby it was pointed out that women occupy almost half of the leadership positions available in groups. In addition, women in Rufiji district had formed forum at different levels (i.e. from the group to the district level. Women are currently using these forums to share and exchange some experiences in business career. Mwamvita Hamis, one of the FGD member at Kilimani Village in Rufiji district quoted;

“Women forum has helped me to self-recognition, knowing each other and exchanging ideas”.

These findings come with explanation that project started much earlier (early 2013) in Rufiji district than the rest of the districts which receive the project in late 2014. Thus, the differences in timing meant that most of
the activities on relational empowerment were done within a limited time for Sikonge and Uyui districts. These facts may serve as explanations for the well developed women empowerment observed in Rufiji than the rest of the districts.

**Material empowerment**
Furthermore, results from the study revealed women empowerment under material empowerment domain. Such empowerment was not confined to beekeeping activities but cut across other income generating opportunities. For example, one of the FGD members at Muyuyu village in Rufiji district reported that women in their group were making clothes such as “Batiki” and had established Village Community Bank (VICOBA). She further pointed out that with all these women were no long totally depending on men to meet some of their needs. It was further found that women participation in beekeeping in all districts had improved. For instance, in Rufiji district women are involved in almost all activities in beekeeping whereas in Sikonge and Uyui due to long distance from their homestead to where beehives are hanged women tend to hire men especially for hanging of beehives, field beehive management and harvesting. This fact shows that distance to the location of hives has a pronounced influence to the participation of women in some beekeeping activities. This dictates a need for development or dissemination of a technology which would favour women participation in the future.

Also, beekeepers in both Tabora and Rufiji were exposed to Nane Nane events where they were introduced to various types of buyers, suppliers and agencies. There were also tours and exchange visits which included both women and men carried out. This built a relationship between beekeepers in the study area with outside buyers and input suppliers.

### 3.5 Efficiency
This study assessed how economic resources/inputs such as funds, expertise and time were converted into intended as well as unintended results. Findings from various consultations and review of reports revealed that time and funds were efficiently used.

#### 3.5.1 Managing partnership with the private sector
This study assessed how economical resources/inputs such as funds, expertise and time were converted into intended as well as unintended results. Findings from various consultations and review of reports revealed that time and funds were efficiently used. Despite the withdrawal of Honey Care which was the implementing partner, the project team managed to do almost all agreed activities using remaining resources efficiently. However, implementation in Sikonge and Uyui districts were delayed by one year following the withdrawal of Honey Care and drop out of some project staff in Tabora.

#### 3.5.2 Technology transfer
In long-run, use of demonstration apiaries (Plate 2) helped to reach many people with little investment. There was also leverage of resources during establishment of the apiary where beekeepers contributed in-kind (they offered a plot to build apiaries) and cash contributions that reduced the burden to the project while ensuring the sense of ownership of the project among beneficiaries.
Also during training session, project staff used public transport instead of hiring vehicles. This has contributed a lot to ensure large results with minimal resources (funds). According to the annual progress report (2015), the project has managed to reach 1,398 new beekeepers in total (out of these 568 are female and 830 are male), which is beyond the targeted goal (1,200 new beekeepers). Out of the reached new beekeepers 766 (537 male and 229 female) were from Tabora region. The rest 632 (293 male and 339 female) beekeepers were from Rufiji district.

### 3.5.3 Working with the government department
Implementation speed was revised through working with the District council and Tanzania Wildlife Research Institute (TAWIRI) after departing with Honey Care. With long-term experiences staff from the district councils and TAWIRI was able to use reasonable resources to reach a good number of beneficiaries. Also there has been a good working relationship with Rufiji district council offices as well especially with the beekeeping officer’s office. The office has been providing several training with regard to the use of improved beekeeping practices. Collaboration with the local authorities was one of the exit strategy put forward by the project management to ensure sustainability of delivered changes.

### 3.5.4 Value for Money of the project
The DFID’s approach to Value for money (VfM) was adopted to assess the optimal use of the resources to achieve the intended outcomes. The approach assesses the project/programme value for money using the 3Es framework that is effectiveness, economy and efficiency (DFID, 2011).

**Effectiveness**
Considering effectiveness the project proved to be of value for money. Outputs from the intervention achieved the desired outcome appropriately. For instance, various trainings offered by the project were of good quality and most of these training were put into use by the majority of beneficiaries. It was reported by 100% of the respondents in each district to have adopted various improved beekeeping practices which were introduced or scaled up by the project. Beekeepers have managed to increase their income by more than 25% which was the project target. This was reported by 93.3%, 89.3% and 90.5% of the respondents in Sikonge, Uyui and Rufiji districts, respectively. Results also revealed that beekeepers who had increased their honey production above the project target (20%) were 96.7%, 75% and 85.7% of the respondents in Sikonge, Uyui and Rufiji districts, respectively.
Economy
Economically the project proved to be of VfM. The project managed to drive down unit costs without compromising service quality such construction of collection centre, apiaries and offering various trainings. These were achieved through use of government staff in various training sessions at a cheaper cost, involvement of beekeepers (both in-kind and cash) to buy land for construction of collection centers and apiaries. Finally the use of public transports for implementation of various project activities among project staff. This helped to cover large area at a cheaper cost. Also there was use of government experts to do the trainings instead of private consultants.

3.6 Sustainability
In order to ensure sustainability of changes brought about by the project in the longer term the project has put some initiatives to establish and revive beekeepers associations. For instance in Rufiji district, Rufiji Beekeepers Association (RUBEA) was supported by the project in various ways to strengthen its capacity to run its regular activities. For example leadership training was provided to the leaders of the association to improve their competence. Leaders were also provided transport support to reach out to their members and create awareness among beekeepers on the role and importance of RUBEA. Findings from FGDs in Sikonge and Uyui districts revealed that beekeepers have lost trust with TABECU leadership. As a result most of beekeeper groups as well as individual beekeepers are currently not active members of the association. Thus, the project has put some effort to ensure that groups are registered as district association or cooperative. This is in contrast to RUBEA, whereby most of beekeeper groups and individual beekeepers are active members of RUBEA. Following collaborative works and financial supports which RUBEA was given by the project, RUBEA has managed to conduct its regular annual general meeting, create awareness among beekeepers on the importance of collective action on beekeeping, capacity building among beekeepers especially beekeeping and environmental conservation and lastly was to coordinate individual and beekeepers’ groups with beekeeping stakeholders such as government and non government organizations. Thus, in order to sustain the observed changes and linking beekeepers to markets RUBEA management still need capacity building support especially on entrepreneurship skills and formation of SACCOs. With a strong SACCO we assume that RUBEA can be in a position of supporting its member in terms of credits for purchasing various beekeeping facilities.

Contrary to RUBEA, currently TABECU is not doing well to fulfill its objectives. The main reason noted during the discussion with beekeepers in different focus group discussion in Sikonge and Uyui was poor leadership. For that matter TABECU with the current leadership which has lost its trust within beekeepers in the area can’t facilitate sustainable development of the sector.

Recruitment of local service providers were thought to be one of the exit strategies of the project to ensure sustainability of its activities. Most of these service providers delivered their services only when they were required or supported to do so by the project management. The project used to support them in terms of financial to meet transport, accommodation and meals. It was reported by the project management that some of service providers had established informal agreement with beekeeper groups to provide their services. For instance, Said Kisoma Bora (one of the service provider in Rufiji district) has already provided services to Tupendane and Kipugiranyuki beekeepers groups in Rufiji under BEET project upon their request. Also the same service provider has extended his services to other beekeepers group such as Mkongo which is not under BEET project. Some beekeepers, however, commented that the service providers’ efficiency was not much appreciated mainly due to issues related to inability or unwillingness of beekeepers to pay basic costs of the service providers like transport. None of the service providers interviewed had formal mutual agreement for the provision of services to their fellow beekeepers.

Working with government departments in respective districts has improved skills and knowledge of their staffs. This is thought to be useful beyond the life span of this project. Also women’s forum in Rufiji will ensure sustainability of women empowerment in both beekeeping and other enterprises.
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3.7 Impacts

3.7.1 Overall impacts of the project on social services

Findings from FGDs, household survey and in-depth interviews revealed that the project has improved the wellbeing of project beneficiaries’. Beekeepers pointed out that increased income from beekeeping has helped them to meet various social needs such as purchase of household food, children education as well as medical care. For example Mwajuma Bakari Mpingirwa an FGD participant at Muyuyu village in Rufiji district reported that:

“income generated from beekeeping has helped me to buy school uniform and pay school fees for my children; my children and those of my fellow beekeepers no longer walk bare footed”.

3.7.2 Impacts on total annual income from beekeeping

To assess the impact of BEET project on total annual household income generated from beekeeping the Propensity Score Matching (PSM) technique was used. PSM is a technique that employs a propensity score which is the probability of receiving the treatment based on the observable characteristics and uses this score to match individuals. The propensity score was operationalized as the predicted probability of participating in the BEET project estimated from a probit regression. The coefficients from this model (Appendix 8) show that the likelihood of having to participate in BEET project significantly depends on the sex, education level (years of schooling) and number of beehives owned.

Results in Table 3 show that the average probability in the treatment for all respondents was 71.5%. This implies that the probability for a particular respondent to participate in BEET project (treatment assignment) was 71.5%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Observation</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev.</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propensity score</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0.7153506</td>
<td>0.1921256</td>
<td>0.0017502</td>
<td>0.9817838</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s computation, 2015

Table 4 shows the impact of the treatment (project interventions) on the treated group. The estimated effect from propensity score matching shows a positive impact of BEET project on total annual household income from beekeeping for beneficiaries. The result indicates that participation in the BEET project increased the total annual income from beekeeping of participant by TZS 326,325.93 (equivalent to £100.72). This describes the impact on annual income attributed to the participation of beekeepers in the BEET project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sample</th>
<th>Treated</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>S.E</th>
<th>T-stat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual total household income from beekeeping</td>
<td>Unmatched</td>
<td>551433.333</td>
<td>395194.444</td>
<td>156238.889</td>
<td>134853.643</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sale of honey)</td>
<td>ATT</td>
<td>551433.333</td>
<td>225107.407</td>
<td>326325.926</td>
<td>115983.664</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Household survey data, 2015
N treated = 90; N control = 36; Total (N) = 126
Kernel matching
4.0 CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings it is concluded that the project has achieved its core objective.

a) It has achieved its objective of enhancing knowledge and skills of beekeepers that were organized into groups for collective action to carry out beekeeping as a business. As a result of this, beekeepers have become well-grounded in beekeeping as a business; have improved honey production in terms of quantity and quality, leading to improved income from beekeeping.

b) Although the project has demonstrated to them good practices of working with honey buyers and introduced them to various buyers during the life of the project further support to enable them forge a long term relationships with specific honey buyers is recommended.

c) Improvement in their annual income from beekeeping has helped target groups to meet various social service needs such as children education, household food and medical care, acquiring better housing structures etc.

d) Many beekeepers have also invested part of their income from beekeeping into other income generating activities. This has helped a lot to reduce the level of poverty among project beneficiaries.

e) The project generally proved to achieve value for money in terms of effectiveness, efficiency and economy components.

f) Women empowerment has been achieved leading to collective action among women in different development activities.

g) The project has supported to strengthen group leaders’ capacity through training on leadership skills, group formations and sustainability.

h) The project has supported RUBEA in terms of capacity building and financial support. This has helped RUBEA to revival its responsibility to serve beekeepers within the district.

5.0 LESSONS LEARNT

5.1 Success factors

The successes recorded from the project are attributable to the following factors:

1) Working through groups and associations enhanced effectiveness of the project interventions, thus contributing to the successes achieved.

2) Linkage of beekeeping activities to microfinance services of VICOBA ensured access to investment capital needed for adoption of improved beekeeping practices.

3) The choice of the project sites was strategic as it focused in areas that were already practicing traditional beekeeping, which means the project had not to begin from nothing.

4) Practical implementation approach. For example the use of experienced government research and extension beekeeping officers to deliver a number of trainings together with the project was efficient use of resources.

5) Project design features (theory of change). A good example is how the project intended to make coordinated interventions like: equipping beekeepers with practical beekeeping knowledge and skills using available trainers from service providers including government extension officers, support beekeepers organize themselves with a special emphasis on women and attract honey buyers to demonstrate to beekeepers working relationships with buyers to help beekeepers sell quality honey to generate enhanced income to improve their livelihoods. This theory worked well.

6) Women empowerment approaches. For instance the women’s forum has connected women to buyers as well as source of information on alternative income generating activities. As a result women are economically empowered and also increased self-confidence among women.

7) The implementation approach of working with groups and association emphasized the power of collective action. Achievements in the project beneficiaries demonstrate the power that comes with collective action through group training, group marketing, group learning through joint sharing of experiences and joint learning forums.

8) Flexibility in implementation modalities to achieve stated objectives of the project. For instance, when the project was delayed due to withdrawal of a local partner and staff drop out the project management looked at the challenges and in collaborative approaches designed a number of...
approaches that enabled them to implement almost all the planned activities. Such approaches include consulting other partners and recruiting new staffs. Collaborating partners consulted by the project were MURL Investment, Building Rural Income Through Enterprise (BRITEN) Tanzania and Farm Concern. MURL investment was mainly responsible for financial management whereas BRITEN Tanzania and Farm Concern were responsible for implementing project activities as well as human resource management.

5.1 Challenges
On the other hand, the challenges encountered from the project are attributable to the following factors:

1) Delayed recruitment of project staff to replace the drop out staff and withdrawal of the project partner from the project at a time when the project was supposed to take off.
2) Inadequate marketing expertise among the project staff has resulted in less technical support provided to the self-help groups, and/or associations with respect to value addition, marketing and market relations
3) Distance involved between villages which affected follow up in some remote beekeeper locations

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS
Following the level of performances accrued from the study area as well as challenges encountered, the following recommendations are put forward for consideration;

1) Consider introduction of value addition by beekeepers through vertical integration. Beekeepers are still selling their honey as raw material at low prices while at the end of the chain the consumer pays a price that is even five times or more than the beekeepers receive. Thus, further value addition activities should be emphasized among beekeepers.
2) There should be proper engagement in a partnership with the private and government sectors along the value chain. A need for clear and adequate guidelines to enter into partnerships with private sector is vital; thus, engagement should be based on merits upon competitive base through cost effective approach for undertaking various activities along the value chain. After beekeepers develop necessary beekeeping husbandry skills, it takes not less than 3 – 5 years to build chain partnerships, develop trust among actors and come up with joint business plan.
3) Strengthen linkage of beekeepers to the market which determine their capacity to bargain with buyers from outside their communities. To ensure this a need of market expert staff in the project would be part and parcel for the success
4) Rufiji Beekeepers Association (RUBEA) has demonstrated the potential to support beekeepers in various activities of the beekeeping value chain. However they could benefit from further capacity strengthening. TABECU seems to have lost trust from beekeepers in Tabora, a need for establishment of another associations meant for each district would serve the purpose of sustaining beekeeping operations in the area
5) The women empowerment forums which have started in Sikonge and Uyui can benefit from further support until they mature. This could assure a number of benefits which are currently enjoyed by their counterpart in Rufiji district.
6) Although the original timeframe envisaged during the project design was enough to impart trainings and demonstrate workability of improved beekeeping practices, it was not enough to ensure proper integration of the beekeepers in the value chain. Experiences suggest that proper integration in the value chain requires longer effective project period of about 5 years or more. Thus, to ensure effective completion of key project processes necessary for sustainability and proper integration of the beekeepers into the value chain it is recommended that the project be extended for two years.
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APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Terms of Reference for the Consultancy

Beekeepers Economic Empowerment Tanzania (BEET) Project - GR002-06013

Terms of Reference for Independent Final Evaluation

1. Introduction

Traidcraft Exchange’s East Africa (TX) is currently implementing Beekeepers Economic Empowerment Tanzania (BEET) project in Tanzania with funds received from Comic Relief and DFID.

Traidcraft Exchange is a UK based development charity specializing in making trade work for the poor by working to enable poor producers in Africa and Asia to grow their businesses, find markets, and engage effectively in trade. Traidcraft's mission is to fight poverty through trade, practising and promoting approaches to trade that help poor people in developing countries transform their lives. Established in 1979 as a Christian response to poverty, we combine a trading company and a development charity – Traidcraft Exchange. We passionately believe that trade can provide opportunities for people to work their way out of poverty by creating fair and efficient market linkages and helping households to increase their earnings and diversify their sources of income.

The project is in the final year and Traidcraft plans to undertake a final independent evaluation to assess the project achievement and impact. The final evaluation will be undertaken in three districts; Uyui and Sikonge districts in Tabora and Rufiji district. This TOR is intended to guide the consultant and all who will be involved in this evaluation.

2. Project description and Context

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>Bee keepers’ Economic empowerment-Tanzania (BEET) GR002-06013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Location | Pwani Region – Rufiji District.  
| | Tabora Region – Uyui, Urambo and Sikonge Districts |
| Project duration | DFID: Jan 2013 – Dec 2015  
| | Comic Relief: 1st Aug 2012 – 31st Dec 2015 |
| Project budget | £769,990.17 |
| Donors | Comic Relief (£260,000.00)  
| | DFID (£509,990.17 ) |
| Implementing agency | Implementing agency: Traidcraft Exchange |

Beekeepers Economic Empowerment Tanzania (BEET) project a three year project that started in January 2013 is being is being implemented by Traidcraft in Coastal Region and Tabora regions of Tanzania with support from DFID and Comic Relief. The three years project overall goal is to see “Reduced poverty amongst men and women bee-keepers and their families across the four districts in Tabora and Coastal regions of Tanzania”. This is being realized by improving beekeeping skills and knowledge of beekeepers for increased production and organizing the beekeepers into groups for collective action. The project is further linking the beekeepers to services providers, information and markets for improved honey quality and increase sales of honey and honey product leading to 25% increase in income for the target households. BEET project is currently reaching 3016 beekeepers and their families (18,096 people in total as direct beneficiaries) who are all organized into 59 group.

The project has the following key result areas:

- Target beekeepers are effectively working collectively and collaboratively to realize business benefits
- Target beekeepers have improved their production practices
- Target beekeepers have increased their income from sale of honey
- Women beekeepers are better organised and have greater knowledge and skills for beekeeping
- Target beekeepers have increased access to appropriate services provided by local service providers
- Target beekeepers have improved and consistent access to local, regional and international markets
3. **Purpose of the independent final evaluation**

The purpose of the independent final evaluation is to assess the impact, effectiveness and relevance of the project in relation to its stated goal, objectives and identifies key lessons and experiences that have resulted from the project during the four-year implementation period.

4. **Key objectives of the evaluation**

The specific objectives of the evaluation are to:

- Identify project achievement impact and ways it can be sustained
- Assess the extent to which the project was good value for money, which includes considering:
  - How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome
  - What has happened because of donor funding that wouldn’t have otherwise happened
  - How well the project aligns with DFID’s goals of supporting the delivery of the MDGs.
- Develop recommendations for further developments of the project or the guidance of similar projects in the future
- Draw key lessons learnt to contribute to the organisational learning of Traidcraft and other stakeholders

5. **Audience for the evaluation**

This independent evaluation is commissioned by Traidcraft and the findings will be shared with project funders, project staff, project beneficiaries, management and staff of Traidcraft and other relevant actors.

6. **Evaluation Issues and Key Questions**

The independent evaluation will address the following three fundamental project issues and questions;

6.1. **Verification of project achievement**

The first task of the final evaluation is to verify project achievement. This exercise could include verifying information that was presented in past annual reports and progress against the project log frame. This information/data will be supplemented with additional information collected through primary and secondary research.

Verifying the results from the project log frame will begin to capture what the project has achieved. However, there will be other activities and results that occur outside of the logframe that may require examination in order to respond to the different evaluation questions. Verifying reports will also necessarily include a review of the data and systems that were used to populate results.

6.2. **Assessment of value for money**

The evaluation will also assess the project impact by answering the following:

- The extent to which the delivery and results of the project are good value for money (How well the project applied value for money principles of effectiveness, economy, efficiency in relation to delivery of its outcome);
- The difference the project made (What has happened because of donor’s funding that wouldn’t have otherwise happened)
- What would we do differently in such project in future? (Strategic relevance and learning)
- To what extent is there evidence that the benefits delivered by the project will be sustained after the project ends?

6.3. **Lessons Learned**

Learning from experience in order to improve future practice is of strategic importance to Traidcraft and its partners.

Using participatory processes to draw on the experience and knowledge of key project stakeholders, the evaluator will identify any learning derived from the implementation of the project that can be incorporated into future activities. Key areas of consideration will be; Lessons related to project implementation / process, for example: project design; project tools, methods and approaches; project management and partnership; project monitoring and evaluation systems; value for money and lessons related to outcomes.
6.4. Evaluation questions

To ensure comparability across the final evaluation reports, the evaluator should adapt and respond to questions that answer the following:

- Relevance of Project Design: i.e. how appropriate and relevance was the project design to the needs of the target communities.
- Value for money: i.e. how efficient was the planning and implementation of project activities and its management:
- Effectiveness: i.e. how appropriate were the approaches and methods used to achieve stated project objectives and intended outcomes
- Project Impact: i.e. what change has been witnessed by target groups and other stakeholders as a result of a combination of inputs and activities the project deployed?

The evaluator should adapt and respond to the questions attached in Annex 1. The evaluator should use his/her discretion in the level of effort used to respond to these questions. In addition the evaluator should write a short synopsis of key points from each section for inclusion in the executive summary.

7. Evaluation Process and Methodology

The evaluation should be conducted in a participatory manner to bring multiple perspectives from key stakeholders in assessing the achievement of the project aim and specific objectives.

A Project Evaluation Group will be established to both inform and support the evaluation process. This will comprise key project staff from Traidcraft in-country, as well as key staff from Traidcraft’s Nairobi Office.

It is envisaged the Methodology will include:

7.1. Desk Phase

- Planning meeting with the Project Evaluation Group to develop guiding questions, elaborate and focus methodology and propose a work-plan.
- A desk review of existing project documents. (To be provided by Traidcraft.)
- An analysis of existing quantitative and qualitative data which will shed light on some of the project milestones
- Identification of issues and questions still to be answered and review of methodology.

7.2. Field Phase

- Semi-structured interviews with a sample of project beneficiaries (beekeepers), focus group discussions with a selection of project actors including, services providers, buyers and project staff for purposes of verifying the reported achievement of the project.
- Where necessary gather limited additional verification information. This will entail interacting with individuals/organisations that are not part of this project but relevant to the work being reviewed.

7.3. Synthesis Phase

- Presentation of Preliminary findings to project partners. This would provide a key opportunity to draw out any lessons learned.
- The findings of the evaluation will be elaborated into a draft evaluation report, which is structured as per the required format for a final evaluation report (see Annex 2).
- The draft report will be assessed by the Project Evaluation Group according to quality standards, and feedback will be provided to the consultant.
- On the basis of comments received, the evaluator will revise and deliver the final evaluation report.

8. Timeframe

This assignment shall commence on or about 7th October 2015, shall be completed on or before 25th November 2015. It is however appreciated that the actual consultancy period will be determined by such developments as responsiveness of stakeholders’ and this will be communicated from time to time as the case may be.
9. Deliverables

At the end of the evaluation, the selected consultant will be expected to deliver the following:

- A comprehensive final evaluation report. The number of pages of the report excluding annexes should not exceed 25 pages. One of the annexes should consist of a table which summarizes the findings against each outcome areas. A suggested report structure is provided as annex 2
- The tools and instruments used during the assessment
- Power-point presentation summarizing the key findings of the assessment

10. Required skills and experience

To carry out the above detailed task Traidcraft is looking for an evaluator with the following skills:

- Understanding and experience in agricultural sector or general development experience
- Background in entrepreneurship, privates sector development, agribusiness, international development or agricultural economics
- Proven experience in monitoring and evaluation including ability to design and implement primary research tools and processes e.g. surveys, in-depth interviews, focus group discussions.
- Experience in project management
- Interpersonal skills and ability to talk to people in different backgrounds and roles
- Ability and experience of using interactive, participatory techniques in monitoring and evaluation
- Analytical skills and ability to synthesise and summarise huge volumes of data
- Evidence of good report writing skills
- Good written English
- Proficiency in Swahili

A copy of a previous evaluation report should be submitted to assess ability to analyse and present findings, and to demonstrate methodologies used.

11. Proposal assessment criteria

Traidcraft will look into the following areas in assessing the quality of the proposal submitted by the bidding consultants

- Qualification, skills and experience of the consultant
- Clarity of understanding of the task at hand as described in consultants own words
- Quality and relevance of methodology proposed including adequacy of tools and approaches to be used in the study
- Value for money including comparison of proposed costs and methodology

12. Reference documents

In order to gain a proper perspective of the assignment at hand TX will provide the following document which the consultant will make reference to:

- Original project proposal (including budget)
- M&E framework
- Baseline report
- Well-being survey
- Annual project reports
- Mid-term evaluation report
- Case studies

13. Guidance on assignment

For overall guidance on the assignment please contact Janet.Ruminju@traidcraft.org, Tel: +254722386335

For any technical information, operational planning and logistics the consultant will liaise with Bupe Kyambiki, Project Manager, Traidcraft Tanzania; Bupe.Kyambiki@traidcraft.org; Tell: +255(0) 789 179 343; +255(0) 754 661 279.

TOR Annex: Key Evaluation Questions
The evaluator should adapt and respond to the questions below. The evaluator should use his/her discretion in the level of effort used to respond to these questions. In addition the evaluator should write a short synopsis of key points from each section for inclusion in the executive summary.

1. **Impact**

   Assess the extent to which the project has contributed to its original aims and objectives and to a long-term positive effect on the target groups/beneficiaries. Please consider how far the achievements can be attributed to the project (or how the project has contributed to any reported changes and impacts) and the extent to which they can be attributed to other external factors. Please also consider the counterfactual, that is, what would have happened to the beneficiaries if the project had not happened. Some of the specific questions to consider are:

   - To what extent and how has the project affected people in ways that were originally intended?
     - Beekeepers organization
       - How many beekeepers have benefited from the project?
       - How are beekeepers organized into groups and associations?
     - Production change
       - How did the production of honey change as a result of the project initiatives?
       - How was the change achieved, i.e. change of practices, productivity per hive, number of hives
     - Beneficiaries Income
       - What achievement has the grant made towards increasing beekeepers incomes from honey? (relationship with buyers, honey quality, price changes)
       - How did the spending power of the project beneficiaries (beekeepers) improve as a result of increased income?
     - Did inflation erode the value of income changes?

   - To what extent and how has the project affected people in ways that were not originally intended?

2. **Effectiveness**

   Assess the achievements of the project in relation to its stated objectives and intended outcomes/results. This should be a systematic assessment of progress against the final version of project outcomes and milestones as agreed with the funders (see shared project logframe). Data already provided by the project’s monitoring and reporting systems should provide much of the basic information. Quantitative and qualitative data should also be referred to. Some of the specific questions to consider are:

   - What outcomes/milestones have been achieved (expected, unexpected, successes)? Which objectives have been most useful and successful? [From the project logframe (to be provided with this TOR) that reports on achievements against the project milestones – the evaluator should verify these reports as part of their assessment of project effectiveness, completing the final column on the spreadsheet].
   - What are the key drivers and barriers affecting the delivery of results for the project?
   - What has not been achieved (failures, disappointments, missed opportunities, challenges) and why?
   - Were the assumptions in the project design realized? If not, how did this affect the project?
   - What were the risks identified? Did these materialize? If so, how did the project deal with them and reduce the impact on the project? Please complete a risk assessment matrix for inclusion in the final report (see annex 3 for template)
   - To what extent has the project used learning to improve delivery?
   - Given the project’s focus on a sector that is economically important to the targeted rural communities yet traditionally male-dominated, what can we learn from this project about overcoming the barriers (practical and cultural) faced by women in participating in and/or benefitting equitably from their participation in trade?
   - What was the nature of the participation in this project of different disadvantaged groups (e.g. women, disabled, elderly)? How and why have different sectors of the population been affected positively or negatively from the project?
   - Are there any exceptional experiences that should be highlighted, e.g. case studies, stories, best practice?
3. Relevance of Project Design
Given that the project context, risks and opportunities may have changed during the course of the project, please assess the appropriateness and relevance of the project design. Assess what adjustments were made and what others might have been necessary. Some of the specific questions to consider are:

- How well did the project respond to the needs of target beekeepers?
- To what extent did the project mainstream gender equality in the delivery of activities (and or other relevant excluded groups)?
  - Women empowerment
  - How did the project influence women participation in the project? i.e. beekeeping, beekeepers groups and in RUBEA (leadership, decision making, voting)
  - Was there any difference in the scale of the benefits accruing to men and women? What were the specific differences and what was the contributing factors?
- What could be done differently if starting a similar project/upscaling in relation to project design, choice of partners and management arrangements?
- The formation and strengthening of beekeeper groups and associations is a key element of this project's methodology. To what extent has the approach used in this project worked?
- To what extent did the grantee support achievement towards the MDGs

4. Efficiency of Planning and Implementation
It is a key concern of many funders that funding is able to demonstrate value for money. Assess to what extent resources were used economically to deliver the project. Some of the specific questions to consider are:

- To what extent were the results delivered on time and on budget against agreed plans?
- Which activities were undertaken in order to achieve project results? Were these conducted efficiently (in terms of expertise, time, costs, etc.)? Were the activities of the expected quality? This applies to the following:
  - Beekeepers organization (Group formation, leadership and governance of groups and associations, Beekeeper group trainings)
  - Honey production
  - Marketing (relationship with buyers, sales)
  - Women empowerment
- How are the beekeepers benefiting from the groups and from the association (RUBEA) e.g. improved access to technical support & services, better terms of trade with buyers, improved links to markets, influence upon policies etc.)
- Were there any planned activities that did not happen? If so, why?
- Have the resources been allocated in the most strategic way? Were the results/outcomes appropriate to the costs incurred? Could the results have been achieved more economically?
- How successful were the roles that Traidcraft played on project management? How could it be improved?

5. Potential for sustainability and replication
Assess the key factors affecting the sustainability of the project. Some of the specific questions to consider are:

- To what extent has the project leveraged additional resources (financial and in-kind) from other sources? What effect has this had on the scale, delivery or sustainability of activities?
- To what extent is there evidence that the benefits delivered by the project will be sustained after the project ends? Such benefits include: access to services from local service providers; access to markets/buyers; Women’s forum. Other factors to assess include:
  - Which organisations could contribute to ensuring continuity of project activities in the project area?
  - How committed are participating organizations/participants/businesses to continue utilizing new skills, knowledge, techniques acquired during the project?
  - Is there evidence of organizations/partners/communities that have copied, up-scaled or replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area? Is such replication or magnification likely?
- Does the current status/operation of the associations (RUBEA) provide platform for sustainability?
- What could be done differently if starting a similar project in relation to project design?
### Appendix 2: List of People Interviewed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SN</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Organization &amp; Contacts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>Janet Ruminju</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Programmes Manager</td>
<td>TRAIDCRAFT EXCHANGE, Office E2, 197 Lenana Place, Lenana Road, P.O. Box 969-00606, Nairobi, Kenya <a href="mailto:janetwr@traidcraft.co.uk">janetwr@traidcraft.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Bupe Kyambiki</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Projects Manager</td>
<td>TRAIDCRAFT EXCHANGE, Mikocheni kwa Warioba, Plot No 106, P.O. Box 13038, Dar es salaam, Tanzania <a href="mailto:bupek@traidcraft.co.uk">bupek@traidcraft.co.uk</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>Moses Kikomati</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Finance and administration officer</td>
<td>TRAIDCRAFT EXCHANGE, Mikocheni kwa Warioba, Plot No 106, P.O. Box 13038, Dar es salaam, Tanzania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>Malcolm Spence</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Donor - representative</td>
<td>Comic Relief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>Rashid Simfukwe</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Project Coordinator</td>
<td>Tabora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6)</td>
<td>Ashura Chambo</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Project Field Officer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7)</td>
<td>Job Lesilwa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Project Field Officer</td>
<td>Sikonge, Tabora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8)</td>
<td>Gideon Dyumyeko</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Project Field Officer</td>
<td>Uyui, Tabora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9)</td>
<td>Musa Abdallah Mlawa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>secretary - RUBEA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10)</td>
<td>Daud Athuman Ngea</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Chairperson – Tujikombe Beekeepers Group</td>
<td>Ndundutawa, Rufiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11)</td>
<td>Zarau Ali Mwela</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Secretary – Malikia Beekeepers Group</td>
<td>Nyaminywili, Rufiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12)</td>
<td>Said Bora</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Chairperson – Muungano Beekeepers Group</td>
<td>Kilimani, Rufiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13)</td>
<td>Asha Hussein Pauli</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Chairperson – Tujikombe Beekeepers Group</td>
<td>Mloka, Rufiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14)</td>
<td>Ramadhan Mchekwa</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Chairperson – Upendo Beekeepers Group</td>
<td>Muyuyu, Rufiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15)</td>
<td>Sarafina Nichola</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Beeking Officer – Sikonge District</td>
<td>Sikonge District Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16)</td>
<td>Amrani Selemani</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Vumilia Beekeepers group member</td>
<td>Mlogolo, Sikonge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17)</td>
<td>Jampani Lushoto</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Vumilia Beekeepers group member</td>
<td>Mlogolo, Sikonge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18)</td>
<td>Balton NdegeUlaya</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Chairperson, Igunavapina Beekeepers Societies</td>
<td>Kiloleli, Sikonge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19)</td>
<td>Swalehe Haruna</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Igembesabho beekeepers grp member</td>
<td>Kigwa, Uyui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20)</td>
<td>Christopher Madole</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Mshikamano beekeepers group</td>
<td>Ikongolo, Uyui</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Household Survey Questionnaire for Final Independent Evaluation for the Beekeepers Economic Empowerment Tanzania (Beet) Project

A) NAME OF THE INTERVIEWER

B) NAME OF THE INTERVIEWEE

C) STATUS OF THE INTERVIEWEE
   1. Project beneficiary
   0. Project non-beneficiary

D) DATE OF INTERVIEW

Instructions

- Please make sure you introduce yourself and explain the purpose of the study as per introduction presented after these instructions
- Ensure that you adequately complete the questionnaire at the time of interview
- Record answers appropriately in the space provided before asking the next question, where necessary use extra writing materials (empty pages attached at the end of this questionnaire)
- Use pencils
- Remember to thank the respondent after the interview
- Options of “other” need to be followed by the details.

E) IDENTITY OF THE INTERVIEWED HOUSEHOLD HEAD/BEEKEEPER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Variable Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01) Name of the region</td>
<td>1. Tabora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Coast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02) Name of the District</td>
<td>1. Sikonge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Uyui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Rufiji</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03) Name of the ward</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04) Name of the village</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05) Name of the Household head</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06) Sex of the household head</td>
<td>1. Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F) DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Variable Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07) Age of the respondents (years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08) Sex of the respondent</td>
<td>1. Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09) Number of years of schooling of the respondent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Education level of the respondent</td>
<td>1. Non formal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Primary Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Secondary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Tertiary education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Marital status of the respondent</td>
<td>1. Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Separated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Widow/widower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Main occupation of the respondent</td>
<td>1. Crop farmer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Name</td>
<td>Variable Value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Number of years in beekeeping (experience)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Total number traditional hives harvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Total number of improved hives harvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Total number hives harvested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Family size of the respondent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

G) RELEVANCE OF THE PROJECT
18) Did the project’s objectives address your problems and real needs in beekeeping?
   1. Yes  2. No
19) Ways in which the project influenced women participation in the project (Multiple response)

H) PARTICIPATION
20) Are People fully in the driving seat and owning their undertakings?  1. Yes  2. No
21) Do the interventions cover the whole spectrum of possible beneficiaries (including marginalized, poor, youth, etc.)?  1. Yes  2. No

I) EFFECTIVENESS
22) Has your annual income generated from honey increased by at least 25% as compared to the situation before the project intervention?  1. Yes  2. No
23) How do you perceive an improvement in your well-being? (“Wellbeing is experienced when people have what they need for life to be good”)  1. High  2. Medium  3. Low
24) Has your honey production increased by at least 20% compared to your previous level of production before the project?  1. Yes  2. No
25) Are you an active member group of Regional Beekeeper Associations such as TABECU or RUBEA?  1. Yes  2. No
26) What benefits are you accessing/getting being a member a group?
27) Are you satisfied or very satisfied with benefits from membership of local groups?  1. Yes  2. No
28) Are you an active member of any beekeepers’ group?  1. Yes  2. No
29) Did you participate directly in project training activities related to bee husbandry and environmental management 1. Yes  2. No
30) Have you adopted at least one new practice as a result of the training received 1. Yes  2. No
31) If yes, mention them

32) Did you receive trainings in business and enterprise, credit and financial management and leadership?  1. Yes  2. No
33) In your beekeepers group, are women given leadership positions (such as chairperson, treasurer, secretary or Board Member)?  1. Yes  2. No
34) Specifically for women; Are you applying new entrepreneurship skills in your honey and other businesses?  1. Yes  2. No
35) How do you rank your ability to access honey markets?  1. Improved  2. No differences  3. decreased
36) Are the number of buyers of your bee products increasing or decreasing?
37) If Increasing, give reasons
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38) If decreasing, give reasons

........................................................................................................................................

J) EFFICIENCY
39) Which activities were undertaken in order to achieve project results? [Multiple response]
   1) Beekeepers organization (group formation, leadership & governance of groups & association,
      beekeepers group management training)
   2) Improved beekeeping production trainings
   3) Marketing (relationship with buyers, sales)
   4) Service providers
   5) Women empowerment
40) Were these activities conducted efficiently (in terms of expertise, time, costs, etc.)? 1.
   Yes 2. No
41) Were the activities of the expected quality? 1. Yes 2. No

K) IMPACTS
42) What has changed (intended ones)?
   1) Beekeepers organization
   2) Production change
   3) Beneficiaries Income
   4) Others (specify)
43) How many litres of honey are you producing annually from improved beehives? .......
44) How many litres of honey are you producing annually from traditional beehives? ...
45) Ways in which changes in production were achieved through
   1) Change of practices
   2) Productivity per hive
   3) Increased number of hives
   4) Use of improved hives
   5) Others (specify)
46) Has the beneficiaries’ income increased as a result of honey sale? 1. Yes 2. No
47) What was your annual income generated from beekeeping? (TZS) .........................
48) As the observed increase in income from honey due to
   1) Relationship with buyers
   2) Honey quality
   3) Prices change
   4) Others (specify)
49) What is the average price of honey per litre? (TZS) ..............................................
50) Was there any difference in the scale of the benefits accruing to men and women?  1. Yes 2. No
51) What were the contributing factors of the differences between men and women?

........................................................................................................................................

L) SUSTAINABILITY OF THE PROJECT ACTIVITIES
52) Are the benefits delivered by the project (such as access to services from local service providers,
    access to markets/buyers, increased honey production, women forum) be sustained after the project
    ends? 1. Yes 2. No
53) If Yes, give reasons
   .....................................................................................................................................
54) If No, give reasons
   .....................................................................................................................................
55) Are there organizations that could contribute to ensure continuity of project activities in the project
    area? 1. Yes 2. No
56) If Yes, mention them

57) Is there evidence of organizations/partners/communities that have copied, up-scaled or replicated project activities beyond the immediate project area? 1. Yes 2. No

58) Does the current status/operation of the associations (TABECU or RUBEA) provide platform for sustainability? 1. Yes 2. No

59) Was the design and implementation of the project participatory? 1. Yes 2. No

Appendix 4: List of Supporting Documents
1) BEET logframe submitted at proposal design
2) BEET Approved proposal
3) Baseline report for BEET Project (Tabora)
4) Baseline report for BEET Project (Rufiji)
Appendix 5: Check List for Buyers

Questions for interviews with honey buyers

Selection or linkage to beekeepers

- When did it happen that you became honey buyer and how did it happen? Do you know why you were chosen? (Selected by whom)

Background (level/coverage of trade e.g. local, national, regional or international, for how long have you been in this trade/business?)

Tasks

- What are your roles as buyers?
- Explain your mode of interaction with individual beekeepers, beekeeper groups, association, BEET and village government (any contract -written/verbal)
- What support is provided to your as buyer by BEET or TRAIDCRAFT and village government
- Number of households / groups you work with
- Number of project components and/or activities you are involved

Pricing

- What factors do you consider to offer a certain price per litre of honey?
- Do you offer different price per one litre of honey as a result of quality difference?

Quality control

- Do you have your quality control criteria?
- If YES, are they known to beekeepers?
- Do you have contract with individual beekeepers, groups or associations?
- Do you have quality control monitoring system?
- Do you provide quality certificates as well as premium to beekeepers who have managed to produce good quality honey?

Successes/benefits

- What benefits are you attributing to BEET project (how has your business benefited from BEET project)?
- How do you compare the quality of honey produced by beekeepers before and after the project implementation?
- Do you get the require volume of honey you wish to buy annually?

To be improved / failures

- What is not working out well – what do you consider as failures?

Reward System / Feedback

- Do you provide any reward for what you do – if yes specify. Do you receive feedback on your work – if yes from whom and how (how helpful is this feedback)?

Strengths and Weaknesses of BEET work

- What do you perceive as strengths and weaknesses of the work of BEET in general?

Future

- How do you see your services as buyer in future – any proposals for the future services?
Appendix 6: Check List for Service Providers
Questions for interviews with Village Promoters or Service Providers

Selection
❖ When did it happen that you became a Service Provider and how did it happen? Do you know why you were chosen? (Selected by whom)

Background information (Name, education, age, etc.)

Tasks
❖ What is your work as a Service Provider?
❖ How much of your time (quantify) do you spent for it in a week?
❖ Did you get any training after being selected as Service Provider? If “Yes” what type of training?
❖ Explain your mode of interaction with BEET and village government (any contract -> written/verbal)
❖ What support is provided to your as Service Provider by BEET or TRAIDCRAFT and village government
❖ Number of households / groups you work with
❖ Number of project components and/or activities you are involved

Assignments
❖ Is there anybody who is assigning the work to you? If yes – who is it and how is it done?

Supervision and Reporting
❖ Is your work being supervised by somebody – if yes, by whom and how? To whom are you reporting to about the work?

Successes
❖ What is going on well and what are the successes that you have achieved in work?
❖ Are you paid by beekeepers outside BEET when offering services to them?
❖ If YES, how much do you charge for each respective services provided?
❖ How much will you charge in future for these similar services you are currently offering?

To be improved / failures
❖ What is not working out well – what do you consider as failures?

Reward System / Feedback
❖ Do you receive any reward for what you do – if yes specify. Do you receive feedback on your work – if yes from whom and how (how helpful is this feedback)?

Strengths and Weaknesses of BEET work
❖ What do you perceive as strengths and what as weaknesses of the work of BEET in general?

Future
❖ How do you see your work as Service Provider or Village Promoter in future – any proposals for the future work? How much longer will BEET work in the village/community (what would you still need to work as promoter without BEET)
### Appendix 7: Results of t-test and Descriptive Statistics for Annual Income from Beekeeping within Project Beneficiaries by Sex across Three Districts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of the district</th>
<th>Test Variable</th>
<th>Grouping variable (Sex)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sikonge</td>
<td>Annual income received from beekeeping (honey selling)</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>294,090.91</td>
<td>314,140.24083</td>
<td>-1,600,759.17 - 190,503.45</td>
<td>-2.651**</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1,189,722.22</td>
<td>1,375,645.80793</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uyui</td>
<td>Annual income received from beekeeping (honey selling)</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>161,825.91</td>
<td>147,270.54486</td>
<td>-641,114.73 - 108,358.44</td>
<td>-2.94***</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>536,562.50</td>
<td>476,902.22181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rufiji</td>
<td>Annual income received from beekeeping (honey selling)</td>
<td>women</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>312,428.57</td>
<td>324,126.60666</td>
<td>-572,782.98 - 2,645.58</td>
<td>-2.04**</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Men</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>600,142.86</td>
<td>559,220.37568</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .01; ** p < .05

Source: Author’s computation, 2015
Appendix 8: Probit Regression Model for BEET Project Participation (Treatment), Given (Outcome)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Standard Error</th>
<th>z</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>-0.0046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex of the respondent (1 = male)</td>
<td>-0.630**</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>-2.32</td>
<td>-1.1632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years of schooling</td>
<td>0.109**</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>-0.0032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience in beekeeping (years)</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>-0.0156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family size</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.81</td>
<td>-0.1113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of beehives owned</td>
<td>-0.012***</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-2.67</td>
<td>-0.0217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.263</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>-1.5714</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s computation, 2015
Number of observation= 146; LRchi² (6) =25.97; Pseudo-R²= 0.1342; Log likelihood= -83.731479; Prob>chi²=0.0002
**. *** = significant at 5% and 1%, respectively
## Appendix 9: Profile of Evaluation Team

### A) Curriculum Vitae For Nicholaus Musimu Kuboja

#### 1. BIOGRAPHICAL DETAILS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Surname:</th>
<th>Kuboja</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full names:</td>
<td>Nicholaus Musimu Kuboja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First name:</td>
<td>Nicholaus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth:</td>
<td>1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality:</td>
<td>Tanzanian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 2. CONTACT DETAILS

Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives, Tumbi – Agricultural Research and Development Institute, P. O. Box 306, **TABORA, TANZANIA.**

Cell phone: +255(0)784 312033/+255(0)763 434888

E-mail: [nmusimu@yahoo.com](mailto:nmusimu@yahoo.com) or [nkuboja@gmail.com](mailto:nkuboja@gmail.com)

#### 3. QUALIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qualifications</th>
<th>Institution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PhD Agric. Economics</td>
<td>Sokoine University of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSc. Agric. Economics</td>
<td>Sokoine University of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSc. Agric. General</td>
<td>Sokoine University of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 4. WORK EXPERIENCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employer</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Years employed</th>
<th>Job description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Ministry of Agriculture, Food security and Cooperatives | Senior Agricultural Research Officer | 2004 – To Date | Conduct adoption and impact research studies of different agricultural technologies  
Production and market researches of different agricultural commodities  
Preparation of research recommendations  
Preparation of Farm/enterprise budgets  
Writing technical research project reports  
Conducting participatory agricultural researches  
Analysing socio-economic issues related to innovative agricultural technologies  
Conducting M & E of innovative and development projects  
Writing research proposal  
Consultancy                                                                                      |
| CARE International in Tanzania                     | Research Assistant                 | 2009           | Designing impact assessment, monitoring & evaluation activities  
Conducting impact assessment  
Conducting monitoring and evaluation                                                             |
| Ministry of Education and Culture                   | Educational Officer                | 2004           | Teaching sciences subjects (Biology and Chemistry)                                                                                              |
| Burka Coffee Estates, Arusha, Tanzania              | Junior Farm Manager                | 2002 – 2004    | Farm budget preparation annually  
Planning monthly activities on coffee pest and diseases management  
Planning irrigation activities                                                                   |
5. WORKSHOPS AND SEMINARS


5.2 Qualitative Research Methods and Research Planning (2013)
Organized jointly by the University of Copenhagen and Sokoine University of Agriculture

5.3 Agribusiness value chains in a methodological perspective (2013)
Organized by the University of Copenhagen

5.4 Agricultural Marketing: Value chain analysis and development (2011)
Organized and sponsored by The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security - Department of Research and Training

5.5 Zonal Agricultural Training Workshop on Strengthening Capacity of the Agricultural Sector to Adapt to Climate Change Impacts in Africa (2011)
Organized by Institute of Resource Assessment, University of Dar es Salaam and Michigan State University

5.6 Impact assessment of agricultural technologies with special emphasis on the use of SPSS (Statistical Programme for Social Scientists) and STATA (Statistical Data Analysis) computer programmes (2010)
Organized and sponsored by The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security - Department of Research and Training

5.7 Lake Basin Catchment Management for Lake Tanganyika (2010)
Organized by Lake Tanganyika Project; sponsored by Lake Tanganyika Authority, World Agro forestry Centre and Global Environment Facility

5.8 Introduction to quantitative methods with SPSS Application (2008)
Organized and sponsored by The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security - Department of Research and Training

5.9 Adoption and impact analysis of agricultural technologies (2008)
Organized and sponsored by The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security - Department of Research and Training

5.10 Monitoring and evaluation of agricultural projects (2008)
Organized and sponsored by The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security - Department of Research and Training

5.11 Formal survey (2008)
Organized and sponsored by The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security - Department of Research and Training

5.12 Farming system Approach (2008)
Organized and sponsored by The Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security - Department of Research and Training

Organized and sponsored by Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA), Faculty of Forestry and Nature conservation & The University of Applied Sciences of Western Switzerland (EIL), Natural Resource Management Department

5.14 Agricultural Research project formulation, experimental design, data analysis and report writing (2005)
Organized and sponsored by The Bureau for agricultural Consultancy and Advisory Services (BACAS) – SUA & Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security – Department of Research and Training
6. CONSULTANCY RESEARCH WORKS

6.1 Consulted by TRAIDCRAFT EXCHANGE to provide a consultancy service to undertake Final Independent Evaluation for the Beekeepers Economic Empowerment Tanzania (BEET) project in order to assess the project achievement and impact [2015]

6.2 Consulted by Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development to undertake socioeconomic impacts of “Up scaling of thermotolerant vaccine technology for the control of Newcastle disease in Tanzania” [2015]

6.3 Consulted by Tobacco Research Institute of Tanzania (TORITA) to conduct researches work on;

✓ Tobacco Production Baseline Survey in Mara Region [2012]
✓ On-farm evaluation of Improved Tobacco varieties in Mara Region [2013]
✓ A comparative analysis of tobacco production and marketing systems between Tanzania and other regional African countries: Opportunities and constraints [2014]

6.4 Consulted by Sokoine University of Agriculture under a research initiative titled “Advancing Conservation in a Social Context: Working in a World of Trade-offs (ACSC)” to conduct a research on “Eviction on Pastoralists from Usangu Basin: Impact Assessment on their Livelihoods” [2010]

7. RESEARCH GRANT AWARD

8.1 Research grant award from REPOA to research on “Impacts of Microfinance on Poverty and Environmental Conservation: The Case of Uluguru Mountains”

8. PROFESSIONAL MEMBERSHIP

8.2 Member of Tanzania Evaluation Association (TanEA) since 2010: Membership ID: 0064

8.3 Member of International Society for Development and Sustainability (ISDS) since 24th March, 2014: Membership ID: M140198

8.4 Prospective member of the European Evaluation Society (EES)

9. PUBLICATIONS AND RESEARCH REPORTS

9.1 Publications in Journals


9.2 Papers in the Conference Proceedings


research Workshop. 9th -11th April, 2014, at Ledger Plaza Bahari Beach Hotel, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.


9.3 Accomplished Research Works
9.3.1 An Investigation of Ifogong’ho: A Semi-Formal Credit System in Mwadubi Village, Mwanza Region, Tanzania
9.3.2 Impact Assessment of Usangu Basin Pastoral Eviction on their Livelihoods
9.3.3 Improving Household Food Security and Income through Introduction of Fertilizer Trees in Maize Production System in Kigoma Region
9.3.4 Introduction of Improved Avocado and Passion Varieties among Smallholder Farmers in Kigoma Highlands for Income and Nutrition Status Improvement
9.3.5 Contribution of Tobacco Industry on Country's Economy, Food Security, Employment and Environmental Conservation in Tanzania

9.4 Ongoing Research Works
9.4.1 Economic efficiency of beekeeping and its implication on poverty among beekeepers in Tabora and Katavi Regions of Tanzania

B) Curriculum Vitae for Dr. Jackson Nkuba

1. FULL NAME: Jackson Madulu Nkuba
2. DATE AND PLACE OF BIRTH: 23/08/1959; Meatu, Simiyu, Tanzania
3. NATIONALITY: Tanzanian
4. MARTIAL STATUS: Married
5. Contact Address:
   Position: Assistant Director – Socio-economics
   CONTACT: Department of Research and Development
   Ministry of Agriculture, Food Security and Cooperatives
   P.O. Box 2066, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
   Tel: +255 787024139 or +255 754760443
   Email: jmnkuba@yahoo.com

6. ACADEMIC QUALIFICATION:
   2007 - PhD. Agricultural Economics, Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania
   1996 - MSc. Agricultural Economics, University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
   1990 - BSc. General Agriculture (Rural Economy Option), Sokoine University of Agriculture, Morogoro, Tanzania
   1983 - Diploma in Agro-mechanisation MATI Nyegezi, Mwanza, Tanzania

7. OTHER COURSES/SEMINARS ATTENDED:
   ▪ Senior Management Programm. Mananga, Swaziland July – August 2015
Leadership and management skills training course conducted by the Eastern and Southern African Management Institute – ESAMI at Njoro Hill, Arusha, Tanzania, February – March 2003

- Strategic planning and research management training workshop organised by Topridas Consultancy Services based in Nairobi, Kenya held at ARI – Maruku, September 2002
- Team building workshop held at Tanzania Coffee Research Institute (TaCRI) - Lyamungu, Moshi, Tanzania. August 2002
- Training workshop on methods of marketing analysis held at ICRAF, Nairobi 1999
- Training on monitoring, adoption and evaluation of agricultural technologies at Egerton University, Njoro, Kenya 1998
- Regional Training workshop on natural resources analysis policy at Egerton University, Njoro, Kenya 1997. From 19 – 30/05/1997.
- Gender analysis workshop at ARI Ukiriguru, Mwanza, 1994
- On-farm research workshop: Diagnostic phase and experimental phase on Farming systems research programme held at University of Zimbabwe. 30/09/1991 – 11/10/1991 and 03 – 21/02/1992 respectively.

8. EXPERIENCES:
1999 - to date: 27 years experiences on research administration and management, planning, monitoring and evaluation of projects, technology transfer, marketing, adoption and impact studies. Also, I have good skills and knowledge on statistical packages (SPSS and STATA). In addition, I am expert on agricultural innovation system and value chain development approach, household economics, Participatory approaches (farming systems approach and Farmer Field Schools and Client Oriented Research and Development Management Approach

1997 - 1999: Head of Socio-economic research programme, ARI Maruku, Bukoba. Tanzania
1991 - 1995: Head of Farming Systems Research (FSR) section, ARI Maruku, Bukoba. Tanzania

9. RECENT CONSULTANCIES (SELECTED)
- Banana value chain analysis and marketing in Kagera and Kigoma regions, Tanzania, 2012.
- Evaluation of comprehensive village based natural resources management and sustainable agriculture Project Phases V and VI, 2010.
- Evaluation of Tanzania Dairy Goats Programme based at Heifer International Tanzania, Arusha in 2005. Funded by Rapid Funding Envelop (REF)/TACAIDS.
- Assessment of socio-economic impacts of improved banana varieties on livelihoods of farmers in Kagera Region, Tanzania funded by IFPRI/INIBAP from 2002 – 2005

10. SELECTED PUBLICATIONS:


## Appendix 10: Evaluation Research Schedule

Key activities for the consultancy on final evaluation of BEET project in Uyui, Sikonge and Rufiji districts and their respective timing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nature of the work to be done</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Briefing and contract signing</td>
<td>7th – 8th Oct, 2015</td>
<td>TX &amp; Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A desk review of the existing project documents, preliminary interview with the project staffs and review of methodology</td>
<td>9th – 14th Oct, 2015</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of Inception Report with a detailed methodology, schedule of training &amp; data collection</td>
<td>15th October, 2015</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enumerators training, reconnaissance survey and selection of respondents</td>
<td>16th – 21st Oct, 2015</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection (household surveys, key interview and focus group discussion)</td>
<td>21st Oct – 4th Nov, 2015</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data processing (entry, compilation and data cleaning)</td>
<td>5th -10th Nov, 2015</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis and report writing</td>
<td>11th – 17th Nov, 2015</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of draft report</td>
<td>17th November, 2015</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback shared with TX</td>
<td>20th November, 2015</td>
<td>TX</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review and submission of final report</td>
<td>25th November, 2015</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix 11: Contribution to GPAF Objectives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPAF Objectives</th>
<th>BEET contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Poverty reduction</td>
<td>The project has helped its beneficiaries to come out of poverty through increased annual income accrued from beekeeping. Findings from different focus group discussions (FGDs) across all the three districts revealed an increase of annual household income generated from beekeeping. The magnitude of increase in incomes from beekeeping was about 70%, 80% and 50% for Rufiji, Sikonge and Uyui districts, respectively. This achievement exceeds the target of 25% increase in beekeeping incomes specified in the project document. It was also noted that the current observed nominal value of income accrued from beekeeping was higher compared to the recorded values during the baseline survey in the study area. For instance, during the baseline survey women and men in Rufiji district recorded an average annual income of TZS 178,087.50 and TZS 85, 601.14 from beekeeping, respectively (Baseline survey Report, 2012). These was lower compared to the current one of which women and men had an average income of TZS 312, 428.57 (£ 96.43) and TZS 600,142.86 (£ 185.23), respectively. Similar trend was also noted in Tabora region though its record was not disaggregated into respective districts. The increase was greatly contributed by adoption of improved beehives, protective gears and smokers during harvesting, a practice they were introduced to by BEET project. It was also further observed that within sex categories, men in Sikonge district had higher annual income (TZS 1,189,722.20) compared to their counterparties in Uyui and Rufiji districts. For the case of women, in Rufiji district women regardless of lower honey production compared to other districts had higher income (TZS 312, 428.60) than in the rest of the two districts. Incomes from beekeeping were used for various household obligations including children's education, food and medical care; and investment in other income generating activities (IGAs). For instance, within the study area beekeepers are using income from beekeeping to invest in clothes making, petty trade (especially fish trade in Rufiji), establishment of grocery and shop. Furthermore, a number of beekeeper groups in Rufiji had established Village Community Banks (VICOBAs) as one of their financial service institutions. Daudi Athuman Ngea, one of FGD member at Ndundutawa Village in Rufiji district quoted “Income generated from beekeeping has helped me to engage in small business such as selling fish, poultry keeping as well as goat keeping” during the interview (October</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Millennium Development Goals (MDGs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPAF Objectives</th>
<th>BEET contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MDG 1: Eradicate extreme poverty and hunger</td>
<td>The project helped the beneficiaries to enhance their capacity to acquire disposable income they can use to meet their basic needs including food. For instance, it was reported in focus group discussions in Uyui and Sikonge districts of Tabora that income from beekeeping has helped a lot to secure their families in terms of food. Members in the focus group pointed out that majority of people depend on tobacco farming to generate income, thus, during the bad season beekeeping has been as an alternative source of income for purchasing of food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG 3: Promote gender equality and empower women</td>
<td>In most of beekeeping communities in Africa beekeeping is basically for men; currently this belief does not hold in the study area whereby women have adopted beekeeping as one of their source of income. For instance in Rufiji number of women beekeepers who were organized into new groups by BEET project outweighs the number of men. Out of 632 beekeepers under BEET project in Rufiji, 339 beekeepers are women whereas the remaining 293 are men. In Tabora region this study noted an increased trend of women to participate in beekeeping activities. For instance, currently women are also involved in beehives hanging and harvesting of honey. Women empowerment was assessed in its three main domains namely material, cognitive and relational. Findings revealed that women in all three districts reported material improvement with respect to both income and assets possession. During the focus group discussion in Rufiji and Sikonge districts, women declared that as a result of increased income they had managed to build good houses, buying goats and cattle. Another woman in a focus group discussion at Kikungu village in Sikonge district quoted that, “I have bought two bicycles from beekeeping which helps me and my family a lot as a means of transport and collection of firewood”. Regarding cognitive empowerment, the project has improved women knowledge and skills on beekeeping through various training which were offered. Traditionally beekeeping has been regarded as men’s activity but this notion was changed for women in the project villages through trainings. Women’s cognitive empowerment resulted in changes of their mindsets, which enabled them to begin beekeeping. Apart from beekeeping, women were also trained in leadership and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPAF Objectives</td>
<td>BEET contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| entrepreneurship skills. Consequently, women recounted that their ability to analyze and act against any unjust treatment had been improved as a result of their participation in project supported trainings. These changes have also helped women to participate in developmental activities compared to the period before the project. One of woman in the FGD at Ndundutawa village in Rufiji district said quoted; “….in these days some of men are looking for some consultation on different aspects of beekeeping husbandry from women”. | A similar finding was also reported in a FGD at Kiloleli village in Sikonge district whereby men admitted that women knowledge and skills on beekeeping has improved a lot. It was interesting to note that men are now beginning to appreciate the role of women in the beekeeping sector and other income generating activities, which were traditionally men's activities. Also, the project has managed to support positive changes in some aspects on the relational empowerment domain for women. Results showed that in all three districts women had formed their own groups meant for various developmental activities apart from beekeeping. These groups had become a steering tool to achieve their well being and thus reducing their level of poverty. Also in groups comprising both men and women; women were found to hold at least one of the top leadership positions (i.e. chairperson, deputy chair person, secretary or treasurer). Similar finding was also reported by the mid-term review whereby it was pointed out that women occupy almost half of the leadership positions available in groups. In addition, women in Rufiji district had formed forum at different levels (i.e. from the group to the district level. Women are currently using these forums to share and exchange some experiences in business career. Mwamvita Hamis, one of the FGD member at Kilimani Village in Rufiji district quoted; “Women forum has helped me to self-recognition, knowing each other and exchanging ideas”. Moreover, results from the study revealed women empowerment under material empowerment domain. Such empowerment was not confined to beekeeping activities but cut across other income generating opportunities. For example, one of the FGD members at Muyuyu village in Rufiji district reported that women in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GPAF Objectives</th>
<th>BEET contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>their group were making clothes such as “Batiki” and had established Village Community Bank (VICOBA). She further pointed out that with all these women are no long totally depending on men to meet some of their needs. It was further found that women participation in beekeeping in all districts had improved. For instance, in Rufiji district women are involved in almost all activities in beekeeping whereas in Sikonge and Uyui due to long distance from their homestead to where beehives are hanged women tend to hire men especially for hanging of beehives, field beehive management and harvesting. Also, beekeepers in both Tabora and Rufiji were exposed to Nane Nane events where they were introduced to various types of buyers, suppliers and agencies. There were also tours and exchange visits which included both women and men carried out. This built a relationship between beekeepers in the study area with outside buyers and input suppliers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| MDG 7: Ensure environmental sustainability | The project enabled the beneficiaries to decide to refrain from engaging in traditional activities that negatively affect the environment. For instance, in each of the two locations of this study (i.e. Tabora and Rufiji) discussion in the focus groups reported that only less than 1% of beekeepers are still using bark hives whereas the rest who are the majority use log hives and improved hives. Use of bark hives has been reported as one of unfriendly environmental practice in beekeeping. The project has also improved the use of improved beekeeping practices (such as use of protective gears and smokers) among beekeepers. These practices have reduced occurrence of wild fire and destruction of bee colonies. Findings of this study revealed that in all districts each beekeeper supported by BEET project has adopted at least one of the improved beekeeping practices. This was reported by 100% of the respondents in respective districts. Every. Also, the project through its training programs has imparted the knowledge among beekeepers on the role of environment conservation for the sustainable beekeeping. |
# Appendix 12: Output Scoring

## OUTPUT 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.1.1</th>
<th>Write output in full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Target beekeepers are effectively working collectively and collaboratively to realize business benefits</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.1.2</th>
<th>Output scores (c – A++)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A+</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.1.3</th>
<th>Write in full each output indicator, the relevant milestone, and state the progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Output Indicator 1.1: Number of beekeeper groups that are active members of Regional Beekeeper Associations

**Milestone:** Rufiji: 22, Tabora: 15

**Progress:** In Rufiji district a total of 22 beekeepers’ groups are active members of RUBEA. This number exceeds the original milestones of 10 groups. All 22 groups pay membership fee annually and their representatives are regularly attending meetings organized by RUBEA. On the other hand, in Tabora a total of 24 old beekeepers’ groups are registered under TABECU whereas 15 new groups are still registered as independent economic groups. Nevertheless, efforts are still in progress to ensure all new groups are registered members of the district associations in their respective districts. Generally in both Rufiji and Tabora beekeepers are working collectively in their respective groups and associations.

### Output Indicator 1.2: Beekeepers that are satisfied or very satisfied with benefits from membership of local groups (disaggregated by gender) (number extrapolated from sample survey)

**Milestone:** Rufiji: 100% (293men,339women); Tabora: 85%, 651 (456men,195women)

**Progress:** Out of 57 respondents in Tabora, 87.7% were satisfied by the benefits accrued from membership of local beekeepers’ groups (*extrapolated to the entire population, this is equivalent to 672 beekeepers out of 766*). In Rufiji from a sample of 40, about 97.5% of the respondents declared to be satisfied by the benefits from their groups (*extrapolated to the entire population, this is equivalent to 616 beekeepers out of 632*). Analysis disaggregated by gender revealed that 97.1% (521 out of 537) and 100% (all 293) of male were satisfied by benefits from group membership in Tabora and Rufiji, respectively. Also, about 73.9% (169 out of 229) and 95.2% (323 out of 339) of female reported to be satisfied with benefit from local groups in Tabora and Rufiji respectively. This is largely attributed to social and economic benefits such as saving and credit services, access to markets and sharing ideas and experience in various income generating activities.

### Output Indicator 1.3: Number of beekeepers (men and women) organized into groups

**Milestone:** Rufiji: 100% (293men,339women); Tabora: 100%, 766 (537 men,229women)

**Progress:** In each district (i.e. Rufiji, Sikonge and Uyui) 100% of the respondents interviewed were organized into local beekeepers’ groups. This included both gender categories. That is to say all new beekeeper groups under BEET project (1518, 605F, 913M) are organised into groups i.e. in Tabora 766 new members (229F, 537M) are organised into 13 new groups while in Rufiji 632 new members (339F, 293M) are organised into 22 new groups since the start of the project. This was a result of project design which intended to achieve its objectives through groups. This also implies that beekeepers in the study area have realized the benefits associated with collective action which is only delivered through working into groups.

### Output Indicator 1.4: Beekeeper groups delivering against their own business plans, as assessed by project staff / evaluators against key business plan targets. These business plan targets were...
targets to include adequate record keeping of groups.

**Milestone:** Rufiji: 70% (15 groups); Tabora: 80% (12 out of 15 groups)

**Progress:** In all three districts (Rufiji, Sikonge and Uyui) progress have substantially exceeded milestones.

In Rufiji all five (5) groups (100%) visited have developed their business plans. In Sikonge all six (6) groups (100%) visited have business plans in place. Similar observation was also reported in all four (4) groups (100%) interviewed in Uyui district. However, most of the business plans developed have not yet started to be implemented. This was due to insufficient capital.

A.1.5 **State evidence that support the progress described**

- Certificate of registration from respective regional associations after full payment of registration fee and annual membership subscription.
- Individual group business plans. Each group have a detailed planned approved and signed by the group chairperson
- Field reports and training reports produced by project staff and trainers
- List of groups and names of members
- Group’s records such as income and expenditure log books
- Field survey findings

**OUTPUT 2**

A.2.1 Write output in full

*Target beekeepers have improved their production practices*

A.2.2 Output scores (c – A++)

A+

A.2.3 Write in full each output indicator, the relevant milestone, and state the progress

**Output indicator 2.1:** Number of beekeepers (men and women) who participate directly in project training activities related to bee husbandry and environmental management or who receive training as a result of this project.

**Milestone:** Rufiji: 632 (339 women, 293 men); Tabora: 700 (250 women, 450 men)

**Progress:** The number of beekeepers who directly participated in the project trainings on bee husbandry and environment management have moderately exceeded the set targets as indicated in the log frame. Thus, beekeepers have adopted improved bee husbandry practices. This has increased production of honey with good quality.

Out of the interviewed beekeepers in Sikonge, Uyui and Rufiji districts 96.4%, 100% and 92.5% have participate directly in project training activities related to bee husbandry and environmental management, respectively. The topics covered include characteristics of honey, reducing residues in honey, honey traceability, honey international market and modern management of honey, improved bee husbandry, environment management.

**Output indicator 2.2:** Number of beekeepers (men and women) who report that they have adopted at least one new practice as a result of the training they have received (number extrapolated from sample survey)

**Milestone:** Rufiji: 613 (329 women, 284 men); Tabora: 736 (220 women, 516 men)

**Progress:** In each district more than 92% of the respondents interviewed declared to have adopted at least one of the improved beekeeping husbandry practices. These included use of improved beehives, protective gears and smokers during harvesting.
**Output indicator 2.3:** Buyers report progressive improvement in the quality of honey.

**Milestone:** Quality better than year 2

**Progress:** In Sikonge and Uyui none of the buyers were interviewed during this study due to their unavailability. However, reports from the previous study show that buyers were satisfied with the quality of honey produced by beekeepers supported by the project. Some of the key quality aspects that buyers were satisfied with are water content, absence of smoke smell and temperature of the honey.

In Rufiji two buyers were interviewed through mailed checklist. These were PAKAYA and B&BRY ENTREPRENUERS. Both of them declared improvement of honey quality in terms of water content, free from impurities as well as smoke smell.

### A.2.4 State evidence that support the progress described

- Training Reports, Quarterly reports, Annual progress reports, GPAF-IMP-060 Year 3, Annual Narrative report, Interview reports, Mailed checklist field by buyers

### OUTPUT 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.3.1</th>
<th>Write output in full</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women beekeepers are better organized and have greater knowledge and skills for beekeeping.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.3.2</th>
<th>Output scores (c – A++)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A++</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A.3.4</th>
<th>Write in full each output indicator, the relevant milestone, and state the progress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Output indicator 3.1:</strong> Number of women trained in business and enterprise, credit and financial management and leadership</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milestone:</strong> Rufiji: 300, Tabora: 260</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Progress:</strong> Finding has revealed that 100%, 92.3% and 100% of the interviewed women had been trained on business and enterprise management and leadership in Sikonge, Uyui and Rufiji districts, respectively. The trainings have helped women to make sound decisions on income generated from beekeeping and other sources of income.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Output indicator 3.2:** Number of leadership positions (chair, treasurer, secretary or Board Member) that are filled by women within beekeeper groups/regional associations |
| **Milestone:** Rufiji: 48%; Tabora: 55% |
| **Progress:** In each of Sikonge and Uyui district women hold about 49% leadership positions in their local groups. In Rufiji district at least 58% of beekeeper groups and associations are women. This exceeded milestones for the reporting period. In RUBEA about 64% of the leadership positions are held by women and only 36% are held by men. It was also noted that groups that are led by women performed much better compared to those which were led by men. |

| **Output indicator 3.3:** Number of women applying new entrepreneurship skills in their honey and other businesses as defined by project staff / evaluators. (number extrapolated from sample survey) |
| **Milestone:** Rufiji: 308; Tabora: 227 |
| **Progress:** Finding has revealed that 77.8%, 84.6% and 95% of the interviewed women had been applying new entrepreneurship skills in their honey and other businesses in Sikonge, Uyui and Rufiji districts, respectively. This implies that 186 out of 229 women in Tabora had been applying new entrepreneurship skills in their various businesses; whereas in Rufiji district 322 out of 339 women do the same. This has helped women to generate their own income which they have its control and use. |
A.3.4 State evidence that support the progress described

- Group election reports and minutes from groups’ meetings
- Group structure and positions
- Attendance List for the training
- Interviews and questionnaires filled by a sample of beekeepers.

OUTPUT 4

A.4.1 Write output in full

Target beekeepers have improved and consistent access to local, regional and international markets

A.4.2 Output scores (c – A++)

B

A.4.3 Write in full each output indicator, the relevant milestone, and state the progress

**Output indicator 4.1:** Beekeepers that perceive an improvement in their ability to access honey markets (disaggregated by gender) (number extrapolated from sample survey)

*Milestone:* Rufiji: 77% (261 women, 226 men); Tabora: 90% (504 women, 1641 men)

*Progress:* About 59.5% (extrapolated to the entire population this represents 376 out of 632) of the respondents in Rufiji perceived an improvement in their ability to access honey markets. Out of these, 35.7% (extrapolated to the entire population of male this represents 105 out of 293) were male while female accounted 23.8% (extrapolated to the entire population of women this represents 81 out of 339). These are mainly beekeepers that were facilitated to attend the Nane Nane event during which they received information on market demand for honey in the world and local market.

About 55.2% of the respondents in Uyui perceived an improvement in their ability to access honey markets. Out of these, 24.1% were male while female accounted 31.1%. This is basically as a result of entrepreneurship training and exposure visits organized by the project which enabled farmers to meet potential honey buyers during Nane Nane and other events.

For the case of Sikonge district, majority of the respondents (66.7%) perceived no difference in terms of their ability to access honey markets compared to the past.

**Output indicator 4.2:** Beekeepers report progressive increase in the number of buyers seeking to purchase from targeted beekeeper groups

*Milestone:* In both Rufiji and Tabora number of buyers is greater than end of year 2

*Progress:* A drop of number of buyers was reported in both Sikonge and Uyui district compared to the past year. For instance Honey Care who brought honey in the past year did not show up this season. Rufiji beekeepers have also reported inconsistence of buyers from season to season. However, records at the project management office show that of recent there are about eight (8) buyers of which six (6) were seeking to buy from target beekeepers in the study area. These include Honey house LTD, Jonas Ntabagi, Ally Kolonzo, Hemed Nassoro, Mr Kapya, Nayopeker, Abdali Juma, B&BRY ENTREPRENUERS.

**Output indicator 4.3:** Increase in honey sold by beekeepers from the end of year 1 (number extrapolated from sample survey)

*Milestone:* Rufiji: 40% Tabora: 60%

*Progress:* Most of beekeepers in all three districts reported that they managed to sell more honey harvested compared to the last seasons. An increase of about 26% of their products was reported in the study area among participating beekeepers. However, the aforementioned increase was not able to ensure total sale of honey in Sikonge and Uyui districts. The increase in honey sold in Rufiji and Tabora is attributed to increased productivity from the higher number of beekeepers that the project is supporting through trainings on bee husbandry,
quality control and traceability. Bee keepers trained have improved production practices as well as quality of honey harvested.

**Output indicator 4.4:** Beekeepers that see an average 5% increase in the price of honey sold (disaggregated by gender) (number extrapolated from sample survey)

**Milestone:** Rufiji :96%(326 women, 281 men); Tabora:85% (476 women, 1550 men)
**Progress:** In all three districts more than 76% of both male and female have realized an average increase of honey price by more than 5%. Extrapolating this finding to the entire population, it implies that in Rufiji (256F, 223M) and Tabora (174F, 408M) beekeepers have seen an average 5% increase in the price of honey sold.

### A.4.4
State evidence that support the progress described

- Quantitative data that was collected from individual beekeepers through household questionnaire.
- Use of improved beekeeping husbandry among beekeepers which had positive effect on the annual harvest of honey
- Change in prices was evidently through observation and interaction with beekeepers.
- Improvement on quality which had a positive effect on prices
## Appendix 13: Risk Assessment Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which risks materialized during the year?</th>
<th>Was the risk anticipated?</th>
<th>What action was taken to address the risk?</th>
<th>Was this action sufficient?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some of buyers not showing up to buy bee products from beekeepers localities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Looking for more other bee products buyers and linking them to beekeepers</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural disasters (e.g. drought) undermine production levels</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>Raise environmental awareness of beekeepers through training on environment management</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TABECU association in Tabora has remained dormant as majority of beekeepers has lost trust with the association leadership.</td>
<td>To some extent</td>
<td>Initiation for establishment of district associations which would have been more active and accountable to beekeepers within their geographical location</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 14: Traidcraft management response to report findings and recommendations

1. Executive summary
   - The executive summary is quite long. Can it be summarized to about two pages if possible?
   - Indicate the number of key informants
   - The registration of beekeepers should be stated i.e. registered by which body and all groups are registered. Let’s discuss this.
   - Outline what the beekeepers do collectively if any.
   - State the role of district council: What exact role were they expected to play in future and how does this relate to any of the project objective?
   - Add a sentence or two here to show that these were problems at the beginning of the project and that the new project team managed to implement project activities successfully?

2. Introduction
   - Too long. Consider revision due to report pages’ limitation.

3. Methodology
   - This section needs to be much clearer. It seems to me that the two broad steps were:
     - Desk review to ascertain project background information like beneficiary numbers, location, stakeholders, actors, type and availability of documentation
     - Field work to verify project information including beneficiaries and reported progress.

4. On findings:
   a. Across all sections provide more quantitative data to support your discussion:
   b. Effectiveness
      - It is also good to mention some of the gender training and women specific activities the project did.
      - Give the numbers of the groups and total membership (disaggregate gender)
      - Revise Table 4, to give more details on benefits the beekeepers received.
   c. Efficiency
      - Managing partnership with private sector section:
      - This section needs to be reviewed as it lacks proper information. Proper discussion took place with honey care prior to selection. After selection also a series of meetings took place. One of the main reasons for their withdrawal was changes in their internal business activities which they decided to focus in other non-honey business activities.
      - Avoid general statement and be more specific on issues.
   d. Impact
      - Provide more information on this section with reference to key evaluation questions i.e. Change in production; change in spending power; effect of inflation
      - Put Table 5 as annex.
      - Elaborate the discussions of Table 6.
      - Include an interpretation of Table 7 data, explaining what the findings tell us about the project?
   e. Sustainability
      - Include here the efforts the project did to contact TABECU leaders and any intervention done.
      - Any recommendation on future support for RUBEA.
5. Lesson learnt
This section should be about the lessons learned from successes and challenges of the project, not the description of achievements since achievements have already been discussed in the findings.

6. Annexes
In addition to the annexes you have appended, please provide the following:

i. Evaluation research schedule
ii. Evaluation framework
iii. Details of the evaluation team
iv. Traidcraft management response to report findings and recommendations
v. Learning document
vi. Risk assessment matrix
vii. List of people interviewed: Add a column for gender (F, M)
viii. Contribution to GPAF Objectives
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