



2010:5

UTV Working Paper

Cathy Rozel Farnworth
Marceline Obuya

Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Kenya Country Report

A special study of the National Agriculture and Livestock
Extension Programme (NALEP II)

Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Kenya Country Report

**A special study of the National Agriculture and Livestock
Extension Programme (NALEP II)**

**Cathy Rozel Farnworth
Marceline Obuya**

UTV Working Paper 2010:5

Sida

Authors: Cathy Rozel Farnworth, Marceline Obuya.

The views and interpretations expressed in this report are the authors' and do not necessarily reflect those of the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency, Sida.

UTV Working Paper 2010:5

Commissioned by Sida, Secretariat for Evaluation

Copyright: Sida and the author

Date of final report: May 2010

Published by: Edita 2010

Art. no. SIDA61283en

URN:NBN: se 2010-27

This publication can be downloaded from:
<http://www.sida.se/publications>

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden.

Visiting address: Valhallavägen 199.

Phone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64.

www.sida.se sida@sida.se

Table of Contents

Foreword by Sida.....	3
Acknowledgements.....	4
Acronyms	5
1. Foreword	7
2. Executive Summary	9
3. Overview of the National Agriculture and Livestock Programme (NALEP II)	17
4. NALEP's Work on Promoting Women's Access to, and Control Over, Productive Resources .	18
4.1. Increasing Women's Control over Assets. Findings from Garissa.....	19
4.2. Increasing Women's Control over Assets: Findings from Bondo.....	21
4.3. Discussion	22
5. NALEP's Methodology: Presentation and Discussion of the Design Stage.....	25
5.1. NALEP's Intervention Step by Step	25
5.2. NALEP's Design Phase: a Closer Look	26
6. NALEP's Methodology: Presentation and Discussion of the Implementation Phase	32
6.1. Focal Area Development Committees (FADC).....	32
6.2. Common Interest Groups.....	34
6.3. Discussion	35
7. NALEP's methodology: Presentation and Discussion of its Outcomes.....	36
7.1. NALEP's Monitoring and Evaluation System.....	36
7.2. The Difficulty of Measuring NALEP's Outcomes	37
8. Challenges and Opportunities in Gender Mainstreaming	38
8.1. Thematic Overview.....	38
8.2. Mainstreaming Gender in Kenya.....	39
8.3. Mainstreaming Gender in the Ministries of Agriculture and of Livestock Development	39
Annex 1. Fieldwork Timetable and People Met	41
Annex 2. Groups Met on the Field Visits.....	43
Annex 3. References.....	47

Foreword by Sida

In the *UTV Working Paper Series*, Sida publishes background material and annexes to Sida Evaluations and Sida Studies in Evaluation, and other forms of working material which we believe to be of interest for a wider audience. Working Papers have not always been proof read or quality assured by the Secretariat for Evaluation.

This working paper belongs to the evaluation project on Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes jointly commissioned by the Sida Secretariat for Evaluation and Team Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security. Findings from the project are synthesised and analysed in the main report, Gender aware approaches in agricultural programmes: a study of Sida-supported agricultural programmes (Sida Evaluation 2010:3). For information on other publications belonging to this project see the bibliography at the end of this report. All reports can be downloaded from www.Sida.se/publications.

Team Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security and Secretariat for Evaluation

Acknowledgements

We wish to thank everyone we met in Kenya for taking time to explain their work to us. The NALEP staff and associate consultants were thoughtful and provocative at our meetings in Nairobi, forcing us to think more rigorously about the aims of our work and, later, our tentative findings. We thank the Embassy of Sweden for hosting two visits from us and their kind attention to our needs.

We were deeply struck by the commitment of the NALEP district level extension workers to the farmers they work with. The extension staff are dedicated professionals, proud of their achievements whilst open about the challenges they face. They showed strong concern about gender issues and, even more so, the most poor.

We found the openness and willingness of the men and women farmers to help us learn about their lives remarkable. They were keen to share their triumphs and the challenges in their lives. Everyone we met had a strong vein of hope that kept them motivated in difficult circumstances. We repeat our thanks to those farmers who laid on food and danced for us. Thank you for taking the time and for being so considerate.

People we met at other organizations in Nairobi shared their ideas freely. We enjoyed our discussions and the insights they gave us into possible ‘alternative approaches’ to working in gender-sensitive ways with organized groups, with value chain development, with methodology development and with data production. Their views helped us to take one step back from the NALEP programme and see it afresh.

Literature for this study was kindly provided by Sida in Stockholm and by the Embassy of Sweden in Nairobi. The names of people we met, and where relevant the organizations they represent, are given in Annex 1.

The people pictured in this study consented to having their photographs taken.

Thank you

Marceline Obuya and Cathy Rozel Farnworth

Boxes

Box 1	Christine Achieng: the story of a widow
Box 2	Garissa: Meeting with Kulmis Group (Somali-Speaking Women)
Box 3	Bondo: Gender and Land
Box 4	Bondo: Gendered Decision Making
Box 5	Bondo: Male Gender Issues
Box 6	Nyiloka Women's Group
Box 7	Steps in the NALEP Process
Box 8	The Broad Based Survey
Box 9	Identifying the Most Poor: The PAPOLD
Box 10	Identification without Solutions: The PAPOLD and the Most Poor
Box 11	Decentralization of Extension through Capacity Building in Focal Areas
Box 12	Successes and Constraints of CIGs

Tables

Table 1	Summary of NALEP II
Table 2	NALEP Logframe on Gender Mainstreaming, 2009

Acronyms

ascu	Agriculture Sector Coordinating Unit
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
BBS	Broad Based Survey
CAP	Community Action Plan
CIG	Common Interest Group
FADC	Focal Area Development Committee
GEMS	Gender Equity Mobilization Strategy
GoK	Government of Kenya

GTZ	German Technical Cooperation
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ITK	Indigenous Technical Knowledge
KAPAP	Kenya Agricultural Productivity and Agribusiness Project
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAEP	National Agricultural Extension Policy
NALEP	NALEP II: National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme
NASEP-IF	National Agricultural Sector Extension Policy Implementation Framework
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PAPOLD	Participatory Analysis of Livelihood Dynamics
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Timely

1. Foreword

In response to the persistent inequalities of women in farming despite decades of development assistance, Team Agriculture, Forestry and Food Security at Sida Headquarters has initiated a thematic evaluation of how gender issues are tackled in Sida-supported agricultural programmes: *Gender aware approaches in agricultural programmes: a comparative study of Sida-supported agricultural programmes*. The purpose is to increase understanding of how Sida's development assistance in agriculture should be designed, implemented and funded to ensure that female farmers are reached, that their needs as producers are met, and that they are able to benefit from the support to achieve a positive impact on their livelihoods. The *Kenya Country Study* forms part of a five country study, the others being SARDP III (Sida-Amhara Rural Development Programme, Ethiopia; *UTV Working Paper 2010:4*), ProAgri II (National Agricultural Development Programme, Mozambique; *UTV Working Paper 2010:6*), FondeAgro (Agricultural Development Fund, Nicaragua; *UTV Working Paper 2010:7*), and ASP (Agricultural Support Programme, Zambia; *UTV Working Paper 2010:8*).

There are two mutually supportive documents to the thematic evaluation: an *Evaluation Report (Sida Evaluation 2010: 3)* to be published in the Sida Evaluation Series and an *International Literature Review (UTV Working Paper 2010: 3)* which looks at the experience of other agencies in involving women in agricultural programmes.

1.1. Kenya Country Report

The Kenya Country Report is designed to both offer specific feedback to the Embassy of Sweden in Kenya and to provide significant input into the Final Evaluation Report. Preparatory research work on NALEP II was conducted in Sweden at Sida headquarters during December 2009. The fieldwork phase (February 1st to 12th, 2010) was conducted in Nairobi, and in three research sites around the country chosen for the study team by NALEP.

The aim of the research is to establish the ways in which women farmers are involved in the agricultural extension work of NALEP across the programme cycle. It should be noted that we are providing an *indicative study rather than an exhaustive evaluation*. Our intention is to raise questions as well as answers, to provide food for thought rather than an in-depth study of NALEP's record on gender mainstreaming.

1.2. Fieldwork Methodology

The research team conducted interviews with District Level Extension Staff, with members of Focal Area Development Committees (FADC) and Community Interest Groups (CIGs), and with farmers currently targeted by NALEP in three districts. These were in Thika (Central Province), Garissa (North Eastern Province) and Bondo (Nyanza Province). The research sites were selected for us by NALEP because they are culturally very different to one another. The intention was to enable the study team to consider how culture and extension activities interact, the hypothesis being that gender relations in particular subcultures may enable women to demand particular extension services freely, whereas women in other subcultures may face gender-specific constraints in accessing, let alone demanding, NALEP's services.

All in all, well over 50 farmers were consulted. A gender perspective was maintained in all areas of enquiry. Our focus was entirely qualitative and sought to capture the views of farmers, extension workers and other stakeholders in their own words. Whilst not statistically rigorous, this participant-centred approach enabled significant and valuable insights to emerge. A good degree of triangulation was ensured due to the number of farmers consulted in different locations, comparison of the views of key

stakeholders, and through the employment of a national gender expert in the research team who has extensive experience of gender analysis and development programmes in agrarian societies in Kenya. After a while, it became clear that particular views were repeated consistently and thus form a good base for analysis.

The study team made reference to the NALEP Operations Manual (2006), the NALEP Semi-Annual Report (2006-7), NALEP Report No 19, and the MidTerm Review (2009) as well as to written and oral briefs provided by district level staff on their activities. These included written reports on the results of the Broad Based Surveys and the Participatory Analyses of Livelihood Dynamics (PAPOLD).

A key limitation should be noted here. In common with all the programmes studied as part of the over-all study, NALEP has not developed a single document that contains its gender mainstreaming strategy. References to its work on gender mainstreaming are scattered in its literature. This makes it difficult to develop a good understanding of its work on gender, and in particular, to compare the aspirations in documentation with the practice in the field. Nevertheless, the study team assumes that the sources consulted, though not comprehensive, provide a valid - if limited - insight into the way NALEP generally works, rather than evidence of 'best practice'.



Juja West Focal Area Development Committee, Thika

2. Executive Summary

NALEP II covers the whole country and is implemented by the Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock Development as a reform programme within the framework of the National Agricultural Sector Extension Policy Implementation Framework (NASEP-IF). NALEP II contributes to the vision 2030 of the Government of Kenya (GoK) through the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy. Sida is the main donor to NALEP and offers support to the whole programme through covering its operational expenses.

NALEP II (NALEP) is bold in its conception. It sees itself as a catalyst, an agent of change, an enabler, as well as a provider of targeted agronomic, livestock and home economics expertise. Its goal is to stimulate farmers to help themselves and thus to empower them as their own agents of development. District level staff work with farmers in a particular location called a Focal Area to arrive at a shared understanding of their constraints and opportunities through a baseline study. The methods used for this are called the Broad Based Survey (BBS) and the Participatory Analysis of Livelihood Dynamics (PAPOLD).

Using the data generated through the BBS and the PAPOLD, NALEP staff, in collaboration with other stakeholders, facilitate the development of a Community Action Plan (CAP). Realization of the CAP is placed in the hands of an elected Focal Area Development Committee (FADC). NALEP staff assist the FADC in their work by providing them with training, and facilitating initial contacts with other actors in the area, such as micro-finance providers, NGOs, and private sector enterprises. Staff also provide conventional extension expertise, such as advice on better crop management, fertiliser use and improved seed. All of this is on offer, but farmers are meant to identify and demand the services they need from NALEP, rather than NALEP providing them as part of a supply-driven assistance package.

The ability of NALEP to contribute to a strengthening of women's agency (simply expressed, the ability to define and attain a goal) appears to vary greatly across the country. In the three study sites, women and men are exploiting with different degrees of success particular combinations of agro-ecological circumstance, economic opportunities and policy, etc. to strengthen, or create, new livelihood strategies. Cultural variations play an important role.

In Garissa, for example, NALEP is aiding former pastoralists to manage irrigation plots. For the women met by the study team, membership of the irrigation scheme visited has resulted in an extraordinary increase in their agency. Discussing household decision-making, women reported that – in contrast to the past – they were now able to take unilateral decisions on many topics, that their personal mobility had increased and that they were able to determine much household expenditure. Male respondents concurred with these claims, stating they were happy with women's increased economic and decision-making capacity. This lessened their responsibility for household well-being, leaving them free to pursue their own interests. They confirmed they contribute to household expenses but are no longer 'solely' responsible for them. It is clear that part of the reason for women claiming the economic space provided by the irrigation scheme is that this is a new space that men do not wish to occupy. The men consulted currently lack interest in settled farming. It will be interesting to see if and how women maintain their gains over time. It should be noted that wider discussion revealed that many former pastoralist women still lack voice, at least in the presence of NALEP staff, and that cultural traditions continued to hamper the ability of NALEP staff to direct extension to women.

By way of contrast it is much more difficult to trace such enormous wins for women from NALEP's intervention in Bondo. There are a number of reasons for this that relate to (i) the overall lack of respect accorded to farming in an area that has traditionally relied upon fishing in Lake Victoria for its chief livelihood; and (ii) the pervasiveness of Luo cultural traditions that in this area still maintain a

strong grip upon the way that women and men interact with productive assets. NALEP district staff in Bondo recognize the vulnerability of women with respect to accessing land and other productive resources, including information, across their lifetimes. However, they have difficulty in offering effective responses beyond trying to persuade male heads of household to accord more decision-making power to women.

At the national level, NALEP is highly conscious of the need for gender mainstreaming. District level staff, working with women and men farmers every day, recognize clearly the constraints gender relations place upon maximizing their work. Indeed, it is self-evident that the potential of smallholder agricultural productivity in Kenya is stymied by the widespread inability of women to develop and deploy their knowledge effectively, and to maximize the use of resources¹. This is because almost everywhere, men act as intermediaries between women and resources (including extension staff). This would not be an acute issue if men were knowledgeable about all the crops, livestock and activities on the farm, but since almost all smallholding farming systems in Kenya demonstrate sex-disaggregated labour by crop and livestock type, and across the year, this results in huge inefficiencies.

Whilst it is generally true that NALEP is, by default, more effective at supporting the needs of male farmers than female farmers, the study team learnt that NALEP district level staff are finding it hard to support the needs of junior men/male youth. In all three research sites male livelihood strategies are undergoing massive revision and in some cases absolute collapse (such as pastoralist and fishing livelihoods). In many cases, men are leaving smallholder farming to women and trying to develop alternative livelihoods, which can be very difficult given the weakness of the overall economic environment in some areas.

Women are responding by (i) retaining their ‘core portfolio’, centred on their reproductive activities e.g. ensuring household food sufficiency; and (ii) expanding their portfolio by becoming much more economically active, particularly in areas like Thika. For such women, this seems to be resulting in a bewildering sense of greatly improved personal agency together with a massive (potentially hard to sustain?) increase in workload and the adoption of responsibilities that previously fell to men. Conversely, many men are experiencing a shrinking of livelihood options and an inability to contribute to the household economy in accordance with cultural norms. These issues are most obvious for junior men who in some study locations are denied access to land by senior men, even if land is not being cultivated.

In sum, the overall impact of NALEP’s intervention upon changing gendered patterns of access to, and control over, productive resources is unclear. Structural changes in asset control are needed, but this is difficult to achieve within the current model of extension employed by NALEP. At the same time, there are a great many triumphs. NALEP is certainly enabling a great number of women, as well as men, to improve their livelihoods. However, such cases are always reported anecdotally rather than unpacked for the purposes of upscaling and outscaling.

A central issue for NALEP to consider is how it can support the *interdependence of women’s and men’s livelihoods*. That is (i) supporting and enhancing male livelihoods so that men do not walk away from smallholder farming; and (ii) ensuring that women are fully integrated into its extension work.

¹ Indeed, a World Bank study (2005) shows that providing women producers and entrepreneurs with the same inputs and education as men in Burkina Faso, Kenya, and Tanzania could increase their output and incomes by an estimated 10–20 %. If smallholder farming practice as a whole in Kenya is to be improved, this requirement of this class of women need to be better understood prior to the formulation of targeted assistance.

Within the current logic of NALEP, the **overarching recommendations** are:

- The articulation of a **gender mainstreaming strategy**, captured in one document. This should include the aims and objectives of the strategy, gender-disaggregated logframes, indicators, and expected outputs and outcomes.
- The development of a **facilitation manual** to realize the strategy. This should aim to help district level staff conduct and analyse gender-sensitive baseline studies (BBS, PAPOLD), better include women in the development of the CAP, and support women more fully in community level institutions (FADC, CIGs).
- A **knowledge management system** that spans the programme cycle must be developed. It has to facilitate iterative learning processes so that best practice can be quickly replicated.

The remainder of the Executive Summary consists of specific observations and recommendations on different stages in the programme cycle, and on gender mainstreaming in the agricultural sector in Kenya. The recommendations are suggested within NALEP's current paradigm. Ways to extend the overall paradigms of this and the other four extension programmes under study are presented in the Final Evaluation Report mentioned in the Foreword. This will be published in May 2010.

Ensuring that Gender is Considered in Programme Design

The *Entry and Design Phases* of NALEP's intervention are well-articulated. The methodologies of the Broad-Based Survey (BBS) and the Participatory Analysis of Livelihood Dynamics (PAPOLD) provide a treasure trove of valuable baseline material from which to design tailored situation-specific interventions (i.e. the CAP).

However, the gender sensitivity of the application of both methods appears to vary considerably across the country. According to NALEP staff the methods are applied in a gender-sensitive manner in some locations. However, in at least one of the districts visited by the study team the BBS was not truly gender-sensitive at any stage of the process from basic data collection to analysis. Sex-disaggregated data was scarcely collected and women and men respondents were not interviewed separately during data collection. In the documents viewed, analysis was cursory with respect to gender analysis. All this casts doubt on the ability of NALEP district level staff to develop strategic interventions to cater for the needs of women farmers in a specific Focal Area. A great opportunity is being missed given that the methodologies are there and that field staff are familiar with their application.

It is not enough to rely on the PAPOLD to provide gender-sensitive data on behalf of the BBS. First, PAPOLD is a methodology intended to identify vulnerable households. Whilst female-headed households may be more strongly represented in the poorest categories, it is critical not to overlook the needs of women in male-headed households, and in polygamous households. Such women may be located in richer categories, but gendered and unequal household decision-making processes often mean that such women have weak access to, and control over, the resources they need for farming. This is likely to affect production and productivity. Second, a true gender analysis should focus on gender relations. These are dynamic. Gender roles and responsibilities are continually being renegotiated between women and men, young and old. Thorough analysis of data will indicate to NALEP staff trends that they can support, and entry points that they can utilize. These entry points are likely to vary from culture to culture.

Recommendations

Methodological improvements to the existing toolboxes are simple to achieve. The BBS and PAPOLD are already quite robust and capable of eliciting action-orientated data. The skills exist in NALEP to conduct such improvements (since BBS are gender-sensitive in some areas). Significant effort to upgrade the skills of many extension workers is needed in both applying, and analysing, gender sensitive methods. There must be scope to work meaningfully with the results of the analysis in post-survey extension activities with the community, for example during the formulation of the CAP and throughout implementation.

- Adding **gender sensitivity to the existing methods** is essential and simple to do, for example by conducting gender disaggregated seasonal calendars and truly gendered access to, and control over, resources profiles.
- Adding **new methods** capable of capturing further gender-sensitive data, for example on cultural practices, may be required.
- To ensure that the toolbox does not become too full, other methods may need to be dropped. A full review of the toolbox is needed.
- Truly gender sensitive application of the BBS and PAPOLD will enable the gender needs of boys and girls, and young men and women, to be distinguished. Appropriate responses to findings will need to be formulated (for example, youth farmer field schools).
- Improving the **process** is a priority. Conducting separate data collection exercises with women and men is essential if results are not to be skewed by the lack of women's voice in the presence of men. Analysis of the results can be usefully conducted by bringing the respondents together in a facilitated process that enables equal participation of women and men.

Targeting. A key conundrum discussed by all extension workers with the study team was the issue of targeting – more broadly, who to work with. The PAPOLD is able to identify the most poor in a particular Focal Area, but NALEP does not have any means of working with them, apart from some initiatives in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL) which provide seed aid. This issue continually frustrates extension workers on a professional and personal level.

Recommendations

NALEP urgently needs to clarify its position with regard to the most poor.

- Deepen and extend partnerships with development actors who explicitly want to work with the most poor. NALEP could conduct the PAPOLD on their behalf to enable identification of the most poor. It already involves other actors through the BBS and could easily extend this work.
- NALEP could offer the most poor 'seed aid'² that aims to tackle immediate survival needs as well as developing medium to long-term livelihood strategies to enable Category A (the most poor) farmers to graduate to Category B. Other development actors could take on their survival needs leaving NALEP to focus on micro-level asset building strategies to help graduation into self-sufficiency.
- The government could expand its njaa marufuku programme which assists people affected by drought and is part of the National Agriculture Input Programme. In the past this assistance has not always been successfully targeted, but the sense among the respondents was that the government is improving in this regard.
- As an extension agency NALEP could focus its work on the B and C categories, with the aim of graduating households in category B to category C and from thence to D (the highest level). It is here that NALEP could explore innovative methods of developing resilience, and asset building.

Cultural issues. Kenya is culturally diverse, creating both richness and a whole host of challenges for NALEP to meet since gender relations are articulated differently in each culture. To take one illustrative example: the study team's discussions and observations in Garissa suggest that NALEP has not been entirely successful in working with pastoralists. It is clear that NALEP, as part of GoK policy, has worked hard to encourage pastoralists into settled farming. This has had some successes and is clearly advancing the social and economic power of women as discussed above. At the same time, NALEP has

² This has already occurred to a limited extent in the ASAL areas.

been poor at recognizing the validity of pastoralist livelihoods, and in supporting them. It is only very recently that the Government of Kenya has recognized its own complicity in causing the widespread collapse of pastoralist livelihoods since 1963, for which it has apologized (GoK, 2007). Still, NALEP staff continue to ascribe this collapse entirely to ‘natural causes’ such as drought and overgrazing. As a consequence of the stated commitment of the GoK to support pastoralism, NALEP in the Garissa area has just commenced some extension to meet the needs of pastoralists, for example by helping to set up small tanneries and encouraging the processing of camel milk. These efforts are vestigial at present and it is clear that there is still a long way to go. It should be added that NALEP has only been in Garissa since 2006.

Recommendations

At this juncture NALEP should seize the opportunity to gain a richer understanding of pastoralist livelihoods by conducting a gender sensitive investigation into pastoralism. This should be done using Somali-speaking native consultants who are (i) already aware of the vast body of Somali cultural tradition and gender roles and responsibilities; and (ii) are able to win trust. This study would enable NALEP to design culturally sensitive interventions and achieve better entry points into the community.

This basic approach can be adapted for each culturally distinct/relatively culturally distinct area that NALEP is working in.

Ensuring that Female Farmers are Addressed During Programme Implementation

Focal Area Development Committees (FADC) are tasked with realizing the CAP. NALEP has an affirmative action policy to ensure that a minimum of 25% of the members are women. In some areas the percentage is higher. However, in the locations visited by the study team extension agents said that the minimum quota was ‘never’ exceeded. The main findings are:

- The quota system helps to provide women farmers with community level recognition.
- Training measures are in place to develop and strengthen the voice of both women and men members.
- FADC are trained on managerial and leadership skills. The facilitators are selected based on their competencies.
- A straw poll indicates that women in FADC often take on the role of treasurer due to the perceived ‘trustworthiness’ of women.
- The quota system does not reflect the proportions of men and women actually involved in farming. In most areas, women are more heavily involved than men, particularly in smallholder farming. Male farmers generally have little involvement in, or understanding of, women’s crops/ women’s roles in farming. On this basis the effectiveness of the FADC in truly representing their constituencies can be questioned.

Moreover, the quality and nature of women’s participation in these groups is not known. Questions arising include:

1. How effective are the facilitators in practice? Have they been trained in communication and facilitation skills, and how do they transmit their skills to both women and men? This warrants examination.
2. In what ways do the facilitators work to strengthen women’s voice in the FADC? Have they received specific training on empowering women? Do women receive targeted training in leadership skills?

Recommendations

- To enhance women's agency at the community level, NALEP should work towards (not impose) a 50% quota for women in the FADC and, as part of this, it should offer women specific support in presentation and leadership skills.
- NALEP should work more closely with local women's groups in their economic and community level activities. This can be a valuable way of enabling women to develop agency (formulating their own goals and acting upon them) in a safe space.

Community Interest Groups (CIGs). Several remarks about CIGs are made in Chapter 6 of this report. In general, the issues around marketing are those that face smallholders in almost all developing countries. For example, overall market development varies hugely. In areas like Thika and Garissa where there are strong markets for particular products, farmers - including many women - have responded quickly. Yet poor road infrastructure makes it difficult for many farmers to supply crops on time, and results in huge wastage. The lack of processing facilities close to farmers, which could transform produce like mangoes into more valuable commodities and eliminate waste, is a great barrier to the development of value addition strategies. A major issue is low consumer demand for quality produce, meaning that it is hard for farmers to create and capture added value.

Regarding gender issues, the study team noted that women appear to be poorly represented in CIG higher level decision-making bodies, such as umbrella groups, but this remains an impression to be verified. It also noted that gendered analyses of value chains are generally not conducted. NALEP's work has a commodity, rather than value chain, focus. A lack of alertness to wider value chain issues may result in the elimination of women from chains (or sectors of chains) that become economically valuable. To this must be added the points made in Chapter 5, namely that in some areas women in male-headed households cannot sell any product without their husband's permission. Ways to overcome this lack of agency must be sought. Women's marketing groups are a good way of enabling women to develop and protect their space in value chains.

Recommendations

Conduct a Gendered Value Chain Analysis²

1. Conduct a market analysis

Generally a value chain analysis begins with a market study to identify the potential gains that could be captured and the state of the chain relative to its competitors.

2. Map the chain and conduct a stakeholder analysis

- A preliminary mapping of the chain identifies the main products and their markets, as well as the kinds of activity involved, the productive unit, and the geographical location for each node in the chain. A (participatory) stakeholder analysis is then conducted to identify the different stakeholders (by function, socioeconomic category, and gender) at each node of the chain.
- The relative distribution of economic value between participants at each node is documented. Research investigates barriers to entry, the interests and power relationships of different stakeholders, and contextual factors that explain inequalities and inefficiencies and blockages in the chain.

3. Identify constraints and opportunities for the value chain

- 'Leverage' points are identified for upgrading the chain and redistributing values in the interests of equity and efficiency.
- The causes of ongoing change are mapped to guide decisions, not only on how to strengthen particular nodes and their associated actors, but also on how to identify any transformative actions that may be required.

4. Develop a strategic action plan

The information assembled in the previous steps forms the basis for a strategic action plan to achieve the goals identified for the chain.

³ Source: Farnworth, C.R., 2008b.

Ensuring that the Outcomes for Women Farmers are Measured

NALEP is in the process of upgrading its monitoring and evaluation procedures. It was not possible for the study team to view the changes. It is clear that the current M&E system has been quite weak in providing useful gender information. Logframes that refer to work with women farmers emphasize activities and inputs, rather than outputs and outcomes.

A widespread lack of sex-disaggregated data in the baseline surveys means that gender-sensitive indicators cannot be formulated, nor can programme outcomes for women and men farmers be properly assessed. The ability of NALEP to properly track and report on its work in targeting and involving women farmers, let alone capture the difference the involvement of women actually makes to programme outcomes, is questionable.

As noted above there is quite a lot of anecdotal evidence – including evidence put together by the study team, which shows that NALEP is making a real difference to the lives of women farmers in some areas. The methodology for substantiating this evidence must be upgraded and made more rigorous.

The emphasis upon developing local solutions with local people is potentially at odds with slotting district level programmes into a national monitoring and evaluation framework. The articulation of gender relations in each of the study sites (see Chapter 5) resulted in very different challenges for the district extension offices, and thus it is legitimate to claim different indicators of ‘success’. The requirements for locally valid M&E frameworks/assessments of success need to be reconciled with national frameworks.

A further issue is the *length of time that NALEP extension workers actually spend in each Focal Area*. Although the team is supposedly active over a three year period in a Focal Area, in practice significant involvement is restricted to the first year, during which the FADC are set up to carry out the ‘Community Action Plan’ co-created by NALEP with the farmers. Their work is backed up by technical extension advice from NALEP. Although NALEP staff are supposed to backstop for a further two years, in practice NALEP disengages rapidly (though they remain on call to farmers) largely due to the fact that it has to start a new set of activities in a new Focal Area each year. This absorbs the limited time, resources and commitment available to the district offices.

Recommendations

1. A knowledge management system, which incorporates better use of baseline data (obtained through the BBS and PAPOLD), the formulation of sex-disaggregated indicators, and the design of gender sensitive strategies to involve women in all stages of the programme is needed.
2. The short time period in the Focal Area makes it very difficult for NALEP to satisfy reporting requirements to Sida, let alone establish personal satisfaction at a job well done. Above all, ensuring that women are targeted effectively, and involved properly, in the work of the extension services takes a great deal of time. NALEP staff suggested the following programme of intervention:
Year 1. Entry
Year 2. Consolidation
Year 3. Ensuring sustainability and exit.
3. Gender monitoring and evaluation in NALEP should be improved. To achieve this, a set of agreed gender sensitive indicators needs to be established and followed (ORGUT Consulting AB, 2010).
 - A Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) framework should be simple to use and reporting requirements should aim to elicit useful, actionable information. Many NALEP staff critiqued reporting requirements as being unduly onerous and time-consuming.
 - The BBS and the PAPOLD provide useful contextual data that can be used to create a baseline against which impact and outcomes can be measured.
 - However, at the macro-level a small number of sector-wide gender related indicators need to be established, followed and reported.
 - Quantitative data is required in order to provide evidence-based information on impact and outcomes: how many households were enabled to graduate from A to B, from B to C? Quantitative data is also good at mapping trends, for example an indicator could be developed on the time spent on economically unproductive activities such as water haulage or wood collection, and show how this changed following the boring of a tube well/introduction of an improved cookstove (jiko).
 - NALEP is already observing processes, for example it reports on how many CIGs are formed. This can be made gender-sensitive by disaggregating the data.Qualitative data can have huge explanatory power if collated and analysed well. What difference did we make, and why? Did the economic empowerment of women lead to increased decision-making power at home and in the community?

Ensuring an Enabling Environment: Mainstreaming Gender in the Agricultural Sector

Gender mainstreaming is being taken seriously at a policy level in Kenya. The Government of Kenya is working towards mainstreaming gender in all sector programmes, including agriculture. A draft document outlining a strategy for mainstreaming gender and human rights in Kenya's agricultural sector is currently under development by the Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit (ASCU). The key players in ASCU are the public sector, the Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Livestock Development. Partners include non-government organizations and agencies like the World Bank. The planned strategy will provide a harmonized guide to accelerating mainstreaming efforts. The gender and human rights issues to be addressed include (i) heavy workloads for women and associated inefficiencies; (ii) women's limited access to, and control over, productive resources; (iii) women's limited ownership of farm tools and implements; (iv) women's limited access to credit; and (v) women's limited access to technology and information.

The Kenya Agricultural Productivity and Agribusiness Project (KAPAP) is developing a survey instrument for gender-sensitive data collection in close partnership with ASCU. The World Bank is working closely with the Government of Kenya and other partners on KAPAP to generate and accumulate a national set of robust data on women's and men's opportunities and constraints in agriculture. This currently does not exist, thus hampering decision-making at the highest levels.

In due course NALEP II should be able to align its own gender mainstreaming strategy with ASCU's overarching mainstreaming strategy.

Recommendations

At the institutional level, gender mainstreaming has to be led by the director level, right at the top. They can ensure that gender mainstreaming is taken seriously at all levels and is built into planning. To achieve results, it is necessary to focus on building commitment, accountability (including an M&E system), political will (which will involve setting aside sufficient human and financial resources, gender responsive budgeting) and the development of an enabling organizational culture.

Top management require short, focused, evidence-based courses on gender issues. The aim should be on making a case for gender rather than build skills on gender issue. Why care: if not this is what you lose. At the highest levels, people want to see figures. They need the empirical data to show that not taking into account gender results in a loss of agricultural productivity. In order to succeed you need huge financial resources, you need to empower the coordinating mechanisms before any proposals get out, and you need to work with other departments.

The main difficulty is that reliable statistics to help guide decision-making are lacking. This can be tackled.

At the programme level, it is necessary to clarify the gender issues: who is affected and why. Programme design needs to develop objectives that are gender focused. Accountability is critical. M&E systems need gender sensitive indicators on activities, outputs and outcomes. They need to be able to tell stories rather than provide just figures. What difference did we make? How did we change people's lives?

At this level gender mainstreaming must be attached to tangible activities. Isolated gender units writing indicators will not work. They will be too complex and may not be relevant to your programme. It is necessary to start by identifying the gaps and then deciding which gaps to address, and how to address these gaps. From there, targets can be set to enhance the livelihoods of women and men, and to close the gender gap.

3. Overview of the National Agriculture and Livestock Programme (NALEP II)

NALEP II (2007–2011) is a national programme run by the Government of Kenya (GoK) that emerged in 2000 from the previous National Soil and Water Conservation Programme (NSWCP). This had been supported by Sida since 1974. In 2000 the GoK formulated a National Agricultural Extension Policy (NAEP); NALEP is the implementation framework. NALEP I (2000–2006) was positively evaluated in 2006 as an innovative approach to demand-responsive and holistic extension. The Impact Study of NALEP I recommended that NALEP be extended to the whole country, notably the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands. Areas for improvement were identified. These included better outreach to the poor, improving the quality of extension, focusing upon farming as a business (with advice on value-added activities), improved mainstreaming of cross cutting issues such as gender and HIV/AIDS, and development of the monitoring system to include impact.

NALEP II commenced in January 2007. It is implemented by the Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock Development as a reform programme within the framework of the National Agricultural Sector Extension Policy Implementation Framework (NASEP-IF). NALEP II contributes to the vision 2030 of the GoK through the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy. A Programme Co-ordinating Unit under the leadership of a programme co-ordinator manages day-to-day activities, but implementation is decentralized to districts and divisions. An international audit company, PriceWaterhouse Coopers, complements the national audit authorities in auditing financial management performance.

Sida is the main donor to NALEP II and offers support to the whole programme through covering its operational expenses. Other donors including GoK, Danish International Development Agency (DANIDA), World Bank, International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and German Technical Cooperation (GTZ) fund specific projects.

Table 1: Summary of NALEP II

Goal	The contribution of agriculture and livestock to social and economic development and poverty alleviation is enhanced.
Aid Modality	Project
Financing Modality	Grant to Government (Ministry of Finance disburses funds)
Time frame NALEP II	2007–2011
Sida Contribution	SEK 327 million (grants for investment in capacity building for farmers, pastoralists and fisherfolk and extension staff, motor vehicles and motor cycles, communication equipment and other materials, studies, hiring of consultancy services and for operational and maintenance costs)
Beneficiaries and target groups	Rural poor people, small-scale farmers, and in the process, extension workers
Areas of Intervention/ Objectives	• To institutionalize demand-driven and farmer-led extension services. • To increase the effectiveness of pluralistic provision of extension services. • To increase the participation of the private sector in providing extension services. • To empower farmers to take charge of Project Cycle Management of extension projects. • To develop accountability mechanisms and transparency in delivering extension services. • To facilitate commercialization of some agricultural extension services.
Implementing Agency	Ministry of Agriculture/Ministry of Livestock Development

Sources: *Kenya_NALEP II_Decision*; *NALEP Semi-Annual Report 2006–7 NALEP Report No 19*.

4. NALEP's Work on Promoting Women's Access to, and Control Over, Productive Resources

The concept of *agency*, defined as the ability to define one's goals and act upon them, is critical to the ability of women and men to take rational decisions in farming, as well as to wider empowerment agendas. Effective agency is closely linked to *resources*, for without resources it is often impossible to realize a goal. In Kenya, as in many countries of the world, women generally have much less access to, or control over, critical productive resources such as land, machinery, or money, than do men. Women's access to land in particular is almost always mediated through male kin and can be withdrawn in the event of marital breakdown or death of the male partner. Box 1 presents the case study of a widow met during the course of fieldwork in Bondo. It shows that women living in patrilocal marriage systems can lack the social capital they need to properly survive and do well, even if they possess the most basic productive asset of all: land.

Box 1: Christine Achieng: the story of a widow

Christine Achieng is a widow in her early 50s. She was married at the age of 15 when her father died. After she was married, the couple was blessed with ten children. They bought two and half acres of land, where they built their home. Not long before her husband's death, Christine secured legal title to the land in her own name to secure this asset. This was not sufficient to guard her family against misfortune because she was left without kin to help her work the farm and feed the children after her husband's death. Five of her children died from malnutrition.

Christine was a young widow. Luo culture allows a woman like her to be inherited. She married her husband's brother and gave birth to a girl who is now in Form 2, but out of school because Christine cannot pay the fees. She lived with this man for ten years but found he was a drain upon her resources and energy, contributing no work to the farm or household well-being. Since Christine had title to her own land and thus the basic means for survival, she was eventually able to make her second husband leave. Yet she is not able to evade responsibility for her own descendents and described a strange situation whereby she has not seen her first-born son for many years. He has disappeared in Uganda, but his wife brings Christine their children to raise. She supports them, despite her immense poverty. At the time of our visit, she was caring for a grandson.

Since the death of her first husband, Christine has been digging her farm by herself. She uses the hand hoe since she cannot afford to rent a plough or tractor. She finds the work very laborious and spoke repeatedly of her ill-health, citing dizziness and a racing heart. Christine grows beans, cassava, and maize but finds that over the years the soil has lost fertility. Yields have declined. She has no overall farm plan.

Christine Achieng is a member of a group called the Nyiloka Women's Group and is one of many farmers currently within a NALEP Focal Area. The challenges to NALEP of working with farmers like Christine are immense. The aim of this chapter is to examine how NALEP's work has strengthened the agency of women like Christine through increasing their access to, and control over, productive resources. The presentation is structured as follows (1) Garissa and (2) Bondo.

The study team talked to two Common Interest Groups (CIGs) in Thika about marketing; the findings are discussed in Chapter 6.

4.1. Increasing Women's Control over Assets. Findings from Garissa

In Garissa, the research team met NALEP staff in their offices and then proceeded to meet with women members of Kulmis Group on one irrigation scheme, and with men at another irrigation scheme. Irrigation schemes are rather new to the area and draw their water from the Tana River. Farmers do not hold private land title on such schemes. However, they can hold a life-long interest in a plot and bequeath their interest to their children. The average holding per farmer is around one acre. Box 2 presents the key findings from the discussion with the women members of Kulmis Group. The membership of Kulmis Group is mostly women, and entirely Somali-speaking. Prior to engagement in the irrigation scheme, the people were pastoralists. Settled farming is a very new activity.

Box 2: Garissa: Meeting with Kulmis Group (Somali-Speaking Women)

Before NALEP started supporting us, women had to stay in the household, and men were supposed to bring everything. How can the husband supply everything? They cannot satisfy every need. It is too much of a burden on the father. Today, the husband is happy when the mother brings in farm produce, whereas before we had to ask him permission for cash, to go to meetings, and to have a bank account. Now we earn money according to the acreage we farm.

Men don't know about farming. They don't even know how big the farm is, or what the farm looks like. My husband did not know anything about my farm. He came with our son and asked him: where does it begin and where does it end? When he found out he said: 'She has worked hard'.

These days, men have their own jobs. They don't bother about the farm. They have changed. Before, they used to say, 'Where are you going? What are you doing? Initially women were against farming. A man took a panga and said, 'I will chop down these trees'. But they gave up. Women just kept on coming back and back to it. Today, we women help ourselves. We pay school fees. We can even build small houses.

The effect of NALEP on the membership of this particular irrigation scheme initiative has been extraordinary in strengthening women's agency. All farming skills had to be learnt from scratch. The impact of involvement has been considerable and deeply motivating. Given that water is freely available, agronomic success is simple to achieve. NALEP has explained how to plant and care for trees, and how to establish tree nurseries onsite to save money and time travelling to buy seedlings. The women in the Kulmis Group have clearly learned to demand, as opposed to merely receive, advice. At the same time, it is clear that part of the reason for women claiming this space is that men have simply not wanted to be involved, feeling that settled farming is alien to their pastoralist traditions. Men in the second group verified the results of the Kulmis Group. They stated that they were happy with women's increased economic and decision-making capacity, because this left them with very few familial responsibilities leaving them free to pursue their own interests. At the same time they confirmed they do contribute to all household expenses.

On further investigation, it became clear that women membership of the Kulmis Group in Garissa was unusually vocal and expressive. NALEP staff identified the following issues that remain to be resolved:

- The women in the Kulmis Group do not carry out all the work themselves. They are managers and employ labourers from other ethnic groups. For this reason they are known as 'telephone farmers'.
- When NALEP conducts training with this and other groups, men wish to be present and sometimes exclude their wives. This means that the messages do not reach either the women, who manage the irrigation plot, or the labourers, who do most of the work. Knowledge transmission under these circumstances is ineffective. Furthermore, even if labourers are taught they are prone to leave employment at short notice, taking all their knowledge with them.
- NALEP is working to ensure that more women are invited for training, but it is still the case that in many meetings women sit on the outer fringes of the meeting with their backs turned to the NALEP extension workers and to men.
- The fact that NALEP employs a senior female extension agent who understands (but does not speak) Somali appears to have greatly enhanced the willingness of men to consider women in new roles. According to her, she often stands in front of 80 men to deliver extension training and this has really changed their attitudes.

A cultural observation should be made, namely that NALEP has worked hard to encourage pastoralists into settled farming. This has had some successes and is clearly advancing the social and economic power of women. At the same time, NALEP has been poor at recognizing the validity of pastoralist livelihoods, and in supporting them. It is only very recently that the Government of Kenya has recog-

nized its own complicity in causing the widespread collapse of pastoralist livelihoods since 1963, for which it has apologized (GoK, 2007). Still, NALEP staff continue to ascribe this collapse entirely to ‘natural causes’ such as drought and overgrazing. As a consequence of the stated commitment of the GoK to support pastoralism, NALEP in the Garissa area has just commenced some extension to meet the needs of pastoralists, for example by helping to set up small tanneries and encouraging the processing of camel milk. These efforts are vestigial at present and it is clear that there is still a long way to go.

At this juncture NALEP should seize the opportunity to gain a richer understanding of pastoralist livelihoods by conducting a gender sensitive investigation into pastoralism. This should be done using Somali native speakers who are (i) already aware of the vast body of Somali cultural tradition and gender roles and responsibilities; and (ii) are able to win trust. This study would enable NALEP to design culturally sensitive interventions and achieve better entry points into the community. One key issue to address is how NALEP can support the interdependence of women’s and men’s livelihoods. That is (i) supporting male livelihoods so that men do not walk away from livestock/farming altogether; and (ii) ensuring that women are enabled to move into, and to secure, new economic and social spaces.

4.2. Increasing Women’s Control over Assets: Findings from Bondo

In Bondo, it was more difficult than in Garissa to trace such enormous wins from NALEP’s intervention. There are a number of reasons for this that relate to (i) the overall lack of respect accorded to farming in an area that has traditionally relied upon fishing in Lake Victoria for its chief livelihood, and (ii) the pervasiveness of Luo cultural traditions that in this area still maintain a strong grip upon the way that women and men interact with productive assets. Findings are presented in Box 3 in the words of NALEP extension workers, and the farmers themselves.

Box 3. Bondo: Gender and Land

NALEP Staff

- At the subsistence level, when fending for the family, women are seriously involved and men tend to be idlers. However, men control the land.

Nyiloka Women’s Group

- For us, collateral is a difficulty. We cannot get anything from financial institutions. Our husbands will not give us the title deeds to use for loans. We even cannot access the animals to use as collateral.
- Here there is an expression. Next of skin = your wife. Next of kin = your brother. We have no kin here. Men say, ‘Why should I recognize my wife in my will? She is next of skin, not next of kin’.
- As a wife you are not allowed to know the size of your husband’s land. Sons do not disclose the size of their portion to their mothers. You can have a real problem when your husband dies as you do not know how much land he had. Brothers-in-law can come and invade to farm there. So widows lose that land and do not have access to land anymore.

The Luo in this area practice a patrilocal marriage system. Women from distant areas enter the local village through marriage. This means that the women have no other kinship networks. They depend on accessing resources through their husband. In the event of marital failure or death of the male partner such women are vulnerable to dispossession by the man’s relatives. Wife inheritance is still practiced, and was accepted by women respondents in the Nyiloka Women’s Group since it offers the only means of accessing resources. HIV/Aids is a particular concern of such arrangements.

NALEP staff recognize the vulnerability of women with respect to accessing land across their lifetimes in this community but it does not, or cannot, offer any responses. It also recognizes that women face challenges regarding which crops to grow on the land allocated to them by men, and in receiving extension advice, as Box 4 demonstrates.

Box 4: Bondo: Gendered Decision-Making

NALEP Staff

- The husband talks to us about maize. The woman wants our help with the kitchen garden, but is blocked by the man.
- Women are the main farmers but often they cannot come to the training forums. There is a gap between who receives the information and who implements it.
- Poultry-keeping is run by women, but the birds are sold by men/head of the family. This brings conflict in the family. It is a big issue. NALEP tries to address it like this: If women have responsibility for the care of livestock, then they should be responsible for sale. If the man wants to sell he should also own some poultry. However, many men will not agree with us.
- There are specific gender roles for women, and for men. But then you find that the role for women means that they have a lot to do in their homes. If you want to work with women in the programme you find they have little time to do so.

Nyiloka Women's Group

- Husbands are jealous. They try to stop women getting control over assets. No resource can be sold without the permission of the husband.
- In a good family the husband and wife can come together and discuss. The women can explain her issues, for example the need to pay school fees. In this case women can ask to sell an asset, or acquire an asset. In bad families women have no say. The man may say, 'This asset is a dowry for my daughter. You did not come with the child. You got her from me'. In another scenario, the husband may go and sell the cow as a dowry for a new wife. The wife does not even know until the new wife comes. Even if the lady is not brought home, he may sell the cow to buy things for his mistress.
- In polygamous families the first wife has to plant first, then the second can plant. The second one cannot do anything unless the first one moves.

It is clear that NALEP has great difficulty in approaching women as farmers in this location, though it recognizes the issues and attempts to work on them. NALEP also recognizes that gender issues complicate the lives of young men who would like to enter farming, as Box 5 shows.

Box 5: Bondo: Male Gender Issues

NALEP

- We need to encourage men to stay in farming. Old men have land here. Youth should be actively involved in agriculture, but they do not have access to land. The father does not permit them to clear.
- Youth cannot plant before the old man plants. The whole family will not plant if he does not plant. We need to address this through the land tenure system to ensure that land is allocated to youth.

4.3. Discussion

The evidence presented shows that NALEP has made serious attempts to reach and involve women. The reasons for the disparity in that success vary widely as the two case studies show. The involvement of women in irrigation schemes in Garissa has shown that considerable change can be worked in women's lives by enhancing their economic and strategic agency. It is fascinating to note that the Garissa experience echoes the wider experience of smallholder farming in Kenya, namely the feminization of farming. Many men are simply walking away from smallholder farming, even if they wish to retain decision-making power over what actually happens on the farm.

At the same time the experience made by the research team should not be generalized to all irrigation schemes in the region, where women still have less voice. It is recommended that a Somali speaking gender expert carry out a gender study in the area to understand better how to involve both women and men in NALEP's work, and how to better support pastoralist as well as farming livelihoods.

In the Luo area surveyed, NALEP staff and women farmers recognize that the effectiveness of smallholder farming is significantly handicapped by prevailing gender relations that accord women the work

in farming, but not the decision-making power. This has a direct impact upon the effectiveness of farming and its outputs, and upon human lives more generally. The findings are a perfect illustration of the work of Amartya Sen (Nobel Prize for Economics) who has developed two important theoretical contributions to help understand the association between gender roles and responsibilities and the use of assets:

1. The 'functionings and capabilities' framework (Sen, 1998) challenges the view that possession of commodities alone translates into well-being, as traditionally posited by economists. He argues that the possession of goods does not translate automatically into well-being since possession is different from the ability to benefit from the characteristics of these goods. That is, it is not the possession of the commodity or the utility it provides that proxies for well-being, but rather *what the person actually succeeds in doing with that commodity and its characteristics*.
2. In his essay 'Co-operative Conflicts' (1990) Sen shows that households are sites of 'cooperative conflicts'. Women and men cooperate to bring goods into the household, but there is conflict over the intra-household division of those goods. Due to unequal power relations in the household, Sen argues, the benefits women secure are not commensurate with their input. Thus, it is necessary to 'unpack' the black box of the household.

The experience of Women's Forums in Ethiopia⁴ shows that women in organized groups have started to demand extension advice and other assistance and thus force the extension services to recognize their needs. In Bondo, the Nyiloka Women's Group is entirely self-organized, unlike the FADC which rely upon NALEP's intervention for their existence. Studying their experience is salutary for an understanding of what stimulates and binds such groups, and it suggests useful entry points for extension workers (Box 6).

⁴ See the Ethiopia Country Report, which forms part of this research exercise.

Box 6: Nyiloka Women's Group

Who we are. We all come from the Southern Nyanza and have come from far, 200 kms away. It all started at funerals. We realized that several of our sisters had also married men here. In some cases the husband had died and the children could not go to school. We did not want to face the same situation. We became conscious of being alone. We began to gather together. Since many of us have lost husbands, we thought: why not help each other? When we started we were six people. Now we are nineteen.

There are three reasons for the **secret of our success**. We love each other. The distance from our family home makes us feel solidarity with one another. We have clear objectives for our group. First, we aim to cover emergency situations. For example, if our father dies back home, we make sure that there is enough money to go for the funeral. We have an emergency kitty for such costs. Second, we have a merry go round to cover other costs. We have two meetings a month, hosted by a different member each time. When we have a meeting we walk with 100 shillings for the host, and 30 shillings for the emergency kitty (260 shillings a month per member).

Our Projects. We have developed farming and catering projects. To do this we collaborated with the Ministry of Agriculture and Jaa Marafuku (Ministry of Agriculture fund designed to assist drought affected areas: grant system). This has enabled us to gain experience on different farming activities. We were given 40,000 Shillings for capacity building from Jaa Marafuku to pay for private facilitators/extension workers with farming skills (equipment, stationary, facilitator allowances). We are part of a food security network trained by Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) at farmer field schools (FFS). In the FFS we learned many things like catering services, food preservation, and beekeeping. We learned how to keep poultry (the local breed) but have not started working on poultry as a group, only as individuals. As a group we offer catering services, for example at parties and at funerals.

We rent an acre of land which costs 2000 shillings per year. It is not easy. For example, the grazing systems in the area mean that cattle and goats may come and destroy everything. If you talk to the owner he will not listen because you are a woman. We have a challenge in getting ploughing equipment so we end up ploughing very late. We are heavily hit by that challenge because we are women. I would like to plough but because I am married my husband will refuse. Also, we always have to plead with men for permission to work on our group farm.

Since we do not own land we are not allowed to stay with the land for more than two years, so we have to search for more land. We hire land from the husband of a member here or from outside. But the farmer does not want to see us benefit because we are women. Yet he benefits from our work because we worked the land the year before. When you acquire land for hire, you have to prepare it (5 000 shillings) and 2,000 for the cost of hiring the land, but you cannot use fertiliser since the owners says it will spoil the land. This is a belief in our area. So we use cow dung. However, there are few animals so we do not have enough manure.

Our hope in the future to buy land (40-50 K for one acre). We hope that if we buy land our husbands will see the benefit, particularly with respect to household food. There will still be some issues though. When we buy land, the husband will feel inferior.

Several of us have been inherited upon our husband's death. We have no choice because without a man we cannot survive.

Some things are changing. It is possible for a women to get employment outside the home, now. Formerly the husband would never agree.

This case study has been quoted in depth because it shows so clearly the gender constraints facing many women in that particular area, and it also shows that women are themselves working for change. There are many easily identifiable entry points for NALEP to work with such indigenously generated institutions, either directly or through helping such women's groups to link up to other development actors.

5. NALEP's Methodology: Presentation and Discussion of the Design Stage

NALEP II is bold in its conception. It sees itself as a catalyst, an agent of change, an enabler, as well as a provider of targeted agronomic, livestock and home economics expertise. Its goal is to stimulate farmers to help themselves and thus to empower them as their own agents of development. It works with farmers in a particular location called a Focal Area to arrive at a shared understanding of their constraints and opportunities. Upon this consensus NALEP staff facilitate the development of a Community Action Plan (CAP). Realization of the CAP is placed in the hands of an elected Focal Area Development Committee. NALEP staff assist them in their work by providing them with training, and facilitating initial contacts with other actors in the area, such as micro-finance providers, Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), and private sector enterprises. It also provides conventional extension expertise, such as advice on better crop management, fertiliser use and improved seed. All of this is on offer, but farmers are meant to identify and demand the services they need from NALEP, rather than NALEP providing them as part of a supply driven assistance package.

This chapter assesses the gender sensitivity of NALEP's work in the design phase of its intervention. It commences by running through NALEP's intervention in a little more detail. This is followed by a closer look at two building blocks of the design phase: the Broad Based Survey (BBS) and the Participatory Analysis of Poverty and Livelihood Dimensions (PAPOLD). These two components provide a baseline upon which an intervention is constructed in the form of a Community Action Plan (CAP). Since the gender sensitivity of the CAP depends on the gender sensitivity of the baseline study, the focus of this chapter is solely upon the BBS and PAPOLD.

Chapter 6 examines two Focal Area structures put into place to realize the CAP: Focal Area Development Committees (FADC) and Common Interest Groups (CIG).

5.1. NALEP's Intervention Step by Step

Each year, NALEP District Offices provide a targeted intervention in a Focal Area. The actual size of a Focal Area varies and depends on population size and other criteria set by NALEP staff⁵. Each Focal Area is divided into four blocks; the demarcation of each block is conducted in consultation with village elders and 'opinion leaders' at a specially convened meeting. Once the overall framework for the intervention has been set, detailed activities begin. These commence with exercises designed to obtain a detailed 'portrait' of the target community, the development of a Community Action Plan based upon the opportunities and constraints identified, and the formation and support of community level groups to enable implementation. When the year is up, NALEP withdraws and begins the cycle of intervention anew in a different Focal Area, though backstopping services are offered to the first Focal Area in the second and third years. Box 7 provides a step-by-step overview of the process.

⁵ See NALEP, 2006.

Box 7: Steps in the NALEP Process

Entry

1. NALEP calls a meeting, known as a baraza, to which the local chief, the elders, and other stakeholders are invited. The aim is to inform them of the proposed intervention and to divide the Focal Area into blocks.
2. A Stakeholder Forum is convened. This brings together actors in and around the Focal Area, and discusses their role in the Broad-Based Survey (BBS).

Design

3. The BBS is conducted across all four blocks of the Focal Area.
4. In one block, a special survey designed to identify the most vulnerable is conducted: the Participatory Analysis of Poverty and Livelihood Dynamics (PAPOLD).
5. A Community Action Plan (CAP) is developed with the community, based upon the information provided by them during the BBS and the PAPOLD.

Implementation

6. Focal Area Development Committees (FADC) and Common Interest Groups (CIG) are formed to realize the CAP.
7. NALEP provides the FADCs and CIGs with capacity building, and helps them develop a growth plan.
8. It brokers linkages between the FADCs and CIGs to service providers and other development actors.
9. NALEP provides technical assistance (e.g. crop production technologies, including improved seeds, fertiliser use and disease control) at field days, barazas, and through demonstrations of particular technologies, including on improved food and nutrition. Farmers need to pay for the demonstration materials.

Exit

10. After one year NALEP withdraws and begins the process anew in a new Focal Area. It provides limited backstopping to the original Focal Area over the next two years.

5.2. NALEP's Design Phase: a Closer Look

NALEP works to establish a database of usable (action-orientated) information at the community level through two related methodologies: the Broad-Based Survey (BBS) and the Participatory Analysis of Poverty and Livelihood Dimensions (PAPOLD).

5.2.1. The BBS: Broad Based Survey

An overview of the Broad-Based Survey is presented in Box 8. A general discussion on the methodology is followed by a discussion of its gender sensitivity.

Box 8: The Broad Based Survey (BBS)⁶

The **Broad Based Survey** is conducted in all four blocks of a new Focal Area. It builds upon existing secondary data including earlier Participatory Rural Appraisals (PRAs), reconnaissance and baseline surveys, and social welfare and economic surveys. This is captured in the form of a Secondary Information Review Report. A field survey is conducted to obtain primary information to meet information gaps and to triangulate the secondary information. 'Opinion leaders', four from each block, work with the NALEP survey team to assist the team in data collection and analysis.

The BBS permits a wide range of data on local population's livelihood strategies, groups and organizations already operational in the area, etc.. to be obtained. A typical timetable is as follows:

Review and analysis of reports (FA based)	2 days	(2 days x 1FA =2)
Field Survey (block based)	8 days	(2 days x 4 blocks =8)
PAPOLD (1 block)	2 days	(2 days x 1block =2)
Problem analysis/CAP development (FA based)	3 days	(3 days x1FA =3)
CAP baraza (block based)	4 days	(1 day x4 blocks =4)
Total Number of days	19 days	

The BBS team is composed of other stakeholders in addition to NALEP staff. They include the Ministry of Water, Community Based Organizations (CBOs), civil society and private partners. The BBS utilizes a wide variety of tools to achieve a community profile. These include, (i) institutional analyses to map existing production groups, schools, health centres, (ii) livelihood mapping (focus on chief crops and livestock etc.), (iii) infrastructure availability analyses (water points, crush pens, quality of roads etc.), (iv) information on variables relevant to farming such as soils, rainfall, forage availability, prevalence of animal and crop disease, and (v) more general information on the community which includes an assessment of the main health issues. The constraints and opportunities for local livelihood strategies are listed.

The tools used are not consistent in each BBS and neither is their presentation in the reports. The lack of consistent presentation may not matter in terms of each report being an effective tool for action in the selected Focal Area, but the lack of consistency in the tool box/data presentation hinders comparison between Focal Areas and thus (presumably) the potential for synergetic learning within and between districts. For example, some BBS include a short historical portrait on the main (remembered) events in the community. Others provide a gender profile of access to, and control over, key resources, and food availability annual calendars.

A further difficulty with assessing the data is that the actual sampling frame is never given; nor the number of respondents to any exercise. It would be useful to know, for example, how many respondents (by gender) completed daily activity schedules or participated in transects. It is not possible to aim for pure 'statistical validity' in such an exercise, but it is important to know (i) the gender/ number of respondents, (ii) the type of sampling undertaken (e.g. every 10th household?), and (iii) were any activities conducted in male-only/female only groups? This information is needed to be sure that efforts were made to eliminate biases in data collection.

All reports provide a short analysis of each data set and a list of the constraints identified in each case. Some reports present the results of problem tree analyses, objective tree analyses, and problem ranking exercises, and they present the CAP.

⁶ Source: NALEP, 2006.

The Gender Sensitivity of the Broad Based Survey

A. The BBS Tool Box

In terms of *methodological content*, in some locations *no gender disaggregated data* is collected. This means that there is little opportunity to *identify gaps and opportunities* that would enable NALEP to:

1. *Disaggregate the gender-specific needs of individuals in the household* and then work towards improving their social and economic well-being through devising specific indicators. For example, close gender gap in incomes by increasing male income by 10% and female income by 20%/increase access of young men to land.
2. Work towards improving the *interrelatedness* of men and women's livelihood strategies. NALEP could work at the household level to ensure that farm activities are mutually supportive. The best example of working with the whole farm family comes from the Agriculture Support Programme in Zambia, which was evaluated as part of this study (see Zambia Country Report).

Small modifications to the BBS Tool Box to make it more gender-sensitive would resolve the following issues:

- Huge opportunities for obtaining gender-sensitive data are being lost in the commonly utilized seasonal calendars element of the BBS, which often do not map activities by gender/crop across the year. This information is needed to target, within the existing framework of gender roles and opportunities, interventions to the gender with expertise and responsibility for a particular crop or activity, and to ensure that they understand, and work to, the requirements of the next stage in the production cycle of the commodity.
- The only frequent attempt to provide gender-differentiated data is in the daily activity schedules. The results are not necessarily discussed in the reports and thus little action is taken. This means that:
 - Opportunities and constraints by gender and age with regard to lessening workloads are missed. For example, girls frequently have much heavier household responsibilities than boys according to the Bondo reports. Other studies⁷ demonstrate that the heavy household burden of girls across Africa negatively impacts on their studies. At the same time, boys/youth are criticized in some BBS reports for being 'idle'. NALEP could (i) work to raise consciousness of these issues in the target community, (ii) propose interventions within its mandate to lessen the workload of girls at home, thus addressing girls' practical gender needs, and (iii) encourage boys to become involved in some household tasks, thus addressing girls' strategic gender needs and encouraging male behavioural change in the young.
 - Overall, NALEP could work to encourage the household to consider how effectively time is being utilized by each gender. In what ways are household level livelihood strategies being compromised by adherence to gender roles? Are all household members spending time on their economic activities to their best economic advantage? Some economic activities may be very time-consuming and offer poor financial returns to labour.
- Data and analysis on the cultural gender norms prevailing in the Focal Area are missing, and yet it is precisely these that vary so widely across Kenya and which need to be understood if interventions are to be designed and targeted effectively in each location. Such a study should do more than present a broad-brush portrait of 'typical' male and female roles in a selected Focal Area.

⁷ In Farnworth, C.R. and Khoudari, K., 2010, case studies are provided which show that girls' work burdens at home can have a serious impact upon their ability to learn effectively when at school (too tired, taken out of school etc..) and to do homework (no time at home due to need to finish other work), and so on. Data on reasons for weaknesses in the performance of boys at school is also provided.

- The addition of classic research tools such as the access to/control over resources profile⁸ to the BBS will enable NALEP to identify more specifically how age/gender intersect in relation to the ability of different groups in the community to command resources, and the social capital they need to do so. From thence, NALEP can work with the community to find ways of alleviating constraints.

B. The BBS Process

In terms of *process*, in some cases *no BBS activity is carried out in gender disaggregated groups*. However, efforts to encourage women and men to speak freely without feeling they have to conform to locally prevailing norms is critical if the information on gender roles and responsibilities is to contribute value to NALEP's work to develop and strengthen farmer livelihood strategies. There is no doubt that these strategies differ by gender, and by the roles of women and men in the lifecycle of a particular commodity. It is also self-evident that processes of change in society are rapidly outpacing cultural norms, and thus closer examination of actual gender roles and responsibilities in a given place is needed to ensure that a gender-sensitive intervention is helpful.

- In mixed groups respondents are very likely to replicate generally accepted models of female/male behaviour and expectations. In some areas, these serve to disadvantage women even physically, by providing men with chairs and expecting women to sit on the ground. This reduces their visibility and forces them to speak louder to be heard.
- At the data collection stage in the process, separate discussions with women and men in secluded spaces is useful. Bringing them together at the interpretation stage can be a very productive learning exercise since the results of gender disaggregated data collection exercises often causes respondents to question their cultural gender norms for the first time. This stage needs to be planned carefully to ensure productive learning, and ways to build on that learning.

5.2.2. The PAPOLD: Participatory Analysis of Poverty and Livelihood Dynamics

An overview of the PAPOLD is presented in Box 9. This is followed by a general discussion on the methodology followed by a discussion of its gender sensitivity.

Box 9: Identifying the Most Poor: the PAPOLD⁹

The PAPOLD was incorporated in the NALEP 2006 Operations Manual. It aims to complement the BBS by providing additional methodological tools to identify the most vulnerable. The tool is based on the following premises (i) that poverty is a multi-dimensional concept; (ii) that poor people themselves are best at articulating what poverty means to them and identifying the appropriate options for livelihood improvement; and (iii) opportunities being promoted to improve livelihoods must fit with the household's aspirations, resource endowment, and capacity levels to access additional resources for investments. The results of the PAPOLD should enable extension providers to do the following:

Indirectly classify households into categories according to gender and poverty levels as perceived by community.

- Identify reasons for falling into poverty and strategies for escaping poverty.
- Identify movers into wealth creation at the disposal of every category.
- Develop appropriate opportunities, targeting mechanisms and necessary support required for each category.
- Plan and implement an inclusive development agenda.
- Contribute to the development of participatory monitoring and evaluation indicators for impact assessment.

⁸ This was conducted in some of the reports examined but was not gender-sensitive.

⁹ Source: NALEP Operations Manual, 2006.

The PAPOLD is a serious methodology designed to elicit quite complex information and arrive at locally valid agreements over the meaning of key words, such as poverty. A critical element of the PAPOLD is a participatory Categorization of households into four categories. Category A is the most poor. Child-headed households and female-headed households are frequently strongly represented in this category.

The PAPOLD is already quite gender sensitive. It could be refined further by working separately with women and men on each activity. Whilst initial analysis could be conducted with each group, interpretation of the findings could be conducted together to enable gender-sensitive learning to occur. Furthermore, it would be useful to conduct some research on local coping strategies. It is likely that reciprocal arrangements – mutual assistance in cash and kind – between households are in place.

- It is probable that households in lower categories have fewer such arrangements, that is, one can hypothesize that they have less social capital. For example, female-headed households are often among the most poor because they lack the male kin required for them to access key productive resources including land, labour, and machinery such as ox-ploughs. Child-headed households are even weaker. The key here is to find strengthen ways of cultivating social capital for these households, as NALEP is already attempting to do. The formation of mutual assistance groups (beyond FADC) and networking with various development actors are vital elements.
- The Agricultural Support Programme in Zambia noted that reciprocal arrangements between farmers were actually keeping them in poverty since the extent of their giving undermined their food security let alone their ability to invest. It worked to ensure (a) farmers defined a minimum level of food and income that had to be retained for their own use across the year (only surplus could be gifted), and (b) everyone in the household had to agree on the size of gift.

It is recognized that some NALEP District Offices will already be conducting gender-sensitive PAPOLD's and acting upon the findings to target women specifically. It would be good to locate such District Offices to learn from best practice. At the same time we recommend that a review is made of the PAPOLD approach to ensure that all offices are able to apply it in a gender sensitive manner (for example by working separately with women and men farmers, and by ensuring that the methods themselves are sufficiently gender sensitive). Equally, it is critical to ensure that NALEP staff are able to analyse the findings correctly and act upon them to design gender-sensitive interventions.

5.2.3. Working With the Most Poor

In discussions, NALEP staff show a keen awareness of issues around social capital, lack of assets etc.. as quotes captured in Box 10 show. It is clear that the PAPOLD works quite well as a poverty identification tool. Frustration hinges critically on the inability of NALEP staff to assist the most poor. This is because NALEP offers advice but is barred from providing any form of grant to kick-start a process of asset accumulation.

Box 10: Identification without Solutions: The PAPOLD and the Most Poor

- NALEP has done wonderful on capacity building. But we need to graduate people from category A in the PAPOLD ranking (the most poor) to category B. The BBS shows us who is the most poor. If people are excluded we know that.
- If there are orphans, we identify them as orphans, but we cannot do anything and we leave them just as they are.
- The farmers that are very poor and need to be supported with seeds so that they can plant and get something. They cannot start from nowhere. It is not money but materials they need.
- The very poor, including those affected by HIV/Aids, need seed capital for them to address food sufficiency for them at farm level. It is impossible for them otherwise to secure even the minimum level of assets that NALEP expects them to contribute, for example materials for demonstration days.

An open question is whether NALEP should work with the most poor and this cannot be answered in this paper. One approach that NALEP could consider is to offer the results of the PAPOLD methodology to development actors in the Focal Area and environs who are mandated to work with the most poor.

Another way in which NALEP could work with the most poor is to enhance its understanding of Indigenous Technical Knowledge (ITK) and to develop co-learning approaches to research. HIV/AIDS has been a major force in eroding ITK. Knowledge holders on particular technologies have simply died, taking their knowledge with them. In the past, they would have transmitted their expertise and techniques to their children. Today, child-headed households are trying to cope without that inheritance.

- This lack of knowledge about farming technologies impoverishes child-headed households. NALEP could help through designing child-centred Farmer Field Schools to teach farming fundamentals.
- Encouraging farmer-centred Plant Varietal Selection (PVS), which helps maximize the genetic potential of a particular crop for a particular area as a component of farmer-researcher breeding programmes (participatory plant breeding) would enable NALEP to strengthen the knowledge base of the livelihood strategies of the most poor as well as other categories of household over the long term. Robust varieties that need fewer costly inputs could form one target. This has already happened in livestock, with local breeds being favoured.
- NALEP's work on introducing improved varieties needs to continue since this is a clear need.

Another approach would be for NALEP to focus on Categories B and C. These categories have the minimum level of inputs required to participate in the programme effectively. NALEP could concentrate its work on (i) graduating Households from Category B to Category C, and (ii) keeping them there. This will require more attention to be paid to identifying and strengthening existing coping mechanisms as well as developing improved and new livelihood strategies, as NALEP is already doing. Any such study would need to be gender sensitive; it is clear that women lack social capital (due to lack of kin and lack of control over key assets) in some sub-cultures and thus have far fewer coping strategies than men will have.

6. NALEP's Methodology: Presentation and Discussion of the Implementation Phase

NALEP has been decentralizing its extension strategy to district and sub-district level for several years as Box 11 explains.

Box 11: Decentralization of Extension through Capacity Building in Focal Areas¹⁰

For improved, effective and efficient extension provision, NALEP is now channelling more support to the division as the centres for activity planning and implementation. The project will operate through the Focal Area approach and a gradual phasing out strategy. During the implementation year, enough capacity will be built among farmers to a level that they fully take charge of their development agenda. Strong linkages will be created between groups and extension providers (both public and private players). In the following years there will be reduction in the intensity of extension input by MOA and MoL FD staff to both groups and individual farmers, but more involvement of other extension providers and players within the specific value chain of enterprises being developed by various CIG's.

The extension staff in collaboration with other stakeholders will mobilize the focal area community to spearhead development in their area. This calls for a focal area extension strategy that entails strong collaboration, participation and partnership between the extension staff and other stakeholders.

To help form the supportive web of links necessary to realize its decentralization strategy, NALEP forms Stakeholder Forums at the Division, District, and Provincial levels. The stakeholders are expected to include, among others, private extension service providers, input suppliers and marketing agents, NGOs, CBOs, Farmer Based Organizations (FBOs), Government Ministries and Departments, representative of the local councils and other development structures. The work of Stakeholder Forums was not studied in depth for this report, although a few remarks are made regarding the effectiveness of the linkages between Focal Area structures and the Stakeholder Forums.

To strengthen farmer bargaining power and to enable them to put forward a coherent, bundled agenda to the Stakeholder Forums and other actors, NALEP works in the Focal Area by forming farmers into groups known as Focal Area Development Committees (FADCs) and Common Interest Groups (CIGs). These are discussed here.

6.1. Focal Area Development Committees (FADC)¹¹

The Focal Area Development Committees are responsible for overseeing the implementation of the Community Action Plan (CAP), for linking NALEP Divisional Offices to the community, for mobilizing local resources, acting as custodians for material donated to enable implementation of the CAP, and for presenting community project proposals to NALEP Divisional Offices. The FADC are elected, with four members from each block.

To work, these groups need to evolve an internal dynamic that enables them to work effectively. They must understand and represent their constituency, and to be able to shape and protect farmer interests. NALEP thus provides capacity development to these groups in the form of soft-skills and competence based training and it helps to broker initial contacts to other stakeholders. FADC committee members are trained over a ten day period across three months. The first session takes three days and focuses on developing leadership, democracy and governance, transparency and accountability, the nature of the NALEP project, its purpose, goal and objectives, cross cutting issues and the roles of the FADC. This is

¹⁰ Source: NALEP, 2006.

¹¹ Source: NALEP, 2006.

to ensure committee cohesiveness and effectiveness in community leadership. On the third day the new FADC elects a secretariat to be the administrative arm of the committee. These officials are elected after the FADC has understood its roles so that those elected understand their responsibilities. Further training of the FADC focuses on technical aspects relating to project development activities.

The successful operation of the FADCs is absolutely critical to NALEP's decentralization strategy. Experience is varied. In some cases the FADC undoubtedly operate very well over a long period of time, but in other cases some FADCs collapse soon after NALEP has started to withdraw from intensive interaction in a Focal Area (the 'implementation year'). The extension workers spoken to in the course of this study were significantly concerned about the long term viability of the FADC's they were forming. District extension staff said:

- It is not easy. FADC's are very active when you are there. Their interest starts waning, goes down, when you leave, despite our capacity building and training. After we shift to a new area, the FADCs in the old Focal Area still require capacity building and training. They need continued support.
- NALEP links farmers to very unwilling stakeholders who have their own programmes. We cannot synchronize their designs with ours. We have a District Stakeholder Forum which should enable co-planning of those stakeholders, but the big ones don't come.
- NALEP has to develop shining examples to convince NGOs. They don't come to our meetings. There is a parallel NGO sector. NGOs have quick win plans. They distribute things quickly. NALEP has longer sustainability and action plans that don't coincide and don't produce quick wins.

The ingredients for 'success' or 'failure' are unclear and would repay further investigation. It can be speculated that in cases where FADC's are weak, this can be partly attributed to NALEP's mode of operation. It simply does not have time to assist the new FADC to develop sufficient capacity, and sometimes NALEP can find it hard to establish the supportive networks that FADCs need.

In cases where the FADCs are successful, this may be because of existing strong webs of social capital or a particularly favourable business environment.

Finally, the payback from NALEP's work on group formation may come several months or years after NALEP has withdrawn from the area.

6.1.1. Gender Sensitivity of the FADC

NALEP has instituted an 'affirmative action' policy with respect to the FADC membership, insisting that at least 25% of the members are women. In practice, the 25% often operates as a ceiling, with NALEP staff advising farmers in each block that they need to put forward/vote for one woman candidate and three men. In some areas of the country women form around 1/3 of the FADC, but it is not clear how widespread this is, or the reasons why women are better represented in some areas than others.

The advantage of the quota policy is that women get an opportunity to take on a formalized role at the community level. They are made visible and they can speak. This can be a tremendous opportunity for women and it is to NALEP's credit that it protects this space. The disadvantage is of course that women form the bulk of farmers in most locations. *A discrepancy emerges between those with the knowledge of farming, and those who represent them.* This can be particularly serious given that (i) male farmers have little involvement in women's crops/women's work; and (ii) farming in Kenya, particularly smallholder farming, is deeply feminized across Kenya.

Finally, the quality and nature of women's participation in these groups is not known. More specifically:

- How effective are the facilitators? Have they been trained in communication and facilitation skills, and how do they transmit their skills?
- In what ways do the facilitators *work to strengthen women's voice* in the FADC?

6.2. Common Interest Groups

Common Interest Groups are groups based on a single commodity, such as rabbits or tomatoes. Through this structure, NALEP aims to empower farmers in a Focal Area to take up commercial agribusiness opportunities. The role of NALEP is two-fold. First, it develops the capacity of the CIGs to meet commercial challenges by training members of a particular CIG in basic accountancy skills (analysis of gross margin), the development of a business plan, and in the development and processing of a quality commodity and providing it in acceptable quality to the market (grading, packaging etc.). This is achieved through classic extension. Second, NALEP works to link the CIGs with potential customers. In this, NALEP staff, particularly the Agribusiness Development Officer, are expected to be very active. According to the Operations Manual: *[NALEP staff should be] pro-active in sourcing, consolidating and analyzing market information and to establish a database of this information for easy use.*

Consolidating farmers into groups has a number of clear advantages (i) farmers can access credit using co-guarantee mechanisms, (ii) they can purchase inputs collectively and bulk products for sale, (iii) it is cost-effective for NALEP to deliver training,

The success of the CIGs appears to vary widely. See Box 12.

Box 12: Successes and Constraints of CIGs

NALEP Staff

- In some cases there is no difficulty linking CIGs to the market. Garissa, for example, is a food deficiency area and thus exhibits strong demand for food. Staff have found it relatively easy to link poultry CIGs and CIGs to local hotels. Other products such as water melons are marketed as far as Nairobi. The farmers currently under NALEP's guidance generally have plots on irrigation schemes in a very dry area, so demand for fruit is very high.
- We train the members, but then they all want to work individually. It is difficult to develop producer co-operatives for historical reasons. People took their produce to cooperatives but were not paid, or were not paid for a long time. People don't like that. They lose money. Cooperatives have a bad reputation. But work is being done on revamping them.

CIG Members

- NALEP said it would link us up to markets but it did not.
- There is huge potential in the concept of energy-saving stoves (jikos). Some members of the Thinka Energy Saving Group make twice as much money as when they were employed. However, considerable costs are involved (travel, time, materials) in demonstrating and following up on the jikos which cannot be recouped. Many members lack enough start up capital, and potential customers also lack money. In many areas the local soil is not suitable for jiko construction so they need a brick depot. Outreach needs to be conducted with women directly, since if husbands try to introduce a jiko women will not use it.

6.2.1. Gender Sensitivity of the CIGs

Some of the commodities within NALEP's extension package are suited to, or preferred by, women, for example poultry and vegetable production. Women are expected to 'opt into' the elements of the package that suit them. However, NALEP does not engage in widespread women-centred outreach. It does focus some attention on researching and improving crops and livestock preferred by women, but it was not clear to the study team how extensive this research is.

The remarks made by the Thika Energy Saving Group (Box 12) show the importance of direct contact with the final user. Many training of trainer approaches rely on training men in the hope that they will train their wives (who actually use the technology). Experience shows that (i) if the trainee does not actually carry out the task then it is hard to ensure that the message is properly understood; (ii) messages get confounded during transmission to the person actually responsible for the task; and (iii) trust in the validity of the message often depends on the gender of the message-bearer.

As with the FADC, women appear to be poorly represented in higher CIG decision-making structures. The study team attended an umbrella body meeting of the Rabbit CIGs in Thika, to which the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Livestock came. Whilst the work conducted by the CIGs in rabbit production is commendable, only around 20% of group representatives at the meeting were women. This impression of course needs to be verified! Nationally, the picture could be different.

Finally, the entry point for the intervention needs to be considered carefully. For example, women's involvement in marketing varies hugely across Kenya. In the Rift Valley, women's activities are typically restricted to the immediate homestead. In such cases the entry point for a women-centred CIG intervention would be to support activities which can be managed close to home. These include: vegetable production under small-scale irrigation, compost making, household water harvesting, small ruminant rearing and fattening, backyard woodlot production, and tree nurseries. Farmgate sales, aided through information communication technologies (e.g. mobile phones with up to date market price information) could be encouraged to ensure that women can sell directly to the buyer.

6.3. Discussion

When discussing the gender sensitivity of the CIGs, it is useful to take a step back to look at the broad picture of women's involvement in value chains and the gender biases they face. To do so, it is helpful to turn away from a commodity focused approach, which is essentially farmer-led, to a value chain approach, which is market-led.

Women in agriculture increasingly supply national and international markets with traditional and high-value niche produce. However, in comparison to men, women farmers and entrepreneurs face gender-specific disadvantages. These include lower mobility, less access to training, less access to farm and market information, and less access to productive resources. Furthermore, location in the value chain matters. Women farmers frequently lose income and control as a product moves from the farm to the market, and they find it harder than men to carve out new roles in value chains. Indeed, men often take over production and marketing - even of traditional 'women's crops' - when it becomes financially lucrative to do so (Gurung, 2006). Women-owned agricultural businesses generally face more constraints and receive fewer services and support than those owned by men (Bardasi, Blackden & Guzman, 2007). These disadvantages reduce women's effectiveness as actors in value chains, as well as reducing overall agricultural and market effectiveness. Studies conducted in Burkina Faso, Kenya, Zambia and Tanzania show that providing women farmers with the same quantity of inputs (such as fertiliser, land and labour) on their plots, and improving their access to agricultural education, could increase national agricultural output and incomes by an estimated 10–20% in each country (World Bank, 2005).

To make value chains work for smaller, weaker actors - especially women working as farmers or in micro- and small enterprises - they must be *enabled to capture a larger slice of the revenues*. There is a need to strengthen relationships between partners to open channels for the transfer of technology, information, and gains. Because men and women frequently pursue distinct activities in a particular value chain, building understanding between them of their respective needs and responsibilities as 'chain actors' ensures that product quality is maintained as it passes along the chain. This results in *efficiency gains*.

Greater *equity gains* can be achieved by encouraging women to take on *new roles in value chains*, for example by engaging in value-adding strategies, or to take on new roles in value chains. Overall, the aim should be to identify and close the gender gaps, for which indicators can be developed. For example, the target may be to increase male incomes by 10% and female incomes by 20% to improve overall well-being and eliminate gendered income disparity.

It is necessary to differentiate between value chain development activities that are likely to benefit women and those likely to benefit men. In Kenya, one approach to ensuring gender equity in market-led development demands a focus on commodities that are considered ‘female’, such as vegetable production, poultry and small ruminants. It is in these chains that women are recognized to have more decision-making capacity and are often able to retain the monies from sale.

The second approach is to ensure that women maintain a strong presence as crops become commercialized. Evidence abounds that women are pushed out of the commodity at this stage. One way forward would be to encourage women-only CIGs to strengthen their market presence.

Many agencies are working on the methodologies for gender-sensitive value chain analysis. These include the GTZ in Kenya and IFAD. There are internet-based learning platforms for gender in value chains practitioners such as Gender in Value Chains at:

http://genderinvaluechains.ning.com/?xg_source=msg_mes_network

7. NALEP’s methodology: Presentation and Discussion of its Outcomes

7.1. NALEP’s Monitoring and Evaluation System

At the time of study, NALEP was not using a true monitoring and evaluation system though one is currently being introduced. It was not possible to view the new system in time for the writing of this report. Therefore some of the comments below may be redundant – though perhaps some will help with the operationalization of the new system.

To date, NALEP has employed M&E staff who read and analyse the various reports. Data that is available typically refers to the number of farmers participating in a given activity. This is useful to establish levels of interest in a particular commodity (say), but clearly such data does not provide information on whether farmers found the activity useful and relevant, for example, or whether they adopted the practice successfully. The participation of women in such activities was not provided in documentation viewed by the study team, yet this would be simple to collate and would add great value providing that such data was used to improve the gender sensitivity of the activity, and provided it was enhanced through other indicators.

A closer examination of the most recent logframe containing NALEP’s indicators for involving women shows that they relate to inputs and activities, rather than to impact and outcomes. Responsibilities for achieving particular outputs are not assigned in some cases, with targets being sector wide (70% of intervention areas). The comments on the logframe (second column) come from the recent Mid-Term Evaluation (2009).

Table 2: NALEP Logframe Gender Mainstreaming, 2009.

At least 3 relevant gender issues identified and analysed in each division annually and implemented.	Unclear what is meant by 'implemented' and by whom	Gender issues identified in all divisions: Unequal labour distribution, unequal access to productive resources and benefits, unequal participation in decision making.
At least three different gender advocacy, equity & equality promotional materials sourced, collected, developed & made available to all programme areas by end of year 2.	SMART	Gender Mainstreaming guidelines distributed, Child Labour and Agriculture study report disseminated.
At least 3 gender sensitive technologies identified & promoted in at least 70% of NALEP intervention areas.	SMART	Fireless cookers, energy saving devices, water harvesting, kitchen gardening, woodlots, tree nursery establishment, horticultural crops, traditional food crops and small livestock reported in all intervention areas.
At least two Subject Matter Specialist (SMSs) in every district trained in gender and able to apply all the key gender tools and NALEP gender guidelines.	Difficult to measure	No data.
At least 60% of training events with gender aspects are covered by trained SMSs.	SMART	Two trained in each district one from MoLD and one from MoA. Total 160 officers trained.
At least 1 collaborator is involved in 60% of TOT	SMART	Gender topics incorporated in all

Source: National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP) – II Midterm Evaluation of NALEP-II' (September 2009) by John Carlsen (PEM Consult, Denmark)

7.2. The Difficulty of Measuring NALEP's Outcomes

It is arguable that all of these efforts will not work unless NALEP spends more time in each Focal Area. It takes time to change farming practices and to develop social capital. NALEP staff remarked:

- NALEP is good at capacity building of groups but we find that the linkage comes much later, after we have left. NALEP cannot associate itself with that success. We want to be somewhere longer, be able to identify ourselves, have ownership
- Sida is interested in outcomes but it is hard for NALEP to show results. Development takes time. The credit for our work goes to other stakeholders
- We are supposed to complete the bulk of our work in one location in a year. In practice the first year is devoted to mobilization. Farmers get to know we are there. After one year we start our exit. The time we have available in one focal area is not sufficient for people to realize the benefits. For us, the methodology of the programmes means we cannot see immediate results.
- We shift the Focal Area each year, leaving farmers when they really need us. Though we should go back in practice over the next two years we have little time to do so since our main efforts have to be with the new Focal Area. We should intensify our work in one Focal Area across the three year period: Devote one year to capacity building, one year to implementation and the final year to work on sustainability mechanisms. This will help us see tangible development.

The short time period in the Focal Area makes it very difficult for NALEP District staff to satisfy reporting requirements to NALEP nationally, let alone establish personal satisfaction at a job well done. Above all, ensuring that *women are targeted effectively, and involved properly, in the work of the extension services takes a great deal of time*. NALEP staff suggested the following programme of intervention:

Year 1	Entry
Year 2	Consolidation
Year 3	Ensuring sustainability and exit.

8. Challenges and Opportunities in Gender Mainstreaming

8.1. Thematic Overview

The Paris Declaration on Aid Effectiveness (Paris Declaration, 2005) sets out five principles for operationalizing aid modalities. The principles are ownership, alignment, harmonization, managing for development results, and mutual accountability. The Paris Declaration mentions gender only in passing in the ‘Harmonization’ chapter (paragraph 42: *‘Similar harmonization efforts are also needed on other cross cutting issues, such as gender equality’*), thus providing no guidance on how to work with gender.

However, as a consequence of the sharpened focus upon gender in the Accra Agenda for Action (2008), a comprehensive review of the Paris Declaration commitments, the German Technical Cooperation (GTZ, 2009) considers that *‘the interplay between national macro programmes and sector programmes offers great potential for the promotion of gender equality, women’s empowerment and national development processes overall’*.

The key is, of course, to realize that potential for change. Whilst women should benefit from the aims of the Paris Declaration and the Accra Agenda for Action just as much as men, structural inequalities facing women in particular mean that it is difficult for them to do so. The political, administrative, financial and sector-specific (economy, health, agriculture etc..) reform processes resulting from the operationalization of the Paris Declaration impact directly, and differentially, upon the living conditions of women and men. It is essential, therefore, to develop principles and processes that explicitly focus on promoting gender equality and facilitate equal sharing of the benefits of development assistance. In other words, development assistance needs to continue its work in levelling the playing field. In the view of the GTZ (ibid.) technical cooperation programmes can assist through:

1. Promoting good governance by mainstreaming gender as a key issue.
2. Promoting equality in political reform processes.
3. Promoting equality on a sectoral basis by dismantling structural inequalities (e.g. in access to resources and services).
4. Promoting gender responsive budgeting and procedures.
5. Contributing to capacity development (e.g. via gender responsive analysis, statistics, monitoring and evaluation).

8.2. Mainstreaming Gender in Kenya

In 2000, the Government of Kenya adopted a National Policy on Gender and Development. The objective of the Policy is to ensure women's empowerment and mainstreaming of needs and concerns of women, girls and boys in all sectors of development initiatives. It provides a basis for the Government to underscore its commitment to the advancement and status of women through concrete steps, including putting in place institutional mechanisms for implementation, monitoring and evaluation of policy. The Government of Kenya has signed international conventions including the Beijing Platform for Action and the Convention on Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women. It is working towards the realization of the Millennium Declaration Development Goals.

8.3. Mainstreaming Gender in the Ministries of Agriculture and of Livestock Development

The Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock Development worked with the World Bank, and later with the Dutch Embassy, during the 1990s to produce studies on women in agriculture. These showed huge gender inequalities: women had few benefits or say in farming activities yet they did a huge percentage of the work. These studies enabled an institutional understanding regarding why gender mainstreaming is important to develop, and a consensus on the importance of gender mainstreaming to be achieved.

As a consequence a gender unit was established in each ministry: the Gender Equity Mobilization Strategy (GEMS). At the Ministry of Agriculture GEMS was placed in the Department of Extension and Home Economics. This immediately made gender mainstreaming appear a household/home-focused issue. This department is now called the 'Youth and Gender Department'.

At district level today, a gender officer works with the Ministry of Agriculture on gender and home economics. The gender officers conduct considerable work on capacity building; they have the skill and the knowledge and can do the analysis. However, they are frequently not integrated properly or they lack specific skills with regard to the actual theme.

8.3.1. The Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit and the Gender Strategy

A draft document outlining a strategy for mainstreaming gender in Kenya's agricultural sector has been developed by the Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit (ASCU). The key players are the public sector, Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Livestock Development partners such as private Non-Government Organizations (NGOs). The strategy will provide a harmonized guide to accelerating mainstreaming efforts geared at reaping maximum returns on investment. The gender and human rights issues are outlined in the strategy include (i) heavy workloads for women and associated inefficiencies; (ii) women's limited access to and control over productive resources; (iii) women's limited ownership of farm tools and implements; iv) women's limited access to credit; and v) women's limited access to technology and information.

The intended strategy will have four core areas of focus. These are: (i) creating gender and human rights friendly organizations; (ii) mainstreaming gender and human rights into programmes; (iii) research, documentation and advocacy; and iv) financial resources. Under each of these components are sub-sections on areas pertinent to that area. It is important to note that up till now the agricultural sector has neither a gender nor human rights mainstreaming policy nor strategy. Because of the significance of these two instruments, the strategy will launch a policy development process as soon as it is itself launched.

8.3.2. The Kenya Agricultural Productivity and Agribusiness Project (KAPAP)

The work of ASCU is being supported by an initiative to ensure a supportive database. The World Bank is working closely with the Government of Kenya and other partners to generate and accumulate a national set of robust data on women's and men's opportunities and constraints in agriculture. This currently does not exist. The Kenya Agricultural Productivity and Agribusiness Project (KAPAP), currently underway, is developing a survey instrument for gender sensitive data collection in close partnership with ASCU which will be focused on the gender issues in agriculture and rural development. Whilst the core of the survey will be focussing on agriculture and rural development, modules are being developed with associated sectors that can be added at low cost.

Modules under development include water and climate management. The project is looking for ways to include critical issues relating to household energy, financial instruments and transportation, which are currently not available. The aim is for the methodology and the survey instruments to be designed in such a way that they can be replicated and used by others as well, hence contributing to an accumulation of critical gender related data. The information will be used to design mitigation measures in KAPAP, and to be used as a basis for the programmes impact evaluation, and to provide critical input into the gender policy in the agricultural sector, which is currently underway in ASCU. KAPAP is being supported by a Sida-secondee to the World Bank in Nairobi, an expert in gender and rural development.

Annex 1. Fieldwork Timetable and People Met

Schedule for the Gender Mainstreaming Study

Date	Person to be interviewed	Position	Time	Venue	Contact details
1.2.10	Rosemary Magambo	NALEP – Coordinator Gender & Social Economics	11am	NALEP	Tel 0724-256157 rmagambo@nalep.co.ke
2.2.10	Charity Kabutha	Gender and Participatory Development Consultant	8.30am	Fairview Hotel	Tel 0722-562638 c_kabutha@yahoo.com
2.2.10	Annika Jayawardena	Embassy of Sweden -Counsellor –Country Director for Development Cooperation	10.30am	Swedish Embassy Office – Lion Place	Lion Place 3rd Floor, Tel 4234000/ jayawardena@foreign.ministry.se
2.2.10	Japhet Kiara	Embassy of Sweden Programme Office	10.30am	Swedish Embassy Office – Lion Place	Lion Place 3rd Floor, Tel 4234000/ japhet.kiara@foreign.ministry.se
2.2.10	Josephine Mweki	Embassy of Sweden Programme Office –Agriculture and Rural Development	10.30am	Swedish Embassy Office – Lion Place	Lion Place 3rd Floor, Tel 4234000/ josephine.mwangi@foreign.ministry.se
3.2.10	Dr. Joyce Thaiya	Programme Officer -GTZ PSDA	2.30pm	Maendeleo Building 5th Floor	0722-952346 j.thaiya@gtzpsda.co.ke
3.2.10	Travel to Thika				
4.2.10	Anne Jacqueline Kungi	NALEP Field Coordinator	8am	NE LAP office in Thika	ajwukungu@yahoo.com; dlpothika@yahoo.com
4.2.10	Rabbit Breeders Groups	County Council Hall	10am	Thika	
4.2.10	Rocket Self Help Group	Chief's Office	12Noon	Thika	
4.2.10	Juju West FADC	Juju West	3pm	Thika	
4.2.10	Travel To Garissa				
5.2.10	Bashir Muhammed Ominde Makutsa Augustine Nyage Gladys Murira Salesa Abdi Makiri Dennis	NALEP Field Coordinator	8.30am	NE LAP office in Garissa	garissa.nalepk@jambo.co.ke

Date	Person to be interviewed	Position	Time	Venue	Contact details
5.2.10	Kulnris Women Group		11am	Garissa	
5.2.10	FADC mixed		3pm		
6.2.10				Travel to Nairobi	
7.2.10				Travel to Kisumu	
8.2.10	Nicodemus Mwonga Peter Gor Risper Okoth Dennis Ujura Monica Osana Jane Koyoda Ben Agira Jared Odume	NELAP Field Coordinator i	9am	NELAP office in Bondo	daobondo@yahoo.com
8.2.10	Nyiloika Women Group	Usigu Division		Usigu	
8.2.10	Female Headed household	Usigu		Usigu	
8.2.10	Sianya Farmers Field Group	Marendia Division		Marande	
9.2.10				Travel to Nairobi	
9.2.10	Dr. Akinyi Nzioka	Chief Executive and Consultant – CLEAR	12noon	Mpaka Plaza – CLEAR Office	akinyi@clearwomen.org
9.2.10	Dr. Eberhard Krain	Deputy Programme Manager -GITZ	2.30pm	Meandeleo House	Eberhard.Krain@gtz.de
10.2.10	Asa Tortensen	Senior Gender Specialist – World Bank	2.30pm	Hill Centre	atorkelsson@worldbank.org
11.2.10	Mr. Bjorn Hansson	Technical Director – Ramboll Nature	7.30am	Fairview Hotel	Bjorn.hansson@ramboll.se
12.2.10	Mr. Jeremy Notley	Consultant	7.30am	Fairview Hotel	jeremy.notley@btopenworld.com
12.2.10	Japhet Kiara Josephine Mweki	Embassy of Sweden Programme Officers	10.30am	Swedish Embassy Office – Lion Place	Lion Place 3rd Floor, Japhet.kiara@foreign.ministry.se Tel 4234000/
16.2.10	Rosemary Magambo	Nale NALAP – Coordinator Gender & Social Economics	9am	NALAP	Tel 0724-256157 rmagambo@nalep.co.ke

Annex 2. Groups Met on the Field Visits

Name	Organization	Position
Annika Jayawardena	Embassy of Sweden	Country Director for Development Cooperation
Japhet Kiara	Embassy of Sweden	Programme Officer
Josephine Mweki	Embassy of Sweden	Programme Officer, Civil Society, Gender and Child Rights
Rosemary Magambo	NALEP	Coordinator Gender & Social Economics
Charity Kabutha	Independent Consultant	Gender and Participatory Development Consultant
Akinyi Nzioka (PhD)	The Centre for Land, Economy & Rights of Women (CLEAR)	Chief Executive and Consultant
Joyce Thaiya (PhD)	GTZ PSDA	Programme Officer
Eberhard Krain (PhD)	GTZ	Deputy Programme Manager
Asa Torlensen (PhD)	World Bank	Senior Gender Specialist
Jeremy Notley	ORGUT Consulting AB (Kenya) Ltd.	Managing Director
Field Trip A. Thika, Central Province		
Ann Jacqueline Kungu	NALEP	District Livestock Production Officer
Esau Mwadime	NALEP	Divisional Livestock Extension Officer
Julius Muiruri	NALEP	District Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
James Njeru	Rabbit Breeders Association (Umbrella Group Meeting)	
Joseph Murega Mwai	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Lucy Wanjiku	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Angela Mwangi	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Isaac Muriethi	Rabbit Breeders Association	
James Karanja	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Ann Muigai	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Joseph Ngatia	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Sammy Kimani	Rabbit Breeders Association	
John Kamau	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Waithera Njunguna	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Kamanda Njoroge	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Agnes Wangui	Rabbit Breeders Association	
George Mwaura	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Jane Ndungu	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Peter Waiganjo	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Hellen Wambui	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Violet Muciri	Rabbit Breeders Association	

Name	Organization	Position
Catherine Muthoni	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Joseph Mbugua	Rabbit Breeders Association	
James Nganga	Rabbit Breeders Association	
James Ngochi	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Peter Githei	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Daniel Warirungi	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Johnson Kariuki	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Timothy Ngoro	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Richard	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Daniel Kangethe	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Daniel Kairuki	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Samuel Ndungu	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Wandia Joseph	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Gichira	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Kariuki	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Carol	Rabbit Breeders Association	
Josephine	Rabbit Breeders Association	
S.A Maina	Rocket Energy Savings Group	Installer
Rose Wanjiru	Rocket Energy Savings Group	Jika maker
Esther Muthoni	Rocket Energy Savings Group	Trainer/Installer
John Wanyoike	Rocket Energy Savings Group	Installer/Trainer
Stanley Muigai	Rocket Energy Savings Group	Installer
Joseph Muthama	Rocket Energy Savings Group	Installer/Trainer
Mary Kambua	Rocket Energy Savings Group	Installer
Peter Kangethe	Rocket Energy Savings Group	NALEP Extension Officer
Joseph Kiare	Juja West Focal Area Development Committee (FADC Leaders)	Chairman
Bernard Muturi	Juja West Focal Area Development Committee (FADC Leaders)	Vice Treasurer
Joseph Kamande	Juja West Focal Area Development Committee (FADC Leaders)	Member
Benedict Mukongo	Juja West Focal Area Development Committee (FADC Leaders)	Member
Thomas Maroya	Juja West Focal Area Development Committee (FADC Leaders)	Member
Jane	Juja West Focal Area Development Committee (FADC Leaders)	Member
Jane Wanjiru	Juja West Focal Area Development Committee (FADC Leaders)	Member
Tabitha Kanyingi	Juja West Focal Area Development Committee (FADC Leaders)	Vice Secretary
Field Trip B. Garissa, Eastern Province		
Bashir Muhumed	NALEP, Garissa	District Agriculture Officer
Salesa Abdi	NALEP, Garissa	District Agriculture Extension Officer

Name	Organization	Position
Ominde Makutsa	NALEP, Garissa	District Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
Augustine Nyaga	NALEP, Garissa	District Agribusiness Development Officer
Gladys Murira	NALEP, Garissa	District Home Economist Officer
Dennis Makiri	NALEP, Garissa	District Cooperative Development Officer
Fatuma Adan Farah	Kulmis Farm Group (Meeting with Women)	Chairperson
Sahara Ibrahim Muktar	Kulmis Farm Group (Meeting with Women)	Member
Shamsa Ibrahim	Kulmis Farm Group (Meeting with Women)	Member
Mahdabo Garoso	Kulmis Farm Group (Meeting with Women)	Member
Harira Ibrahim	Kulmis Farm Group (Meeting with Women)	Member
Hussein Khalifa AW	Kulmis Farm Group (Meeting with Women)	Member
Ahmed M. Noor	Kulmis Farm Group (Meeting with Women)	Member
Yusuf Matan	Kulmis Farm Group (Meeting with Women)	Member
Serhab Sulim	Kulmis Farm Group (Meeting with Women)	Member
Mahummed Abdi	Iftin FADC (Meeting with Men)	Member
Mohammed Abdul	Iftin FADC (Meeting with Men)	Member
Abulahi Ibrahim	Iftin FADC (Meeting with Men)	Member
Shido Hassan	Iftin FADC (Meeting with Men)	Member
Abdi Ishmael	Iftin FADC (Meeting with Men)	Member
Field Trip C. Bondo, Nyanza Province		
Nicodemus Mwonga	NALEP	District Agricultural Officer
Risper Okoth	NALEP	Division Home Economics Officer
Dennis Ujura	NALEP	District Home Economics and Monitoring and Evaluation Officer
Monica Osana	NALEP	Divisional Crop Officer- Marande
Jane Koyada	NALEP	Extension Officer
Ben Agira	NALEP	District Livestock and Production Officer
Jared Odume	NALEP	Divisional Agribusiness Officer
Peter Gor	NALEP	District Agribusiness Development Officer
Caroline Omondi	NALEP	Livestock Officer

Name	Organization	Position
Elizabeth Atieno	Nyiloka Women's Group	Member
Risper Ochieng	Nyiloka Women's Group	Chairman Development Group
Beatrice Odiyo	Nyiloka Women's Group	Welfare Secretary
Christine Achieng	Nyiloka Women's Group	Member
Mary Ndege	Nyiloka Women's Group	Member
Leonida Awour	Nyiloka Women's Group	Member
Samuel Otieno Aoko	Sianya Farmers Field Group	Chairman
Pastor Solomon Odong	Sianya Farmers Field Group	Organizing Secretary
Moses Okwacho	Sianya Farmers Field Group	Facilitator
Harrison Otieno	Sianya Farmers Field Group	Member
Christine Awino	Sianya Farmers Field Group	Treasurer
Peris Achieng	Sianya Farmers Field Group	Assistant Chairman
John Odeba	Sianya Farmers Field Group	Member
Samson Siage	Sianya Farmers Field Group	Village Elder

Annex 3. References

- Berdegue, J., Rearden, T., 2008. *The retail-led transformation of agrifood systems*. In: Farnworth, C. R., Jiggins, J., Thomas, E.V., 2008. *Creating food futures: trade, ethics, and the environment*. London: Gower.
- Farnworth, C.R., Khoudari, K., 2010. *Enhancing gender sensitivity in post-primary education*. Eschborn: GTZ.
- Farnworth, C.R., 2008. *Module 5: gender and agricultural markets*. In: *Gender in agriculture sourcebook*. World Bank. <http://worldbank.org/genderinag>
- Government of Kenya (2007) *National Policy for the Sustainable Development for Arid and Semi Arid Lands of Kenya*.
- Gurung, C., 2006. *The role of women in the fruit and vegetable supply chain in Maharashtra and Tamil Nadu India: the new and expanded social and economic opportunities for vulnerable groups task order under the Women in Development IQC*. Washington, DC: USAID.
- Orgut Consulting (AB) Kenya, 2010. *Lessons Learned and Good Practices from Support to the Kenyan Water Sector (2010)* by ORGUT Consulting (AB) Kenya Ltd./ Royal Danish Embassy/DANIDA 2010
- Sen, A.K., 1990. *Gender and cooperative conflicts*. In: Tinker, I. ed. *Persistent inequalities*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sen, A.K., 1998. *The living standard*. In: Crocker, D.A., Linden, T. eds. *Ethics of consumption: the good life, justice, and global stewardship*: 287-311. Oxford: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
- World Bank, 2005. *Gender and 'shared growth' in sub-Saharan Africa. Briefing notes on critical gender issues in sub-Saharan Africa 2005-1*. Washington DC: World Bank. Available at <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTABOUTUS/Resources/GenderGrowth.pdf>.

Personal Communications (in addition to the list of people met)

Kabutha Charity, pers. Comm.. February 1st, 2010

NALEP Documentation

- NALEP Operations Manual (2006). Nairobi. Kenya.
- Kenya_NALEP II_Decision.
- NALEP Semi-Annual Report 2006-7.
- NALEP Report No 19.
- National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP) – II Midterm Evaluation of NALEP-II' (September 2009) by John Carlsen (PEM Consult, Denmark).

Bibliography to this Study

- Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes: (Sida Evaluation 2010:3)
- Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – International Literature Review: (UTV Working Paper 2010:3)
- Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Ethiopia Country Report (UTV Working Paper 2010:4)
- Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Kenya Country Report (UTV Working Paper 2010:5)

- Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Mozambique Country Report (UTV Working Paper 2010:6)
- Enfoques de Género en los Programas de Agricultura – Informe en Nicaragua (UTV Working Paper 2010:7)
- Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Zambia Country Report (UTV Working Paper 2010:8)

UTV Working Paper

- 2010:1 Gender Equality in Swedish Development Cooperation
Annex IV: Ethiopia Country Report**
Gabriela Byron, Mulunesh Woldemariam
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:2 Gender Equality in Swedish Development Cooperation
Annex V: Kenya Country Report**
Charlotte Örnemark, Pauline Nyamweya
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:3 Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – International Literature Review**
Ambra Gallina
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:4 Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Ethiopia Country Report
A special study of the Sida-Amhara Rural Development Programme (SARDP III)
and the work of selected agencies in Ethiopia.**
Cathy Rozel Farnworth, Tamene Hailegeorgis Gutema
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:5 Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Kenya Country Report
A special study of the National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP II)**
Cathy Rozel Farnworth, Marceline Obuya
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:6 Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Mozambique Country Report
A special study of the National Agricultural Development Programme (ProAgri II)**
Ambra Gallina, Catarina Chidiamassamba
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:7 Enfoques de Género en los Programas de Agricultura – Informe en Nicaragua
El caso del programa Fondo de Desarrollo Agropecuario (FondeAgro)**
Ambra Gallina, Lola Ocón
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:8 Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Zambia Country Report
A special study of the Agricultural Support Programme (ASP)**
Cathy Rozel Farnworth, Monica Munachonga
Secretariat for Evaluation
- 2010:9 How Basic Community Infrastructure Works can Trigger Livelihood Improvements
and Good Governance
Personal notes on a validated model integrating socio-economic progress
and democracy development in poor urban areas**
Pierre Frühling
Department for Conflict and Post-Conflict Cooperation,
Team for Regional cooperation Latin America and the Caribbean



Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes – Kenya Country Report

This study is part of the evaluation project on Gender aware approaches in agricultural programmes. The purpose is to increase understanding of how Sida's development assistance in agriculture should be designed, implemented and funded to ensure that female farmers are reached, that their needs as producers are met, and that they are able to benefit from the support to achieve a positive impact on their livelihoods. The Kenya Country Study of the National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP II) is one of the project's five country case studies.

SWEDISH INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT COOPERATION AGENCY

Address: SE-105 25 Stockholm, Sweden.

Visiting address: Valhallavägen 199.

Phone: +46 (0)8-698 50 00. Fax: +46 (0)8-20 88 64.

www.sida.se sida@sida.se

