

Community Parliaments make voices heard and needs felt

RIU

Validated RNRRS Output.

Community Parliaments (CPs) offer well-structured, innovative mechanisms for making local voices heard. They also improve coordination and dialogue among community groups, creating an empowering platform to steer local development. In Kenya, farmers had little access to market-chain information, and lacked basic farm inputs, labour and credit. Intermediaries, who deprived farmers of their profits, ran markets. Finally, poor infrastructure made it difficult to get farm produce to markets. Community Parliaments have helped to change this picture in four parts of Kenya, addressing these and other problems. Micro-credit is one of the important services they offer. The government, private companies, and development agencies are using CPs to reach almost 10,000 people in the four locations and the model is quickly spreading to other parts of the country.

Project Ref: **CPH11:**

Topic: **6. Promoting Success: Partnerships, Policy & Empowerment**

Lead Organisation: **Kenya Network for Draught Animal Technology, Kenya**

Source: **Crop Post Harvest Programme**

Document Contents:

[Description](#), [Validation](#), [Current Situation](#), [Current Promotion](#), [Impacts On Poverty](#), [Environmental Impact](#), [Annex 1](#), [Annex 2](#),

Description

Research into Use

NR International
Park House
Bradbourne Lane
Aylesford
Kent
ME20 6SN
UK

Geographical regions included:

[Kenya](#), [Malawi](#), [Tanzania](#),

Target Audiences for this content:

[Crop farmers](#), [Processors](#),

CPH11

A. Description of the research output(s)

1. *Working title of output or cluster of outputs.*

In addition, you are free to suggest a shorter more imaginative working title/acronym of 20 words or less.

The project for which the outputs are being described was referred to as:

Improved Agricultural Rural Transport for Kenya

Working title of the proposed project is:

Empowering end-users in agro-enterprise and value-chain development through Community Parliaments and techno-service information hubs for East Africa

2. *Name of relevant RNRRS Programme(s) commissioning supporting research and also indicate other funding sources, if applicable.*

RNRRS: NRIL: Crop Post-Harvest Programme (CPHP).

Other sources of funding:

- Swedish International Development Agency (SIDA).
- International Forum for Rural Transport and Development (IFRTD).
- DFID's Infrastructure and Urban Development Department (IUDD).

3. *Provide relevant R numbers (and/or programme development/dissemination reference numbers covering supporting research) along with the institutional partners (with individual contact persons (if appropriate) involved in the project activities. As with the question above, this is primarily to allow for the legacy of the RNRRS to be acknowledged during the RIUP activities.*

The project R number was R8113

Institutional Partners

International Forum for Rural Transport and Development (IFRTD)

Contact Person: Peter Njenga

P.O. Box 314 00502

Karen Nairobi, Kenya

Tel/fax: +254 020 883323

International Labour Organization/Advisory Support Information Services and Training (ILO/ASIST)

Contact Person: Stephen Muthua

Practical Action (Formerly ITDG)
Contact Person: Rahab Mundara

East African Growers Association (EAGA)
Attn: George Solomon
P. O. Box 49125 – 00100 Nairobi
Tel: +254 020 822025/ 822029/ 822034
Fax: +254 020 822155

Development Technology Unit, University of Marwick
Contact Person: Dr. Colin Edwin Oram

Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences, Department of Agricultural Engineering
Contact Person: Prof. Girma Gebresenbet

International Development Group, Silsoe Research Institute
Contact Person: David H. O'Neill

Seracoatings Ltd

Community Parliaments (established by project); MTMO, LAMP, BIAMF, KDUC

Kenya Agricultural Commodity Exchange (KACE)

Horticultural Crops Development Authority (HCDA)

Kenya Horticultural Development Programmes (KHDP)

Ministry of Agriculture, Horticulture Department.

4. *Describe the RNRRS output or cluster of outputs being proposed and when was it produced? (max. 400 words). This requires a clear and concise description of the output(s) and the problem the output(s) aimed to address. Please incorporate and highlight (in bold) key words that would/could be used to select your output when held in a database.*

1. *Community parliaments*

Communities lacked well-structured innovative platforms to articulate and coordinate community's needs and development programmes. Thus they neither had a strong voice to advocate and lobby for their rights nor did they have the capacity to undertake development projects. The **Community Parliaments** as a model (see *Appendix VI*) for local dialogues brought together community groups with varying activities and interests in order to develop a **community empowerment platform** that would **steer development** at local level.

2. *Innovative partnerships*

The communities were dealing with issues as individuals or very small groups without any **external partners and/or collaborators**. Consequently, they had no avenues for **accessing market chain information** that would support the **growth** of their **agro-businesses**. After identifying needs; Community Parliaments used **Innovative Partnerships Approach (need-driven partnerships)** to engage key stakeholders in implementing interventions on the priority needs.

3. *Innovative credit schemes*

Most farmers lacked the basic farm inputs during planting time and labour to harvest the produce when ready. This was mainly due to lack of **pro poor credit facilities to boost horticultural production**. Community Parliaments were trained on initiation and management of **credit schemes**. This was meant to facilitate acquisition of farm inputs by farmers through low interest credits. The systems and approaches used in the credit scheme by various Community Parliaments varied depending on their innovations.

4. *Linking farmers to markets and market chain development*

Farmers were mainly faced with produce marketing problems. Markets were mainly run by **middlemen** who deprived farmers of their profits. The farmers had limited **knowledge and skills** to negotiate with buyers of their farm produce. KENDAT worked as an intermediary in **linking farmers to markets**. **Horticultural produce** exporting companies Like EAGA and input suppliers like Regina Seeds Ltd were linked to the Community Parliaments, which then linked them to **farmer groups**. Through the linkages farmers entered into written contracts to acquire inputs and sell their produce to **guaranteed buyers**.

5. *Labour-based infrastructure development and intermediate means of transport*

In areas where KENDAT had community development projects, there existed poor infrastructure and limited options for **intermediate means of transport** for getting farm produce to the **markets**. To mitigate the problem, Community Parliaments were trained on how to use **labour-based technologies**, including the use of **locally available resources**, to improve **transport infrastructure** with a view to enhance transportation of horticultural produce to rural collection centres and markets.

5. *What is the type of output(s) being described here?*

Please tick one or more of the following options.

Product	Technology	Service	Process or Methodology	Policy	Other Please specify
	X	X	X		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Learning alliances • Community empowerment platform.

6. *What is the main commodity (ies) upon which the output(s) focussed? Could this output be applied to other*

commodities, if so, please comment

The outputs mainly focused on horticultural produce and intermediate means of transport. All outputs of the project could be applied to other commodities. Livelihood support in Kenya, just like other countries in the region, is mainly through agricultural production both for subsistence and **wealth creation**. Farmers therefore need to produce, transport and sell commodities in order to achieve their subsistence and wealth creation objectives.

Farmer empowerment platform like community parliaments, **partnerships** with various **stakeholders**, **innovative credit schemes**, suitable markets and appropriate means of transport are all required in order to develop a suitable **market value chain**. These are required not for horticultural produce but for the wide range of commodities that farmers deal with. For example the outputs can be applied in marketing of livestock products.

7. What production system(s) does/could the output(s) focus upon?

Please tick one or more of the following options. Leave blank if not applicable

Semi-Arid	High potential	Hillsides	Forest-Agriculture	Peri-urban	Land water	Tropical moist forest	Cross-cutting
X	X	X	X	X			X

8. What farming system(s) does the output(s) focus upon?

Please tick one or more of the following options (see Annex B for definitions).

Leave blank if not applicable

Smallholder rainfed humid	Irrigated	Wetland rice based	Smallholder rainfed highland	Smallholder rainfed dry/cold	Dualistic	Coastal artisanal fishing
X	X		X			

9. How could value be added to the output or additional constraints faced by poor people addressed by clustering this output with research outputs from other sources (RNRRS and non RNRRS)? (**max. 300 words**)

Community parliaments need to be more empowered through training and exposure visits to various community-based projects. This ensures that they have well developed **internal systems** and **structures for sustainability**. Through such empowerment the community parliaments would be able to initiate more diverse agro-enterprises thus creating a more **sustainable resource base** at household levels. The model of community parliaments published and widely disseminated as a tool for community empowerment. Print and electronic media should be used to publicize the model.

Access to research output and other information is crucial for **poverty reduction** process. Adoption of Community Parliaments Model for the purpose of enhancing access to research outputs and other market chain information by farmers is important. Thus developing **innovation platforms** comprising Community Parliaments, research institutions, input suppliers and produce buyers is needed. Such platforms would facilitate **the flow of information** that would benefit the farmers' production, transportation and marketing.

Please specify what other outputs your output(s) could be clustered. At this point you should make reference to the circulated list of RNRRS outputs for which proformas are currently being prepared.

KENDAT outputs on this project could be clustered with projects with the following R numbers. 8182, 8418, 8275, 7151, 8274, 8498, 6344, 7013, 7668, 7496, 8432, 8250, 8114, 7494, 8422, 8402, 5539, 8438, 8297

Validation

B. Validation of the research output(s)

10. How were the output(s) validated and who validated them?

*Please provide brief description of method(s) used and consider application, replication, adaptation and/or adoption in the context of any partner organisation and user groups involved. In addressing the “who” component detail which group(s) did the validation e.g. end users, intermediary organisation, government department, aid organisation, private company etc... This section should also be used to detail, if applicable, to which social group, gender, income category the validation was applied and any increases in productivity observed during validation (**max. 500 words**).*

The programme was implemented in 4 localities in Kenya, namely, Mwea, Lari, Busia and Kalama. A **partnership approach** was applied in all the action research activities that involved the **Community Parliaments** as the **end users** of empowerment concepts and processes. The validation of the viability and sustainability of Community Parliaments and the various **innovative partnerships** and **community-led development initiatives** had been done at various levels.

The Government of Kenya (GOK) through the Ministry of Gender, Sports, Culture and Social Services, vets **community-based groups** before registering to become legal entities. Through interviewing their officials, the Community Parliaments (CPs) were vetted and approved by Community Development Assistants (CDAs) (GOK Officials) and subsequently registered. The CPs are therefore recognized by the government and legally allowed to transact business in their localities.

The International Forum for Rural Transport and Development (IFRTD) in partnership with KENDAT conducted an assessment of the Community Parliaments to determine their suitability as platforms for implementation of **Poverty Watch Programme** that aimed at building the capacity of **civil society** to generate greater knowledge on issues pertinent to transport and poverty and further facilitate the initiation of projects that would influence transport sector policy. This assessment approved the CPs as appropriate **Civil Society Organization’s platforms** for implementation of Poverty Watch Programme due to the cross cutting representation of the **Common Interest Groups** (CIGs).

Horticultural produce Market-driven partnerships between private companies and the CPs evolved in Mwea and Busia. Prior to engagement into contracted horticultural production the CPs in these areas were taken through a 1 year pilot production phase by each of the companies that include East African Growers Association, (EAGA),

Frigoken Ltd. Kenya Horticultural Exporters (KHE) and Mace Foods Ltd. During this period the companies closely monitored the farmer groups' production process to particularly assess the viability of the contracted farming system. They have now approved the CPs in these areas as suitable for engagement in contracted horticultural farming.

Value chain analysis meetings were held between KENDAT and the CPs in the 4 localities to establish the benefits acquired from contracted farming system as compared to non-contracted system. The farmers in the CPs being the **end users** have accepted and adopted contract system as a preferred approach for **market development** because it is more beneficial than the non-contracted broker dominated system. An increase in the number of farmer groups entering into contractual farming was observed in Mwea and Busia.

Innovative credit schemes were initiative in the four areas with a view to assist the small holder farmers enter into profitable business-oriented agro-enterprises. The schemes have been evaluated annually by KENDAT and a growth trend of the schemes has been observed over a period of 4 years. This initiative has also been tested by other NGOs including Poverty Eradication Network (PEN), Farm Africa and Kenya Horticultural Development Programme (KHDP) who are currently giving the CPs more funds to boost the credit schemes portfolio.

11. *Where and when have the output(s) been validated?*

*Please indicate the places(s) and country(ies), any particular social group targeted and also indicate in which production system and farming system, using the options provided in questions 7 and 8 respectively, above (**max 300 words**).*

The outputs of the project were validated in 4 localities in Kenya namely Mwea, Lari, Busia and Kalama.

- a) **Mwea** in the Central Province of Kenya is on the foothills of Mt. Kenya and presents high potential and semi arid production systems. farmers here practice irrigated and small holder rainfed highland farming systems.
- b) **Lari** in the Central province of Kenya is on the foothills of Abandares Mountains and has high potential, forest-agriculture and peri-urban production systems with small holder rainfed humid and small holder rainfed highland farming systems.
- c) **Busia** in the Western Province of Kenya has high potential, peri-urban production system with small holder rainfed humid farming systems.
- d) **Kalama** in the Eastern Province of Kenya presents semi-arid, hillsides production systems with small holder rainfed highland farming systems.

The processes of validation targeted the main beneficiaries of the outputs who include the members of the various CP constituent groups. They are mainly small holder peasant farmers who are in one way or another involved in cash and subsistence crop production, transportation and marketing. They also represent a crosscutting nature of social groupings including farm casual labourers, farm owners, transport services providers, local business people, single mothers and physically challenged persons.

The validation involved various stakeholders including the government, NGOs and Private companies (see answers to question 10 above) and has been done at varying dates between the years 2003 and 2006.

Current Situation

C. Current situation

12. **How and by whom** are the outputs currently being used? Please give a brief description (**max. 250 words**).

The outputs are being used by;

a) Community

The community is using the CPs as agro-enterprise development platforms that also serve to address other community problems. Through the CPs innovative partnerships with private institutions including input suppliers like Regina Seeds Ltd, Zuzuka Ltd and produce exporting companies like EAGA, KHE, Mace Foods Ltd and Frigoken Ltd are developed.

b) Private Companies

Private companies use the CPs as a channel for marketing their products including farm inputs and low cost transport options like motorcycles trailers from Zuzuka Ltd. In the CPs horticultural produce exporting companies like EAGA, KHE, Mace Foods Ltd and Frigoken Ltd have found organized farmers who they have contracted to produce commodities such as French beans and Chillies for export markets.

c) The Government

The government is using the CPs to reach out to more farmers with extension services including information and technical training. For example the Agricultural Extension Officers in the Ministry of Agriculture use the CPs to implement National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP) that seeks to empower small holder farmers by giving them information and technical support in agricultural production. Members of the CPs have also been incorporated into committees dealing with Government funds such as Constituency Development Fund (CDF) and Local Authorities Transfer Fund (LATF).

d) Development Agencies

Development agencies including NGOs use the CPs as a platform to set up community development projects. NGOs like Farm Africa, KENDAT, DGAK, ICIPE, GBM and KHDP use the CPs to disseminate various farming technologies.

13. **Where** are the outputs currently being used? As with Question 11 please indicate place(s) and countries where the outputs are being used (**max. 250 words**).

The CP concept started in 4 localities in Kenya namely Mwea, Lari, Busia and Kalama and has now spread to other areas of Kenya and East African region. In Kenya, the concept has spread 42 districts due to its use by NALEP although referred to as “forums” instead of “parliaments” and Forest Conservation initiatives where they are referred to as Community Forest Associations (CFAs).

Farmers in Arusha, Tanzania have adopted the CP model in Conservation Agriculture Projects implemented by KENDAT and Farm Africa. A delegation from Malawi Ministry of Agriculture and the University of Malawi in a UNIDO sponsored project that works to improve the livelihoods of widows and orphans by engaging in enhanced agricultural production and business practices visited the CPs in Kenya and have adopted the model.

Under the CP platform Innovative partnerships helped develop various outputs that are being used in Kenya. Linking farmers to markets with contracted-farmer system is being used in Mwea and Busia. However, Farm Concern and KHDP are linking farmers to markets in at least 15 out of 42 districts in Kenya. Low cost 2 and 3 wheeler motorcycles are now widely used for transport in Busia, Kisumu, Naivasha, Nakuru, Mwea, Eldoret, Mombasa in Kenya as a result of products promotion done by Zuzuka through the CPs. Innovative savings and credit schemes that are owned by the farmers are being implemented in Mwea, Lari, Busia and Kalama, where CP members save regularly and borrow to buy farm inputs.

14. What is the scale of current use? Indicating how quickly use was established and whether usage is still spreading (max 250 words).

The CP in Mwea has 21 CIGs with 658 individuals, Lari has 15 CIGs with 450 members, Busia has 14 CIGs with 480 members, and Kalama has 2 CIGs with 57 members, thus the 4 CPs have a total membership of 1645. An average household in Kenya has 6 members. By using CPs as platforms for various initiatives, the government, private companies, and development agencies are able to directly reach about 9870 members in the 4 localities. This is the CPs establishment over a period 4 years. Adoption of the CP model is quickly spreading to other parts of the country as illustrated in question 13 above.

Innovative partnerships have continued to grow over the last 4 years. For instance, in Lari the CP started with 5 partners namely KENDAT, IFRTD, ILO and ITDG (Now Practical Action) and Seracoating Ltd. It has now grown to 12 partners including Heifer International, GBM, FD, ICIPE, DGAK, GBM and Regina seeds.

Establishment of micro-credit schemes took 1 year in each of the 4 localities and has to-date benefited 91 members (60 women and 31 men) with credits estimated at US\$ 70 (Kshs. 5000) per member. Usage of micro-credits is spreading fast with members demanding a 50% subsequent increment of credits.

Linking farmers to markets in Mwea started with 6 groups each with an average of 15 members (90 farmers). In Busia 3 groups with an average membership of 15 (45 farmers) were linked to direct market. The number of groups involved has for the last 4 years increased by 70%. The number of exporters involved in Mwea has also increased from 1 to 3 while in Busia it remained 1.

15. In your experience what programmes, platforms, policy, institutional structures exist that have assisted with the promotion and/or adoption of the output(s) proposed here and in terms of capacity strengthening what do you see as the key facts of success? (max 350 words).

The communities across the country tend to exist as organised CIGs including farmer groups, business people, transport service providers, single mothers etc.

The current government has put in place policy guidelines that help the ongoing efforts: In her Strategy for

Revitalising Agriculture (SRA – 2004-2014), an off-shoot of the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERS – 2003-2007) of the current administration of the Kenya Government states under:

- Output 2.4 (pp89): Legal Empowerment of Stakeholders: Activity Item 2.4.1 is: Review legislation and restructure the Commodity Boards to function as self regulatory bodies managed by stakeholders.
- Output 3.1 (pp90): Responsive Research Services Developed: Activity Item 3.1.1 is: Devise modalities to institutionalise client-oriented and collaborative agricultural research and Activity Item 3.1.5 is: Strengthen modalities to facilitate farmer participation in priority setting for research stations in their areas.
- Output 3.2 (pp91): Demand-Driven Participatory and Private Sector Led Agricultural Extension Established: Activity 3.2.1 is: Developing modalities for demand driven agricultural extension for dissemination of research findings and collation of research topics.
- Output 3.4 (pp93): Comprehensive Agricultural Information System Established: Activity Item 3.4.1 is: Establish data base units at all Min of Ag, Min of Livstck & Fish. Dev, Min of Trspt and Min of Coop Dev, to collect, process and disseminate agricultural data for crops and livestock production and marketing. Activity Item 3.4.3 is: Promote establishment of databases at Local Authorities (LAs) to facilitate preparation and monitoring local action plans.
- Output 3.7 (pp96): Quality Control Services Improved: Activity Item 3.7.2 is: Support stakeholder associations to take-up self-regulatory roles.

The above policy guidelines show the government's good intentions. The extent of success however remains wanting. This is mostly because communities remain un-empowered to know of, let alone, participate in making the guidelines translate into reality interventions.

A good example of what has succeeded is the establishment of CDF, LATF, HIV and other Community funds. These funds are however meant for basic infrastructure including rural roads, schools, health facilities etc. Loose policy provides for community participation in vetting and implementing projects that the funds support, within communities. An imperfect but improving operational situation of the funds is currently in place. Awareness and call for community participation in this process was done under this Output, at CPs level. This has seen some CP members elected to sit in the management Committees of these funds.

International market policies have also played a role in promoting the establishment and strengthening of CPs. The EUREPGARP regulations required certain standards be met at horticultural farm level. These included construction of produce grading sheds with high levels of sanitation. These expensive ventures called for farmer cooperation, and security in numbers enhanced group formation.

The key to success in this project lies in the proven approach of empowering farmers with voices and information, against which they can shield themselves from persistent poverty. Information platforms will help them make demands that challenge supply-side actors to take the development actions that the set policy guidelines were intended to address.

Current Promotion

D. Current promotion/uptake pathways

16. Where is promotion currently taking place? Please indicate for each country specified detail what promotion is taking place, by whom and indicate the scale of current promotion (max 200 words).

The CPs in the Mwea, Lari, Busia and Kalama are undertaking various projects including horticulture farming, dairy farming, fish farming, transport services, agro-forestry, soil and water conservation and micro-credit schemes, which are serving to demonstrate the CPs potential at the grassroots. These projects have become promotion centres for the CP model and the associated outputs. The government through Ministry of Agriculture is implementing NALEP, which uses the CP model and promotes farmer credit schemes and market oriented group production. The programme holds monthly forums and the CPs are invited to promote their work. Annual stakeholder meetings conducted by CPs in each of the 4 localities bring together NGOs, Government Departments, Civil Society Organizations and private companies to demonstrate and promote the outputs.

Through replication of the outputs in other areas, private companies including EAGA, KHE, Frigoken Ltd. Zuzuka Ltd. and Mace Foods Ltd and NGOs including KHDP, PA, Heifer International, GBM, FD, ICIPE, DGAK and GBM play a crucial role in promotion of the outputs.

Promotion of outputs has been done at various national and international workshops including IFRTD sponsored International meetings held in Tanzania, South Africa, India, Rwanda, Ethiopia, Peru, Uganda, and Kenya. The outputs have also been posted to websites www.kendat.org and www.ifrtd.gn.apc.org. Annual project reports including an end of project toolkit are being shared with individuals and organization at local, national and international levels.

17. What are the current barriers preventing or slowing the adoption of the output(s)? Cover here institutional issues, those relating to policy, marketing, infrastructure, social exclusion etc. (max 200 words).

Barriers/challenges/problems

Communities faced a myriad of problems in health, water, education, transport, and agricultural sectors. The long-time approach by the government to deal with each sector problems in seclusion has created a mindset of sector-based interventions. Thus, the holistic approach by CP model is yet to be fully understood and change people's mindsets at the grassroots. In addition, government policies have overtime influenced community perception on infrastructure development. It's perceived as government responsibility.

Marketing of agricultural produce in Kenya involves middlemen (brokers) at different levels. Linking farmers directly to markets is met with a lot of opposition from these brokers. In addition, government institutions mandated to protect farmers' interests are overwhelmed by private companies' interests that involve exploiting farmers to make exorbitant profits.

There are generally few innovative value-adding technologies for most agricultural produce at community level. This leaves the community with few options for innovative partnerships they can develop with various institutions.

Most rural communities are de-linked from centres of information thus disempowered as far as development is

concerned. Without linkages to information centres the communities are not able to adopt new development approaches and technologies.

18. What changes are needed to remove/reduce these barriers to adoption? This section could be used to identify perceived capacity related issues (max 200 words).

Pro-poor community-based information systems should be set up and developed to ensure that the community has access to a wide range of information that holistically covers the various sectors of the rural economy including health, water, education, transport, and agricultural. This would help the community understand the holistic concept in dealing with community poverty issues, a crucial aspect in promoting the understanding and adoption of the CP model and the associated outputs. Community empowerment through information access is also crucial in developing innovative partnerships including those that link farmers to markets and micro-credit schemes that support initiation of agro-enterprises. The community-based information system would develop into information centres through which empowered communities learn new agro-technologies and acquire information requires to steer development at the grassroots.

Poverty alleviation in Kenya is heavily dependent on smallholder viable and profitable agro-enterprises. For viability and profitability to be achieved by smallholder farmers, there is need for a concerted effort by all stakeholders to advocate and lobby for fair trade legislation and policies. Such legislation and policies should be localised, understood by the local people and used to develop local, national and international trade practices.

19. What lessons have you learnt about the best ways to get the outputs used by the largest number of poor people? (max 300 words).

Lessons learnt include;

- Rural poor communities are not sufficiently organised to enable them uptake and transform research outputs into projects that address poverty issues at community level. This hinders their economic development, thus poverty reduction is very slow process at the grassroots. However, well-organised community institutions such as CPs have the potential to positively transport research outputs and technologies to projects that contribute towards poverty reduction.
- Building innovative partnerships and coalitions is crucial in poverty alleviation. The potential of partnerships as far as community development is concerned is great and must be built on well-established principles.
- In regards to community empowerment, access to information in the rural areas, community training, exposure visits and field demonstrations are key aspects that need to be scaled-up in order to create substantial impact in poverty alleviation.
- Community innovation heavily relies on a lead partner in the initial stages but later the community takes charge as the innovation start bearing fruits. For instance, initially, farmers thought they were not capable of contributing savings on regular basis but now those that have taken up the challenge are happy to own passbooks and funds deposited in the local banks. Equally so, the whole idea of taking a loan was alien to majority of the farmers as no established micro finance house is willing to take a risk by lending seasonal credit.
- Interaction with communities has shown that poor communities are extremely hard working, but are relatively un-progressive, economically. One of the reasons for this is that they lack the basic knowledge and skills to

run their enterprises from a profit making point of view. Farmers do not have simple business plans to guide the production processes. Therefore, many farmers are ever making losses from their farming enterprises without realising.

Impacts On Poverty

E. Impacts on poverty to date

20. Where have impact studies on poverty in relation to this output or cluster of outputs taken place? This should include any formal poverty impact studies (and it is appreciated that these will not be commonplace) and any less formal studies including any poverty mapping-type or monitoring work which allow for some analysis on impact on poverty to be made. Details of any cost-benefit analyses may also be detailed at this point. Please list studies here.

KENDAT has conducted a community level assessments that show farmer income based on the project outputs;

1. Impacts of Farmer Credit Schemes in Kalama, Machakos

21. Based on the evidence in the studies listed above, for each country detail how the poor have benefited from the application and/or adoption of the output(s) (max. 500 words)

What positive impacts on livelihoods have been recorded and over what time period have these impacts been observed? These impacts should be recorded against the capital assets (human, social, natural, physical and, financial) of the livelihoods framework;

For whom i.e. which type of person (gender, poverty group (see glossary for definitions) has there been a positive impact;

Indicate the number of people who have realised a positive impact on their livelihood;

Using whatever appropriate indicator was used detail what was the average percentage increase recorded

Farmer credit schemes were started in Kalama, Machakos in the year 2004 and their impacts assessed in the year 2006. One group, Kalama Donkey Users Club, with a membership of 39 (13 men and 26 women) was selected for the assessment. Six members (all women) took the 1st loan to purchase 6 donkeys while others bought farm inputs.

Interviews conducted with the group members indicate that women using donkeys are spending 2 hours a day to fetch water for domestic use, unlike the previous situation where the whole day was spent in fetching same amount of water. Using the donkeys, the women are now making up to Kshs. 500 (US\$ 7) a day by fetching and supplying water to their neighbours. On average, one donkey fetches 160 litres of water in a day from a distance of 5 kilometres. Use of donkeys in Kalama has reduced household expenditure on water and casual labour by between Kshs. 1,000 (US\$ 14) to Kshs. 1,500 (US\$ 21) per month. The number of donkeys purchased through the credit schemes has since increased from 6 to 17.

Through the credit scheme, farmers in Kalama have been able to purchase fertilizer and hybrid maize seed

resulting to a rise in yield from 2 to 6 bags/Acre. This has improved the household food security. Previously, stock lasted a few months and the farmers had to look for alternatives incomes to purchase food but are now able to sell surplus to earn some income which are used to pay school fees and medial expenses for family members. (See Appendix VIII).

Environmental Impact

H. Environmental Impact

24. What are the direct and indirect environmental benefits related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 300 words)

This could include direct benefits from the application of the technology or policy action with local governments or multinational agencies to create environmentally sound policies or programmes. Any supporting and appropriate evidence can be provided in the form of an annex.

Horticulture farming involves use of chemical herbicides and pesticides, which are potentially harmful to the environment. This has necessitated setting standards that farmers producing for European markets have to adhere to in order to protect the environment and the produce consumers. Farmers had to comply with these EUREPGARP regulations if they have to remain in business. Through strategic partnerships with the exporting companies like EAGA, KHE and Frigoken and NGOs like KENDAT and KHDP, farmers organized in CPs were easily trained on these requirements, collectively instituted the required actions and are now certified for European markets export. This plays a crucial role in protecting the environment through appropriate farming practices including use of right chemicals and environmental friendly farming practices like organic farming, growing of disease and pest resistance crops.

Groups constituent to the CPs are directly involved in environmental conservation activities. Through innovative partnerships with GBM and Forest Department of the Ministry on Environment they raise tree seedling and plant them on their farmlands and forest reserves to safeguard the environment and rehabilitate degraded sites. In addition, the CPs have continued to serve as an appropriate platform to advocate for better environmental conservation practices, prompting some CP constituent groups to venture into diverse environmental conservation projects including wildlife conservation, fishing farming, water conservation through runoff harnessing and storage in sub-surface sand dams and surface water pans.

Profitable agro-enterprises that the CP farmer groups are involved in ensure overall improvement in their economic status at household level. This has indirectly benefits to the environment in that farmers can afford alternative sources of energy like solar and hydro-electricity that are more environmentally friendly compared to use of firewood. Energy saving technologies like use of energy saving stoves and fireless cookers also become affordable to the farmers.

25. Are there any adverse environmental impacts related to the output(s) and their outcome(s)? (max 100 words).

The CP farmers have established a profitable produce marketing system that other farmers are striving to join. This has motivated indiscriminate clearing of vegetation to open more farmlands even in areas at high risk of soil erosion. This coupled with the use of 'unaccepted chemicals' to produce for local markets (not bound by strict environmental standards) has adverse effects on the environment. In addition, the flourishing horticultural business facilitates growth of human settlement hubs that have high demand for resources like fuel wood, water, food, and housing. To meet the high demand such areas suffered environmental degradation through tree cutting and inappropriate agricultural practices.

26. Do the outputs increase the capacity of poor people to cope with the effects of climate change, reduce the risks of natural disasters and increase their resilience? (**max 200 words**)

The effects of climate change in this region include prolonged dry spells, heavy downpours like *El-Nino* of 1997, and change in ecosystems. These effects are associated with disasters like floods and drought. The outputs out the project buffer the community from such effects in the following ways;

- The CPs have adopted diverse income generating projects (IGPs) including horticulture, dairy farming, silk farming, commercial transport services, farm forestry and fish farming. The IGPs are handy during disasters in providing alternative sources of income for households.
- After disasters farmers have little capacity to rehabilitate their farm-based projects. Micro-credit schemes help farmers to get back to production.
- Heavy downpours and floods destroy transport and other infrastructure. Through use of labour-based technologies communities organized in CPs are able to rehabilitate such infrastructure and regain community-based operations.
- Through innovative partnerships with the government, NGOs and private sector the CPs are suitable platforms for response to disasters.
- The CPs have been practicing appropriate farming and land care practices including tree planting, conservation agriculture, soil and water conservation that ensure high and sustainable land productivity. This increases food production and is a suitable buffer to food shortage during drought or floods.

Annex 1

Appendix I: List of Abbreviations

ATIRI	Agricultural Technology and Information Response Initiative
BIAMF	Busia Integrated Agricultural Marketing Forum
CDA	Community Development Assistants
CDF	Constituency Development Fund
CFA	Community Forest Association
CGIAR	Consultative Group for International Agricultural Research
CIGS	Common Interest Groups
CP	Community Parliament

CPHP	Crop Post Harvest Programme
DAP	Draught Animal Power
DGAK	Dairy Goats Association of Kenya
EAGA	East African Growers Association
FD	Forest Department
FFS	Farmer Field School
GBM	Green Belt Movement
GOK	Government of Kenya
HCDA	Horticultural Crops Development Authority
ICIPE	International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology
IFRTD	International Forum for Rural Transport and Development
ILRI	International Livestock Research Institute
ITDG	Intermediate Technology Development Group
IUDD	Infrastructure and Urban Development Department
ILO/ASIST	International Labour Organization/Advisory Support Information Services and Training
ISAAA	International Service for the Acquisition of Agri-Biotech Applications
KACE	Kenya Agricultural Commodity Exchange
KARI	Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
KDUC	Kalama Donkey Users Clubs
KEFRI	Kenya Forestry Research Institute
KENDAT	Kenya Network for Dissemination of Agricultural Technologies
KHDP	Kenya Horticultural Development Programme
KHE	Kenya Horticultural Exporters
LAMP	Lari Agricultural Marketing Programme
LATF	Local Authority Transfer Fund
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MTMO	Mwea Transport and Marketing Organization
NALEP	National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
PA	Practical Action
PEN	Poverty Eradication Network
PIM	Partnership Innovation Model
RNRRS	Renewable Natural Resources Research Strategy
UNIDO	United Nations Industrial Development Organization
CIAT	International Centre for Tropical Agriculture
IITA	International Institute of Tropical Agriculture
AU	African Union

Annex 2

Related documents

Click below to view the related information

[PF_CPH11_Annex2.pdf](#)

