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Abstract

In 2007 Sida received a lot of criticism for not keeping track of the Swedish aid to countries in Africa. Aid has been sent to developing programmes which have been poorly evaluated and where there have been high risks of corruption. The aim of this study is to view the implementation of the National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP), which is the largest development extension programme in the East African country Kenya. The purpose of NALEP is to decrease the poverty and increase the production in the focal areas of the country. It is also supposed to increase the influence the small scale farmers have in their own production. Sweden has been funding the programme since the start in June 2000 and has been the only external financial supporter during the whole process. The programme started off with a five years plan and was later extended another five years. This paper will view the entire implementation process of the programme as well as evaluate whether or not the programme has been successful.

The results received by the evaluation have shown that the programme has had a positive effect on the agricultural sector. The programme has also been a relatively successful way to increase the small scale farmers’ influence in the local political decision making processes.
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**Abbreviations and Acronyms**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIDS</td>
<td>Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASCU</td>
<td>Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASAL</td>
<td>Arid and Semi Arid Lands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>Community Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIG</td>
<td>Common Interest Groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSO</td>
<td>Civil Society Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FADC</td>
<td>Focal Area Development Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO</td>
<td>Government Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>Human Rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KARI</td>
<td>Kenya Agricultural Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDG</td>
<td>Millennium Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoA</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoALD</td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoLFD</td>
<td>Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoLD</td>
<td>Ministry of Livestock and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M&amp;E</td>
<td>Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NALEP</td>
<td>National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSWCP</td>
<td>National Soil and Water Conservation Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM&amp;E</td>
<td>Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sida</td>
<td>Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SNAO</td>
<td>Swedish National Audit Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRA</td>
<td>Strategy for Revitalization of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

In 2007 the Swedish National Audit Office (SNAO) published a report where they criticized the work done by Sweden’s International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) in Africa. They claimed that Sida did not keep track of the Swedish taxpayer’s money and that there could even be corruption involved in some programmes funded by Sida. In May 2010 Sida had to fire their general director and the agency was forced to begin doing more thorough evaluations of the development programmes requesting funds from Sida.

Three of the development programmes evaluated and criticized by SNAO were located in the East African country Kenya. Kenya is also one of the five countries receiving the most funds from Sida. These are the main reasons why I have chosen Kenya as my target for this research. The aid send by Sida have been prioritized into three main sector areas; (i) Urban development, (ii) Democratization & Human Rights (HR) and (iii) Environment & Natural resources. Due to time limitation I decided to specify my research into one these three areas. I have chosen the Environment & Natural resources area since I found this area to be the one where least previous researches have been made.

If we combine all the aid given by Sida to this sector area during the past 10 years we can see that almost all Sida’s support has been given to one single programme in Kenya, the National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Program (NALEP). In the past 10 years Sida has been sending roughly 400 million SEK to NALEP to support the NALEP’s effort to endorse the socio-economic growth in agricultural sector as well as assist in the national struggle towards poverty growth. The programme was only supposed to run between June 2000 and July 2005 but was later extended for another 5 years between January 2007 and December 2011.

1.1 Purpose

The purpose of this paper is to study the implementation process of NALEP, as well as to evaluation the success of the programme.

1.2 Research Questions

- How has NALEP been implemented?
- Which have been the hold backs for the programme?
- In what way has Sweden assisted Kenya’s agricultural development work?
- Has the NALEP programme been successful?

---

1 SNAO (Rikrevisionen) Independent government agency responsible for reviewing the states activities
2 Appendix 1
1.3 Method

The method that will be used when writing this thesis is to analysis previous reports concerning NALEP and Sweden’s overall development work in Kenya. By analyzing different sources an understanding of the implementation process of NALEP can most likely be made. After combining the results from the previous reports made on NALEP an evaluation of the programmes success will be done.

1.4 Source Analysis

Sweden has been giving aid to Kenya since 1969 but unfortunately the data and the evaluations of the projects have not been sorted out and published properly during the period 1969 - 1997. In 1998 Sida, in cooperation with Government of Kenya, decided to keep better track of the statistics and data from the agricultural projects so the majority of the sources on this topic have been published after the year 1998.

NALEP has been evaluated and studied a few times before both internally, by Sida and Government of Kenya, and externally by different Non Governmental Organizations (NGO), institutions and researchers. This thesis will be based on a collection of various sources including reports, research and evaluations from Government Organizations (GO), NGOs and individual studies. It will also be based on information collected by the Swedish Governments Investigation Agency ³ through interviews with staff members at Sida and the Embassy of Sweden in Nairobi. This information will be referred to as “Utredningstjänsten, 2011” in the text below.

Other sources for this thesis have been a number of different evaluation reports concerning Sida’s overall development work in Kenya. Most of these have been published by SNAO and criticized Sida’s development work. As a response to these reports both Sida and other individual NGOs have published their own evaluation reports where they have defended their criticized projects.

A majority of the sources used during the process of this text have been published by Sida, or in cooperation with Sida, or else by the Government of Kenya. Therefore there is great risk of these sources being biased in one way or another. However, this has been taken into consideration during the process of this thesis.

³ Utredningstjänsten (Sweden’s governments research group)
1.5 Disposition

This paper will be divided up into six main parts. In the first part there will be an explanation of the theory and approach used when writing this paper. In the second part there will be a brief description of the agricultural sector in Kenya. The second part is devoted to explaining Sweden’s involvement in Kenya development process. The fourth part includes both chapter five and six and here the implementation process of NALEP Phase I and II will be described. In part five the challenges and criticism of NALEP will be brought up. The final part of this paper concerns the analysis and the concluding discussion.
2. Theory and Approach

The implementation of NALEP and the evaluation of the programme will be studied with the help of the Implementation theory as well as with the evaluation approach. Therefore this chapter will give an explanation the implementation theory followed by an explanation of the evaluation approach.

2.1 Implementation Theory

The implementation theory can be seen part of the policy analysis. It was first introduced in USA during the 1970s when research was made concerning how well political decisions were implemented in the society after the formal decisions had been approved by the government. The results given from these studies indicated that the policy decided were not always implemented in the way that it was meant to. After this a whole new research area was formed where the implementation process of political decisions became the research topic (Municio, 1982).

Within the implementation theory there are two primary approaches, the “top-down” and the “bottom-up” approach. The two approaches are separated through their methodological presumptions of how an empirical study should be structured. The top-down approach claims that a “policy” can be identified through formal decision documents, such as governmental decision papers for instance. According to the followers of the “top-down” approach, the governmental policy in a certain matter can be determined by viewing formal decision documents within that policy area. The followers also indicate that the formal organization is based on the content analysis. It is the analysis which is supposed to implement the policy. In practice this means that the followers of the “top-down” approach has a theory of who the main actors will be and therefore collect the empirical data from these actors. Looking at the responsibility taking, the “top-down” approach is connected to its formal structure, which means that the responsibility should be formed after the hierarchical structure. The structure will point out who that should be responsible for what (Viklund, 2001).

The “bottom-up” approach is actually not a consistent approach but a number of different approaches. This can especially be seen in Benny Hjerns “implementation structure approach”. The bottom-up approach was introduced as an alternative for the top-down approach after faults had been found in this approach. One of the main problems with the top-down has been its view of policy. According to Hjerns approach, “policy” can be seen as a result of empirical studies rather than a benchmark, and it is formed during the administration process. A policy is not only one single decision, according to the followers of Hjerns approach.

Hjerns opinion is that you should not follow the formal organizational structure but rather reconstruct the content analysis. With this he means that it is better to recreate the network
that is built when people organizes themselves to accommodate problems in society. Hjern claims that this gives a better description of how organization is performed. Concerning the responsibility taking, Hjern mean that actions rationality should be valued depending on the target groups need and the problems solution, and not based on formal decisions and laws. (Viklund, 2001) (Hjern, 1983).

This paper will be, more or less, based on analysis of previous research from actors within the NALEP programme, which are Sida and the Government of Kenya. Therefore we can considered the approach used when viewing the implementation process of NALEP as a “top-down” approach.

2.2 Evaluation Approach

The evaluation approach is defined as a “social science activity directed at collecting, analyzing, interpreting, and communicating information about the workings and effectiveness of programs” (Rossi et al, 2004:2). Evaluations of programmes are done for a number of different reasons, such as; to determine whether or not a programme should be continued, improved, expanded, or curtailed; it can be to determine the success of new programmes and initiatives; to increase the effectiveness of programme management and administrations; or to please the accountability requirements of programme donors (Rossi, Lipsey, & Freeman, 2004).

A programme evaluation is important to conduct due to the fact that it is a way to study the social intervention in a programme, in this case the NALEP programme. The results from the study of the programme, concerning the design, the implementation, the impact, and the efficiency of NALEP can hopefully be a contribution to the previous research on the specific topic.
3. Kenya’s Agricultural Sector

The development of the Agricultural sector in Kenya has been following a negative trend during the past decades and the reason for this will be discussed in the chapter. There will also be a general description of the agricultural sector to give an understanding of why an agricultural development programme has been needed in Kenya.

Brief Description of the Agricultural Sector

The agricultural sector in Kenya had its triumph years during the 1970s when Kenya was an important exporter of agricultural goods. Unfortunately the sector has not been able to face the growing population and the increased needs of food in the country. Kenya has had to become an importer of food to be able to feed the population. One of the main reasons for this is the increased number of droughts experienced the past decades. (Embassy, 2006)

In Kenya two thirds of the population lives in the rural areas and are dependent on agriculture. In the rural areas almost 80 % are employed within the agricultural sector and this shows how important the sector is for Kenya’s overall economy. According to the Government of Kenya “The Agricultural sector contributes 26% to the GDP directly and another 27% indirectly through linkages with other sectors such as manufacturing, distribution and service-related sectors” (MoA & MoLD 2010:5).

Kenya is divided into two different rainfall areas where the larger region is the Arid and Semi Arid Areas (ASALs). This part covers 84 % of the total land area in Kenya and receives only 200 – 350 mm rainfall each year. The remaining 16 % of the land areas are the high and medium rainfall areas where they get 750 – 1000 mm rainfall each year. The smaller land area with the receiving most of the rainfall is also where the majority of the livestock and crop production are produced. In the livestock production in Kenya dairy and poultry are being produced and among the food crops; root crops, pulses, maize and horticultural crops are being produced. In Kenya there is also a large production of commercial crops such as; tea, coffee and pyrethrum4. The ASALs region comprises mostly livestock production and wild life parks.

Kenya also has fisheries production in the Indian Ocean, Lake Victoria as well as in other lakes and rivers in the country. The government of Kenya claims that “Fisheries directly and indirectly support more than one million Kenyans, mostly undertaken by small-scale fisher folk who account for 90% of the country’s fish production” (MoA &MoLD, 2010:6). Having this in mind it is easy to understand the importance of a sustainable exploitation of the natural resources in the country (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

---

4 A type of flower plant produced in Kenya
In 1964 the land tenure system in Kenya changed and lots of the former large scale farmers were divided up among small scale farmers. The smallholders were further divided into two main groups; subsistence farmers and pastoralists. These small farms are most often found in the medium and high rainfall areas. This sector accounts for 75% of the total agricultural production in the country and up to 70 % of the production sold on the foreign market. Although the large scale farmers, with a standard farm size of 750 ha, most often have more capital and a further developed production. This gives them a higher enterprise return on their farming production (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

In Kenya you can see clear connections between the rural and the urban poor people. Many poor farmer families send some of their family members into the cities to find jobs to increase the family’s income while the remaining members take care of the farm and the young children. This has lead to many female-headed households that often are the poorest and most vulnerable (OPTO, 2006).

Another serious problem in Kenya and big parts of the rest of Africa is the spread of HIV/AIDS. According to the research made by OPTO International AB “The HIV/AIDS pandemic has reached a scale in some parts of Kenya where it is no longer a health problem, but a development problem” (OPTO, 2006:11). When a poor and struggling family loses a family member in HIV/AIDS they also lose a source of income, consequently increasing the poverty. There are many different factors, both in and outside of the sector, involved when it comes to the development of the agricultural sector in Kenya (OPTO, 2006).
4. The Swedish Involvement

“The overall objective with the Swedish development work in Kenya is to form a Kenya where all the poor and vulnerable people will have the possibilities to improve their own living standards and to form a country where human rights are imposed” (Author’s own translation: Utrikesdepartementet, 2009:1). Sweden has been supporting Kenya financially for more than 40 years and has focused the support to three main areas. This chapter will briefly describe the three focus areas as well as Sweden’s overall development work in Kenya. Further on there is a thorough explanation of Sweden’s involvement in the NALEP programme.

4.1 Sweden’s Development Work in Kenya

The development program Sweden and Kenya have decided on is both bilaterally and multilaterally pursued. In the multilateral program there are a number of different states cooperating with their financial aid. The cooperation’s are most often organized through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP), the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) or the World Health Organization (WHO). Sweden’s bilateral development program in Kenya is organized by Sida (Utredningstjänsten, 2011).

Sweden’s and Kenya’s development program puts a lot of focus on the poorest people in the country. Sweden has decided to help Kenya to form a country where sustainability and justice are the main goals. The ambitions are to see a Kenya where the poor and vulnerable people have a chance of changing their own future. Sweden wants to assist the people of Kenya in forming a society where peace and human justice can be seen throughout the political and global development work (Utrikesdepartementet, 2009).

Kenya’s long-term development vision – a globally competitive and prosperous nation with a high standard of living by 2030 – has focused mainly on the economical development of the country, even though the development of democracy is included. The Swedish vision for Kenya’s development puts more focus on human rights and the involvement of the poorer part of the population in the politics.

Sweden’s development plan for Kenya has been more or less connected to the Paris declaration written in 2005. The Swedish government has been sending a larger share of the aid through the Kenyan government who thereby has the control over the money. Sweden and Kenya have decided that a dialogue will continue between the countries where questions regarding; economic growth, human rights, natural resources and corruption will be discussed. Although the main question which needs to be dealt with is the enforcement of political reforms in the Kenyan Government that will provide further strength and reliability for democratic governance (Utrikesdepartementet, 2009).

———

5 Through the Paris declaration the aid receiving countries was given a bigger responsibility for their own countries development through economical and political reforms. At the same time the donor countries promised to adjust their aid programs more depending on the wishes from the receiving countries.
According to the Swedish Ministry of Foreign Affairs strategy plan Sweden has specialized their aid to Kenya into three main areas; Democracy and Human rights, Urban development and Natural resources. The main goal for the democracy and human rights programme is to help Kenya become an efficient state where legal security and human rights are the foundation of the country. The aim of the urban development programme is to improve the living conditions for the people living in the urban areas and to help them to become more involved in forming their own future (Utrikesdepartementet, 2009 & Sida, 2010).

The third area where Sweden contributes which aid is the Natural resources program. The purpose of this program is to help the people of Kenya to become better at utilizing their own natural resources, which will hopefully benefit the poorest in the country. Sweden’s role in this program is focused on the water resources. Kenya needs to have a secure and sustainable supply of water resources, especially clean water. The water supply also affects the productivity in the agricultural sector where Sweden also is closely involved (Utrikesdepartementet, 2009 & Sida, 2010).

Sweden has been supporting the socially active organizations who involve the people in the planning, decision making, and the implementations of different political questions. This also contributes to more awareness concerning rights and responsibilities regarding the natural resources. In both the water – and the agricultural programs both women and the youth have the opportunity to receive experience and knowledge in how the different local committees works, which can lead to more participation of the women and youth (Utrikesdepartementet, 2009 & Farnworth & Obuya, 2010).

In these three prioritized areas Swedish development support not only includes financial aid but also, institutional development, dialogue, guidance, capacity increase, and not least assistance for individuals and organizations to demand more responsibility from the government of Kenya. One of Sweden’s main goals with the overall support to Kenya is to see more women in political power positions, both on local levels and on regional levels. Therefore a lot of the support to Kenya’s society is directed to the projects helping the women in the country (Utrikesdepartementet, 2009).

In addition to these three main areas Sweden has also been sending aid to a few other sectors such as Kenya’s program to prevent further spreading of the HIV/AIDS epidemic. Sweden also supports Kenya’s open policy towards foreign refugees by giving aid to the refugees living there. In addition, Kenya has also been a victim of trafficking and Sweden has been supporting the work done to prevent this kind of illegal business in Kenya.

The major part of Sweden’s support to the civilian society in Kenya is given through UN’s organizations since they have a better chance of distribution the aid. At the same time UN have a closer connection with the Government of Kenya, and therefore have a chance of involving the government with the civilian society. Lately Kenya has been increasing its public procurement system. Sweden has taken advantage of the system by using it to do more thorough revisions and quality controls on the Swedish supported aid projects (Utrikesdepartementet, 2009).
4.2 Sweden’s Role in NALEP

As was mentioned earlier, Sweden was supporting NSWCP from 1974 until 2000 when both the programme and the Sida funds were shifted to the new NALEP design. The importance of Sweden and Sida for Kenya was very well summarized by OPTO International AB in their implementation assessment of NALEP published in 2006. They wrote “The over 30 year Sida presence in a Ministry with a single activity (…) cannot be viewed as anything but strength. It shows a level of commitment to reaching smallholders with services and attention that is concomitant with a serious intention to be effective in the battle against poverty” (OPTO, 2006:14).

The reason why Sweden needs to help out with the funding of NALEP is because the Government of Kenya “does not have, or do not want to distribute, enough funds (or does not allocate) enough funds and other resources except the manpower (presently 5,000 staff)” (Embassy, 2006:21). Sida’s funds are used for research activities, training, demonstrations, consultancy inputs (including one long term advisor) and logistics including office supplies. These funds given by Sida are highly appreciated by the staff in NALEP. The reason is not the amount given but since these funds are always reliable. The funds promised by the Government of Kenya are not as trustworthy and “can be adjusted during the budget year and it is not uncommon for the extension service to receive less than was originally budgeted for” (OPTO, 2006:12).

Sweden’s achievement goal for the farmers in Kenya is to help them “increase the productivity and the commercialization of the agricultural sector” (Author’s own translation: Utrikesdepartimentet, 2009:7). Sweden will assist with advisory operations and help out increasing the access to markets, inputs and funding with the purpose to facilitate the commercialization of the agricultural sector. This will in turn lead to better food security, economic growth and more productive jobs in rural areas. Sweden has also been supporting reforms necessary for the performance in the agricultural sector such as the land reform (Utrikesdepartementet, 2009).

Sweden has been supporting Phase II of the programme with experts in different areas such as gender issues, HIV/AIDS matters, human rights, as well as drugs and substance abuse. Since it is the Government of Kenya who is the owner and the responsible manager of NALEP it is also them who are responsible for implementation, follow-up, reporting as well as procurement of services and goods. Sweden is only responsible for providing the agreed resources on time and monitoring the development in the sector and programme implementation. Only if there is an urgent need or request from the Government of Kenya or NALEP will Sweden help out with dialoguing or other issues. Additionally the Government of Kenya has also indicated that it would welcome Swedish assistance in policy and strategy development for the agricultural sector as a lead for further development of the sector (Embassy, 2006).

The Government of Kenya’s small involvements in the agricultural sector as well as the lack allocated funds to the sector are two reasons for the rural development problems. In
2005/06 the government budgeted 2.4 % to the sector and in 2008/09 they had increased it to 3.5 %. These levels are far too low compared to the importance of the agricultural sector for the country. The Government of Kenya’s funds to MoA and MoLFD are mostly spent on staff and transfers of staff. Concerning the Governments funding to NALEP it is said that “an increasing share of the NALEP budget should be dedicated by the Government of Kenya to prepare for a future phase-out of Sida assistance” (OPTO, 2006:5). However, there has still not been a specific date determined for this. (Embassy, 2006 & OPTO, 2006)
5. **NALEP Phase I (2000-2005)**

This chapter will describe the history and the implementation of Phase I (June 2000-July 2005). There will also be a thorough explanation of the two major foundations for the programme, which are the Focal Area Development Committee (FADC) and the Common Interests Group (CIG). In 2004 the Government of Kenya decided on the new Strategy for Revitalization of Agriculture (SRA) that would help the country to reduce poverty. This strategy will briefly be introduced and the main characteristics will be brought up here. There will also be a part concerning NALEPs work against the spreading of HIV/AIDS, which have been a main reason for the slow development of Kenya’s agricultural sector. The final part of this chapter will concern the purpose of the extension of the programme into Phase II (2007-2011) as well as the improvements which had to be done in the second phase.

5.1 **Brief History**

NALEP is financially supported by Sida and was launched in July 2000. The project was “planned and designed by two sector ministries with some help from Kenyan consultants and not by a donor agency” (Embassy, 2006:20). The two ministries in charge of the project are the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and the Ministry of Livestock and Development (MoLD). The goals of the project are “to promote the socio-economic development of the agricultural sector (in its broadest sense including livestock, forest and processing activities based on agricultural raw materials); while at the same time contributing towards the national priority of poverty alleviation” (OPTO, 2006:12).

The structure of NALEP is based on the results gathered from the Sida sponsored NSWCP program, which was an agricultural program reaching more than 1.5 million small scale farmers in Kenya during the years 1974 to 2000. NSWCP was seen as a very successful program resulting in considerable reductions of soil erosion and improved productivity in the agricultural sector. In the 1970’s NSWCP was one of the first programmes that introduce the idea that soil erosion was not only an engineering concern. Being able to better control soil erosion was actually an important part of agricultural management and was it improved the farming productivity (Mustisya et al, 2010).

After NSWCP had demonstrated that agricultural extension was a good solution to solve some of the difficulties the agricultural sector was facing, a decision was made to expand the agricultural program. The new program would be based on the positive fundamentals from the NSWCP, which was to be renewed to fit the whole extension service. In 2000 Sida decided to carry on financing the development of Kenya’s agricultural sector by supporting the implementation of the NALEP programme (OPTO, 2006).

According to the Impact Assessment report put together by OPTO International AB in 2006 “Some observers lament the fact that NALEP was created out of the old and ongoing NSWCP. It was never allowed to “start afresh” and was burdened with the staff and
management procedures of the old programme” (OPTO, 2006:13). The assessment memo given out in 2006 by the Swedish Embassy in Kenya sees this mate from another point of view “Many of NALEP’s staff used to work in the previous soil conservation programme and are experienced in this field” (Embassy, 2006:19). Therefore it is difficult to evaluate whether it was wise or imprudent to imbricate the two development programmes (OPTO, 2006 & Embassy, 2006).

5.2 Implementation Strategy for NALEP

The main strategy of implementation of NALEP was to form and promote institutions on the local level. These institutions have been necessary to “sustain programme initiatives and activities and support agricultural sector reforms related to the delivery of agricultural research and extension services and strengthen research extension-farmers’ linkages” (Mustisya et al, 2010:10). NALEP has also been a promoter of a multi-sectoral approach towards agriculture and rural development services, as well as collective rural innovations addressing difficult tasks. The last strategy which was improved when NALEP was designed was the monitoring and evaluation of the programmes implementation. This had not been done as well during the former NSWCP (Baiya, 2000).

The NALEP programme has three different components implemented by different institutions. The first one is the Extension component based on “Shifting Focal Area Approach” and this has been implemented by the MoALD 6. The second is the Research component, which has been implemented by both Kenya’s Agricultural Research Institute (KARI)-Embu’ and by the International Centre for Research in Agroforestry (ICRAF) in separate regions. The final component is the Advocacy component that has been implemented by the three different NGO’s; Forestry Action Network (FAN), East Africa Wildlife Society (EAWS) and Resource Project Kenya (RPK) (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

NALEP Phase I started in July 2000 and ended in June 2005 and covered “267 divisions in 43 districts in 5 provinces, providing extension services to 100,000 farmers per year through the Focal Area Approach (FAA)” (Mustisya et al, 2010:10). It may be regarded as a process where the three components are closely connected. NALEP operates in Districts where there are a lot of small scale farmers and where few, or no other, development organizations are present. In these areas a Division Stakeholder Forum is established consisting of farmers, project and NGO representatives (if there are any in the specific area), commercial representatives, and Community-Based Organizations. The Forums purpose is to identify a focal area covering a large number of farmers 8 based on a number of criteria. The NALEP team concentrate at one focal area a time and after one financial year, the team move to the next identified focal area (Mustisya et al, 2010 & OPTO, 2006).

---

6 During the beginning of phase I MoALD was only one ministry but later became two separate once
7 Embu is a town in Kenya where KARI has their research institute
8 In the first year only 400 farmers were included but nowadays the area is covering up to 2,000-6,000 farmers, pastoralists and fisher folk
The Forum, in cooperation with the Field Extension Workers and local stakeholders, collects data concerning the poverty mapping and individual farm planning. The data can later on be used to “determine the agricultural production gaps existing in the area which need to be addressed” (Mustisya et al, 2010:10). The actual extension activities begin with stakeholder recruitment and an election of a stakeholders committee and planning of a broad based survey (Mustisya et al, 2010).

The surveys involve; extension staff, rural service providers and the farmers and the purposes of these surveys are to determine the local farmers’ development problems. After the results from the surveys have been concluded a Community Action Plan (CAP) will be formed to solve the identified problems together with the farmers. To do so a focal area Development Committee, consisting of 16 members, is democratically elected to coordinate the community activities and link the community with the service providers. The focal areas are divided up into 4 blocks so the FADCs are also divided up with 4 farmer members in each block (Mustisya et al, 2010).

During the process of the surveys, extension staff looks for agricultural enterprises with the possibility of increasing the agricultural yields which would lead to an improvement of the households’ economy and food security. During the whole financial year the extension staff provides business and technical education to the farmers and also helps the farmers to come in contact with other service providers. NALEP also arranges cross-site exchange visits for the farmers. (Mustisya et al, 2010)

### 5.3 Political Decision Process of NALEP

Looking at the political system in Kenya today it can be discussed if the political decisions made by the Government of Kenya can be characterized by the bottom-up planning. The political trend is “towards devolution of power and a greater role for the private sector” (OPTO 2006:14). The Government has wanted to move the decision making to a level closer to the people to increase their involvement in the process. By doing so they have hoped to see a faster development in the country as well as more specialized research on the areas needed.

Since Sweden begun supporting development programmes in Kenya the design and focus of the programmes have changed from the ”initial top-down technical assistance focus, to the current NALEP which aims at delivering ‘demand-driven’ services to farmers” (Sida Evaluation 2002:25). This shows how the focus of development programmes in Kenya has shifted to a bottom-up approach during the past decades. The main objective with NALEP programme has been to implement a bottom-up decision planning through facilitating and promoting the formation of Stakeholder Forums. These Forums will be responsible of decision making on a more local level in the focal areas. Through these Forums the farmers’ opinions and requests will be better heard and also easier to respond to (MoA & MoLD, 2010).
NALEP has been politically approved, designed, as well as implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (MoLFD). These two ministries are also the owners and superiors of the whole programme. However the major part of the founding has been done by Sida. The decision to fund the programme was taken by Sida as a lead of Sweden’s development program in Kenya. In the organizational structure plan for NALEP the Government of Kenya and Sida are the heads of the programme while the ministries are the subheads responsible for the programme (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

5.4 Focal Area Development Committee (FADC)

In the NALEP program a “Focal Area Development Committee is democratically elected and this committee is provided training and is anticipated to work as a coordinator of extension and local development work” (OPTO, 2006:3). The work in the Focal Area runs for a period of one year and the expected result is a more developed area that can attract relevant research, commercial and development collaborations (OPTO, 2006).

These committees have had diverse effect depending on which areas and committees are evaluated. The reason for this is the variation of activities the FADCs have been taking responsibility over. However, in all new focal areas the committees have been working as a “tool for mobilizing the participatory forces within a focal area and introducing group work” (OPTO, 2006:27), which the FADCs have earlier been introduced to by NALEP staff. The committee members are given a three day course to learn how to work in committees and later on the FADCs are supposed to work as heads of new community development projects or as demonstrators of new technologies in their focal area (OPTO, 2006).

NALEP staffs assist the FADC in their work by not only providing them with training and facilities, but also by helping them connecting with other actors in their area, such as private sector enterprises, NGOs and micro-finance providers. Additionally the staff can suggest new and better crop management, fertilizers or improved seeds. These are things NALEP can contribute with 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” (Farnworth & Obuya 2010:9).

In some areas these FADCs have been a real success and are still active with meetings on regular basis. Most often the success has come after the community leaders have been active and used their own farms as examples of how new technology can increase the production of the farms. When the FADCs have been keeping a close relationship with the active CIGs in the areas, as well as with the local Field Extension Workers, the communities have been even more successful with their development processes (MoA & MoLD, 2010).
However, unfortunately all FADCs have not had the same positive outcomes. The impact assessment from 2006 brings up the example of the non-functioning Karumu FADC. It is located in Maragua in the Central Province of Kenya. The committee was formed during the first year of NALEP’s operation but is today a non-active committee. Although the former members of the Karumu FADC claim that it was internal constrain and lack of focus which lead to the failure of their FADC (OPTO 2006 & Farnworth & Obuya, 2010).

5.5 Common Interests Group (CIG)

The idea of the CIGs established by NALEP is to encourage more involvement by women and the poorest groups in the farming sections. CIGs are when a number of farmers cooperate with tasks such as; farming, imports of crops and marketing of products. This approach is now enforced in all the extension field works and has been considered by far the best approach towards the farming sector. The positive results of the approach can also be seen through the increased effectiveness among all levels of the field staff. It has been estimated that 30 to 50 percent of all the CIGs managed to fulfill their original plans during phase I. The CIGs results are likely to be connected to their opportunities and their marketing arrangements (OPTO, 2006).

According to internal reports from NALEP there where more than 150 000 individual farmers participating in one of the 7,000 CIGs active in Kenya after Phase I. During the end of Phase I interviews were made with both male and female farmers participating in the CIGs. The results indicated that by being active in CIGs both their families’ food security and their overall productivity were improved. The internal assessment of NALEP done in 2006 shows that “as many as 80% of the farmers interviewed in the focal areas stated that the introduction of the programme has offered new opportunities for men, women and youth in agriculture” (OPTO, 2006:3). It also indicates that over 70% of the farmers had begun viewing their farming as a business rather than a way of surviving, after being introduced to NALEP. Many of the CIGs have also been encouraged to open their own bank accounts, assess loans and make use of the micro finance institutions available. This would also be a step towards changing the overall view of farming from a way of surviving into being a business (Mustisya et al, 2010).

According to interviews conducted by OPTO International AB in 2006, many of the CIGs have been able to mobilize and grew stronger since their start. NALEP has encouraged farming in rural areas and have understood that the CIGs common goal to form a commercial enterprise will help the small scale farmers to receive an economical expansion. It has also been seen that a number of the CIGs has been recruiting widows and female-headed households as members of their CIGs. By being part of the CIGs the women have been able to increase their standard of living and at the same time helped the CIGs by acting as entrepreneurs and positively affecting the work done by the other members (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010).
Some of the CIGs have even involved themselves in the social work in their villages by supporting the poorest and most vulnerable once. The CIGs have set up schemes where HIV/AIDS infected as well as orphans receive food and help with their farming by the other CIG members. This solidarity system is something which is especially recommended to recently formed CIG groups (OPTO, 2006).

One of NALEPs principles is that at least 30% of the participants in the activities have to be women. The interview research shows that widows have been one of the most driving social categories in the CIG groups. Up to 70% of all the CIG members have actually turned out to be females. One of the main reasons for this is that there has been a “considerable increase in women participating in commercial farm enterprises previously undertaken only by men, such as dairy cows, bee-keeping, horticulture, marketing and processing”(OPTO 2006:32).

5.6 Strategy for Revitalization of Agriculture (SRA)

In the UN Millennium development Goals (MDGs) it has been decided that the world should “Halve, between 1990 and 2015, the proportion of people who suffer from hunger” (MDG Report 2010:11). Both Kenya and Sweden have subscribed to these goals. In 2004 the Government of Kenya agreed on the national policy of SRA whose objective is to “reduce the population below the poverty line from 56% to 28% by the year 2015 through a transformation of the agricultural sector” (Embassy 2006:7). (UN, 2010)

The policy will help Kenya to reverse the declining trend in the agricultural productivity. To do so the Government of Kenya is initiating new strategies such as encouraging farmers to form organizations that would help them “benefit from economies of scale in accessing inputs, services and output markets, promotion of value addition and agro-processing and provision of financial services.” The fact is that this new extension policy has relied heavily on the design and recommendations from NALEP (OPTO 2006 & Embassy 2006).

The Government of Kenya’s also wants to reduce the large unemployment in the country, which is one of the main reasons why the poverty is so high. The SRA has summarized the policies and institutional reforms the government has implemented in the agricultural sector in both the short and the long term and these are:

- To evaluate and complement the regulatory, legal and institutional framework
- Develop the extension, research, education and training support in the sector
- Increasing the market access for the rural areas
- Reorganize the structure in GOs and Ministries to receive more effectiveness
- Expand the access to financial services and farm inputs
- Enforce policies and programmes responsible for food security

OPTO International AB: NALEP phase I (Impact Assessment), June 2006, p. 11
As seen in this text NALEP has been working with the implementation of most of these policy areas and has therefore been a great assistance partner for SRA (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

5.7 NALEP vs. HIV/AIDS

One of the major hold backs for NALEP has been the spread of HIV/AIDS among the poor and vulnerable in Kenya. Many of the farmers have not had time or possibilities to participate in the information meetings held by the NALEP staff. Nor have they been able to implement the advice offered due to the lack of time, money and labor. When a member of a small scale farmer family falls ill in HIV/AIDS it is a terrible loss for the family, not only sentimentally, but also financially (OPTO, 2006).

A report was made in 2004 by; Matthew P. Fox, Sydney Rosen, William B. MacLeod, Monique Wasunna, Margaret Bii, Ginamarie Foglia and Jonathon L. Simon, concerning the impact of HIV/AIDS on overall productivity in Kenya. They wanted to estimate in what ways, and how fast the disease would actually have an effect on the contained workers. The results from the research provided “empirical estimates of the impact of HIV/AIDS on labor productivity (…) Decreased attendance and output may put sick workers in jeopardy of losing their jobs and impose financial burdens on employers” (Fox et al, 2004:318).

HIV/AIDS have affected the implementation of NALEP in many different ways. A lot of money had to be spent on medical expenses to help the poorest and most vulnerable. In addition a number of the NALEP staff members have fallen ill or died because of the disease. NALEP has tried to increase the awareness of HIV/AIDS both among the staff members and the Kenyan population. During phase I the staff was given courses and education in the subject and a field guide informing about HIV/AIDS was produced and sent out to the public.

NALEP staff has seen a connection between the spread of HIV/AIDS and the increase of gender inequality, abuse of drugs and alcohol. By decreasing HIV/AIDS among the poor and vulnerable the staff hopes to see a more equalized society where there will be less orphans and children headed households. At the same time they hope to see more women involved in the local communities (OPTO, 2006).

Discussing HIV/AIDS has been a big issue in many areas of Kenya and the topic has sometimes even been taboo. This has caused problems for the NALEP staff members who are often not professionally trained on the topic themselves. In some parts of Kenya the culture prevents the field staff from even discussing sexual behaviors, which is the reason for the large spread of the disease in the area. If the field staff brings up the subject they might even be forced to leave the area and this would prevent them from being able to assist the poorest and most vulnerable. Therefore HIV/AIDS is, in some areas, not even mentioned, which prevents solutions for the issue from even being discussed.

This chapter starts off with briefly explaining the motivation of the five year extension. This will be followed by a description of the second Phases objectives as well as the implementation of Phase II. During the second period the promotions of Stakeholder Forums have been important and therefore there will be a more detailed description of these. During Phase II it was decided that the programme should work further with issues concerning democracy, human rights, gender issues and conflict solving, which all will be discussed in this chapter. The chapter will finish off viewing how the internal monitoring and evaluation of the programme has been done.

6.1 **Motivation of the Phase II Extension**

NALEP was supposed to be tested for a few years and had only received funds from Sida for the first years in operation. Both Government of Kenya and Sida had decided that they wanted to see whether or not the design of the programme was the right strategy for fighting poverty and turn around the declining production in the country. The reason for the; Government of Kenya, the NALEP staff and the local consultants, decided to extend the programme another 5 years was because the programme had turned out to be relatively successful and Sida had agreed to carry on funding the programme. There were still a number of things which had to be improved during the second face but the overall design of NALEP had proved to be successful (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010 & Mustisya et al, 2010).

6.2 **Purpose of Phase II**

After the Government of Kenya and Sida had seen that NALEP had been effective they decided that the programme should be prolonged another 5 years. Although a number of things had to be corrected, changed or developed further during the upcoming Phase II, in order to receive even better results from the programme.

The impact assessment from 2006 identified a number of areas where phase I had not been doing enough work and where more focus was needed during phase II:

- There should be a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system put into practice examining everything which is done in the programme.
- Additional education the staff working with HIV/AIDS victims and other vulnerable groups
- During phase II a lot of money and effort will be spent on increasing the knowledge and understanding of HIV/AIDS among the youth in the country
- Increase the time spent for working with focal areas to be able to do a more effective work in the area
- Further education of the staff concerning the rural marketing and how to attract researchers and rural financial institutions to the farmers.
- NALEP should promote more cooperation with NGOs and service providers active in the rural areas. MoA and MoLFD should assist to accomplishing this.
- The Government of Kenya should take a larger responsibility concerning the funding of NALEP so Sida eventually can be phased-out (OPTO, 2010 & MoA & MoLD, 2010).

According to the Embassy of Sweden in Nairobi there were also a number of areas concerning democracy and human rights where NALEP had been lacking. Therefore Phase II had to deal with these:

- To locate more organizations that could help out with the training of NALEP staff and farmers in human rights questions.
- To increase the democracy among men, women and children at all different levels, institutions and groups.
- To make sure that the monitoring and evaluation of the human rights, governance issues, women and children’s rights and mainstream advocacy is included in the program.

In Phase I only the high rainfall districts were covered, which makes up only 20% of the country. Since NALEP has been a success in reforming the extension service the Government of Kenya decided that Phase II would be enlarged to cover the whole country (Embassy, 2006).

6.3 Implementation of Phase II

“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 through the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010).

During Phase II the programme increased even further and now covers 70 districts in the country. It embraces 2,000-6,000 farmers, pastoralists and fisher folk in each focal area and includes both arid and semi-arid districts. Phase II will have reached up to 4 million people by the end of the programme in December 2011. (Mustisya et al, 2010)

There will be a closer more effective partnership with other Government ministries, private sectors, social society and other development agencies working in the agricultural and rural areas. The bottom-up implementation course the programme has taken is overlapping with the Government of Kenya’s efforts to “provide improved policy environment for public-private sector service providers-partnerships” (MoA & MoLD, 2010:2). Cooperation between different service providers is an effective way of developing the life style of small scale households by assisting them with a better access to financial services, inputs and to
social and legal institutions close to them. By devolution of the power and the decentralization of services NALEP has been given more impetus than during Phase I. Also during Phase II the bottom-up planning and collaborative provision of advisory services remain as the cornerstones of the programme (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

6.4 Stakeholders Forum

Also in Phase I the Stakeholder Forums were used but not with as much influence as during Phase II. In the second Phase the Forums promoted and facilitated by both the Government of Kenya, and the NALEP staff is seen as a good way for small scale farmers to be able to regain power and a chance for all different actors in the rural areas to collaborate. As was mentioned earlier the Stakeholders Forum is a “platform that brings together all actors; clients, NGOs, Government departments and private sector firms, in agriculture and rural development at the provincial, district and divisional levels with the farmer at the centre” (MoA & MoLD, 2010:3).

The tasks of the SF are to take care of community mobilization, ranking of projects, joint planning, project resource mobilization and allocation of resources. The SF is also responsible for coordinating implementations and the M&E. In each area of jurisdiction there is a SF which is overall responsible of the project cycle management of all development work done in their area. Once a SF has become institutionalized they are allowed to approve new development projects and programmes in their specific area. By allowing SFs to be responsible for the decisions of new projects means that the decisions not always have to come from the top-down (MoA & MoLD, 2010 & Mustisya et al, 2010).

6.5 Democracy and Human Rights

“Human rights are basic rights and freedoms that all people are entitled to regardless of nationality, sex, national or ethnic origin, race, religion, language, or other status. Human rights include civil and political rights, such as the right to life, liberty and freedom of expression; and social, cultural and economic rights including the right to participate in culture, the right to food, and the right to work and receive an education. Human rights are protected and upheld by international and national laws and treaties” (Amnesty, 2011).

In both the former Swedish foreign affairs and in the planning of NALEP Phase II the cooperation with individual organizations has been discussed. Individual organizations have been seen as important actors when it comes to development of rural areas, both through practical work and through dialogs with the locals. In addition, they could also be good messengers of fundamental values regarding Human Rights (HR) and democracy. During Phase II NALEP has not only formed partnership with KNCHR but also with different NGOs working for HR and democracy in the focal areas (Lodenius, 2008).
The main goal Sida has put up to enforce HR and Democracy in Kenya is to address the social inequalities and discriminations based on gender, religion and social status as well as fight HIV/AIDS. In Kenya it is important to enforce advocacy, HR and equal governance on all levels in the society, not only in the Government of Kenya but also in organizations on lower levels such as in FADC and CIGs. Advocacy, HR and governance issues can be used as tools to create a beneficial democratic environment and to dialogue with other interest groups and communities. The dialogue on rights and governance issues will include “discussions on the formation of mechanisms of empowerment that ensure sustainable and equitable wealth creation from ecologically or environmentally friendly agricultural production, marketing and manufacturing opportunities” (MoA & MoLD, 2010:79), which will assist farmers, pastoralists and fisher folk in the focal areas. (MoA & MoLD, 2010)

6.6 Gender Issues

If HR has been overviewed during phase I the gender questions have been almost ignored. Many of the NALEP staff in charge of the focal areas has not been capable of distinguishing important gender issues other than that “women do most of the work and men take most of the decisions” (MoA & MoLD, 2010:46). However, the gender mainstreaming has started to be discussed by the Government of Kenya and has actually now been enforced in all different sector programmes, including the agricultural sector. (MoA & MoLD, 2010)

The ASCU in Kenya has outlined a new strategy plan for the mainstreaming of HR and gender in the agricultural sector, Sweden is one of the development supporters of this new strategy. The MoA, the MoLD and the public sector are the main members of the ASCU and responsible for enforcing the strategy. Though the three actors will receive help by different voluntary NGOs and agencies such as the World Bank to make sure these important questions actually will be implemented. The strategy will be focusing on four main areas, which are:

(1) Building gender and HR supporting organizations
(2) Mainstreaming gender and HR into programmes, such as NALEP,
(3) Research, documentation and advocacy,
(4) Financial resources,

Each area also has sub-sections related to the specific area and HR and gender will be just as mainstreamed too these. For the sake of the fact, it should be mentioned that the agricultural sector in Kenya has never had a policy or a strategy focusing on the HR or gender issues before the implementation of this one (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010 & Embassy, 2006).
In the new strategy a harmonized guide to accelerate mainstreaming efforts will be provided. The HR and gender issues that will be addressed in the new mainstreaming strategy are the following:

- Heavy workloads for women and associated inefficiencies,
- Women’s limited access to and control of productive resources,
- Women’s limited access to credit,
- Women’s limited access to technology and information,
- Women’s limited ownership of farm tools and implements,

During Phase I these questions have not received enough attention but during the second Phase they have been more noticed. There have been a need to “evolve from documentation of gender sensitive technologies to accessing gender sensitive advisory services” (MoA & MoLD, 2010:46), since gender is actually about involving both women and men. Gender is not only about enforcing the women rights but to make the men understand that the women’s opinion is important for the whole community. NALEP has been trying to reach out with gender and HR education to all men in the rural areas, including; old, sick, landless, disabled and poor. The focus has been to increase both men and women participation in the communities’ development interventions (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010 & (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

Another central issue for NALEP has been to support the interdependence of women’s and men’s livelihoods. This has been to (i) support the men in the household to prevent them from abandoning their small scale farms and families to find work in the cities, (ii) to help the women to be fully integrated in the extension work so they will be able to provide for themselves and their children if that would become the case (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010).

Sweden has been working in Kenya to strengthen the women’s rights during many years. The plan have been to “strengthen women’s access to, control over and right to own, buy and inherit land, property and other productive resources” (Embassy, 2006:7). Sweden has pursued the plan by supporting selected Civil Society Organizations (CSO), NALEP and other GO and NGOs working towards these goals (Embassy, 2006 & MoA & MoLD, 2010).

According to the assessment made after Phase I it is stated that 44% of the farmers reached by NALEP were women. The women had increased their access and control over productive resources and benefits, and the women had also been better connected and networked with relevant collaborators who could provide resources. It was also claimed that 70 % of the CIGs food crops and small livestock were produced by women. There had also been an increase in the number of women who had been elected as members of the FADCs and Stakeholder Forums (Embassy, 2006).
6.7 Household Conflict

In the essay “Cooperative Conflicts” from 1990 Amartya Sen claims that a household is a location where a cooperative conflict can take place between a man and woman. He points out that even though both the partners help in bringing income to the household it often ends up with the man taking it all and the women getting nothing, or only a very small share of it. The reason for this is because of the power relation where the man has gotten all the power in the household and the woman has been pushed aside (Sen, 1990).

A good example of this can be found in the agricultural sector in Kenya where NALEP staff has had to become involved. The issue concerns poultry-keeping where it is the women in the households who take care of the birds but where it often are the men who sells the birds and keep all the income. This has lead to many family conflicts which has forced NALEP to go in and deal with the conflicts. NALEP has decided to take the following position to the issue: “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” (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010:22). However, unfortunately there are many men who do not care at all about NALEP’s opinion and still carry on keeping all the money and leave nothing to their women (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010).

6.8 Water Resource Conflict

The first phase of the programme only included farmers and covered not more than 26 % of the whole country. In the second phase the remaining 74 % of the land, as well as the pastoralists and fisher folks were included in the programme. As a consequence NALEP had to take a larger responsibility in the water conflict between different groups (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

The pastoralists put all their wealth into cattle, which they need to move around in search for pastures and water. Unfortunately Kenya is hit by extreme drought quite frequently, which leads to a low water supply. This has lead to a high number of conflicts between pastoralists, farmers and other groups that are depending on the water supply. Pastoralists’ production and livelihood are reliant on the water since their cattle dies without it, which puts their families in economic difficulties that later may lead them into poverty (Embassy, 2006).

Because of the extreme and long droughts Kenya has suffered from the past decades the number of poor and vulnerable has increased among pastoralist families. Some of them also steal cattle from others to be able to survive and this has lead to an increase in the number of bloody conflicts where people have been killed. In an attempt to protect their own cattle pastoralists have protected themselves with weapons, which only lead to even further conflicts between different groups.
To be able to solve this conflict NALEP Phase II has promoted “new innovative extension methods that enable the large proportion of pastoralists to access extension and production service and that retain their traditional ways of life while at the same time minimizing livestock losses and incidences of conflicts” (MoA & MoLD, 2010:45). NALEP tackles the issues with animal health service to prevent big losses of cattle, increase the access to markets and promoting opportunities for introduction of a cash economic system to the areas (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

6.9 Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)

During Phase I the M&E was not done properly and NALEP received a lot of criticism from both internal sources, such as extension officers at district and divisional level, and from the external sources, such as the midterm review and the impact assessment done in 2006. It is only the financial administration and a limited amount of the performance data that was properly done during Phase I. Though, the financial monitoring and control done proved to have a high standard (Embassy, 2006 & OPTO, 2006).

Given the fact that the M&E was a very weak part of NALEP during Phase I it has become a “major priority by both ministries to put in place a comprehensive M&E system that embraces participatory M&E” (MoA & MoLD, 2010:59) in Phase II. The further developed Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation system (PM&E) should be used to capture important information on process, outcome and impact indicators of the NALEP programme (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

To make sure the M&E will be properly done during Phase II some officers have been trained in the area of monitoring and evaluation including participatory, they have also been educated in survey studies so they can be refereed back to when the programme is evaluated or studied. It has been important that all officers carrying out participatory monitoring and evaluation during the programme implementation have had the right competence (MoA & MoLD, 2010 & Farnworth & Obuya, 2010).
7. Evaluation of NALEP

The programme staff has been facing a number of different challenges during the 10 years in field. These have been slowing down and preventing the programme from helping out with development work in some areas. Examples of challenges which are discussed in this chapter are political interventions, cultural issues and administrative problems. During the programmes existence there have also been a number of complaints and criticism against them that are brought up in this chapter. For instance the monitoring and evaluation have not been done properly and women have been discriminated against some areas of the programme.

7.1 Challenges

The “Socio-economic and environmental conditions” as well as the “Long-term funding of the NALEP” have been the two overall long term risk factors for the whole programme. While in the short-term, when NALEP was formed, the two main risk factors were to ensure that the “Ministry structure remained conducive” and to make sure that the “Institutional supports necessary for NALEP really came through” (OPTO, 2006).

There have been a number of different challenges which have occurred during the implementation of NALEP. For instance there have been issues when the Stakeholder Forums have had their meetings to draw the Community Action Plan (CAP). The process can take up to three weeks and the all members cannot participate all the time due to their other core activities. Therefore it has been a great challenge for NALEP to get the stakeholders to commit themselves to the SFs and the drawing of the CAP, which in some cases have prevented the CAP from being completed in a correct way.

Concerning the administration in NALEP there have been issues relating to staff changes. Staff has been coming and going from the programme and unfortunately some staff members have even fallen ill in HIV/AIDS. There have also been problems with the implementation of different tasks because of unfinished documents and delays in the decision making processes. While NALEP has tried to solve these issues with the use of computers and technical instruments other issues such as limited capacity of the telecommunication system has become the problem instead (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

In some rural areas NALEP staff has confronted cultural issues when the communities have had a number of different events and ceremonies, and these have disrupted or prevented the development process. These events can be for instance circumcision and burials. A “circumcision may disrupt agricultural activities for about two months in a year in the area where it is traditionally performed, while death of a member of the community can lead two to three weeks mourning period, hence causing delay in the development activities” Mustisya et al, 2010:13). Some communities still have very strict cultural laws where they do not allow women to participate in development activities freely, which

10 The Long-term perspective can be seen as a timeframe of more than 2 years
NALEP staff has to respect to be allowed to stay in the community and help out (Mustisya et al, 2010 & OPTO, 2006).

The political situation in Kenya is not one of the most stable ones. There have been a lot of divisions of the administrative units, or districts, among the political leaders ever since the start of the programme. This has led to long delays of financial resources, personnel and even of the implementation of the programme in some of these areas, which has lead to further suffering among the small scale households. During the time of political elections, which are held every 5 years, it is common that the men abandon their farming chores and only focus on the elections, and this has led to large declines in individual communities’ agricultural productions (Mustisya et al, 2010).

Other difficult challenges for NALEP that have been mentioned earlier in the text are: the increasing spread of HIV/AIDS, the increasing poverty and declining productivity, the ignored HR and gender issues, and the armed water conflicts. These are all important issues that will not be solved over night by either NALEP or the Government of Kenya. However, in Kenya’s long-term development vision the plan is that these issues shall be completely solved or only minor concerns by 2030 (MoA & MoLD, 2010 & Mustisya et al, 2010).

7.2 Criticism

As discussed in the beginning of this text NALEP received criticism already in the beginning of the process. Some observers did not think that the new extension programme should have been founded on the on-going NSWCP programme, but should have been allowed to “start afresh” (OPTO, 2006).

More resent complains towards NALEP have been concerning internal gender issues. The programme has been seen as biased against women in the technological competence areas. There are also a minority of female extension workers in NALEP overall, and the women who are employed by the government and work for NALEP are active in the home economics area. Although, this area can be seen as an extension of the household work, which therefore means that it already belongs to the women’s normal chores. Not many of the female staff in NALEP works with issues concerning the technical agricultural and livestock issues. There is obviously also a bias towards male staff in the area of delivery and advisory of technical services instead (MoA & MoLD, 2010).

NALEP has received a lot of criticism concerning their internal M&E. During Phase I there were no proper M&E except for the financial sector, which had been done properly. Without a properly done M&E it is difficult for both internal and external observers to see what the programme has actually accomplished. A proposal for the M&E system comes from a report named “Gender Aware Approaches in Agricultural Programmes” published by Sida in 2010. They suggest that the M&Es “need to be able to tell stories rather than
provide just figures. What difference did we make? How did we change people’s lives?” (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010:17). To give a more descriptive M&E would be valuable for both NALEP itself and also for external development programmes who would better understand the design of NALEP (Farnworth & Obuya, 2010).

There has also been criticism aimed at NALEP for being rigid compared with other donor-funded programmes. The reason for this is because NALEP has a principle of no free handouts and requires payments for holding demonstrations and extensions. In other projects the meeting allowances can often be paid or the projects sometimes include free hand-outs, which makes these extension agents more positively viewed among farmers. NALEP have also declined the paying of travel costs to farmers for training courses. The reason for these decisions is because NALEP wants to move away from the dependency syndrome among the farmers, pastoralists and fisher folk (OPTO, 2006 & MoA & MoLD, 2010).

In the beginning of Phase I Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) was part of NALEP and an early complaint against KARI Kenya Agricultural Research Institute was concerning their research methods. The criticisms were that farmers had to, or might even still have to “approach one of the research centers in order to present their needs. This tends to favor groups of better of farmers located close to the regional offices who are able to physically mobilize and articulate their needs to a researcher” (OPTO, 2006:29). However, the research made by NALEP nowadays concerns the vulnerable farmers out in the focal areas and not the groups that are better off, which might have been the case during the start of the operation (OPTO, 2006).
8. Analysis

This final chapter gives an overall analysis of the implementation of NALEP. First of all there is a discussion of whether or not the programme has been important for the development of Kenya’s agricultural sector. Secondly the strengths of the programme are analyzed to determine what it is that has kept the programme running for over 10 years. The final part of this chapter analyzes the risk factors involved in the programme.

8.1 Importance of NALEP

In most areas where NALEP has been active few or no development organizations have been active earlier. Therefore the importance of the NALEP programme in these areas has been great. The methodology of NALEP is not a traditional agricultural extension methodology but actually a “methodology for community mobilization in areas where the predominant economic activity is agriculture” (OPTO, 2006:39). To change the small scale farmers view of agriculture from “a way of surviving” to seeing it as a “business to generate income” has been a small revolution in the agricultural sector.

If we compare NALEP with other rural development approaches, we can see that this programme has been highly efficient, particularly in a long term perspective. The programme has been focusing on poverty alleviation on a national scale and covers the whole country. The ambition has been to link farming communities to other public and private rural service providers to create considerable organizational complexities. Because of NALEPs long term approach and focus on agriculture expansion and integration in government structures, the programme provides an important contribution towards economic expansion and poverty alleviation.

According to Kenya’s; Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP), Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERS) and the Strategy for Revitalization of Agriculture (SRA), successful revitalization of the agricultural sector is the key to poverty reduction and economic recovery in Kenya. NALEP is the largest agricultural extension programme in the whole of Kenya and considered to be the most successful core poverty programme in the two sector ministries. The reason for this is because the programme has managed to involve the small scale farmers, and other vulnerable, in CIGs, FADC, Stakeholder forums, which have proven to be successful. The two ministries, MoA and MoLFD, were severely under-financed and had a bad reputation amongst Kenyans and donors before the development of the new NALEP methods. Due to the wide coverage and outreach, NALEP has been able to receive a comparative advantage compared to previous development programmes. The NALEP programme has also managed to shift the decision process from the top level down to the small scale farmer level, which have increased the farmers own voices (MoA & MoLD, 2010).
After completing Phase I in the beginning of 2006 the Impact Assessment report claimed that 61% of all farmers involved in NALEP had become members in a CIG. Up to 72% of all farmers had increased their production after being trained by NALEP. Further on the assessment claimed that 89% of all interview farmers had improved their technologies through NALEP, and as many as 71% of the 592 farmers had increased their surplus after the implementation of NALEP (OPTO, 2006).

8.2 Strengths of NALEP

The biggest strength of NALEP has been the formation and capacity building of grassroot farmer organizations in form of the Common Interest Groups (CIGs). Through these groups the farmers have been able to survive difficult challenges and increase their individual incomes. It can often be difficult for individual small farmers to access credits and technological innovations are often too expensive investments for lone farmers. Through CIGs the farmers make use of “economics of scale” when uniting their investments in production and this have lead to increased financial incomes for the individual households.

By involving local farmers in the Focal Area Development Committees (FADC) and educated them in new farming technologies have shown to be another successful strategy. These local farmers have been working as heads of new community development projects as well as demonstrators of new technologies in their focal areas. When the leaders in the communities have proved that new technologies have increased their production and income the other farmers in the communities have been willing to test the new technologies.

During the first Phase NALEP introduced the Stakeholder Forums where the local farmers were able to have their voices heard. These forums were further promoted during the second Phase and have proved to be a winning concept and strength for the programme. To let the small scale farmers be involved in the decision making in their areas have helped the development of the whole regions since the SF have been able to specialize the work in the areas where it has been of most assistance.

8.3 Risk Factors

The programme has been characterized as a fairly “low risk programme” by both Sida and the Government of Kenya. This means that there have not been any large risks from the programme towards the participating farmers, pastoralists and fisher folk participating. However, there are still a number of internal and external risk factors against the implementation and running of the programme, which are discussed below.
8.3.1 Internal Risks

Kenya is a country where corruption is widely spread. There is even a risk for corruption within the two responsible ministries of NALEP as well as internally in the programme. The Government of Kenya has been working hard to prevent corruption in NALEP with a well developed, and very costly, rolling audit function and a strict control of the economical monitoring and evaluation. It is even said by auditors that NALEP have had the “lowest level of corruption in all run development programmes” (Embassy, 2006:25).

Other internal risks, which have been brought up earlier, are the delays and problems with the administration in the programme. Without a correct and working monitoring and evaluation might cause problems for the programme to receive long-term funding from Sida and the Government of Kenya. There is also a risk that the internal staff working with NALEP might leave for better paid jobs in private sectors, donor agencies or foreign supported CSOs, due to the far too low salaries given to the Government of Kenya staff.

There have also been problems with NALEP staff having a too low level of education when it comes to gender issues, human rights, HIV/AIDS, and psychological support to vulnerable and poor people. During phase II NALEP has been working harder with the collaboration with other development organizations to involve more experts on these issues who could educate the NALEP staff further.

8.3.2 External Risks

For NALEP staff to be able to reach out to the poorest and most vulnerable in the rural areas there is a need of road infrastructure for transportation vehicles. During Phase II the staff has been given more motorbikes and a few cars but the infrastructure in the country is incredibly undeveloped and the problem is still as bad. This situation has meant that there are risks for more people to end up in severe poverty in the focal areas.

Another big risk for the NALEP programme is the Government of Kenya’s small involvements in the agricultural sector as well as their lacking allocation of funds to the sector. Between the years 2005 and 2009 the amount budgeted to the agricultural sector only increased with 1.1 %. This level is far too low compared to the importance of the sector. The risk is that Government of Kenya does not understand the importance and more people will end up extremely poor.

NALEPs ambition to gradually privatize the advisory services may prove to be more complicated than expected. The reasons for this are the lack of capacity and interest from the private sector due to the risks of not gaining any profit from it. The small scale farmers have not received enough profit in the short run and are still too vulnerable. For the farmers to become more profitable they need more support in terms of capacity building
and be better organized in order to access market competitiveness over a long-term period. First then will this sector be able to become privatized.

Today the small scale farmers in Kenya are facing a number of external risks and their profitability may not increase at all, or might even decrease due to factors such as: low prices of farm output, (caused by the world market and dumping of surplus from rich countries with huge subsidized farming), high prices on seed, declining soil fertility, decreasing farm sizes, unavailability and low quality of farm inputs. The future of the small scale farmers in Kenya is not the brightest one. For Government of Kenya, Sida and other development organizations to be able to change the future of the agricultural sector is going to cost a lot of money, time and work. However NALEP has been doing a successful work enabling a great number of women, as well as men, to improve their livelihoods and income.
Concluding Discussion

The aim of this study has been to evaluate the implementation process of the National Agricultural and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP) in Kenya. The programme was implemented in July 2000 by the Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (MoLFD).

In the 1970s Kenya was a large exporter of agricultural goods but has during the past decades been a victim of political, economical and environmental issues, which have lead to large poverty increases and productivity reductions in the agricultural sector. Regarding the environment the main issues have been the soil erosions and shortages of water. To tackle these issues the National Soil and Water Conservation Program (NSWCP) was developed in 1974, which was financed by Sida. In 2000 both the programme and the funds were shifted over to a new agricultural extension design in the form of NALEP.

The ambition for NALEP has been to “promote the socio-economic development of the agricultural sector (...) while at the same time contributing towards the national priority of poverty alleviation” (OPTO 2006:12). During the Phase I, July 2000 – June 2005, the programme reached out to 267 divisions in 43 districts in 5 provinces, providing extension services to over 100,000 farmers. NALEP operates in districts where there are a lot of small scale farmers and where few, or no other, development organizations are active.

Looking back at research question one, we can conclude that the implementation of NALEP has been done through a number of steps. One of the first steps has been the establishment of a Stakeholder Forum. These forums consisting of; NALEP staff, male and female farmers, NGO representatives (if there are any in the specific district area), commercial representatives, and Community-Based Organizations, have been a good way for the small scale farmers to get their voices heard.

Further on the implementation process has continued with the institution of Focal Area Development Committees (FADC). The committees have been democratically elected and provided with training and education to work as coordinators in extension work. The FADCs has also been working as heads of new community development projects or as demonstrators of new technologies in their focal areas. These committees have assisted the NALEP staffs to show the farmers that new technologies actually increase the farming production.

One of the foundations of the NALEP designs has been the Common Interest Groups (CIG). These groups consisting of a number of farmers, have cooperating with tasks such as; farming, imports of crops and marketing of products, which have lowered the individual costs for small scale farmers. Through the CIGs NALEP has managed to encourage more involvement by women and the poorest groups in the communities. This approach is now enforced in all the extension field works and has been considered as the by far best approach towards the farming sector.
During Phase II there has been more focus on the human rights (HR) and gender issues in the agricultural sector. NALEP has formed partnership with both Kenya National Commission on Human Rights (KNCHR) and different NGOs working for HR and democracy in the focal areas. The Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit (ASCU) in Kenya has also outlined a new strategy plan, Strategy for Revitalization of Agriculture (SRA), for the mainstreaming of HR and gender in the agricultural sector. NALEP has been playing an important role in the enforcement of this strategy. One of NALEPs main focus areas has been to equalize the power positions between men and women in both the social communities and in the domestic households.

Concerning research question two, the NALEP programme has faced challenges, as well as criticism. The challenges, brought up 8.1, are connected to Political interference, cultural issues, administration problems as well as the spread of HIV/AIDS. The criticisms, discussed in 8.2, especially concern the programme lacking monitoring and evaluation process. The staff blames this on the bureaucracy and the delays in the administrative work, caused by; staff falling ill in HIV/AIDS, changing of staff, and especially the shortage of networking and communication such as computers.

To answer the third research question, concerning Sweden’s development work towards Kenya’s agricultural sector, we can conclude that without Sweden’s assistance the NALEP programme would not have been possible. Since the Government of Kenya still do not allocate enough funds to the agricultural area in Kenya external donors, such as Sida, are important for the sector to be able to develop.

As mentioned by Sweden’s Embassy in Nairobi, “It is most often the successful cases and performances done by NALEP that are brought up in the internal reports” (Embassy, 2006:17). This must be taken into consideration when answering the fourth research question, concerning if the programme has been successfulness. Since the beginning of the programme in 2000 over 3.5 million farmers have participated in the NALEP programme and it is the largest agricultural extension programme ever operated in Kenya. NALEP’s focus on improving the conditions for the most vulnerable and poorest people in the rural areas, as well as shifting the decision making from the top-down to the bottom-up approach have been relatively successful. By implementing the Stakeholder Forums, FADCs and CIGs NALEP has helped the farmers to receive more influence over their farming businesses as well as their own futures. In 2004 when the Government of Kenya enforced the new SRA policy, there it was easy to draw the parallels of the design between the new policy, and the one of NALEP.

To sum up, there has been a great demand of a development programme for the agricultural sector in Kenya. There are still hundred thousands of farmers, pastoralists and fisher folks in need of assistance. One of the main objectives for NALEP has been to “hand over” the chores of this programme to the private sector. Though, there have not been any real requests from the private sector to take over the development work due to the risks of losing money and not gaining any profit. Therefore NALEP will probably have to be prolonged another period of time due to the great need of assistance in the rural areas.
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Appendix

Table 1

Aid sent by SIDA to programme in Kenya years 1998-2010, million SEK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1998</th>
<th>1999</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total amount</td>
<td>129.1</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>136.4</td>
<td>139.8</td>
<td>205.9</td>
<td>213.8</td>
<td>315.8</td>
<td>378.8</td>
<td>314.0</td>
<td>424.1</td>
<td>513.2</td>
<td>343.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural sect.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Agriculture</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project

- **NSCW**: 13.5, 14.8, 12.5, 0.1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
- **NALEP**: 0, 0, 0, 6.6, 23.2, 19.9, 23.4, 17.1, 37.2, 0, 0, 0, 0
- **KARI Embu**: 2.8, 1.1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
- **KARI Mugu**: 1.1, 0.4, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
- **NSWC**: 6.0, 2.3, 2.1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0
- **NALEP II**: 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 21.4, 37.2, 85.3, 57.8, 64.0

Source: (Utredningstjänsten, 2011)