

Country Name	Community Agricultural Development Project in Semi-Arid Lands in Kenya
Republic of Kenya	

I. Project Outline

Background	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASAL) account for 89% of Kenya's land area, and 14 million people lived on ASAL. ¹ Severe natural conditions had created difficulties in securing foods and providing job opportunities there. In addition, there was a concern that migration from neighboring areas to ASAL was increasing demographic pressure on the land, inducing to the unsustainable exploitation of resources and environmental degradation. The government of Kenya developed its Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture (SRA) in 2004. The SRA called for greater decentralization, establishment of local governments, and broader participation of stakeholders such as Community Based Organizations (CBOs) and the private sector in agricultural development. Moreover, SRA placed livestock farming as a main production system in ASAL and recommended infrastructure development, including watering places for livestock. In order to support SRA, JICA implemented the development study "Integrated Rural Development Project in the Baringo Semi Arid Land Area" (1999-2002) which made the development master plan through verification of some pilot projects. This project is based on results and lessons learned of these verified pilot projects.														
Objectives of the Project	1. Overall Goal: Agricultural production is increased in Keiyo and Marakwet Districts. ² 2. Project Purpose: The target group increase agricultural production in a sustainable manner.														
Activities of the project	1. Project sites: Keiyo District (Metkei, Soy, and Tambach Divisions) and Marakwet District (Tunyo and Tot Divisions) 2. Main activities: (i) Training to farmer groups on project planning and implementation, (ii) Training to farmer groups on verified farmer-friendly technologies, (iii) Technical support for extension service providers, (iv) Networking among stakeholders to prepare the community action plan (CAP) 3. Inputs (to carry out above activities) <table border="0" style="width: 100%;"> <tr> <td style="width: 50%;">Japanese Side</td> <td style="width: 50%;">Kenyan Side</td> </tr> <tr> <td>1) Experts: 7 persons</td> <td>1) Staff allocated: 7 persons</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2) Trainees received: 5 persons</td> <td>2) Land and facilities: Office space</td> </tr> <tr> <td>3) Equipment: Vehicle, PC, AV equipment, agricultural equipment, etc.</td> <td>3) Local cost: 2,439,188 Sch.</td> </tr> <tr> <td>4) Operational cost: 68,795,386 Sch.</td> <td></td> </tr> </table>					Japanese Side	Kenyan Side	1) Experts: 7 persons	1) Staff allocated: 7 persons	2) Trainees received: 5 persons	2) Land and facilities: Office space	3) Equipment: Vehicle, PC, AV equipment, agricultural equipment, etc.	3) Local cost: 2,439,188 Sch.	4) Operational cost: 68,795,386 Sch.	
Japanese Side	Kenyan Side														
1) Experts: 7 persons	1) Staff allocated: 7 persons														
2) Trainees received: 5 persons	2) Land and facilities: Office space														
3) Equipment: Vehicle, PC, AV equipment, agricultural equipment, etc.	3) Local cost: 2,439,188 Sch.														
4) Operational cost: 68,795,386 Sch.															
Ex-Ante Evaluation	2005	Project Period	October 2005 to March 2011 (Extended project period) October 2010 to March 2011	Project Cost	356 million yen										
Implementing Agency	Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) (Restructured as the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fishery (MoALF) in 2013)														
Cooperation Agency in Japan	Nihon University, Kyoto University, Obihiro University of Agriculture and Veterinary Medicine														

II. Result of the Evaluation**1 Relevance**

This project has been highly relevant with Kenya's development policy of "promotion of agricultural development and strengthening of extension services in ASAL" as set in policy documents including the Economic Recovery Strategy (2003-2007) and SRA (2004-2014) at the time of both ex-ante evaluation and project completion. It has been consistent with development needs for stable agricultural and livestock activities with extension services. The project was relevant also with Japan's ODA policy at the time of ex-ante evaluation: Country Assistance Program (2000), in which one of the assistance priority areas was agricultural development through boosting productivity.

Therefore, relevance of this project is high.

2 Effectiveness/Impact

The project aimed to increase the agricultural production of the farmer groups in the target divisions of Marakwet and Keiyo Districts, mainly through (i) training of the farmers on the project planning/implementation and verified farmer-friendly technologies, (ii) strengthening of the extension services, and (iii) building of the network among the stakeholders for CAP preparation. The Overall Goal was set forth for increasing the agricultural production in the whole divisions of Marakwet and Keiyo as a result of the dissemination of the project experiences in the target districts.

The Project Purpose was achieved by the time of project completion. In all the target divisions, CAP was prepared and utilized, and the farmer-friendly technologies were verified for production of mushroom, peanut butter, sunflower oil extraction, etc. As a result, as shown in the following table, 93% of the farmer groups sustained the activities of the Community Initiated Projects (CIPs)³, and 81% of the implementers of the Community Participatory Technology Development (CPTD)⁴ activities

¹ Sessional Paper No. 8, National Policy of the Sustainable Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands, 2012

² "District" has been re-categorized as "Sub-County" by the time of the ex-post evaluation due to the devolution reform in 2010.

³ CIP is planned by each community, and implemented after approved by the Project Management Unit. The farmer group (CIP group) has to share 20% of the necessary resources for CIP.

⁴ CPTD is a series of activities for developing and verifying farmer-friendly technologies for agricultural development with participation of the farmers groups.

used the technologies verified by the project. And, through these activities, 83% of the groups which implemented CIPs and 100% of the groups which implemented CPTD activities increased the agricultural productivity by 15%.

After the project completion, most of these effects have continued. Most of the farmer groups which were active during the project period (both CIP groups and CPTD implementers) have continued their agricultural activities.

The Overall Goal has been achieved. Both in Marakwet and Keiyo Districts, agricultural and livestock production has increased by 10-25% on the average. While 96 CIP groups and 55 CPTD groups increased production, the production decreased in 12 CIP groups and 12 CPTD groups, probably due to the difference in the level of extension services. The leading products for the increased production include tissue culture bananas, goats, camels, and coffee, and some of the products such as tissue culture bananas have been adopted in the County Government Development Budget as prioritized products. This increase of the production has been brought through the diffusion of the project experiences. In other divisions than the project target divisions, several groups have been trained on Project Cycle Management (PCM)/Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), CAP, group management, some agricultural techniques, etc. Thus, 15 CIPs in four non-target divisions of Keiyo and 11 CIPs in five non-target divisions of Marakwet were implemented, and CPTD activities were extended in 7 and 8 non-target divisions in Keiyo and Marakwet respectively, as well.

So as to other impacts than the Overall Goal, the livelihood of the farmers who implemented CIP and CPTD activities has been improved. 100 interviewed farmers answered that they can now invest more in agricultural activities than before, 137 answered that they can buy daily essentials more than before, and 80 answered that they can send their children to schools. The access to the market has been ensured so that the farmers could sell their products under the contract with private companies. There has not been negative impact on the environment. There was no land acquisition and resettlement.

Thus, the Project Purpose was achieved at the time of completion, and the Overall Goal has been achieved. Although decreased production of some CIP and CPTD groups suggests the necessity of further improvement of the extension services, the agricultural production increased on the district average. Therefore, effectiveness/ impact of the project is high.

Achievement of the Project Purpose and Overall Goal

Aim	Indicators	Results																				
(Project Purpose) The target groups increase agricultural production in a sustainable manner.	1) More than 90% of Community Initiated Projects sustain agricultural group activities.	(Project completion) - Achieved: 100 groups (93%) continued to implement their activities. (Ex-post Evaluation) - Effects being mostly continued: 96 groups (89%) have continued their activities.																				
	2) More than 50% of CPTD implementers use verified technologies.	(Project Completion) - Achieved: 30 CPTD implementers (81%) used the verified technologies. (Ex-post evaluation) - Effects being continued: 55 CPTD implementers (82%) have continued to use the verified technologies.																				
	3) CIP and CPTD increase agricultural productivity more than 15% by the end of the project.	(Project completion) - Achieved: 83% of CIP groups and 100% of CPTD implementers increased the productivity by 15%. (Ex-post evaluation) - Effects being partially continued: 52% of CIP groups and 46% of CPTD implementers increased the productivity by 15% from 2011.																				
(Overall goal) Agricultural production is increased in Keiyo and Marakwet Districts.	Crop and livestock production are increased by 15% in the target districts.	(Ex-post evaluation) - Achieved: [Livestock and agricultural production in the target districts (increase from the previous year)] <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2011</th> <th>2012</th> <th>2013</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Keiyo South</td> <td>10%</td> <td>12%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Keiyo North</td> <td>20%</td> <td>20%</td> <td>25%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marakwet West</td> <td>15%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Marakwet East</td> <td>10%</td> <td>10%</td> <td>15%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2011	2012	2013	Keiyo South	10%	12%	15%	Keiyo North	20%	20%	25%	Marakwet West	15%	10%	15%	Marakwet East	10%	10%	15%
	2011	2012	2013																			
Keiyo South	10%	12%	15%																			
Keiyo North	20%	20%	25%																			
Marakwet West	15%	10%	15%																			
Marakwet East	10%	10%	15%																			

Source: Results of the interview with the MoALF officer.

Source: Terminal Evaluation Report and interview with MoALF.

3 Efficiency

Both the project cost and the project period slightly surpassed the plan (ratio against the plan: 107% and 110%, respectively) because the project period was extended to develop the action plan for enhancing the sustainability of the project. Therefore, efficiency of the project is fair.

4 Sustainability

In the policy aspect, the project is still given importance in the current development policy. Besides SRA and the Vision 2030, in the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (2010-2020), promotion of agricultural extension services is envisaged as one of the critical inputs required for increased agricultural productivity. Also in the National Agricultural Research System Policy, objectives include increasing the outreach and technology dissemination, applying agricultural research results in service delivery, etc.

Institutionally, the project functions to implement CIP and CPTD have been incorporated into the existing institutions after the project completion. For example, functions of the Project Management Unit (PMU) have been taken over by MoALF (former MOA), and those of District Working Groups (DWG) and Divisional Implementation Teams (DIT) have been performed by Sub-country Sectional Heads and extension workers.⁵ The agricultural section of MoALF has 180 technical staff for Marakwet

⁵ PMU was set up for the project implementation, which had functions including overall supervision, management, and reporting of

and Keiyo Districts, but this number is not sufficient to cover the area, as the districts are very large. For agricultural extension activities, the agricultural department receives sufficient technical support from the livestock and fishery section (former Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development).

Regarding the technical aspect, more than 60% (at the agricultural section of MoALF) and 75% (at the livestock and fishery section) of the extension workers who were engaged in the project still work for the same sections. There are training opportunities for them, but they are not on a regular basis due to the budget and time constraints, and they need more in-service training for effective service delivery. As for the new staff, sufficient training has not been given on CIP and CPTD. 35% of the farmer groups in the target divisions have received more than one technical support from either agricultural or livestock and fishery section. For diffusion of the project experience to other divisions, training has been given to the farmers on PCM/PRA, CAP, group management, some agricultural techniques. However these are through county's other programs, day-to-day extension services, etc. and not regularly conducted due to the budget constraints. The guidelines and manuals developed by the project have been utilized by officers at the district and locational levels.

In the financial aspect, the budget for agricultural development in Keiyo and Marakwet Districts has been the same since the project completion till 2013 (0.8 million Sh. for each district, every year). The budget allocation depends on each county's priority in County Integrated Development Plan. According to the county officer in Marakwet District, the budget for agricultural development is not sufficient to steer more activities, and sufficient transportation and budget have not been given to the extension workers. For CIP activities, most farmer groups have shared the necessary cost (50%) with each county.

From these findings, it is considered that there are some challenges in institutional, technical and financial aspects of the implementing agency; therefore, sustainability of the project is fair.

5 Summary of the Evaluation

The project has achieved the Project Purpose and Overall Goal. The target farmer groups increased the agricultural production through CIP and CPTD activities. Since the project completion, extension services of the project approach have been implemented and they have increased the production on average in both Keiyo and Marakwet, although diffusion of the project approach has not covered all divisions of Keiyo and Marakwet Districts. As for the project sustainability, the number of the extension workers and the budget have not been sufficient. Regarding the efficiency, both the project cost and period slightly exceeded the plan.

In light of above, the project is evaluated to be satisfactory.

III. Recommendations & Lessons Learned

Recommendations for Implementing agency:

For MoALF:

- It is recommended to secure more budget for personnel assignment and transport so that extension workers could provide technical support for the existing CIP and CPTD groups and deliver diffusion services of this project approach for the new groups and groups whose production is decreasing.

Lessons learned for JICA:

- In order to provide extension service more effectively and efficiently in situations that extension workers are insufficient, collaboration with multiple extension service providers needs to be considered in planning and implementation of the project so as to facilitate knowledge acquisition for farmers.



Dairy goats belonging to Kamogich Dairy Goat Breeders in Anin Village below the Tambach escarpments.



NERICA rice farm in Arror In Marakwet West Sub-County

agricultural development activities. DWG were responsible for approval of divisional and farmers' work plans/budget, supervision and coordination of farmers' activities, technical and managerial support to farmers, and making reports of farmers' activities. DIT had functions of technical advice to farmers, delivery of extension services, monitoring of farmers' activities, and support to communities in making action plans/budget.