

Royal Netherlands Embassy

Ministry of Land Reclamation,
Regional and Water Development

REVIEW OF THE ASAL PROGRAMMES

PART ONE

**LAIKIPIA DISTRICT
REPORT**

ETC East Africa, November, 1997

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

A. BACKGROUND

- 1 BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAMME**
 - 1.1 Overview of the District**
 - 1.2 History of the Programme**
 - 1.3 The 1993 Review and Recommendations**
- 2 INSTITUTIONAL SETTING**
 - 2.1 ASAL Laikipia**
 - 2.2 GoK / NGO / Private Sector Partners**
- 3 THE PRESENT PHASE**
 - 3.1 PlanOps and Annual Work Plans**
 - 3.2 Objectives and Strategies**
 - 3.3 programme Components and Target Groups**
- 4 REVIEW METHODOLOGY**
 - 4.1 The Sectoral Matrix**
 - 4.2 Household Survey**
 - 4.3 Participatory Rural Appraisal**
 - 4.4 SWOT Analysis**

B. RESULTS OF THE REVIEW

- 5 INSTITUTIONAL SETTING AND FUNCTIONING**
 - 5.1 Introduction**
 - 5.2 Placement of ASAL Programmes within the Ministry of Land Reclamation, Regional and Water Development (MLRRWD)**
 - 5.3 The District Focus Policy**

- 5.4 The programme Management Unit
- 5.6 Financial Management in the programme
- 5.7 District Decision Making
- 5.8 Government of Kenya Inputs
- 5.9 Low Input and High Input Strategy
- 5.10 Collaborating Partners
- 5.11 Target Groups

- 6 PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES
 - 6.1 Assessment of Objectives
 - 6.2 Assessment of Strategies
 - 6.3 Gender Aspects

- 7 MAJOR COMPONENTS AND ACTIVITIES
 - 7.1 Sector Balance
 - 7.2 Sector Results

- 8 MONITORING AND EVALUATION
 - 8.1 Introduction
 - 8.2 Historical Trends
 - 8.3 Elements of Monitoring and Evaluation
 - 8.4 M&E Systems

- 9 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

ANNEX

- Expenditure for 1994, 1995 and 1996

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

(one list is used for all the reports; for that matter, not all abbreviations will show in the separate reports)

AEZ	Agro Ecological Zone
AIC	African Inland Church
ALRMP	Arid Lands Resources Management Project
AMREF	African Medical and Research Foundation
ARU	Applied Research Unit
ASAL	Arid and Semi-Arid Lands
ASC	ASAL Steering Committee
ATC	Assistant Transect Area Co-ordinator
CAP	Community Action Plan
CBO	Community Based Organisation
CBS	Central Bureau for Statistics
CCF	Christian Children's Fund
CMC	Credit Management Committee
CMG	Credit Management Group
CMIP	Co-operative Management Improvement Programme
CMPP	Community Member Participation Programme
COPP	Community Oriented Project Planning
CSRP	Civil Service Reform Programme
DAC	Development Assistance Committee
DDC	District Development Committee
DDO	District Development Officer
DDP	District Development Plan
DEC	District Executive Committee
DEC	Drought Escaping Crops
DFRD(S)	District Focus for Rural Development (Strategy)
DGIS	Directorate General for International Co-operation
DIDC	District Information and Documentation Centre
DO	District Officer
DPU	District Planning Unit
E	East
ECF	East Coast Fever
EMI	Embu, Meru, Isiolo
FES	Field Extension Staff
FLS	Front Line Staff
GA	Gender Adviser
GACP	Gender and Co-operative Programme
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
CMC	Credit Management Committee
CMG	Credit Management Group
GoK	Government of Kenya
GoN	Government of the Netherlands
GSIME	Gender Sensitive Impact Monitoring and Evaluation
HoD	Head of Department
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
ILO	International Labour Organisation (UN)
IS	Implementation Scheme
ITDG	Intermediate Technology Development Group
KANU	Kenya African National Union
KCPE	Kenyan Certificate for Primary Education
KNFC	Kenya National Federation of Co-operatives
KVDA	Kerio Valley Development Authority
KWS	Kenya Wildlife Services
LDF	Laikipia Development Fund

LFA	Logical Framework Approach
LMC	Livestock Marketing Centre
LRP	Laikipia Research Programme
LRDP	Laikipia Rural Development Programme
LUP	Land Use Planning
LUPA	Land Use Planning Adviser
MDP	Marsabit Development Programme
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIDP	Machakos Integrated Development Project
MIS	Management Information System
MLRRWD	Ministry of Land Reclamation, Regional and Water Development
MRDASAW	Ministry of Reclamation and Development of Arid and Semi-Arid Areas and Wastelands
MoA	Ministry of Agriculture
MoALD	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development
N	North
NEP	National Extension programme
NGO	Non Governmental Organisation
NLG	Dutch Guilder
NPO	National programme Officer
NRM	Natural Resources Management
O&M	Operation and Maintenance
OPS	Office of Project Services (UNDP)
PA	programme Advisor
PAM	Project Administration Management
PAWS	Problem Analysis Workshops
PlanOps	Plan of Operations
PMC	Project Management Committee
PMU	Project Management Unit
PO	programme Officer
PPM	Project Planning Matrix
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
RCA	Reformed Church of Africa
RNE	Royal Netherlands Embassy
RRA	Rapid Rural Appraisal
S	South
SDC	Swiss Development Co-operation
SLO	Sector Liaison Officer
SMS	Subject Matter Specialist
SNV	Netherlands Development Organisation
STD	Sexually Transmitted Disease
SWOT	Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats
TA	Transect Area / Technical Assistance
TAA	Transect Area Approach
TAAP	Transect Area Action Plan
TAC	Transect Area Committee
TAM	Transect Area Meeting
TBA	Traditional Birth Attendant
TC	Transect Area Co-ordinator
TOR	Terms Of Reference
TOT	Trainer of Trainers
TPM	Transect Planning Meetings
TPS	Transect Planning Sheets
UN	United Nations
UNDP	United Nations Development programme
UNSO	UNDP Office to Combat Desertification and Drought
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
VI	NGO

W
WB
WID
YP

West
World Bank
Women in Development
Youth Polytechnic

A . BACKGROUND

1. BACKGROUND OF THE PROGRAMME

1.1 Overview of the District

Laikipia District lies east of the Rift Valley and forms part of the Rift Valley Province. It is located between longitudes 36 degrees 14 minutes and 37 degrees 27 minutes East, and between latitudes 0 degrees 17 minutes South and 0 degrees 45 minutes North. It covers an area of approximately 9,723 square kilometres. It borders Samburu District to the north, Nyeri District to the south, Isiolo District to the north east, Meru District to the south east, Nyandarua District to the south west and Baringo and Nakuru Districts to the west. It is located west of Mount Kenya and north of the Aberdare mountain range. Physiographically, the bulk of the district is a plateau lying at an altitude varying from 1600 metres to 2200 metres above the mean sea level.

Despite this altitude is the district comparatively dry, due to the rain shadow effect of the surrounding mountains. Most of the area receives 500 - 700 mm per annum, with decreasing amounts towards the centre and the northern boundary of the district. A small section on the western side receives more rainfall, the total reaching between 800 - 1000 mm.

In pre-colonial times, most of Laikipia was used by Maasai pastoralists. Under colonial rule they were forced outside the area in 1912, and confined to Mukogodo Division. The colonial era saw the district being transformed into large scale ranches. After independence, some of the ranches were transformed into settlement schemes to accommodate small scale farmers, either through Government Settlement Schemes, or through land buying co-operatives and companies. Small scale farming is a mode of land use new to the district, and its appearance within a former ranching area creates a complex spatial pattern of large and small scale land users. Since small scale farming was evolved in the wetter and, therefore, higher potential areas of origin of the immigrants, it encounters a series of problems, the most serious of which is insufficient and unreliable rainfall. Since small scale farming is practised by over 50% of the population, this mode of land use and the problems which beset it are of great importance for the district as a whole.

According to the 1989 population census, the total population of the district was 218,957 (more recent census data are not available; projections made for 1994 are at 279,000). With an estimated annual average growth rate of 4.6% (national average 3.4%) the current (1997) projected population is 313,770. The population comprises people from different ethnic groups. Illiteracy is high and school enrolment is low, especially among the pastoralists.

The major economic activities pursued by the population are agriculture, livestock, agroforestry, and trade and commerce. Small scale farming, especially crop farming, has been on the increase more than pastoralism which was the main activity of the people in the past. The number of small holders is increasing, while the holdings continue to diminish in size. Frequent droughts in the district have adversely affected both crop farming and livestock. Consequently, most of the small scale farmers and pastoralists have very low incomes and, hence, are categorised as poor.

1.2 History of the programme

From 1984 the Swiss Government, through the Swiss Development Co-operation (SDC), provided financial support to the Laikipia Rural Development programme (LRDP). However, SDC decided to phase out its financial support to LRDP in 1993. Subsequently, the Government of Kenya requested the Royal Netherlands Government

to take over financial support to the ASAL Development programme in Laikipia, to allow for its continuity.

The Netherlands supported ASAL Development programme, Laikipia District started actively towards the end of August 1993 after a brief inception phase. The information gathered and the experience gained during the period 1993 to 1994 was taken into account during the preparation of the Plan of Operations (PlanOps) for the current phase (1995 - 1999).

1.3 The 1993 Review and Recommendations

The 1993 ASAL Review recommendations for all the ASAL programmes were:

- The broad ASAL objectives were to be made operational in the individual districts and priority ranking of the objectives and / or sectors was required.
- The "bottom-up" approach to development has to be complemented by a "top-down" element.
- A more gender specific strategy and approach should be elaborated, with special reference to community participation.
- Institutional strengthening should be considered as one of the priority objectives of the ASAL programmes. Training needs assessment should be carried out and PMUs enlarged to increase their effectiveness.
- With regard to the productive sector and environment, a thorough analysis of development constraints and potentials should be conducted and long-term development strategies developed.

Although the 1993 Review did not include the Laikipia programme most of the review recommendations were taken into consideration by the programme in preparation of its PlanOps for the current phase (1995 - 1999). The programme accepted the philosophy of "high input" to allow for programme impact.

2. INSTITUTIONAL SETTING

2.1 ASAL Laikipia

The ASAL Development programme is implemented under the Ministry of Land Reclamation, Regional and Water Development (MLRRWD). Within the Ministry there is an ASAL department which co-ordinates all the ASAL programmes. From the donor side, the programme is funded by the Netherlands Minister for Development Co-operation, through the Directorate General for International Co-operation (DGIS).

At district level, the programme is represented in the District Development Committee (DDC) which is responsible for determining the development priorities of the district. The membership of the DDC comprises Heads of Government Departments, Parastatals and Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) working in the district, and elected leaders. The ASAL programme is a member of the District Executive Committee (DEC) and the District Planning Unit (DPU), which gives a planning input to the DDC decision making process. However, the programme remains as a normal Government department within the district organisational framework. Policy issues of the programme are deliberated by the programme Steering Committee whose membership represents all institutions involved in the implementation of the ASAL Development programme.

The programme Officer is in charge of the programme and is responsible for all its activities. He is assisted by an Assistant programme Officer in financial and administrative matters. The programme Adviser supports the programme Officer in all aspects of the programme implementation, while at the same time he is responsible for administration of the donor contribution. Occupying executive positions are the Gender Adviser and the Community Adviser. Other staff of the programme are as follows:

- Accounts section: one Head of Section with three other staff (one GoK staff).
- Audio-visual section; one contracted officer.
- Registry: one contracted officer.
- Transport section: twelve drivers (two GoK, rest contracted).
- Support staff: one copy typist/secretary (GoK), two messengers (contracted).

The programme Management Unit (PMU), which comprises the Programme Officer, the Programme Adviser, the Gender Adviser, the Community Adviser and the Assistant Programme Officer, is responsible for the programme operations.

To address research issues related to the productive sector, the Applied Research Unit (ARU) was created by the ASAL Development programme in 1994. For convenience ARU was initially located physically within the Swiss funded Laikipia Research programme (LRP). However, as LRP management deteriorated in its effectiveness, the ASAL programme withdrew the ARU from being under the general management of LRP and took over its management. Since that time in 1995, the ARU has been a direct subsidiary of the ASAL programme with limited autonomy. It has five technical staff members.

Quarterly progress reports are prepared and submitted to the Royal Netherlands Embassy, the ministry and the Chairman of the programme Steering Committee. Monthly financial statements are prepared and circulated to all implementing institutions. The programme has initiated a Gender Sensitive Impact Monitoring and Evaluation (GSIME) system.

2.2 GoK / NGO / Private Sector Partners

The ASAL development programme depends on the target group(s), Government departments and, where possible, on NGOs for implementation of projects. Although the number of NGOs in the district is small, it is foreseen, however, that they will play an increasingly important role in implementation of projects. Among the NGOs, the programme works with are the Catholic Church, the Pastoralist Integrated programme, and the Laikipia Wildlife Forum.

The programme works with two types of Community Based Organisations (CBOs): those which are partners, such as the Laikipia Bee-keeping Association, the Agro-forestry Seed Association, and those that are recipients, such as women groups.

Private sector partners, among others, include a large scale rancher contracted to manage a breeding herd of small stock. The credit system is also managed by a private contractor: the Laikipia Development Fund.

The programme makes extensive use of consultants, particularly for training and undertaking specific studies.

3 THE PRESENT PHASE

3.1 PlanOps and Annual Work Plans

The programme started with an Inception Phase in 1993 during which period the first preparations for the PlanOps for the programme from 1995-1999 took place. In the first instance, community level planning workshops were held throughout the district, with the assistance of a consultancy company. These Community Oriented Project Planning (COPP) workshops were followed by Problem Analysis Workshops (PAWS) where community representatives were also trained in project formulation. Through this process many proposals were generated at community level. Subsequently two district Strategy Workshops were held, with representatives from GOs, municipal and town councils, parastatals and NGOs.

The community and district level workshops led to expected outputs for the programme. More detailing followed by sectoral task forces. The programme used this as a basis for the development of the PlanOps, taking also into consideration what the programme could do. The programme has taken over a year to gradually develop the basis for the PlanOps. In addition, the findings of the 1993 ASAL Review have motivated certain choices in the PlanOps.

Annual work plans are presented to the donor at the end of each year for the following year. The programme uses the Logical Framework as a planning tool for the development of the annual plans. However, it considers as a major drawback of the Logical Framework the abstract level of thinking and has, therefore, adapted it. The programme uses five planning modules:

- *Bottom-up planning:* preparation of project proposals by communities. Annually financing takes place through non-commissioned funds.
- *Top-down Planning:* e.g. environmental issues, policy issues, training and matters concerning physical infrastructure. Proposals developed by line-Ministries or NGOs.
- *Internal Planning:* proposals submitted by various development agencies (GO, NGO). Annual work plans and budgets are made by the implementing agencies.
- *Economic Empowerment:* a separately managed and administered credit fund. Annual work plans and budgets are made by the Laikipia Development Fund.
- *Micro-Project Fund:* a small fund for direct disbursement of funds to small, already ongoing, development initiatives within the communities. Specific activities are not identified in advance, a lumpsum is reserved for this.

3.2 Objectives and Strategies

During the inception phase a range of expected outputs were identified as a result of the various workshops. The programme has translated these outputs to immediate objectives. Overall and medium-term objectives were not formulated. In the 1997 Annual Work Plan, objectives have been reformulated, taking into account changes in the programme (some immediate objectives have been removed). Below the original and reformulated objectives are summarised.

- reformulation of the policy and approach to adult education;
- improvement of quality of education;
- school inspection improved;
- school enrolment, especially for girls promoted•

Ngarua and Rumuruti Divisions (Zone 3)

- **Productive sector:**

- existing agriculture system improved through increased diversification of crops and fodder production;
- livestock production intensified;
- organic farming promoted;
- labour constraints alleviated;
- marketing of produce improved;
- agroforestry as part of the farming system promoted;
- local manufacture of farm tool promoted;
- small scale agri-business introduced;
- co-operative movement supported;
- fish production assisted;
- provide access to financial resources;

- **Service sector:**

- sustainable water development;
- primary health care in the area contributed to;
- traditional herbalism promoted;
- appropriate technology for low cost construction of buildings introduced•

- **Social Sector:**

- existing initiatives for the disabled supported;
- reformulation of the policy on polytechnics;
- improvement of quality of education;
- school inspection improved•

- **Immediate Objectives Relevant to the Whole District**

- institutional strengthening of development agencies within the district;
- planning and co-ordinating capacity of district improved;
- monitoring at all levels strengthened;
- mobilisation and training of communities for self-reliance;
- dialogue on the overall development strategy facilitated (district);
- studies facilitated to strengthen the information base for planning and development;
- support to applied research;
- co-financing provided through attracting NGOs;
- increased awareness among communities on environmental issues;
- gender sensitiveness of all project activities•

REFORMULATED IMMEDIATE OBJECTIVES (summarised)

- **Productive Sector:**

- sustainable agriculture promoted;
- livestock production improved, emphasis on small stock;
- integrated small holder farming developed and promoted;
- labour constraints alleviated;
- rationalisation of small scale irrigation;
- marketing of produce improved;
- small scale individual water harvesting projects promoted;
- agroforestry as part of the farming system promoted;
- local manufacture of farm tool promoted;

- small scale agri-business introduced;
- co-operative movement supported;
- fish production assisted;
- provide access to financial resources;
- wildlife farming introduced•
- livestock production improved;
- delivery of animal health care improved;
- range improvement and the use of agroforestry introduced;
- tanning of hides and skins introduced•
- **Service Sector:**
 - sustainable water development;
 - primary health care in the area contributed to;
 - improvement of the road system;
 - appropriate technology for low cost construction of buildings introduced•
- **Social Sector:**
 - quality of education improved;
 - school inspection improved;
 - school enrolment, especially for girls, promoted•
- **Immediate Objectives Relevant to the Whole District**
 - institutional strengthening of development agencies within the district;
 - planning and co-ordinating capacity of district improved;
 - monitoring at all levels strengthened;
 - mobilisation and training of communities for self-reliance;
 - dialogue on the overall development strategy facilitated (district);
 - studies facilitated to strengthen the information base for planning and development;
 - support to applied research;
 - co-financing provided through attracting NGOs;
 - increased awareness among communities on environmental issues;
 - gender sensitiveness of all project activities;
 - increased project activities carried out through CBOs•

3.3 programme Components and Target Groups

The programme components are directly linked to the above mentioned immediate objectives, with as main components: Productive Sector, Service Sector, Social Sector and Institutional Strengthening/Capacity Building. Within these sectors the programme supports a wide variety of activities.

The main economic activity for Laikipia district is livestock and small scale farming. Small scale farmers and pastoralists form the target group of the programme. The programme roughly targets the poorer sections of the population in Laikipia District. The programme has not specifically selected target groups through an elaborate target group analysis.

Existing non-formal local level groups (including all kinds of associations) and existing formal local level groups and district level organisations are also targeted through the programme.

4 REVIEW METHODOLOGY

The approach adopted for this ASAL review comprised a combination of methods: activity matrix, household surveys, participatory rural appraisals (PRAs), and a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis. The data generated through each method was supposed to compliment each other and allow cross-checking of information. In addition, a review of the existing information was carried out (see also Annex II, Part Three).

4.1 The Sectoral Matrix

The purpose of using sectoral matrices was to get an idea of the project outputs and effects by involvement of all participating line ministries / departments. Each of the participating sectors was supposed to provide self-assessments on the basis of their own experiences. It was assumed that the programme management team would check the outcome of the matrices. However, this did not proceed as originally anticipated. Consequently, the Review Mission had to obtain the performance matrix information from the programme management and annual reports. The information collected consisted of the projects implemented per sector, project costs, targets set, and the achievements. From this information, the project expenditures as a percentage of the total ASAL programme budget were calculated, target achievements were assessed and the relevance and impact of the project was evaluated qualitatively.

4.2 Household Survey

Household surveys were used as part of the ASAL evaluation in order to obtain quantitative data. A questionnaire was designed to help determine impact as specified in the Terms of Reference. Questionnaires for each district were a little different to capture the unique nature which characterises each district and also measure the range of ASAL activities. Questionnaires were pre-tested in each district in order to reduce error. Enumerators were chosen for each district.

Households, where the questionnaires were administered, were chosen at random. In Laikipia, random sampling was done where possible, using a systematic numbering method of households. To help gauge the impact of ASAL programmes, households were chosen on basis of intervention versus non-intervention by programme activities. In Laikipia, the sample was split into high-intervention versus low-intervention areas. The areas for sampling were chosen by the programme, based on its knowledge of activity levels in the various project areas. In certain cases an area was chosen for analysis based on a special request by the programme.

For ASAL Laikipia, questionnaires were pre-tested from 9 - 11 June 1997 and the systematic household survey was carried out during the period 16 - 28 June 1997. The high-intervention areas covered were: Salama Location (19 HHS), Makurian (24 HHS), Ngobit Location (7 HHS), Sirima (7 HHS) and Wiumererie (9 HHS). The low-intervention areas included Ewaso Location (20 HHS), Sipili Location (19 HHS), Wamula and Exerok Sub-locations (21 HHS).

4.3 Participatory Rural Appraisal

Participatory Rural Appraisal was designed to provide information to complement data gathered through other methods, particularly the household surveys.

With the focus being on the processes necessary for community participation, information was sought at policy, operation strategy and implementation levels to determine the extent to which community members were targeted and reached by programme interventions. The methodology used involved review of operation documents and discussions with PMU, discussion with implementing agencies, and field visits to project and non-project areas.

ASAL activities in Laikipia are spread throughout the district. Therefore projects to be visited were sampled from all the divisions. Based on a prepared check list the PRA exercise involved discussions with members of the PMU, various departmental heads, a member of the OSILIGI community organisation and a staff member of the Laikipia Development Fund. Efforts were made to meet and discuss with divisional teams in three of the divisions visited, in an endeavour to gauge their perspective of community participation and their procedures in achieving it.

At community level, the mission sought discussions with project leaders, usually members of the project committee, and visited a few project members in their homes. The homes were chosen at random, just for informal discussion guided by a checklist. Field visits covered four water projects in various divisions, two women group projects and two pig keeping projects. Discussions were held with the family members found at home, be it the male household head, the wife or other family members, as long as he or she had the necessary information.

The PRA exercise ended with a feedback session where findings were presented and discussed.

4.4 SWOT Analysis

Participatory workshops were organised where the SWOT analysis was carried out in order to elaborate on institutional issues (organisational, financial, human resources, administration, et cetera) that affects the programme. For Laikipia, the workshop was attended by members of the PMU, Heads of Department, CBOs, the KWS and farmers. The results of the SWOT analysis, plus those of the PRA and discussions with ASAL management, formed the basis for observations and conclusions on institutional setting of the ASAL programme.

B. RESULTS OF THE REVIEW

5 INSTITUTIONAL SETTING AND FUNCTIONING

5.1 Introduction

The Review team conducted a SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities and Threats) analysis of various institutional concepts as indicated by the Terms of Reference. The SWOT sessions were attended by Heads of Department, members of the programme Management Unit, and a few farmers. The Kenya Wildlife Service was also represented. The results of the SWOT analysis, plus those of the PRA and discussions with the ASAL management, form the basis for observations and conclusions made in this chapter.

5.2 Placement of ASAL Programmes within the Ministry of Land Reclamation, Regional and Water Development (MLRRWD)

The strengths of placing the ASAL programme in the Ministry of Land Reclamation, Regional and Water Development (MLRRWD) are that the Ministry provides the overall policy framework that justifies the existence and the programme's operations. At the district level, the programme works within the government structure which is well understood. Government departments accept and understand the programme well.

The weakness of this placement is that there is little understanding of the overall ASAL programme concept at the ministry headquarters, little support and feedback and lack of institutional memory. The Department of Land Reclamation has a weak capacity to co-ordinate ASAL programmes in the country and has no capacity for policy Review and Development. This situation arose due to loss of grip of staff handling ASAL matters during the transition from the former Ministry of Reclamation of Arid, Semi-Arid areas and Wastelands (MRASW). As a sector ministry, the MLRRWD gives high priority to water activities while ignoring, to a large extent, the complexity of development in marginal lands. Environmental issues and land use matters are critical and need to be addressed within its fragile ecology. This ministry is not well-placed to handle these matters.

The dialogue between the ministry and the donor has been constrained due to the fact that there are limited discussion partners available within the Ministry. One of the threats is that there may arise a conflict of approaches between the donor and the government, due to policy changes from either of the partners.

There was consensus among the participants of the SWOT, that the ASAL programme is technically placed in the wrong ministry.

5.3 The District Focus Policy

The District Focus for Rural Development policy has local relevance and, therefore, provided a framework for the programme to function sufficiently. Further, it was concluded that the District Focus has political support and enjoys some good will. In principle, it enables sensitisation of communities on bottom up approaches, enhancing local participation and improved planning.

However, the District Focus strategy is afflicted with many problems. The planning capacity of the district at all levels is low. There is inadequate management skills among some communities. Communities have no control over the system because in many parts of the district community priorities are influenced by the local administration. Projects generated through this process are biased towards the social sector. The

District Focus Strategy has insufficient back-up support from the headquarters in terms of resource allocation to enable the district to carry out its obligations.

The District Planning Unit (DPU), whose mandate includes serving as a secretariat to the District Executive Committee for day-to-day co-ordination of planning, implementation of projects and monitoring, has also been a weak element in the implementation of the DF.

ASAL Laikipia strengthened the DF by providing resources to facilitate better bottom-up planning, mobilisation of local resources, and by involving communities and other actors in planning, in order to come up with proper prioritisation of community needs. However, the feedback system from the District Development Committee to the beneficiaries through the established DDC channels, remains insufficient.

5.4 The Programme Management Unit

The SWOT analysis dealt with the issue of whether the set up of the PMU was suitable for co-ordination and supervision of a multi-partner and multi-sectoral programme. It was noted that in terms of management, both the Netherlands and Kenya Governments are represented in the PMU by the Programme Adviser and Programme Officer respectively. The PMU works as a multi-disciplinary team to screen project proposals, and facilitates monitoring and evaluation of projects. It was noted that the PMU was transparent in terms of allocation and management of funds. In decision-making the unit was said to be faster than the government decision making process. Facilitation of smooth implementation of community projects was observed as a strength of the unit.

The weaknesses of the PMU were identified as:

- It has few staff handling many departments resulting in heavy workload.
- Delays in providing feedback on decision making to stakeholders.
- It has no mandate to resolve inter-institutional conflicts.

The options for improving the PMU are an internal reorganisation, and to simplify the management and reporting system. Presently, the dual management systems and the approval and reporting procedures to the donor and ministry, require too much time. Privatising the ASAL programme through contract management is favoured by the district. Contractual arrangements for specific works can be made with government departments that are able to fulfil the agreed obligations, NGOs, CBOs and the private sector. With this arrangement, the PMU should be able to reflect adequately the wishes of the various client groups it represents.

For more specific recommendations in this respect, reference is made to Part Two.

5.5 Applied Research Unit (ARU)

As mentioned in § 2.1, the Applied Research Unit (ARU) was created by the ASAL development programme in 1994 due to the realisation that there were research needs of the productive sector (agriculture, livestock and forestry) in ASAL Laikipia. Since then, ARU has been conducting applied research aimed at:

- Providing viable alternatives to smallholder maize / beans / potatoes production systems, through the introduction and promotion of drought escaping crops.
- Availing clean planting materials of prioritised drought escaping crops, through multiplication / bulking of seeds on-farm and on-station.

- Improving the performance of farming systems, especially in agro-ecological zones II - IV through diversification by introducing high value fruit trees and sensitising farmers on utilisation options.
- Introducing alternative fodder sources to supplement feed resources, especially in rainfall deficit areas.
- Disseminating appropriate technologies through demonstrations and provision of literature materials.
- Increasing the knowledge base of ASAL Laikipia through studies (e.g. vegetation), and characterisation of the farming systems.

ARU prepares annual Work Plans taking into account issues that have been noticed in the field. Initially, the activities implemented by ARU were sectoral in nature. However, with the realisation of the need to integrate the activities of the various sectors involved in the productive sectors, ARU embarked on joint participatory planning workshops with all stakeholders (farmers, researchers and extension staff) in preparation of its annual Work Plans.

ARU, in collaboration with extensionists and farmers, is promoting some promising oil crops, leguminous grains, Irish potatoes and root crops. It is also playing a significant role in the investigation and testing of possible options with the farmers, and promotion of the same, jointly with the department of agriculture. ARU's activities have promoted greater awareness among farmers which has enabled them to make informed choices about the technologies to adopt.

The ASAL programme has been successful in setting up an Applied Research Unit, to provide inhabitants of the district with alternative options for farming and livestock keeping. ARU has fulfilled the research needs in the productive sector, developed alternative options and created greater awareness of these alternatives. The fact that the present LRP and the Department of Agriculture could not fulfil the district needs for alternative options that were urgently needed.

5.6 Financial Management in the Programme

The financial procedures of the programme are outlined in the PlanOps for the year 1995 - 1999. The programme disburses funds directly, which provides advantages such as flexibility, direct control, and fast action. It has also disadvantages such as the need for a control mechanism within the programme and an extensive book-keeping system.

The programme runs the PAM (Project Administration Management) computer software, as introduced by DGIS. It is a bookkeeping system based on the Dutch budget code system and is not compatible with the Kenyan system. For that matter, the financial information is difficult to translate to the GoK. While the bookkeeping system is Dutch, the financial control mechanism is with the implementors, predominantly the line departments, thus the GoK.

That the PO and the PA, are both co-signatory to the ASAL programme payments, provides the solid principle of joint responsibility. However, the PO is the sole signatory to GoK funds leaving the PA with little insight in this. The double chain of command where ASAL funds are concerned in preparation and final payments, can easily lead to conflict situations. A PA cannot always refuse to co-sign even if the validity of a payment is doubtful.

Formally, the ASAL programme depends for the financial control on the GoK structure and history teaches that this control system is not always watertight and cannot always avoid misappropriation of funds. Avoidance of major financial conflicts is only possible if the PA is involved in each and every detail of the programme. Such intimate

knowledge of all the details of the programme provides the additional control mechanism required.

The latter is too much of an informal condition for a programme of this magnitude and importance.

Likewise for the PMU, either the set-up of the programme needs reconsideration or the system of the financial needs an overhaul. This renewal should also make it more appropriate for M&E which is not the case at the moment since the Dutch budget code system aggregates types of costs incurred under different activities.

5.7 District Decision Making

The programme is a member of all the decision making fora in the district i.e. the DDC, the DEC and the DPU, which form the District Focus for Rural Development strategy. However, the day-to-day decision making as far as the programme related matters are concerned, is the task of the PMU. The ASAL Steering Committee meets half-yearly to discuss Work Plans. At the initial stages of the programme, the Steering Committee discussed policy issues and strategies of the programme. Now, the Steering Committee in particular focuses on monitoring progress and assessment of the annual Work Plans. Issues pertaining to the partners, e.g. allowances and transport, are also discussed.

The programme has played a facilitating role in planning and decision making of community initiatives. Project beneficiaries have generated project proposals for support by the programme, in particular through the initial community planning workshops. Projects that are proposed by communities, are referred to the relevant agency for further scrutiny and comments. The major decisions are taken by the PMU and the PU. Appropriation of ASAL funds is transparent, thereby assuring accountability.

The programme enhances dialogue, co-ordination and co-operation in particular in relation to programme activities. Moreover, the programme also stimulates further co-ordination through the DDC.

5.8 Government of Kenya Inputs

For Laikipia District, the presence of donor funds has reduced government funding of various interventions. Available information indicate that government provided development funds amounted to K£ 58,168 in 1986 / 87. Over the last three to four years, the development budget has certainly decreased (exact figures are not available). However, it is not clear to what magnitude this is related to the presence of the ASAL programme.

In order to ensure government commitment to ASAL programme, there should be a conditionality for matching funds. This would enable government to be much more concerned with the programme due to the stake it holds in it. This will ensure enhanced institutional sustainability.

5.9 Low Input and High Input Strategy

The programme, at its inception, considered the "low input" and "high input" philosophy discussed by the 1993 ASAL Review. The programme opted for a higher input philosophy to allow for programme impact. The programme's high budget of NLG. 19.9 million for the period 1995 - 1999, has enabled it to be more flexible in its implementation style for choice of partners. It has, thus, been able to support ARU,

commission certain studies to LRP, to support the LDF, and to sub-contract consultancies to undertake some tasks.

Such flexibility allows for room for experimentation, for instance taking on large projects such as hay making and feed production.

Impact is likely to be felt in the credit empowerment project where a lot of resources have been disbursed as loans to the people. The water and education sectors also have a high input and the impact is high.

5.10 Collaborating Partners

One of the characteristics of the programme is that it chooses its partners on the basis of their capacity and performance. The ASAL programme has worked with various organisations, thus increasing the implementation capacity of the district. Government departments, though, are still the key agents through which most of the interventions were channelled. The other partners are local institutions, the private sector, and consulting firms. NGOs have only played a relatively small role in programme implementation.

The programme has used the skills and expertise within the government to plan and execute projects, particularly in the productive sector, infrastructure and social sectors. Those departments with limited capacity and those delivering poor quality work, have been discontinued as implementation partners.

The perception is often still that programme activities must be implemented through government departments, while it is clear that implementation is constrained by their capacity, as well as by government rules and regulations. At the district level, the participants of the SWOT supported privatisation of ASAL implementation through contracting agencies or individuals.

In Laikipia District there are only a few NGOs, with limited capacity. Most of the NGOs are church-based. The programme does not have very positive experiences with NGOs. There have been instances where NGOs duplicate projects, as they were reluctant to plan together with other stakeholders.

The programme works with CBOs at two levels: as recipient and as implementing agency. In both cases the CBOs are strengthened through their collaboration with the programme. In some instances the programme has created CBOs, e.g. the Laikipia Beekeeping Association. OSILIGI is a lobby group in Mukogodo, and implements a number of projects on behalf of the programme. Quite a number of self-help groups are registered as CBOs. The programme supports them to strengthen their capacity through training and follow-up.

ASAL Laikipia has collaborated with several consulting firms and individual consultants. Two of the larger assignments were the implementation of the economic empowerment project, providing credit to groups, and the community planning activities.

The programme has positive experiences with consultants. The relationship is straightforward, which is less the case with NGOs who usually have their own agenda and approach. The programme uses consultants for evaluations and in cases where there is no local capacity available.

5.11 Target Groups

The main economic activity for Laikipia District is livestock and small scale farming. Small scale farmers and pastoralists form the target group of the programme. The programme has not specifically selected target groups through an elaborate target group analysis. At the start of the programme a wealth analysis was done, which showed that within areas there were more wealth differences than between areas. The programme targets specific groups through the type of activities which it finances. Large farms and livestock ranching are not directly covered by this programme.

The social, economic and environmental changes may result in the need to address other groups, such as the youth. However, the programme feels that they are not in a position to address all groups, and in general those who fail, leave the district.

6 PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND STRATEGIES

6.1 Assessment of Objectives

Programme objectives

The programme has, during the inception phase, through workshops at different levels, facilitated a process of participatory problem analysis and identification of activities. During this phase, objectives of the first phase of the programme were set. As a result, numerous immediate objectives (some of them confused with activities) have been identified, with no links to higher level objectives such as medium-term or overall objectives. The programme considered overall objectives too vague to provide a practical framework for the programme. Reference is only made to the National level, overall objective of ASAL Programmes, although not clearly spelled out. These immediate objectives are formulated almost at project activity level, although they sometimes relate to groups of project activities (e.g. promotion of sustainable agriculture).

The mission feels that there is a need to group these numerous immediate objectives and has, therefore, tentatively formulated "medium term objectives" to serve as a basis for grouping the immediate objectives.

This has been done with feedback from the programme. The purpose of grouping these objectives is two-fold:

- it will be difficult to assess for each individual immediate objective whether they have been successfully translated into activities and whether the strategies applied to achieve these objectives are relevant;
- only by grouping the objectives does it become clearer what the focus of the programme is and whether there are certain activities which are less relevant within the focus of the programme.

ASAL Laikipia has identified three zones of attention in the district and grouped objectives according to these zones. This has added to the number of objectives, including considerable overlap. This differentiation could also take place at activity level, whereby the activities to be carried out in order to achieve the objectives can be varied to suit the ecological and socio-economic conditions prevailing in the respective zones.

A tentative overall objective for the programme could be: "To improve the living standards of smallholder farmers and pastoralists in the ASAL zones of Laikipia District, through increased income by development and exploitation of available resources sustainably." This would already assist the programme in focusing on natural resources and the productive sector.

Grouping of Immediate Objectives and Strategies

The medium-term objectives, which serve a group of headings here, are tentative formulations. Please note that the immediate objectives are summarised.

To promote and develop sustainable production systems including livestock, agriculture, agroforestry and wildlife, through promotion of sustainable technologies, diversification and intensification.

Strategies which have been applied to operationalise these objectives are:

- *land use planning*, to identify within the district major “ecological” zones where different types of activities will take place to achieve this objective (e.g. pastoralist areas, small scale agricultural production areas);
- *innovation in the productive sector*, to develop and identify new opportunities, in particular with regard to the farming systems.

The original “immediate objectives” which can be grouped under this medium term objective are:

- sustainable agriculture promoted;
- livestock production improved, emphasis on small stock;
- integrated small holder farming developed and promoted;
- labour constraints alleviated;
- small scale individual water harvesting projects promoted;
- agroforestry as part of the farming system promoted;
- fish production assisted;
- wildlife farming introduced.
- livestock production improved;
- delivery of animal health care improved;
- range improvement and the use of agroforestry introduced;
- support to applied research;
- increased awareness among communities on environmental issues.

To promote commercialisation and utilisation of agricultural and livestock produce through improved processing and marketing.

Strategies which have been applied to operationalise these objectives are:

- *innovation in the productive sector*, developing and identifying new opportunities, in particular with regard to the storage and processing of agricultural and livestock produce;
- *economic empowerment*, providing opportunities for financing through either cost sharing or credit facilities.

The original “immediate objectives” which can be grouped under this medium term objective are:

- marketing of produce improved;
- small scale agri-business introduced;
- co-operative movement supported;
- tanning of hides and skins introduced;
- improvement of the road system.

Comment: the improvement of the road system should, in this case, be directly related to improvement of the marketing system.

To stimulate economic empowerment of the community through income generating activities and access to credit facilities.

Strategies which have been applied to operationalise these objectives are:

- *economic empowerment*, providing opportunities for financing through either cost sharing or credit facilities.

The original “immediate objectives” which can be grouped under this medium term objective are:

- local manufacture of farm tools promoted;
- small scale agri-business introduced;
- co-operative movement supported;
- provide access to financial resources;

Comment: here, for example, the first objective fits but seems selected somewhat randomly, unless a great potential for local manufacture of farm tools exists.

To improve basic living standards of the target population through increased availability of water and health services and increased participation in education.

Strategies which have been applied to operationalise these objectives are:

- *capacity building*, at community and individual level to manage and effectively make use of these services;
- *community participation*, to identify and prioritise the most urgent needs.

The original “immediate objectives” which can be grouped under this medium term objective are:

- sustainable water development;
- primary health care in the area contributed to;
- appropriate technology for low cost construction of buildings introduced;
- quality of education improved;
- school inspection improved;
- school enrolment, especially for girls, promoted.

Comment: appropriate technology for low cost construction of buildings is of course related to improved living conditions, however the programme could focus in this respect on water, health and education rather than spreading itself too thinly.

To support institutional strengthening at district level with emphasis on planning, co-ordination, monitoring and improvement of the information base.

Strategies which have been applied to operationalise these objectives are:

- *capacity building*, to strengthen the relevant institutions at district level.

The original “immediate objectives” which can be grouped under this medium term objective are:

- institutional strengthening of development agencies within the district;
- planning and co-ordinating capacity of district improved;
- monitoring at all levels strengthened;
- dialogue on the overall development strategy facilitated (district);
- studies facilitated to strengthen the information base for planning and development;
- co-financing provided through attracting NGOs;

Comment: for this set of immediate objectives, the programme could focus its activities by specifying the type of agencies that will be supported, e.g. agencies facilitating/supporting development of the productive sector.

To support increased capacity of CBOs to plan, implement and monitor their own development priorities.

Strategies which have been applied to operationalise these objectives are:

- *community participation*, to encourage CBOs and informal groups to take on responsibilities to plan, implement and monitor;
- *capacity building*, to ensure that these CBOs and informal groups have the capacity to plan, implement and monitor.

The original “immediate objectives” which can be grouped under this medium term objective are:

- mobilisation and training of communities for self-reliance;
- increased project activities carried out through CBOs.

To promote gender awareness and gender sensitivity in planning, implementation and monitoring of development activities.

Strategies which have been applied to operationalise these objectives are:

- *gender*, to promote gender awareness and sensitivity;
- *capacity building*, to develop capacities to promote gender awareness and sensitivity.

The original “immediate objectives” which can be grouped under this medium term objective are:

- gender sensitiveness of all project activities.

Comment: gender is also an overall strategy of the programme. It could therefore be incorporated as such, rather than as an objective in itself.

Conclusions

During the programme’s Inception Phase, many immediate objectives have emerged through community and district level workshops. The danger of this identification process and this level of objective setting, is that each activity in itself may seem relevant, and can be translated into an immediate objective. Focusing the programme, or “narrowing down”, now depends on the success and achievements of different activities rather than relevance and specific programme choices. The programme could experiment more efficiently if it did not formulate so broadly, experiment and subsequently omit unnecessary ballast (e.g. activities which ultimately do not really fit into the programme), but rather make some choices in the beginning. For example, earlier objectives such as reformulation of Polytechnics, rehabilitation of street children and support to handicapped, could have been omitted in the first instance.

The programme has made choices but has not always made these choices explicit. The programme should, therefore, formulate higher level objectives to ensure that at that

moment already a focus is decided upon and thus choices are more clearly made, why certain activities will take place and others not.

6.2 Assessment of Strategies

Community Participation

Community participation has been facilitated, in particular, by providing the opportunity for communities and groups in the district to prepare their own project proposals and submit these for financing (Planning / Financing Module 1). The programme operationalised this through the District Focus strategy, thus using a system in principle already aiming at facilitating community participation. The strategy has its shortcomings but in effect, the programme has managed to work with the various actors to ensure effectiveness at community level.

District wide Community Oriented Project Planning (COPP) workshops took place during the inception phase at locational level (24 locations), and were facilitated by consultants in collaboration with the Community Development Advisor. The first round of two-day workshops was on problem analysis, the second round, also two-days, was on project planning. Participants were community leaders among them local administrators, church leaders, prominent community members and local extension staff, chosen from the whole location, 35-45 participants. Subsequently, participants expected to facilitate the identification of problems and formulation of proposals from their respective communities. A proposal format was developed and availed to them through the ASAL programme.

The completed proposals were submitted to the sub-locational development committee so that they can be vetted by the various committees in the DF system until approved (or disapproved) and financed. The approach has led to the generation of more than 450 proposals to date, some of which have been implemented and completed, others are on-going and most are in a "project bank" in the district.

Advantages of this approach are:

- It provided ample opportunity for the re-appraisal, formulation, financing and implementation of top-priority community projects that had been constrained in scope or by shortage of funds.
- Community organisations are mostly in groups, co-operative societies and associations. Their linkages with the sub-locational development committee and with relevant supporting agencies were strengthened. Over time, their awareness of the services of these committees and agencies is growing as they try to pass their proposals through the system and to follow them up.

Some of the issues arising from this approach are:

- There is still a danger that the process is dominated by local leaders. Procedures for general public participation in decision making are not very explicit. However, this risk decreases as awareness increases and more capacity building at community level takes place.
- Communities generally propose projects with short-term benefits and effects at household level. Projects with longer-term, usually indirect household benefits, are sidelined. Environmental and natural resource management, extension and training needs were thus generally left out at community level. The programme has taken this into account by developing other planning modules (explained below) and not only depending on the community proposals.

Land Use Planning / Environment

During the evaluation of the ASAL programmes in 1993, it was concluded that land use planning (or rather resource management) should receive more priority in these areas and that the programmes should actively start developing methods for land (resource) use planning. The full mission report on LUP in the four ASAL districts, including Laikipia is annexed in Part Three (Annex III). A summary and some additional comments will be given here.

The Laikipia ASAL programme has made resource management the central approach of the programme right from the start in 1993:

- a zonation of the district was introduced, allowing development of planning strategies for the different zones;
- a scenario study was conducted in 1994 for the smallholder sector indicating different strategies for the identified farming systems;
- the Applied Research Unit (ARU) was established to test and monitor several introduced technologies in the different zones of the district;
- a district forum on land use planning was planned (however not yet established) to bring the land use issues at the (district) policy level.

The ARU is instrumental as an interface between research and extension. Quite a wide range of technologies have been introduced through on-farm trials. The initial scenario study gave the framework for strategies for the development of farming systems in the smallholder sector. The study indicated possible interventions for the different farming systems. The programme should now review the on-farm experiences in relation to the scenarios. The district is confronted with a few land use policy issues which need to be addressed at national level, such as subdivision of former private ranches into non-viable units, agriculture in unsuitable areas (zones V and VI), and the livestock economy in Mukogodo Division which is undergoing serious soil and pasture degradation.

The programme has focused on technological analysis and solutions of resource use problems. Negotiation and discussions with stakeholders are attempted at the district level. This takes place less at "local" level. Likewise, methodology development of land use planning at local level has been limited.

Capacity Building

Capacity building at community level has taken place through the COPP and PAWS, by training of communities and assisting them in preparing their own proposals, implementing these and monitoring these. In addition, the co-operatives department has adopted a training programme to enhance the Community Member Participation Programme (CMPP), the Co-operative Management Improvement Programme (CMIP), the Gender and Co-operative Programme (GACP), as a means of community capacity building and organisation for additional society enterprises. This approach, borrowing from OOPP procedures, was developed by the Kenya National Federation of Co-operatives (KNFC). District level co-operative officers were trained on the process and they in turn trained and facilitated the implementation of the process at society level. The department only deals with community members who are registered in societies, currently numbering an estimated 10,500 members in 86 registered societies. Through this system, many societies have initiated secondary activities in addition to the main activity, usually marketing.

The programme has given ample financial and technical support to and through the DPU, to improve the divisional and locational level planning. This included training of

Chiefs, divisional and location development committees. At district level, strengthening the planning capacity and co-ordination of development activities within the district is of major concern.

Innovation in the Productive Sector

Innovations in the productive sector were identified as crucial for the district. Resource management and use changes, have led to a situation where alternative crops and husbandry practices are urgently required in the agricultural sector. In the livestock sector, urgent changes are also required. Diversification and intensification of farming and livestock systems are essential.

The programme focuses on the productive sector, and aims at providing alternative options to improve the productivity and sustainability of productive sector activities such as agriculture, livestock and agroforestry.

ARU has been specifically set-up to fulfil this need. Farmers are closely involved in identification and experimentation.

Economic Empowerment

Economic empowerment is considered essential to avoid a dependency syndrome and to provide project beneficiaries with the means to economically participate in developments. Several levels of financing are provided, depending on individual or community benefits and uncertainty of success of activities (e.g. when agricultural innovations are still in an experimental phase). Two modes of financing are applied:

- cost sharing, whereby the programme provides part of the financing. Cost sharing with individual farmers and groups takes place in the productive sector. This is in particular for activities which are still innovative / experimental;
- provision of credit facilities, whereby the beneficiary bears the full costs but is assisted through credit facilities.

Module 4 is specifically developed for the latter.

The programme in general only provides a contribution to capital investments after it is assured that a project can be sustained by the community, a group or other institutions.

Gender

Gender is considered a major strategy affecting all project activities. It has been discussed separately in § 6.3

Planning / Financing Modules

The above strategies have been translated into five Planning / Financing Modules. The programme has developed these planning / financing modules to ensure that project activities can be generated at several levels and that bottom-up as well as top-down planning find a place in the programme. The Modules and their relevance are described briefly here:

Module 1: Bottom-up Planning

Communities are encouraged to prepare their own project proposals and have been assisted to do so through the Community Oriented Project Planning and Problem Analysis Workshops. These proposals are submitted via the Location and Divisional Development Committees to the DPU. They are forwarded for approval by the DEC and finally for final approval by the DDC. Financing is not only sought through the ASAL programme but also through other sources.

Annually financing takes place through non-commissioned funds.

Module 2: Top-down Planning

This is in particular in relation to larger scale, longer term issues which can not always be overseen by communities only, in particular environmental issues, policy issues, training and matters concerning physical infrastructure. Proposals are developed by line ministries or NGOs, and are submitted to the DPU to follow the same procedure.

Annual Work Plans and budgets are made.

Module 3: Internal Planning

Development agencies (GO, NGO) can submit project proposals with regard to, either internal strengthening, or to projects which create awareness amongst communities and expose and train them to adopt innovations, new techniques, et cetera. Exposure of communities to new techniques and innovation will lead them to come up with new project proposals via the first planning module. The proposals are directly agreed upon between the programme and the development agencies concerned.

Annual Work Plans and budgets are made by the implementing agencies.

Module 4: Economic Empowerment

This module comprises all initiatives and projects which are directly income generating, either proposed by groups or by individuals. Economic empowerment is based on a number of small revolving funds which will target the development of various main categories of income generating activities, but each fund is a separate entity. Each small fund is directed to a particular purpose and target group and is meant to follow-up through the internal planning module. This planning module requires its own organisation to manage and administer. Therefore, a consultancy company has been requested to implement this. Annual Work Plans and budgets are made by the Laikipia Development Fund.

Module 5: Micro-Project Fund

A small fund for direct disbursement of funds to small, already on-going development initiatives within the communities. The fund is a grant. Criteria for support are:

- the project is community or group based and not directly income generating;
- the project is ongoing and in an advanced stage;
- the one-time financial input will assure the successful continuation of the project without further support by the programme;
- the project does not contradict the programme policy and strategy.

Annually a lumpsum is reserved for this. Activities are identified throughout the year.

A basic element of the programme has been the decentralisation of decision making, project planning, implementation and operation to the communities through the District Focus (Module 1). To reinforce this, a Community Development Advisor was engaged under the ASAL programme. The Applied Research Unit (ARU), was also established to identify, develop and test, with other relevant agencies, feasible options especially in

the agricultural sector. Government agencies and NGOs provide services and assist in implementing relevant activities (Modules 2 and 3). Programme operations have been linked to a credit scheme, the Laikipia Development Fund (LDF) intended to provide investment capital to those who wished to engage in economic enterprises (Module 4). The intention is also to facilitate, through the provision of credit, the implementation and dissemination of innovations.

Conclusions

The main strategies applied by the programme to achieve its objectives are: community participation, land use planning, capacity building, innovation in the productive sector, economic empowerment and gender.

Each of these strategies is considered relevant and complementary. The strategies could be made more explicit in its documentation and planning, and defined more clearly by the programme. This would enhance effectiveness of these strategies.

The programme has translated the strategies into five planning / financing modules. These modules are complementary and include different levels of planning (bottom-up and top-down).

The translation of strategies into planning modules is appreciated and considered useful. There is still scope for improvement e.g. by limiting the number of planning modules to facilitate programme management and an understanding of the functioning of the programme for outsiders and clients.

6.3 Gender aspects

Situation of Women

As in many other districts in the country, women play a major role in the productive sector. This is particularly true in the drier areas (North and Central Divisions, zone 1) where, because of the harsh environment and low production potential, many of the men have gone to towns and urban centres in search of employment, leaving the farming activities as well as the care of families to the women. Up to 60% of the households in this area are female headed.

In the higher potential parts of the district in the south (Zone 3) both men and women participate in agricultural production with men concentrating on cash-related activities while women are involved to a larger extent in food production and also participate in livestock and cash crop production.

In the pastoralist areas, (zone 2), women are increasingly involved in livestock herding although this was formerly men's responsibility. As the life of the pastoralists is becoming more sedentary and new activities such as agriculture are finding their way in, the women are taking up more and more activities.

In addition to their role in productive activities, women in all the zones are fully involved in the family maintenance activities. Collecting firewood and water are particularly tedious and take many hours each day as these resources are far away for most families. Women are walking up to 8 kilometres daily to collect water and fuelwood.

Production resources and benefits are in most cases controlled by men, even when the men reside away from home. This makes decision making difficult for the women who are in most cases the implementers at the household level. Decision making at

community level is also in most cases done by the men as the decision making structures in place seem to favour them.

Programme Gender Approach

Through its participatory approach, the programme aims to stimulate the participation of men and women in the different stages of the programme in order to ensure equitable and sustainable development for all. Since 1993, the Laikipia project has had a gender adviser who is also a member of the PMU and who has the responsibility to ensure a gender perspective in all programme components. Recently the gender adviser has also taken up responsibility to co-ordinate the planning and monitoring activities.

The plan of operation 1995 indicates that all programme components will have a gender perspective. The approach is further articulated in the Work Plan and log frame for 1997.

The programme has employed the approach of "mainstreaming", i.e. incorporating gender in all the programme components and activities. In addition a number of women specific activities are implemented in response to women's specific felt needs and priorities. These, however, are intended to strengthen the integration rather than to implement separate programmes for women. Gender sensitisation and training have also been undertaken in efforts to strengthen the integration process.

Results of the Gender Interventions

Institutional Strengthening

At the institutional level, the programme has introduced the gender concept to the different development actors in a cautious but systematic way. This has created interest and support for gender at different levels. Some training has also been given on participatory planning and gender inclusion in the logical framework resulting in some improvement in planning with regard to setting targets for participation of men and women in various activities. However, further attention needs to be given to strengthening capacity for gender analysis planning and monitoring. An important step has been made in setting up a gender sensitive monitoring and evaluation system used at the district, divisional and locational levels.

Activities in the Productive Sector

At the community level, the introduction of new crop varieties including drought escaping crops (DECs) in the dry parts of the district has widened the options for farmers and increased chances of production. On some farms, production has more than tripled in the last two years as a result of growing new varieties of legumes such as beans and peas and root crops such as cassava and sweet potatoes. Although it is still too early to record major changes in food security and income earnings, it is evident that ARU's efforts in participatory technology development and transfer resulted in awareness creation as well as improved skills among men and women farmers. In 1996 for instance, 172 women and 159 men farmers participated in training and other on-farm activities in the different divisions. While men and women are recruited as focal points for different technological packages, it is observed that only 2 women against 12 men participated at community level in 1997, in spite of the fact that women play a major role in the production of grains.

In livestock, the promotion of improved small stock such as poultry, pigs and rabbits has not only increased household access to proteins but also increased income earning

opportunities for women and youth since they have control over the small stock and products such as eggs. At the same time, improvement of indigenous livestock has increased meat and milk production both for home consumption and for the market.

In some cases, the introduction of new or additional activities has resulted in increased workload particularly for women who are often involved in both the food and cash crop production as well as livestock activities in addition to the maintenance activities. However, both women and men appreciate the new activities and the benefits accruing from them. Some households have hired additional labour on a permanent basis or during peak labour periods while some have re-allocated their time in terms of priority activities.

Credit

Credit provision through the Laikipia Development Fund (LDF) has enabled both men and women to access loans to undertake on-farm and off-farm income generating activities. Special loans have also been given to a few individuals to undertake small industry or wholesale business to provide service to other target groups. As of August 1997, 489 women and 798 men had benefited from the credit facility. Out of Kshs 39.6m given out as loans, Kshs 15.8m went to women while 23.8m went to men. As a result of the loans, improvements have been noted in the farming and business enterprises such as bigger acreage in the cultivation of wheat, purchase of improved livestock such as dairy heifers and improved bulls and increased stock, among other improvements. In addition to making repayments as scheduled, a number of people have been able to undertake side activities such as purchase of farm equipment, house improvement and construction of water tanks among other investments.

The scheme has also contributed to developing skills for business and credit management through training and contributed to employment creation. As of June 1997, 135 CMC officials had been trained on credit management and administration. Out of these, 59 were women while 76 were men. In the same period 1047 clients (420 women and 627 men) were trained on business management skills.

Considering that women play an important role in food production and family maintenance and the fact that a large number of households in the district are headed by women, the management of the credit scheme should pay more attention to creating more favourable conditions to women's participation in order to increase the number of women taking loans and benefiting from the activities.

Reduction of Workload

The problem of workload has also been addressed through the introduction of labour saving technologies such as the establishment of kitchen woodlots, construction of water tanks for roof catchment and promotion of fuel-saving cookstoves. These technologies have become very popular with women and have contributed greatly to reducing workload and saving women's time and energy.

(comments of a woman in Mutirithia - Central Division.)

“ I used to spend three hours each day just to collect water on my back. Since I got this tank 6 months ago, I have rested from these journeys and I have even grown fat “.

The use of animal power for ploughing, weeding and transportation attracts men and youth to participate in these activities thus reducing the workload of women and changing the gender roles. With the use of this technology, men are also undertaking family maintenance activities such as carrying water and firewood and hence reducing

women's workload - unfortunately some of the farms in the district are too small to keep oxen.

Participation in Decision Making

Women's participation in decision making has been promoted through such efforts as sensitisation of the community on the need to involve women in decision making both at household and community level, training of women in leadership skills, formation of women's leagues and inclusion of women in extension and training activities. Most management committees such as water committees and other functional group committees now include a few women.

More women are now participating in extension and training activities with a few recruited as demonstration or focal points. This not only enhances women's technical and management skills but also improves their confidence and self image.

(comments of a male community member)

"We used to think women cannot manage projects because they were shy and never spoke in meetings. But we have now seen what they can do. The water project was dormant for several years. Since the women took over and appointed their own management committee, the project is running well and will soon be complete."

Training of women through women's groups and the opportunities for expression and contribution in such groups has also strengthened the confidence of women with a few now appointed to decision making bodies that previously had only men, such as the management boards of primary societies.

Conclusions

It can be concluded that the Laikipia programme has made recognisable achievements in integrating gender of different levels and components of the programme. The support by the PMU has led to gender being regarded a responsibility for all the staff and not only for the Gender Advisor. The programme has also addressed important gender concerns such as the gender imbalances in the access and control of resources and decision-making processes. In the coming phase, the programme should build on these achievements and strengthen capacity of all actors for gender integration. There is also need to formulate clear objectives and indicators for key areas of concern.

7. MAJOR COMPONENTS AND ACTIVITIES

This chapter summarises the findings and analysis of the physical and financial information collected from the programme for the period 1994-1996. This information was primarily collected through the household surveys, the matrix, community participation assessment and secondary data sources such as the Programme's financial records.

In 1994, quite a number of studies and inventories were carried out, and a number of consultancies initiated to provide additional technical support in various fields. The programme started co-operating with quite a number of departments and was afterwards in a position to assess their capability. This has led to narrowing down the fields of activities and the number of implementation partners and, after that, continuing with core government departments. The programme focused on preparing itself, the communities and all agencies involved in the development process for the implementation strategy and their roles in it. Financial and administrative management were strengthened, and planning procedures were developed and introduced.

7.1 Sector Balance

[The project expenditure in the productive sector is above 48%.

Presently, water development is considered part of the social/services sector. This can be considered correct but a major part of the water development activities is also directly related to the productive sector. Project expenditure in the social/service sector is 38%, including all water development projects. 12% of the project expenditure is spent on the planning and capacity building. The programme's overhead is 23%. This includes the vehicle pool for departments in the district.

7.2 Sector Results

Below the different sectors are discussed. Project expenditure is given for the period 1994-1995-1996, considering the percentage of project related funds (thus excluding ASAL overhead) spent on this particular project / sector. Target achievements are mentioned wherever possible. Relevance and impact are discussed on the basis of various information sources: the households surveys, the matrix, the PRAs and discussions with the PMU. The latter in particular also served the purpose of verifying the information.

Productive Sector

Agriculture

Project Expenditure: 11% including support to ARU (which is also partly Livestock and Agroforestry)

Relevance and Impact:

There has been an increased awareness in terms of alternative crops and farming systems in the district including high value crops e.g. for export. There have been efforts to introduce energy saving systems for cooking, and animal traction for cultivation. Much of the increased awareness is likely to be due to the activities undertaken by ARU and collaborating extension field officers. The fact that there is an organisation on the ground which can provide back-up support with the introduction of these new crops, has been an important factor. It is, however, expected that it will take time to have a major impact on the farming systems, since introduction of new crops will take considerable time to have a wider impact.

According to the household surveys, improved seeds are used by 65% of the intervention households and 52% of the low-intervention households. Given that so many of the Laikipia farmers have come into the district from surrounding higher potential districts, the percentage of farmers who use improved production techniques is expected to be higher. Fodder promotion, especially napier grass and sweet potato vines, has become popular with farmers growing and selling plant material.

Overall, intervention area households have a slightly higher usage rate of production techniques in comparison with low-intervention area households. It is difficult to assess to which extent this is an impact of the programme, or due to other factors.

Livestock

Project Expenditure: 11 %

Relevance and Impact:

Generally in the livestock sector, the targets have been achieved to a reasonable level, apart from beef cattle and camel introduction. Activities included pig, poultry and rabbit production, upgrading of small stock (sheep and goats), fodder improvement, beef improvement and camel production in addition to extension and follow-up activities. Paravet training took place, with mixed levels of success.

Attempts have also been made to strengthen the marketing of livestock and products, particularly honey and milk.

According to the household survey, 12% of the households in the intervention areas and 33% in low-intervention areas market honey.

Honey marketing is especially prevalent in Mukogodo with 90% of the households selling honey. This seems rather high, as the experiences of the programme are that most of the honey in the district does not reach the market yet. The programme has supported the development of a beekeeping association to improve the marketing of honey.

Milk is sold by 46% of the households in the intervention area. This could point to a positive impact of the animal health interventions, and improved grazing and feeding systems promoted by the programme, particularly in the wetter western zone. However, the programme doubts this as their activities in these fields have been limited.

Upgrading of goats and sheep, in particular through groups, is expected to have a positive impact. Considerable awareness has been created in terms of new opportunities in livestock production, such as pigs and poultry. These are beginning to be introduced in some farms, even on a commercial scale. This has enabled farmers to diversify and has greater income earning potential compared to traditional livestock keeping systems. Some effort has been made to improve the quality of the local cattle by introducing improved bulls to some communities. The Artificial Insemination Programme has been privatised.

Forestry / Agroforestry

Project expenditure: 1.5%

Relevance and Impact:

Forestry and agroforestry activities were, in the first instance, implemented through the Forestry Department. However, the programme was not satisfied with the performance of the department. Now, implementation of agroforestry activities will be much more part of the farming system, and thus be handled through ARU.

According to the household surveys, about two thirds of the households in both intervention and low intervention areas indicate environmental awareness; in practice 53% of the intervention area households report terracing and 38% in the low-intervention areas. An appreciable percentage 61% and 45% in intervention and low-intervention areas respectively, report on-farm tree planting, the highest among the four districts.

Fisheries

Project Expenditure: 1%

Relevance and Impact:

The fisheries programme, implemented through the Fisheries Departments, concentrated in 1996 on the stocking of ponds. However, this year the management of these 43 ponds is the main focus of the programme. The ASAL Community Advisor organises training for the fishing groups. It is expected that the programme will have a positive impact in due course.

Jua Kali / Co-operative Development

Project Expenditure: 3%

Relevance and Impact:

With ASAL support, the co-operative department adopted a training programme under the following sub-activities; Community Member Participation Programme (CMPP), Co-operative Management Improvement Programme (CMIP) and Gender and Co-operative Programme (GACP). The training greatly enhanced the performance of co-operative societies and encouraged them to initiate subsidiary activities and women's leagues to address women's needs in particular. Three women's leagues are now in existence and are operating successfully. To back-up investments, the sector initiated a small loan scheme, the ASAL Co-operative Credit, which disbursed Kshs. 2.8 million in 1995 / 96, all financed by ADPL. The loan scheme was expected to develop into a revolving fund, but its sustainability is questionable as it is already having repayment problems. Co-operative operations are restricted to society members, number 10,500 at present. In overall terms, the sector seems to be innovative and should produce positive results.

In the Jua Kali sector programme activities have been less successful. Training has taken place, but presently activities are very limited. An earlier activity consisted of linking local entrepreneurs to Nairobi based entrepreneurs, thus providing them with an opportunity to improve their skills. This was successful, but unfortunately too expensive to continue.

Credit

Project Expenditure: 21%

Relevance and Impact:

The Laikipia Development Fund (LDF) has its own outreach programme. Through the credit sensitisation training that was undertaken with the launching of the scheme, credit groups were formed. These are then trained to ensure that they understand the credit scheme, operation rules, loan conditions, et cetera. Those interested in loans were required to form pressure groups of five members, called a CMG (Credit Management Group). Two to five groups are required to get together to form a Credit Management Committee (CMC). Loans are disbursed through the CMC. Thus the LDF uses the "pressure group" and group pressure approach to ensure sustainability of the credit

scheme. To qualify for credit, a resident must be able to meet the conditions and belong to the CMG and CMC organisation.

To date, loan repayment is reported to be 97.2%. The target group of the LDF is all those who are able to meet their conditions, which include capacity to raise a 30% deposit, identify a viable and on-going enterprise (beginners are discouraged), establish the credit management groups (CMG) and credit management committee (CMC), and be able to repay within the given time and interest rates, which are currently higher than some commercial bank rates.

LDF operates in four zones, and therefore it has four credit officers. By August 1997, 1287 men and women had received credit, with a total value of Kshs 39.6m.

The credit scheme is considered very successful. It is part of the programme's economic empowerment strategy. Other districts have followed and developed similar credit programmes (Keiyo- Marakwet and Kajiado).

Wildlife Utilisation

Wildlife utilisation is still only a very small component. The programme has facilitated some studies in this field to explore possibilities in the district. Presently, guinea fowl and quails are promoted through central hatching, and using farmers as outgrowers. The KWS provides licenses.

Services and Social Sector

Water Development

Project Expenditure: 25%

Relevance and Impact:

The impact of water projects is considered high. Activities are more or less according to target. The household survey shows that more households in the intervention areas have access to water through dams, roof catchments and through water schemes (77%) as compared to the low-intervention areas (45%).

General criteria applied by the programme for selection of water projects are: focus on smaller projects only for drinking water (human and cattle) excluding irrigation, focus on rainwater and ground water, rather than surface water. Low maintenance systems are preferred. The programme insists on the establishment of a maintenance fund and a revenue collection system. Sensitisation and training is given to the community / group involved.

Water projects are expected to reduce the time and distance to domestic water sources as well as offer alternative water sources for animals. Most of the activities have been undertaken or co-ordinated by the Water Department, which often contracts the work out due to its specialised nature. Water activities facilitated by the Social Services Department are the construction of water tanks and roof catchments.

The roof catchment / water tank project has been highly appreciated and is popular with the communities. Approximately 700 water tanks have been constructed. They are successful particularly in areas where population density is too low to start a water supply project. It has reduced the distance to collect water, thereby allowing women to take up other activities and has also reduced the incidence of water borne diseases. A side effect has been increased knowledge of health and child care, which is covered during the training sessions.

Over 30% of the households interviewed said they use roof catchment water. There was no significant difference between ASAL intervention and low-intervention areas. The programme does not follow a high-intervention area policy for this activity.

Health

Project Expenditure: 1.3%

Relevance and Impact:

During the inception phase, various health-related activities were identified. However, over the years the programme has been disappointed by the results of these activities and the capacity of the implementing agencies. As a result this component has been decreased and only some small pilot projects through the private sector will be funded.

Roads / Infrastructure

Project Expenditure: 2%

Relevance and Impact:

Rehabilitation and development of roads has not been a very successful activity within the programme. The Ministry of Works is a weak counterpart organisation. The programme also worked with the County Council, communities and some large scale ranches. In general, the problem of insufficient roads in the district is a rather large problem and requires more funds than that available within the programme.

Other infrastructure related activities have been the Farmers' Training Centre, which could not be implemented yet, and the irrigation pipeline to the prison. The latter has been completed. The intention is that quality seedling (fruit trees) are produced for sale.

Education

Project Expenditure: 6%

Relevance and Impact:

In general the level of achievement in the education sector has been good with activities focusing on pre-primary awareness in communities and teacher training, the establishment of education resource centres, training of PTA committees, improved school inspections and provision of laboratory equipment and bursaries. The Department of Education also organised activities on subject matter strengthening for their own teachers. Improvements were very evident, especially in Mukogodo Division, courtesy of the efforts of the Divisional Education Office.

More responsibility has been taken up by the communities. PTA committees have become more involved in matters relating to education and there is improved relationships between the head teachers and the committees even in financial management. The 1996 training course was appreciated so much that the head teachers organised a follow-up course by themselves in 1997. The standard of inspection of schools has improved and the result is that there is an improvement in performance. It is expected that training of inspectors and tutors will boost their morale even further.

Bursaries for girls (and handicapped) have enabled more to attend secondary school especially from the pastoral area of Mukogodo. Scholarships for the brightest pupil have motivated pupils. The attendance figures for boys and girls are higher than those of any other district under review, and reflect the awareness of the importance of education.

Planning and Capacity Building (Whole District)

Project Expenditure: 12%

Relevance and Effectiveness:

The programme has placed much emphasis on improving the planning capacity at community level through workshops during the inception phase and by providing them an opportunity for bottom-up planning through Planning Modules 1 and 5. Now, the emphasis is focused on project committees at that level. However, the programme also recognises that feedback and support from the DPU and DDOs office to the communities is still insufficient. Improvement of divisional and locational level planning through the DPU, was considered important by the programme.

Strengthening of the planning and co-ordination capacity of implementing agencies in the district has been supported by the programme and should systematically continue. The programme concludes that strengthening the co-ordination capacity has not been very successful yet.

8 MONITORING AND EVALUATION

8.1 Introduction

The purpose of the analysis of Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) was to examine the existing data collection and analysis practices and develop proposals for improvement.

The analysis of M&E was done first by gathering information from key stakeholders through interviews and, second, by analysing the information using M&E framework. Interviews were conducted at three levels: Project Management Unit, implementing staff, and community.

8.2 Historical Trends

The ASAL programme in Laikipia is the ASAL programme most recently financed by the GoN (1993). An informal M&E system has always been in place which relied on progress reports. Often these reports contained inadequate information to enable effective management decisions. Several efforts have been made to develop systematic M&E. In the early stages, workshops held to design a formal M&E system, could not yield practical solutions. As a result of this, the programme began an orientation to LFA among the implementing staff. Meanwhile, they continued with Participatory M&E and sensitisation on gender.

The current system involves activities both at the district and divisional level. Feedback and provision of information takes place between these two levels. Standard formats have also been developed to keep track of activities and output targets. By the time of the review, the M&E system was still at an early stage, and participants could not give ample critique on its strengths and weaknesses. However, anticipated problems were discussed.

8.3 Elements of Monitoring and Evaluation

M&E Activities

Several activities are undertaken to provide information to M&E. These are:

- Steering Committee meetings;
- PMU field visits;
- PMU meetings;
- Heads of Department meetings;
- Monitoring visits at departmental level;
- Platform meetings;
- Internal evaluations;
- Diagnostic surveys;
- Reports;
- Community monitoring activities.

Cost monitoring

The PMU is involved in monitoring costs through budgeting and budgetary controls. This is done on a continuous basis and involves interaction with Heads of Department, other relevant staff, and communities. Quarterly financial reports are also produced.

Tools for Data Collection

Besides the above mentioned monitoring and evaluation activities, the programme uses the activity schedules and budgets presented in the annual plans to keep track of the financial and activity progress. These tools provide reference points for discussions during M&E meetings.

Apart from these planning tools, the programme has also developed data gathering formats for M&E purposes. The major weakness is the lack of tools to measure project effects and impacts. The programme argued that their implementation process was not at a sufficiently advanced stage to give responses at the effects and impact level (see recommendations in § 4.3 of Part Two).

Data Base for M&E

The programme generates much data on financial and physical progress. Most of it is stored in various software. The financial data are managed through PAM, introduced by the RNE. Progress data are stored differently. By the time of the review, Laikipia did not have an integrated data base to store both financial and progress data.

A computerised data base is not present. The “hard copy” data base is, in particular, aimed at sorting community requests by region. In Laikipia, the activities in progress are stored in a “hard copy” data base. It is difficult to use this information as a management tool, due to the large amount of data and, thus, substantial data analysis required.

Gender

The gender expert combined the responsibility with M&E functions. As shown by data formats and reports, gender segregation of data usually takes place. One difficulty remains integration of gender and M&E into the implementation process. Although data collection formats were noted to have gender data, most of it focused on participation and activity. Output oriented data such as access and control profiles were yet to be incorporated. As the M&E develops, the programme will hopefully be able to integrate such data into M&E tools both for ARU and in the main programme.

8.4 M&E Systems

Presently, there are two main M&E systems in ASAL Laikipia: the system used by the ARU, and the system used for the entire ASAL Programme. They are briefly described here.

- **ARU:** The ARU is ahead of the overall programme in terms of M&E. Data gathering tools, keeping track of financial, activity and output targets, have been developed. There are also attempts to incorporate measurement of effect / impact. However, the latter remains difficult. One problem is the complexity of data formats. As result, divisional and front line staff have difficulties in using some of the formats.

A participatory procedure to appraise and evaluate technological innovations has also been developed by the ARU. Pre-season assessment and post-season evaluations are conducted. Farmers are brought together to either appraise the season (intervention) or evaluate the outcome of the trial.

One weakness, mentioned by the ARU team, is the difficulty to link such participatory assessment criteria with objectively set performance indicators in the planning matrix.

- **ASAL programme:** The M&E system for the overall programme is at take off stage. The programme has recently started reviews at different levels involving the DPU and divisional platforms. So far, a trial of a divisional review has been undertaken in March 1997. The implementing staff feels that they need to go through the whole cycle before they can assess the strengths and weaknesses of the system. Data gathering tools, such as terms of reference and observations, were used in this first divisional review. Although the ToR were formulated following the major components of LFA, they had very little or no relationship to the objectively verifiable indicators. This made the review one of supervision rather than one of monitoring of activities.

Other monitoring tools used are data formats for activity targets and gender. According to divisional staff interviewed, the forms are not difficult to use. What is more difficult is how to relate them to targets set in plans, especially so for front line staff. This staff has not been trained on log frame and find the process complicated. The highly descriptive nature of the Laikipia Annual Plan has left out critical components for M&E such as activity time charts and specification of targets. In its current form, it is difficult to use it as a tool for activity and output target monitoring.

Conclusions and recommendations on M&E are valid for all four districts and are, therefore, made in the Overall Report in part Two (see §4.3).

9. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Follow-up to Recommendations Review Mission 1993

The programme has made an effort to include the recommendations of the 1993 Review Mission into its PlanOps and Annual Work Plans. Details of this inclusion are presented here.

With regard to recommendations on Strategy and Approach, the following observations can be made:

- The programme has applied a "high input" approach, as generally advised, to allow the programme to have more impact.
- With respect to finding a balance between a "bottom-up" and "top-down" approach, the programme has developed five planning modules which vary between "bottom-up" and "top-down", complementing each other.
- The programme has included gender as a mainstream approach and initiated Gender Sensitive Impact Monitoring and Evaluation.
- The programme has included non-ASAL areas such as Ngarua Division in West Laikipia, to ensure that the linkages between non-ASAL and ASAL areas are incorporated.

The programme has paid attention to institutional strengthening and District Planning, in particular through an intensive awareness creating campaign amongst communities and training of communities, expansion of the PMU with qualified local staff, making use of outside expertise and supporting the DPU in implementing the District Focus Strategy.

The productive sector and environment have been the main focus of attention of the programme. An Applied Research Unit for farming systems in ASAL has been created and is financed by the programme. Relevant research questions and appropriate solutions are developed with and through the ARU. The programme concentrates on the land use, land ownership, farm size and farming systems problems, which are the main issues in the district. Some policy issues, such as irrigation are brought to the attention of appropriate fora by the programme.

Institutional set-up

It can be concluded that the ASAL Programme is placed in the wrong Ministry. Technical and policy support and feedback is insufficient. The ASAL programme would prefer to operate outside the Ministry, thus opening scope for a more flexible and less time consuming management system.

The programme presently functions as a "joint venture" between the GoN and the GoK. If the programme would continue to function as a joint venture, more commitment from the GoK would be required. Commitment should be expressed in matching funds and transparency of GoK funding in the district, to avoid double financing of projects. As the programme also calls for less complicated structures and more straightforward relationships with collaborating partners, alternatives to the joint venture structure should be explored.

For improved day-to-day management of the ASAL programme a simpler system of management and reporting is required. The present system of reporting at District and National level, to GoK and GoN is considered too time consuming.

The District Focus for Rural Development policy is considered a relevant concept, and the programme as well as the mission support this concept of decentralisation and increased participation in decision making. However, it does not function with the present planning capacity and the resources made available. Government support to the District Focus is insufficient. The programme has actively strengthened the District Focus, but does not believe in its sustainability.

The ASAL programme has been successful in setting up an Applied Research Unit, to provide inhabitants of the district with alternative options for farming and livestock keeping. ARU has fulfilled the research needs in the productive sector, developed alternative options and created greater awareness of these alternatives. The programme made a deliberate choice to set-up a new organisation, considering that the present LRP and Department of Agriculture could not fulfil the district needs for alternative options which were urgently needed.

The "high input" approach of the programme is considered successful. It allows for flexibility, experimentation and more impact in the district can be achieved.

Objectives / Strategies

The programme has, during the inception phase, through workshops at different levels, facilitated a process of participatory problem analysis and identification of activities. During this phase, objectives of the first phase of the programme were set. As a result, numerous immediate objectives (some of them confused with activities) have been identified with no links to higher level objectives such as medium term or overall objectives.

The danger of this identification process and this level of objective setting, is that each activity in itself may seem relevant, and can be translated into an immediate objective. Focusing the programme or "narrowing down", now depends on the success and achievements of different activities rather than relevance and specific programme choices. The programme could experiment more efficiently if it did not formulate, experiment and subsequently omit unnecessary ballast (e.g. activities which ultimately do not really fit into the programme). The programme should, therefore, formulate higher level objectives to ensure that at that moment already a focus is decided upon and thus choices are made why certain activities will take place and others not.

The main strategies applied by the programme to achieve its objectives are: community participation, land use planning, capacity building, innovation in the productive sector, economic empowerment and gender. Each of these strategies are considered relevant and complementary. The strategies could be made more explicit and defined more clearly by the programme.

The programme has translated the strategies into five planning / financing modules. These modules are complementary and include different levels of planning (bottom-up and top-down). The translation of strategies into planning modules is appreciated and considered useful. There is still scope for improvement, e.g. by limiting the number of planning modules, to facilitate programme management and an understanding of the functioning of the programme for outsiders and clients.

Sectoral Focus

Project expenditure in the productive sector is above 48%. Presently water development is considered part of the Social/Services sector. This can be considered correct but a major part of the water development activities is also directly related to the productive sector. Project expenditure in the social/service sector is 38%, including all water

development projects. 12% is spent on the planning and capacity building. Overhead is 23%, this includes the vehicle pool.

The programme has developed a wide range of activities, which range is now, in the third year of this phase, being reduced. Most disappointments have been within the social/services sector, with as a result that the project is automatically focusing on the productive sector. Within the productive sector, it is also becoming clear which project activities are successful and which not. The programme acknowledges that the principle of only supporting successful projects does not always apply, since in some cases not yet successful, but relevant activities remain to be supported (e.g. animal traction).

In the productive sector, many project activities have been implemented aiming at diversification and sustainable intensification of the agriculture and livestock systems. The district was urgently in need of alternative options, in particular for farming. The programme has successfully supported the development and extension of such alternatives. The credit programme has provided the much needed financial requirements for implementation of such alternatives. Smaller activities such as support to the Jua Kali sector, fisheries and wildlife utilisation have been limited in their achievements.

The major expenditure category in the Social/Services sector is water development. The programme has recorded considerable success in water development. Support to improved education is also considered successful. Improved education and increased participation in education is considered essential for the future of the district as an increasing number of people will need to find employment outside the agriculture and livestock sector.

Higher level policy decisions and interventions are particularly needed in the livestock and irrigation sector. Both are threatened by un-sustainable practices and severely limited resources.

Implementation Mechanisms and Partners

The programme started its implementation particularly with government departments. After a phase of experimentation with various partners, several have been excluded. The result of providing each institution with an opportunity to perform, has been that such exclusion usually took place without clashes.

The programme prefers straightforward collaboration with implementing agencies, GO, NGO, CBO, consultancy firms and private sector, on the basis of performance. The programme has experimented with a wide range of partners and, on the basis of their performance, has continued or discontinued collaboration. The strategy of "weeding out" appears to be successful. However, it is the mission's opinion that this could be done more efficiently if the programme linked collaboration more closely to its objectives. Presently, the objectives are numerous (see above). Improved objectives and the combination of objectives and performance could limit unnecessary experimentation with partners.

An explicit target group analysis did not take place. This has led to the situation whereby the activities formulated, reach specific groups and, thus, the type of activities financed defines the target group. This functions well if the objectives are well formulated and contain information on "for who". This is not always the case in the programme.

Monitoring and Evaluation

The conclusions and recommendations on the monitoring and evaluation in all the districts are presented in the overall report - Part Two, chapter 4.3.

ANNEX TO DISTRICT REPORT LAIKIPIA

Expenditure for 1994, 1995 and 1996

in '000 KSHS.	1994	1995	1996	Total
Agriculture	1,705	2,330	3,211	7,246
Livestock Production	467	6,044	9,433	15,944
Animal Health	984	2,209	3,964	7,157
Forestry	187	1,330	1,744 ¹	3,261
Fisheries	255	943	1,351	2,549
Jua Kali/ Coop./Ind.	303	3,389	2,551	6,243
Water	1,255	21,277	29,992	52,524
Health	76	2,126	659	2,861
Social Services/ Women Groups	2,096	2,663	4,047	8,806
Education	960	5,319	6,650	12,929
Credit	-	10,913	33,032	43,945
ARU	-	-	9,491	9,491
LRP	1,761 ²	3,994	598	6,353
DPU	- ³	-	4,484 ⁴	4484
Environment	878	- ⁵	-	878
Roads	-	3,000	1,450	4,450
Community mobilisation	6,654	- ⁶	-	6,654
Consultancies	3,270	900	2,121	6,291
Training	-	4,931	3,506	8,437
ASAL Overhead	14,703 ⁷	19,593	28,392	62,688
Total	35,554	90,961	146,676	273,191
Total Project Expenditure (excluding overhead)				210,503
<i>Actual expenditure</i>	<i>40,376⁸</i>	<i>96,457</i>	<i>154,129</i>	

¹ Includes a number of environmental projects such as establishment of environmental committees at locational level and workshops on grass root level initiatives.

² ARU running costs under management of LRP during 1994 and 1995.

³ DPU costs absorbed within ASAL running costs.

⁴ Includes M&E activities and logistical support to Divisions and Locations.

⁵ Environmental issues became integral part of productive sector activities.

⁶ Community mobilisation became part of training.

⁷ 35-40A% of the total overhead is accounted for by the vehicle pool both in investment and running costs. The vehicle pool was established to provide logistical support to implementing agencies.

⁸ Total actual expenditure includes smaller expenditures not listed and not considered important.