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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The agriculture sector is a key contributor to economic and social growth and development in Kenya. It has therefore been recognized as the major contributor to the projected 10% annual growth rate laid out in the country’s development blueprint, Vision 2030 Economic pillar as well as a key component of the President’s Big Four Agenda. The sector is divided into five sub-sectors; referred to as state departments under the Ministry of Agriculture Livestock Fisheries and Irrigation (MoALFI) namely: Agricultural Research; Livestock; Fisheries, Aquaculture and the Blue Economy; Irrigation and Crop Development. According to the 2018 Agriculture Rural and Urban Development (ARUD) sector report, in 2016, Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries and the Blue Economy sub-sectors directly contributed to an estimated 31.3% of the overall Gross Domestic Product (GDP). Indirectly, the sector contributes about 27% of GDP through its linkages with other sectors such as manufacturing, distribution and the service industries. Fundamentally, the sector contributes to 45% of Government revenue and an estimated 75% of raw materials for industrial use are derived from the sector. Agriculture augments about 50% of the overall export earnings while creating employment for an estimated 60% of the total employment, especially for the rural population. Over 80% of the above 45 million Kenyans, especially living in rural areas, derive their livelihoods mainly from agricultural related activities. For this reason, the Government of Kenya (GoK) has continued to give agriculture a high priority as an important and strategic sector for promoting national development and economic transformation. Agricultural productivity has stagnated or progressively declined over the years. This decline has been attributed to prolonged droughts that posed a risk to food security and exacerbate the vulnerability of the farming community, poor access to agricultural inputs and an inadequate enabling environment among other institutional and infrastructural factors. The Government through its Medium Term Plans (MTPs) has made efforts to improve the performance of the sector through the implementation of flagship projects to reduce over-reliance on rain-fed agriculture and input subsidy programs. However, these efforts have not significantly improved the sector despite the increased focus on the sector by the government and development partners.

The main objective of this assignment was to conduct “Institutional and policy assessment of the agriculture sector in selected African countries - A ‘systems-level’ deep dive.” This study was commissioned by the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) and used both secondary and primary information gathered from desk research and interviews with relevant stakeholders, respectively.

The assessment focused on four major components: Component 1-Aligned strategies which reviewed and ascertained the clarity and alignment of Kenya’s national agricultural sector vision, national development plan, as well as sector strategy, investment plan and flagships programs. Component 2- Complementarity of policies that create the right enabling (policy and regulatory) environment for agriculture and agribusiness reviewed and identified Kenya’s institutional bottlenecks around the implementation of sector policies, laws, regulations and administrative practices that create disincentives to agricultural investment. Component 3- Availability of capacities and systems for delivery of agricultural services assessed the institutional capacity gaps of all sector stakeholders responsible to contribute to an enabling environment in the agriculture sector. Component 4- Efficiency of sector coordination and cooperation mechanisms examined the functioning intra-sector and inter-sector coordination mechanisms as well as institutional arrangements in place that anchor inter-ministerial cooperation, effective donor and sector working group coordination, and, the inclusion of private sector and non-state actors. Component 5- Existence of strong monitoring and accountability mechanisms reviewed the results framework and its link to the CAADP Results.
Framework, and assessed the performance of monitoring and evaluation systems and the capacities in place to support its implementation as well as the effectiveness of accountability system.

This report presents the findings from an institutional and policy assessment of the agriculture sector in Kenya, a study that was commissioned by the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) to identify the gaps and constraints that hinder the implementation of agricultural policies and strategies in the country. Specifically, the study targeted the MoALFI and other relevant ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs) within the sector. The focus of the study was divided into five components which are meant to i) ascertain the clarity and alignment of national agricultural sector vision, national development plan, sector strategy, investment plan and flagships programs; ii) assess the complementarity of policies that create the right enabling (policy and regulatory) environment for agriculture and agribusiness; iii) assess the availability of capacities and systems for delivering agricultural services; iv) assess the efficiency of inter-sectoral and intra-sectoral coordination and cooperation mechanisms; and v) assess the performance of monitoring, evaluation and accountability mechanisms in the agriculture sector. Execution of the study was undertaken in two phases: the first phase involved desk research which entailed identification, screening, collection and reviewing of relevant literature. This was followed by preliminary stakeholder consultation through Key Informant Interviews (KII) and Focus Group Discussions (FGDs). These findings were validated through a national stakeholder workshop that was organized by AGRA.

Key Findings

**Component 1: Aligned Strategies**

With regards to Component One, findings from the study indicate that despite the lack of an overarching agriculture sector policy, the agriculture sector has had several policies, strategies and planning frameworks such as the Vision 2030, the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) and the recently launched Agriculture Sector Transformation and Growth Strategy (ASTGS) to inform the sectoral development objectives as well as the Presidential Big Four Agenda. Further, there are existing sectoral policies and planning frameworks that are aligned to the national development goals and the medium term plans (MTPs). It was noted that there have been a number of projects and programs in the sector over the years that were aligned to the overall food and nutrition security goals at the national level as well as other continental and regional goals. Some of these include the Fertilizer Cost Reduction Project, establishment of diseases free zones, enactment of consolidated agricultural reform bill and strategy for development of the Arid and Semi-Arid Land among others. This report also highlights the extent of evidence-based policy formulation and implementation processes at the national and county levels. Posing a serious challenge in the agricultural sector is the uncoordinated implementation of policies, strategies and projects between the national and county governments.

**Component 2: Optimized Enabling Environment**

With regards to the status of the enabling environment, findings show the presence of legislation and laws that can ensure the institutionalization of the various Acts within and across the sector. Furthermore, the study highlights the existence of policies that create synergies between and within the sector for the effective and efficient functioning of the sector. Needless to say, poor accountability mechanism, overlapping institutional mandates and inadequate technical and administrative capacity among others are some of the issues hindering the optimal implementation of sectoral policies, strategies and projects.

**Component 3- Sustainable Implementation**

In ensuring sustainable implementation of agriculture sector policies, coordinated delivery of agricultural services both at the national and county level is paramount. Devolution of extension
services was found to be one of the biggest challenges facing the county governments in the implementation of sector policies. This has been aggravated by inadequate human and administrative capacity, poor monitoring and evaluation to track sector performance, inadequate linkages between universities, research organizations and other sectors. Higher education institutions, international research organizations and research organizations are not able to meet the needs of agriculture sector players. It further emerged that the country has a fairly elaborate banking system to offer financial services to smallholder producers. State owned corporations such as the Agricultural Finance Corporation have in the past played a significant role in financial service provision. Despite existence of such elaborate systems, access to credit for input purchase and related agricultural activities is still a threat to agricultural productivity.

**Component 4: Coordinated investment and action**

Given the complexity of the agriculture sector, coordinated investment activities are paramount in ensuring sustainable implementation of policies. Previously, the sector activities were coordinated through the Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit (ASCU) under the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS). This unit, however, failed to live up to its initial intended goal and after the enactment of the new constitution in 2010, the sector faced new challenges. Supremacy wars between the national and county governments emerged as a major impediment to formulation and implementation of sector policies. Other coordination mechanisms have been proposed such as the Joint Agriculture Sector Cooperation and Consultation Mechanism (JASCCM) and the Agriculture Transformation Office (ATO) through the recommendation of the Intergovernmental Forum (IGF) and through the Agricultural Sector Transformation and Growth Strategy (ASTGS) respectively. At the county levels, the County Executive Committee (CEC) for agriculture has the responsibility to oversee the implementation of agricultural policies. Under the ASTGS, a coordination unit, ATO has been proposed to coordinate all sector actors including donors and development partners. Donor participation is also enabled through the Agriculture and Rural Development (ARD) platform which provides opportunity for government - donor interaction on sector priorities, strategic objectives and investment plans.

**Component 5: Accountability for results**

Monitoring, accountability and evaluation mechanism in the sector is guided by the National Integrated Monitoring System (NIMES) at the national level and the County Integrated Monitoring System (CIMES) at the county level. These systems have however been designed to capture data for all sectors and have not been customized to capture all the variables in the agriculture sector and therefore may not provide the critical data to gauge the development of the sector in the country. Fortunately, there have been other forms of monitoring, evaluation and accountability in the form of sectoral Biennial Reviews (BRs) which are undertaken through Joint Sectoral Reviews (JSR) and quarterly economic reviews. Despite having all these, the accountability mechanism in the sector is still underdeveloped. There have been recent efforts to have an overarching monitoring and evaluation policy. This has resulted in the development of a draft Monitoring and Evaluation policy.

The significance of the agriculture sector in the country in economic transformation is one that cannot be overlooked. Through the national development goals such as Vision 2030, the Presidential Big Four Agenda and in recent times the ASTGS, the Kenyan government has made considerable efforts in ensuring growth and development of the sector. It was also noted that the sector’s development objectives through the ASDS are aligned to the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) goals. Needless to say, the sector is without an overarching policy and has been relying on sector strategies to guide agricultural development projects and programs. It is therefore recommended that the draft agriculture policy is finalized and used as the overarching policy to guide

The sector. This will streamline how the sector is being driven across and amongst the various actors as well as provide clear coordination roles for the different actors and players in the sector. It is anticipated that anchoring these in a legal framework will minimize negative competition and enhance synergy amongst stakeholders, therefore, leading to growth and development in the sector.

There are gaps both in human and technical capacity for policy formulation and implementation that have been identified as major causes of the derailed development in the sector. This has been exacerbated by uncoordinated investment priorities between the county and national governments. This has led to the disjointed and erratic implementation of policies, plans and strategies in the sector. It is necessary that the national capacity for policy analysis is improved by building a cadre of well-trained policymakers and implementers within relevant government agencies and to strengthen their links to a network of policymakers and implementers in national research organizations at national, regional, continental and global levels. This is expected to streamline the low capacity of the staff in the short term while at the same time building a strong team of trained policymakers and implementers in the medium and long terms.

Policy Recommendations

Aligned Strategies
In the short to medium term, it is prudent that the sector has an overarching sector policy to inform investment and overall development. As such, the process of revising and finalizing the draft Agriculture Policy should take precedence. Secondly, given the fragmented nature of the sector institutional setting, harmonization of roles between the various ministries, departments and agencies is critical in ensuring sustainable implementation of sector policies and strategies. In the long term, there is need to streamline the use of agriculture policies, strategies and planning frameworks by other national planning bodies such as the National Treasury. In as much as there exists a mechanism for incorporation of the sector policies in national development plans, the establishment of laws and a sound regulatory framework to ensure the stipulated investment priorities are followed to the latter will be critical in the sectoral growth.

Optimised Enabling Environment
In the short term, public sector budgeting process and expenditure should be realigned to reflect sectoral investment priorities. This is because budgetary misallocations have led to poor operating administrative capacity both at the national and county governments thus hindering activities such as data collection and analysis which are critical for evidence-based policymaking. There is need for capacity building to improve the policymaking process by wide stakeholder consultation, training and sensitization on policymaking and reviewing policies and legislation. Sustainable implementation of sector policies and strategies is reliant on the presence of coordinated institutional setup. One of the key challenges facing the agriculture sector in Kenya is undefined institutional mandates with at times overlapping responsibilities. In the long run, the ministry in conjunction with sector stakeholders need to ensure the establishment of directorates and institutions with specific mandates and non-overlapping functions for efficient and effective implementation of sector policies and strategies.

Sustainable Implementation
Inadequacies in human and technical capacity such as extension officers at the county government level are one of the constraints hindering the implementation of sector policies and strategies. In the short term, there is need for budgetary allocations towards increasing the number of extension officers available to smallholder producers while promoting capacity building through training and continuous strengthening of the technical, administrative and infrastructure capacity for county governments. Secondly, the successful implementation of sector policies and strategies is dependent
on the presence of a monitoring and evaluation system to track sector performance. Despite the presence of CIMES and the NIMES, it is critical to have a long term monitoring and evaluation system which incorporates projects and programmes undertaken by the two levels of government. This can be made possible through the implementation of the draft monitoring and evaluation policy. Weak linkages between government and research institutions have led to duplication of research activities and are a hindrance to sustainable policy implementation. In the long run, there is need to establish a formal framework to harmonize research activities, develop and execute a code of conduct involving all sector players while enhancing linkages between research and development priorities for the sector.

**Coordinated Investment and Action**

In the short to medium term, there is need to strengthen the existing coordination and cooperation mechanisms within the sector, among sectors, and between the levels of governments (national and county), development partners and private sector and have these structures streamlined and gazetted by establishing and operationalizing a policy development and coordination organ with a clear mandate to improve coherence among policies and relative actions for policy implementation. This includes Gazetting and strengthening the capacity of the new sector Consultation and Cooperation Mechanism (JASCCM). Short term actionable recommendations include establishing a legally recognized central coordination unit for the ministry, stakeholders and other non-state actors for sector-wide coordination of policy frameworks and re-energizing the Joint Agriculture Secretariat and explore possibilities to domesticate these structures at counties.

**Accountability for Results**

An actionable policy recommendation in the short term is to finalize the National Monitoring and Evaluation policy to be the overarching sectoral policy for effective and efficient accountability. Further, commitment should be made towards improving and embedding transparency and accountability mechanisms at all levels such as the country sector accountability forums, Joint Sector Reviews and Biennial Reviews. Despite the existence of national and county monitoring systems, in the medium term, there is need to strengthen the NIMES and CIMES to capture more robust indicators and actors relating to the agricultural sector.
FOREWORD

This country report was developed in the context of the assignment “Institutional and policy assessment of the agriculture sector in selected African countries - A ‘systems-level’ deep dive” commissioned by Agra – Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa – to Areté Srl. The report is an outcome of deep dive multi-pronged approaches including in-depth desk reviews of relevant literature around the country’s agricultural sector and allied institutions, key informant interviews, and focus group discussions with the relevant stakeholders. Details about the sources used for the collection of secondary and primary information and data are provided in the references list to the report.

INTRODUCTION

Kenya is located in East Africa bordering the Indian Ocean in the South East. Its neighbouring countries are Ethiopia, Somalia, South Sudan, Tanzania, and Uganda. Kenya has an area of 224,081 square miles (580,367 square kilometres). The population of Kenya is estimated at 45.8 million in 2017 (National Council for Population and Development [NCPD], 2018), with an inter-censual population growth rate of 2.9 per cent and is expected to reach 52 million in 2020 and about 65 million by 2030 (UNDESA, 2017).

The agriculture sector is a key contributor to economic and social growth hence critical in meeting the projected 10% annual growth rate laid out in the country’s development blueprint, Vision 2030 Economic pillar. The sector is divided into five departments namely: State Department for Agricultural Research; State Department for Livestock; State Department for Fisheries, Aquaculture and the Blue Economy; State Department for Irrigation and the State Department for Crop Development. According to the Agriculture Rural and Urban Development (ARUD) sector report (2018), in 2016, Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries and the Blue Economy sub-sectors directly contributed to an estimated 31.3% of the overall GDP (GoK, 2018). Indirectly, the sector contributes about 27% of GDP through its linkages with other sectors such as manufacturing, distribution and the service industries. Fundamentally, the sector contributes to 45% of Government revenue and an estimated 75% of raw materials for industrial use are derived from the sector. Agriculture augments about 50% of the overall export earnings while creating employment for an estimated 60% of the total employment, especially for the rural population.

Figure 1: Agricultural Sector contribution to GDP

(Source: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics [KNBS], 2018)
GDP from Agriculture in Kenya decreased to KES 221,801 Million in the third quarter of 2018 from KES 281,316 Million in the second quarter of 2018. GDP from Agriculture in Kenya averaged KES 210,864 Million from 2009 until 2018, reaching an all-time high of KES 308,786 Million in the first quarter of 2018 and a record low of KES 142,195 Million in the fourth quarter of 2009 (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics [KNBS], 2019).

Over 80% of the above 45 million Kenyans, especially living in rural areas, derive their livelihoods mainly from agricultural related activities (NCPD, 2018). For this reason, the Government of Kenya (GoK) has continued to give agriculture a high priority as an important and strategic sector for promoting national development and economic transformation. Agricultural productivity has stagnated over the years. The Kenya Economic Report (2017) by the Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA) indicates that, in 2015, the decline in agricultural growth rate was 5.5% compared to a 4.0% decline rate in 2016. This decline was attributed to prolonged droughts that posed a risk to food security and exacerbate the vulnerability of the farming community, poor access to agricultural inputs and an inadequate enabling environment. The Government through Medium Term Plans (MTPs) has made efforts to improve the performance of the sector through the implementation of flagship projects to reduce over-reliance on rain-fed agriculture and input subsidy programs.

In a bid to improve productivity in the agricultural sector the GoK launched Kenya Vision 2030 as the new long-term development blueprint for the country whose focus is to create a “Globally competitive and prosperous country with a high quality of life by 2030”. The Vision also aims at transforming Kenya into “a newly industrializing, middle-income country providing a high quality of life to all its citizens in a clean and secure environment”. The Vision is anchored on the economic, social, and political pillars and is supported by the foundations of macroeconomic stability; continuity in governance reforms; enhanced equity and wealth creation opportunities for the poor; infrastructure; energy; science, technology and innovation; land reform; human resources development; security; and public sector reforms (GoK, 2008). Implementation of the Vision will also enable achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) for Kenya. In the agricultural sector, the Agricultural Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) -2010-2020; the Draft Agricultural policy and draft Agriculture Sector Transformation and Growth Strategy (ASTGS) 2019-2029 and the President’s Big Four Agenda are providing a guiding and regulatory framework for the overall growth and development of the sector.

Devolution which is a result of the Kenyan Constitution 2010, has led to devolved functions and roles in the agriculture sector. The sector has been devolved to the County governments which have the mandate to oversee and ensure implementation of nationally formulated agricultural policies. This does not mean that county governments cannot formulate their own policies derived from the nationally enacted policies. In light of these changes, the national government and the 47 County governments have to work hand in hand to promote agricultural growth and increase productivity.

Efforts have been made to ensure efficient functioning and coordination between the two levels of governments through the establishment of the Joint Agricultural Sector Consultation and Cooperation Mechanism (JASCCM) that comprises of four institutional structures namely; Joint Agriculture Sector Steering Committee (JASSCOM), Agriculture Intergovernmental Forum (IGF), Joint Agricultural Sector-Intergovernmental Secretariat (JAS-IGS) and the Joint Agriculture Sector Technical Working Groups (JAS-TWGs). However, despite concerted efforts by the two levels of governments in driving growth, challenges such as budgetary allocations for the different functions on the levels of governments, inadequate human and technical capacity at the county level to provide services and poor coordination and cooperation mechanism are some of the bottlenecks hindering the performance of the sector.
1. OVERVIEW OF THE INSTITUTIONAL AND POLICY STRUCTURES/FRAMEWORKS FOR THE AGRICULTURAL SECTOR

This section provides an overview of the institutional and policy framework that guides the Agricultural sector in Kenya. It provides descriptions and functions of the key government institutions, private sector institutions, non-state actors that play the greatest role in the sector.

1.1 Institutional framework of the Ministry of Agriculture Livestock, Fisheries and Irrigation

The Ministry of Agriculture Livestock Fisheries and Irrigation (MoALFI) is the overall state accredited body, whose mandate is to ensure continued growth and development of the agricultural sector by ensuring policy formulation to support financial, technical and an enabling regulatory and legal framework, maintain linkages with donors and supervise sector’s performance to meet the overarching objectives. The ministry is divided into five state departments namely: state department for agricultural research, state department for livestock, state department for fisheries, aquaculture and the blue economy, state department for irrigation and the state department for crop development. The ministry is led by the cabinet secretary who is appointed by the president and the state departments are headed by the principal secretaries. To ensure sectoral growth is achieved, the ministry has institutional and policy frameworks that act as the guiding frameworks reflecting on the national development blueprint Vision 2030, the president’s Big Four Agenda and the region’s Global development goals: the Malabo declaration and the SDGs.

In cognizance of the importance of transformative agriculture, the sector had strategies in place such as the Strategy for Revitalization of Agriculture (SRA) of 2004 a ten year strategy whose objective was to “transform Kenya’s agriculture into a profitable, commercially oriented and internationally and regionally competitive economic activity that provides high quality, gainful employment to Kenyans”. The SRA surpassed its set target by 2007 having achieved agricultural growth of 6.4% (GoK, 2010). In light of the progress made under SRA and following the formulation of the country’s development blueprint, Vision 2030, there was need to develop a strategy that captured the government’s development agenda of achieving 10% annual growth under the economic pillar. The Agriculture Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) 2010-2020, an initiative of the 10 Agricultural Sector Ministries was formulated to drive agricultural growth and development. Although launched in 2010, the ASDS faced a major setback, following the promulgation of the Kenya Constitution 2010. The sector institutional framework as outlined in the ASDS was no longer devolution compliant.

Devolution has been lauded as one of the best outcomes of the implementation of the Kenyan Constitution 2010. The Fourth Schedule of the Kenyan Constitution outlines the devolved function to be undertaken by the two levels of governments. At the National level, the national government has the mandate to undertake agricultural policy formulation whereas the County governments are tasked with the implementation of the policies. The responsibility and coordination of agricultural activities spread across different sectors, ministries and support organizations including the private sector, donor partners and civil societies that play different roles to ensure sectoral objectives remains a big challenge. To enhance coordination and cooperation between the two levels of governments, the Joint Agricultural Sector Consultation and Cooperation Mechanism (JASCCM) was established. The mandate of JASCCM is to oversee coordination between the two levels of government to avoid conflicts and promote harmonization in policy formulation and implementation. The Joint Agriculture Secretariat (JAS) provides secretariat role to JASCCM activities. The two levels of government have seconded staff to JAS, including providing office space. The capacity of JAS is weak and is yet to be gazetted to allow government budgetary allocation to its activities.
For continued and transformative agricultural development, the government recently formulated the Agricultural Sector Transformation and Growth Strategy 2019-2029 (ASTGS). The ASTGS captures the need to improve food security, alleviate poverty and lower the cost of food for sustainable livelihoods. The strategy is also aimed at increasing small scale incomes, boosting household food resilience and increasing agricultural productivity and promoting value addition. The strategy outlines nine flagship projects that will be implemented by the county governments through the sector plans and County Integrated Development Plans (CIDPs). Formulation and implementation of the sector strategies and policies are being supported by a number of organizations and authorities performing varied functions. To facilitate efficient functioning of the ministry, a number of institutions provide support to the ministry. These include:

- **The Kenya Agriculture Livestock and Research Organization (KALRO)** is a corporate body created under the Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Act of 2013 to establish a suitable legal and institutional framework for the coordination of agricultural research in Kenya. The institution has a mandate to restructure agricultural and livestock research into a dynamic, innovative, responsive and well-coordinated system that will enable the ministry to meet its overall objective. Through coordinate and regularly research that seeks to meet user needs and address existing policy challenges and needs, it is directly supporting the ministry in ensuring accelerated sectoral growth.

- **Agriculture and Food Authority (AFA)** is the successor of former regulatory institutions in the sector that were merged into Directorates under the Authority, with the commencement of Crops Act, 2013 on 1st August 2014, including Coffee Board of Kenya, Kenya Sugar Board, Tea Board of Kenya, Coconut Development Authority, Cotton Development Authority, Sisal Board of Kenya, Pyrethrum Board of Kenya, Horticultural Crops Development Authority. It has the following directorates: Coffee Directorate, Nuts and Oil crops Directorate, Fibre Directorate, Horticultural Crops Directorate, Food Crops Directorate, Sugar Directorate, Tea Directorate, and Pyrethrum & Other Industrial Crops Directorate. Through its strategic plan (Agriculture and food Authority Strategic Plan 2016-2021), the Authority has committed itself into supporting the sector by ensuring that institutions policies and frameworks in place support investment in the sector to increase productivity.

- **Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services (KEPHIS)** is a government parastatal whose responsibility is to assure the quality of agricultural inputs and produce to prevent adverse impacts on the economy, the environment and human health. Fundamentally, KEPHIS contributes to agricultural productivity by ensuring market access of products through inspection and compliance to the regional and global needs.

- **Kenya Meteorological Department (KMD)** is the National Hydrological and Meteorological Service provider in Kenya and has the responsibility of weather monitoring and dissemination of weather and climate information to various users. The KMD is implementing the concept of ‘climate intermediaries’ who are users and also act as a bridge between the final users and the climate information provider. Intermediaries receive forecasts through Short Message Service (SMS) and work with the County Department of Meteorology (CDM) to provide a network for the dissemination of information and feedback on the services provided. Intermediaries are selected from across institutions and agencies with existing extensive reach including County Administrations and the MoALFi, as well as religious and community leaders and NGOs. The KMD is a critical institution for the agricultural sector due to the sector’s over-reliance on rain-fed agriculture.
1.2 Key line Ministries relevant to the Agricultural Sector

1.2.1 The National Treasury
The National Treasury derives its mandate from the Constitution 2010, the Public Management Act 2012 and the Executive order No. 2/2013. The National Treasury has been executing its mandate in line with any other legislation as may be developed or reviewed by Parliament from time to time. The institution is key in economic and public financial management and in promoting economic transformation for shared growth through formulation, implementation and monitoring of prudent economic and financial policies at National and County levels of Government. The core functions of the National Treasury as derived from the above legal provisions include formulating, implementing and monitoring macro-economic policies involving expenditure and revenue, formulate, evaluate and promote economic and financial policies that facilitate social and economic development in conjunction with other national government entities, mobilize domestic and external resources for financing national and county government budgetary requirements among others. The National Treasury is mandated by law to: Strengthen financial and fiscal relations between the National Government and County Governments and encourage support for county governments in performing their functions; Assist county governments to develop their capacity for efficient, effective and transparent financial management; Prepare the annual Division of Revenue Bill and the County Allocation of Revenue Bill; Provide logistical support to intergovernmental institutions overseeing intergovernmental fiscal relations; Coordinate the development and implementation of financial recovery plans for county governments that are in financial distress; and Coordinate capacity building of County Governments on public finance management matters.

The National Treasury is a fundamental entity in ensuring that the public expenditure in the agricultural sector meets the set Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) recommendation of 10% annual expenditure for the sector. Beyond allocation, efficiency in expenditure of the available funds is critical for sector performance in terms of agricultural service delivery, technical and human capacities and infrastructure development.

1.2.2 Ministry of Devolution and ASAL
The Ministry of Devolution and ASAL was established in January 2018 following the restructuring of the Government. It consists of two State Departments; Devolution and ASAL, both of which formed part of the defunct Ministry of Devolution and Planning from April 2013 to January 2018. The Ministry is in charge of the Management of devolution affairs and ASAL. The functions of the Ministry are drawn from Articles 6, 187, 189 and 190 of the Constitution of Kenya, the Executive Order No. 1/2016 and the various Acts under which devolution is implemented including Transition to Devolved Government Act, 2013; Intergovernmental Relations Act, 2012; and County Governments Act, 2012. Institutions that are technically under the Ministry include Council of Governors; Intergovernmental Relations Technical Committee; and National Drought Management Authority. The ministry has the mandate to oversee coordination and development of laws, policies and guidelines for management of devolution and ASALs; capacity building and technical assistance to counties; facilitation of intergovernmental relations between the national and county governments and among county governments; facilitation of public participation in policy and decision-making processes; tracking of programme implementation in counties; Coordination of stakeholders’ engagement; Overseeing management of public assets and liabilities at the county level; facilitation of transfer of functions between the national and county governments; establishment and promotion of systems for efficient and effective implementation of devolution and ASAL; and coordination of implementation of targeted policy interventions. Others include: promote socio-economic development; community mobilization; food relief management; and implementation of special programmes for the development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands. Given that 80% of land in the country is in the ASALs, development of the
ASAL areas is critical in increasing agricultural productivity through emphasis on irrigated production rather than relying on rain-fed cultivation (GoK, 2010). Whereas the ASALs are viable for livestock production, diversification of agricultural activities to agro-pastoralism through irrigation will go a long way in reducing risks, conflicts and vulnerability to shocks while increasing incomes and resilience to climate change effects and as a result, improved livelihoods. The ASDS through the MTPs has projects and programmes in the Northern Kenya region such as the Galana-Kulalu irrigation project to increase maize production and the area under agricultural production.

1.2.3 Ministry of Lands and Physical Planning
Other than labour and capital, land is the most important factor of production necessary for agricultural production to take place. Sustainable use of land is a key component that if utilised well, can be used to drive growth and development in the sector. The Ministry is responsible for efficient land administration, physical planning and management to ensure sustainable land management for improvement of the livelihoods. The potential of agricultural land in the country has been declining due to soil erosion, poor tillage practices, and low soil fertility, among others. In light of this, the ministry has the mandate to formulate policies that promote sustainable land use and management. The National Land Policy of 2009 forms the premise for productive and sustainable land use to address issues such as land deterioration, underutilization of farmlands and reduce cases of land conflicts in agro-pastoralism areas. Poor land tenure systems, conflicting land uses due to demand for residential areas have resulted in low agricultural production, unsustainable natural resource exploitation, and climate change effects and high land fragmentation among others pose a threat to the agricultural sector. The Ministry of lands and physical planning has the mandate to ensure equitable and sustainable land allocation and use between the agricultural sector and other sectors.

1.2.4 Ministry of Environment and Forestry
It is responsible for protection, restoration, conservation of the environment and natural resources. The Vision of the ministry is for Kenyans to enjoy a clean, healthy, safe, and sustainably managed environment and Natural resources while its Mission is to facilitate good governance in the protection, restoration, conservation, development and management of the environment and natural resources for equitable and sustainable development. The key mandate of this ministry is to protect, conserve and manage the environment and natural resources for socio-economic development. Semi-autonomous government agencies under the ministry include National Environment Management Authority (NEMA), Kenya Water Towers Agency (KWTA), Water Resources Authority (WRA), Kenya Forest Service (KFS), Kenya Forest Research Institute (KEFRI) and National Environment Trust Fund (NETFUND). This ministry of Environment & Forestry and MoALFI have jointly developed the Kenya Climate Smart Agriculture Strategy 2017-2026 (KCSAS) and its accompanying Kenya Climate Smart Agriculture Implementation Framework 2018-2027 (KCSAIF) to address challenges affecting the agriculture sector brought about by climate change.

1.2.5 Ministry of Industry, Trade and Cooperatives
This ministry is responsible for promoting industrialization and enterprise development. The Vision of the Ministry is to make Kenya Globally competitive and sustainable industrial, enterprise and cooperative sector while its Mission is to create an enabling environment for a globally competitive, sustainable industrial, enterprise and co-operative sector through appropriate policy, legal and regulatory framework. The agricultural sector contributes about 50% of the overall export earnings (ARUD, 2018). Trade plays a key role in spurring economic growth and development through its linkages to other sectors such as agriculture. Expansion of regional integration and bilateral trade agreements has created a market for Kenyan products thus an increase in incomes for different value chains. As aforementioned, the agricultural sector is primarily a major exporter of traditional products such a coffee tea and cut flower to markets in the European Union (EU), United States of America

(USA) and in recent times Asia. The ministry in its effort to support trade and industrialization has formulated the National Trade Policy which is a key instrument in promoting beneficial bilateral agreements for different sectors while targeting low productivity, un conducive business regulatory environment and poor infrastructure. The trade policy is inter-linked with policies and strategies in the sector such as the ASDS and the National Livestock Policies that providing a framework for sectoral growth and development.

This ministry has several state corporations. They include: Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS), Anti-Counterfeiting Agency (ACA), Export Processing Zones Authority (EPZA), Export Promotion Council, Kenya Accreditation Service (KENAS), Kenya Industrial Estates (KIE), Kenya Industrial Property Institute (KIPI), Kenya Industrial Research and Development Institute (KIRDI), Kenya Investment Authority (KIA), Sacco Societies Regulatory Authority (SASRA) among others including companies such as the New Kenya Cooperatives Creameries (New KCC), East African Portland Cement company etc. These corporations play different roles in promoting trade and industry in the country as well as generate revenue for the country through conducting business or through the issuance of licenses in the process of ensuring compliance to the set quality standards and regulatory procedures.

KEBS’s mandate is to develop quality standards for all sectors. It is currently in the process of developing a national quality policy that aims at developing and strengthening the national quality infrastructure to achieve accelerated economic growth, export enhancement, ensure supply of safe and quality goods and services in the market and contribute towards environmental protection (Tumo, 2018). KEBS has a Food and Agriculture Department responsible for the development of standards covering food technologies, food safety, fertilizers, agricultural produce, livestock and livestock products, poultry and poultry products, etc. KEBS is developing 31 standards for the manufacturing sector to support textile, apparel and leather processing, revive 27 schemes of supervision and control for the leather industry to respond to the concerns raised in the Kenya Leather Industry. Lack of harmonized Standards has in the recent past created a number of Non-Tariff Barriers (NTBs) for Kenyan manufacturers, especially for the food industry. There is need for stakeholders to tackle issues of food security and agro-processing by developing standards for agro-processing, food safety and development of schemes of supervision and control to improve the final agro-processed products.

1.2.6 Ministry of Transport, Infrastructure, Housing and Urban Development

This ministry is responsible for the provision of transport infrastructure, infrastructural development, and urban development and housing. The Vision of the Ministry is to make Kenya a global leader in the provision of transport infrastructure, maritime economy, the built environment and sustainable urban development. Its Mission is to develop and sustain world-class transport infrastructure, maritime economy, public works and housing for sustainable socio-economic development. Agricultural production majorly takes place in rural areas with consumption taking place in urban areas. Poor rural transport and road networks coupled with inadequate infrastructure more so cold storage and refrigeration facilities have led to the increased cost of production, post-harvest losses, poor distribution of inputs and high food prices.

The Summit: This is a consultative body that brings together the Council of Governors (COG) and the national government to deliberate on issues that arise during the planning period. The role of the summit is to support strategies that result from sector related consultative forums and strengthen coordination between the two levels of government. For the sector issues to feature in the Summit, the lower level sector structures at both levels will require capacity for internal processes and for relationships with other actors to influence the agenda of the Summit to support agriculture policy reform process.
Council of Governors (COG): The Council of Governors is the apex body of the 47 county governors. The council identifies priority issues and collectively addresses issues of public policy and governance at the county and national levels. The vision of the council is to have prosperous and democratic counties delivering services to every Kenyan. The mission of the council is to benchmark excellence in devolution that is non-partisan; providing a supporting pillar for county governments as a platform for consultation, information sharing, capacity building, performance management and dispute resolution. The council has 10 technical committees that are mainly sectoral-based to effectively achieve desired results.

Agriculture Committee (AC) of the Council of Governors: The council addresses all matters related to agriculture and food security including the following: i) sustainable agricultural practices; ii) poverty eradication iii) value addition for farmers; iv) food security and drought management; v) production and marketing; vi) fisheries development; and vii) adoption of technological advancements in agriculture. The committee also addresses matters related to land survey and mapping and seek out sustainable and accountable solutions for subdividing and transferring land.

Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (PCA): The National Assembly has formed sector committees to enhance efficiency and effectiveness. The role of NACA is to advise parliament on all issues related to agriculture. This committee is involved actively in the agriculture policy process.

Senate Committee on Agriculture (SCA): The Senate has formed a committee on agriculture to address all matters related to policy and regulations at the county level. Currently, the committee is involved in policy formulation processes as demonstrated by their participation in the recently drafted agriculture policy. The SCA and NACA have a structured working relationship and often hold discussions on policy-related issues in the agriculture sector. Their discussions have enhanced citizens’ engagement in the policy process. They also provide an oversight role in the implementation of other sector policies.

Caucus for CEC members for Agriculture: This group is composed of all 47 CEC members for agriculture and consists of an executive arm and four technical thematic groups. The CEC Agriculture Forum is part of the IGS at the national level and addresses county policy issues. Five members of the forum represent the counties at the IGS. The committee has not been able to fulfil their role effectively due to constraints related to internal processes at the national level, and the commitment of the two levels of government to engage in dialogue and consultations regarding the policy process.

The County Assemblies Forum (CAF): This forum is the coordinating body of the 47 county assemblies. The forum seeks to strengthen capacity and institutionalize law-making for the county assemblies. It also seeks to form linkages with other arms of government. Implementation of national and sectoral policies is linked to the counties’ goodwill to achieve food and nutrition security. CAF significant in driving devolution and the presidential Big Four Agenda in the 47 counties by ensuring coordinated and harmonization of investment priorities in the sector and promoting public participation in the legislative process.

County Assembly Committee on Agriculture (CACA): The County Assemblies (CAs) are responsible for drafting laws within their respective counties. In order to achieve its objective, CAs often have committees that deliberate on sectoral matters and guide the assemblies. The County Assembly Committee on Agriculture is a committee that assists CAs on all matters related to agriculture and food security policy. Their participation in the national policy reform process is very important for the
integration of national policies into county government processes. Although this committee significantly participates in policy processes, the county government still exhibits capacity challenges.

**County Executive Committee for Agriculture:** This committee coordinates agricultural policy implementation at each county. It is headed by the CEC for agriculture and composed of technical directors of multiple departments. Its major role is to implement sector policies at the county level. The composition of this committee varies from county to county depending on what constitutes the agricultural sector.

### 1.3 Other sector stakeholders

The role played by non-governmental organizations, development partners, civil society and the private sector in the agricultural sector is key in driving the country’s development goals. The organizations are important in agricultural service delivery such as research, extension service provision, provision of agricultural inputs and market access for smallholder producers leading to increased incomes, improved livelihoods and poverty reduction.

**Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA) and the Agriculture Council of Kenya (AgCK):** The private sector plays an important role in the sector through advocacy, resource mobilization and promoting innovations for sectoral growth. The sector is monumental in value chain development through processing, marketing, service and input provision. It is well organized with an overarching body: the Kenya Private Sector Alliance (KEPSA) which is an umbrella body that engages all private sector players on issues such as the provision of infrastructure and legal and institutional reforms in favour of the agricultural sector. Focus on mainstream agricultural challenges by KEPSA has been limited, resulting in dissatisfaction by several agricultural non-state actors. This resulted in the formation of the Agriculture Council of Kenya (AgCK). The AgCK is the apex body for all agriculture sector private stakeholders. The private sector includes all value chain actors whose interest are commercial gains and includes producers, Civil Society Organizations (CSO) have focused more on service delivery within the sector. A limited amount of CSOs in the sector participate in policy formulation, including KENAFF and LMO. A major challenge to their effective participation in the policy process is a lack of capacity in policy advocacy.

**Agriculture and Rural Development (ARD):** A donor working group formed to engage development partners in the overall policy process. The group supports the government by providing information on international best practices and supporting policy reforms. Moreover, they provide substantive finances and technical assistance to implement the policies through projects and programs. Challenges that hinder the effectiveness of the working groups include inadequate coordination within groups and among different actors. Recently the ARD undertook a donor mapping of their investments in the agricultural sector based on key thematic areas. However, to ensure proper alignment with government priorities, the mapping will need to be reviewed to showcase donor investments across the ASTGS.

**Research Institutions:** Agriculture research is guided by the National Agriculture Research Systems Policy (NARSP). The main objective of NARSP is to provide direction for national research and sustainable development. This involves the formulation of research agendas to focus on impact-driven national priorities consistent with sectoral policies and strategies. In addition, Kenya is home to several international, regional research institutions among them CYMMIT, ICRISAT, ICRAF, in addition to the local research institutions there are international institutions that collaborate with National research institutes.
Universities: Universities build the capacity of the agriculture workforce and participate in the collection of data to inform policy dialogue. They also do research in support of food and nutrition security. In the formulation process, they provide staff for analysis both at field level and at the policy consultancy and advisory level.

The agricultural sector has various categories of institutions that provide services that include training, research & technology development, policy, financial, extension, marketing, ICT and value addition. The majority of institutions in the country (26%) provide extension services (Figure 2) while about 8% provide training services and only 0.8% of the institutions offer ICT services (GoK, 2017a).

Figure 2: Institutions participation in the Agriculture sector

(Source: GoK, 2017a)

Annex 3 shows a list of other stakeholders who work in the Agriculture Sector in Kenya. Their activities and functions are provided in the Table. Annex 4 on the other hand, provides various formal and informal organizations and projects that provide or provided support services to the agricultural sector. These services are grouped under the following themes:

i. Demand articulation
ii. Network Building
iii. Knowledge brokering
iv. Innovation process management
v. Capacity building
vi. Institutional innovation

The complex nature and the intricate interconnectedness of functions of the agricultural sector require inclusive participation of various actors and stakeholders from other ministries and non-state players for efficient and effective agricultural service delivery. However, this is not always the case. Different players in the sector act in isolation focussing on their own interest. This is exacerbated by the fact that there is lack of a fully formal functioning coordination and cooperation mechanism in the sector.
The overall goal of the agricultural sector is to achieve an average growth rate of 7 per cent per year over the next 5 years. Given the critical strategic issues that need to be addressed, the strategic mission for the sector is: An innovative, commercially oriented and modern agriculture. The overall development and growth of the sector is anchored in two strategic thrusts: increasing productivity, commercialization and competitiveness of agricultural commodities and enterprises and developing and managing key factors of production. To achieve this, the government has put in place national and sectoral guiding framework to steer the agriculture sector and overall economic growth and development.


The Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation 2003-2007 was a prerogative of the National Rainbow Coalition (NARC) which sought to restore poor economic performance that the country was facing in the ’80s and ’90s (GoK, 2003). The ERS was anchored on poverty reduction, employment creation for the growing population and overall economic growth and development. Identified as key priority areas in the strategy are the need to increase domestic revenue collection to reduce over-reliance on foreign aid by broadening the tax base, expenditure on pro-poor sectors and implementation of monetary policies that encourage economic growth; restructuring the country’s governance structure more so in public administration; improvement and modernization of infrastructure; and investment in human capital to increase labour productivity and overall poverty reduction. With respect to the agriculture sector, the ERS sought to address the high cost of inputs, poor governance and week legal and regulatory frameworks, low labour productivity as a result of HIV/AIDS prevalence and low technological use in agricultural value chains among others.

1.4.2 The Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture (SRA) 2004-2014

The Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture (SRA) 2004-2014 is linked to the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERS), which gives high priority to the development of the agricultural sector as the basis of economic recovery and increased growth. SRA aims at reversing declining trends in agricultural performance by introducing a new approach in the management of the agricultural sector. This approach constitutes a paradigm shift involving drastic changes in the way the agricultural sector ministries operate and interact with key stakeholders. The vision of the strategy is a shift in ministerial culture to emphasize on private-public partnerships that facilitate competition, enhance markets, and raise efficiency in resource utilization and improve the profitability of agricultural enterprises. To ensure seamless implementation of the SRA, the Agriculture Sector Coordination Unit (ASCU) was formulated. An inter-ministerial coordinating unit, ASCU was mandated to spearhead the agricultural reform agenda, oversee efficient resource allocation and a centre for stakeholder capacity building among others (MoA & MoLFD, 2004).

1.4.3 Vision 2030

Vision 2030 is the country’s development blueprint covering the period 2008 to 2030. It aims at making Kenya a newly industrializing, “middle-income country providing high quality life for all its citizens by the year 2030”. The Vision was developed through an all-inclusive stakeholder consultative process, involving Kenyans from all parts of the country. The vision is based on three “pillars” namely; the economic pillar, the social pillar and the political pillar. This vision’s programme plan comes after the successful implementation of the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ERS) which has seen the country’s economy back on the path to rapid growth since 2002 when GDP grew at 0.6% rising to 6.1% in 2006. Under the economic pillar, the agriculture sector has been
acknowledged as a contributor to GDP growth through processing and value addition enabling it to compete at a global level. Further, the document has earmarked priority investment areas to transform the sector. These include: preparation and passage of consolidated agricultural policy reform legislation; development and commencement of the implementation of a 3-tiered fertilizer cost reduction programme.; by improving the value gained in the production and supply chain through branding Kenyan farm products; planning and implementation of 4-5 Disease Free Zones (DFZs) and livestock processing facilities to enable Kenyan meat, hides and skins to meet international marketing standards; the creation of publicly accessible land registries, under an improved governance framework; and Tana River Basin Agricultural Development Scheme among others.

1.4.4 The Draft National Agriculture Policy

This policy provides a framework for sustainable development of the agricultural sector based on the requirements of the Constitution, the Kenya Vision 2030, Sustainable Development Goals and other National, regional and international development goals in agriculture. It outlines effective guidelines for efficient use of opportunities and resources available in the Sector and provides for inter-linkages of agricultural support systems such as irrigation, extension, infrastructure and research. The draft policy provides a basis for mainstreaming food and nutrition security concerns in the country’s development programs and plans. Key primary factors of agricultural production include land and water, to attain continuous food and nutrition security, the policy provides for their efficient use and management. Further, the policy incorporates the role of county governments in ensuring that household and National food and nutrition security are attained through innovative and cost-effective measures linked to the country’s long term development goals.

1.4.5 Agriculture Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) 2010-2020

The ASDS of 2010 provides a framework for progressive agricultural growth and development up to 2020. The agricultural sector continues to be a key economic and social driver of development in Kenya’s Vision 2030 and SDGs. Vision 2030 was followed by the revision of the Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture (SRA), 2004-2014. This revision led to the development of the ASDS, 2010-2020 (GoK, 2010b) that foresees a food secure and prosperous nation by 2020 and aims to achieve a paradigm shift from subsistence to agriculture as a business. It provided the ground for the government to launch the formulation of the ASDS and Medium Term Implementation Plan (MTIP) jointly with the CAADP compact. Identified priority issues to be addressed in the strategy include: low productivity which has stagnated over the years; inefficiencies in the supply chain due to limited storage capacity, lack of post-harvest services and poor access to input markets that have limited the country’s performance in international markets; under exploitation of high potential land in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands (ASALs); and the importance of value addition in in accessing international markets. The ASDS takes into account the new political system, legal and institutional reforms that are key in the transformation of the sector and it incorporates the regional and global initiatives such the Comprehensive African Agriculture Development Program (CAADP).

1.4.5.1 Kenya Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) Compact 2010

In cognizance of the importance of agriculture in employment creation, increasing incomes and improving the overall well-being of the rural; economy, the Organization of African Unity (OAU) heads of state endorsed the formation of CADD under the Maputo declaration of 2003. Being a member of the African Union (AU), Kenya has the mandated to adopt the CADD framework and integrate it with the country’s agriculture sector overarching development framework (GoK 2010b). The Kenya CAADP Compact is, therefore, a strategy document that commits the government to implement the common
vision of the sector, as described in the ASDS, to address the agricultural development agenda. Development partners and the Government of Kenya have already signed a Code of Conduct that requires all participants to support and work towards achieving the national, regional and global commitments. The six ASDS thematic areas are an equivalent of the four CAADP pillars with the inclusion of a national biannual process a platform for stakeholder involvement on the assessment of the implementation of the ASDS in tandem with the CADDP priorities.

1.4.6 The Agricultural Sector Transformation and Growth Strategy (ASTGS) 2019-2029

The ASTGS 2019-2029 strategy seeks to transform the Kenyan agriculture sector into a modern commercially oriented sector with a focus on the implementation of CADDP commitments as a pathway to achieve the global sustainable development goals (MoALFI, 2018). Successful implementation of the ASTGS will heavily rely on the active involvement of the national and county governments to increase smallholder farmer incomes, increase agricultural production and value addition and increase household food resilience to achieve food security. Given the complex nature of the institutional arrangement in the country, outlined in the strategy is the role of the Agriculture Transformation Office (ATO) as a central coordination unit for efficient implementation of the ASTGS activities and projects both at the national and county level. The ATO will also collaborate closely with the COG, and the Joint Agricultural Sector Steering Committee (JASSCOM), which will help the counties to domesticate the strategy. The ASTGS is thus aligned with the medium term national agriculture sector priorities and Medium-Term Investment Plan III, the 100% food and nutrition security aspiration in the Big Four presidential agenda and other continental and regional development commitments. The ASTGS has been designed to allow delivery at the highest levels to be a collaborative effort between the Cabinet Secretary (CS) of the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries and Irrigation (MoALFI), the Council of Governors (COG), and the other associated national sector ministries.

1.4.7 The Presidential Big 4 Agenda

The country, under the Jubilee government, have made a commitment to provide housing, improve manufacturing, provide affordable health care and ensure food security for its citizens. Popularly known as the ‘Presidential Big Four Agenda’, the development agenda which was launched in 2018 has a focus on providing basic needs that will greatly contribute to the achievement of the Vision 2030. Agriculture has been identified as one of the priority areas towards achieving food security by promoting indigenous food consumption and diversifying the staple foodstuffs; enhancing reduction of food wastage and food loss; strengthening the supply chains and linkages to value addition; improving on food information market systems; and increasing investment especially in agriculture infrastructure. These objectives mirror the development priorities and objectives of the overarching agriculture sector development plans such, the National agriculture policy, the ASDS and recently the ASTGS. Other relevant policies to the agriculture sector include the National Food and Nutrition Security Policy, 2011 whose mandate is to achieve adequate nutrition for optimum health of all Kenyans, increase the quantity and quality of food available, accessible and affordable to all Kenyans at all times and to protect vulnerable populations using innovative and cost-effective safety nets linked to long-term development; National Potato Industry Policy 2005 whose objective is to raise productivity in the industry through the provision of appropriate technology and services; develop and implement processes that will lead to increased empowerment of growers and other stakeholders; and develop and promote the use of standard packaging and weight measures which was put at 100 Kgs per bag; The National Biotechnology and Development Policy 2006 which addresses issues related to capacity building and resource mobilization, financial and business support, public protection and support, public education awareness and access to information with regards to biotechnology; and the Kenya Youth Agribusiness Strategy 2017-2021 seeks to ensure optimal utilization of youth potential in contributing to the sector goals of achieving food and nutrition security, income generation,
Figure 3: Institutional Map for Agricultural Sector Development and Policies

(Source: GoK, 2017c)
COMPONENT 1- RELEVANT NATIONAL AND SECTOR POLICIES AND ALIGNED STRATEGIES

2.1 Overarching policy and planning frameworks

Formulation and implementation of national and sectoral policies are intricate processes that rely on various stakeholders to provide evidence that informs action. The sector policies mirror the overarching national policies and strategies such as the Vision 2030, the Medium Term Plans (MTPs) and the Big Four Agenda which has a lot of emphasis on achieving food security for the Kenyan citizens.

The first medium-term plan (2008-2012) forms the foundation of the first phase of implementing Vision 2030’s objectives of increasing real GDP growth from an estimated 7 per cent in 2007 to 10 per cent by 2012 (GoK, 2007). In the agricultural sector, the MTP seeks to increase agricultural GDP growth to an estimated 12% by the year 2012 through the implementation of policies that enhance agricultural productivity, provide better markets and encourage value addition among others. On completion of the first medium-term plan, implementation of the second medium term is based on the success and lessons learnt from the period 2008-2012. The second medium-term gives priority to devolution as a pathway to national development with continued implementation of flagship projects such as fertilizer reduction strategy, the establishment of disease-free zone to promote market access and irrigation of the ASALs among others. The third medium-term plan builds on the previous MTPs while incorporating the implementation of the Presidential Big Four Agenda. To ensure food and nutrition security for its citizens, MTP III has a focus on irrigation expansion and agro productivity and value addition in the food processing value chain. Further implementation of various projects and programs in the plan are aligned to the continents Agenda 2063 and the global sustainable development goals. Some of the flagship projects and programs consistent with the investment priorities outlined in the medium-term plans include:

a. Enactment of the Agriculture Fisheries and Food (AFFA) Bill, Crops Bill and National Agricultural Research Bill in 2012. This was made possible through the enactment of the Consolidated Agricultural Reform Bill project. Through concerted efforts, the sector swiftly took up the implementation of the aforementioned Bills which resulted in the formation of the Agriculture, Fisheries and Food Authority (AFFA) and Kenya Agricultural Research Organization (KARO) now Agriculture and Food Authority (AFA) and KALRO respectively.

b. In the Fertilizer Cost Reduction Project a feasibility study was conducted to determine the viability of setting up a fertilizer manufacturing plant and total of 274,000MT purchased during the first MTP. Having identified and short-listed potential investors, subsequent activities in this programme will majorly focus on establishing the fertilizer plant and identification of investors who will play a key role in blending of the fertilizers for different production activities. The cost reduction strategy will be achieved through a three-tiered process that involved the purchase of inputs, private sector involvement to improve the supply chain of fertilizers and blending and manufacturing of fertilizers to lower the production cost.

c. Establishment of Disease Free Zones (DFZs) project was aimed at improving the quality of Kenyan livestock products such as meat and leather so as to access local, regional and international markets. Strategic areas to be tackled by the project include; enhancement of zonal infrastructure in the by renovation and building new office blocks, laboratories and quarantine areas; reconnaissance surveys on diseases that could hinder the implementation of the DFZs; and mass vaccination of stock as a roadmap for achieving a DFZ.

d. The strategy for Development of the ASAL was successfully implemented in the first MTP where area under irrigation increased from 119,000 ha to 159,000ha in Bura, Hola, Kano and
The objectives of this project are to increase food production and incomes through increased use of irrigation and land under irrigable agriculture.

e. **National Agricultural and Rural Inclusive Growth Project (NARIGP)** is a project under the state department of agriculture funded by the government of Kenya and the World Bank. The project development objective ‘is to increase agricultural productivity and profitability of targeted rural communities in the selected counties, and in the event of an eligible crisis or emergency, to provide immediate and effective response’ The project was agreed during a financing agreement which was signed on 14th October, 2016 by the cabinet secretary, national treasury representing the government of Kenya and International Development Association (IDA).

f. **Other projects** that were set to be implemented in the second MTP include: Agricultural Development along LAPSSET corridor Programme; National Agricultural Sector Extension Programme (NASEP) to enhance agricultural extension provision and access; Agri-Business Development Programme to improve market access for various value chain actors; Agricultural Credit and Financial Services Access Programme; among others.

The policies and strategies within the agricultural sector have been formulated to address the most pressing issues such as food insecurity, low agricultural productivity, climate change adaptation, and resilience and mitigation strategies and markets access among others. Productivity is partly determined by sustainable land utilisation. In Kenya, less than 20% of the land has medium to high production potential with over 80% of the land being in the ASAL areas. Production activities in the ASAL are constrained by water deficit and therefore, rain-fed agriculture cannot potentially meet food and nutrition security needs for the country (GoK, 2010 a). In recognition of this, the sector policies and strategies, more specifically the ASDS has flagship projects whose focus is the development of the ASALs where about 9.2 million hectares have a potential to be irrigated. This is an avenue to address the food insecurity challenges while increasing incomes for livestock farmers through diversification into agro-pastoralism and reducing conflicts. According to Mabiso et al. (2012), implementation of the ASDS is executed through the first medium-term investment plan (MTIP) which is anchored on Increasing productivity; commercialization and competitiveness; promoting private sector participation; promoting sustainable land and natural resources management; reforming delivery of agricultural services; increasing market access and trade; and ensuring effective coordination and implementation of projects and programs. The MTIP framework is aligned to the ASDS priority of attaining 7% growth in the sector by 2015 and implementation of the CAADP Kenya compact. Further, the MTIP highlights pertinent issues including coordination mechanism for efficient implementation which was to be undertaken by ASCU through thematic working groups; and the relevance and significance of a monitoring and evaluation framework to track sector performance through the use of National Monitoring and Evaluation Framework.

The **Agriculture Sector Transformation and Growth Strategy (ASTGS)(2019-2029)** whose main objective is to transform the sector, seeks to address these challenges through prioritizing flagship projects that will drive sectoral growth. Although food security is a function and mandate of the national government, the ASTGS seeks to address the devolved functions of the sector and by so doing, it incorporates the participation of the county governments in the implementation of the strategy. Investment priorities in the ASTGS will be guided by the National Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP) which was launched in 2016 to ensure agricultural investment is aligned to the CAADP country compact.

The **presidential Big Four Agenda** is a policy statement that acknowledges the significance, challenges and opportunities in the sector if well addressed could be a solution to the country’s food and nutrition security menace. Prioritized in the food security tenet is an investment in irrigation to transition from small scale agriculture production to profitable commercial farming. Given the complex nature of the sector, the agenda proposes the formulation of an Agriculture and Irrigation Sector Working Group.
which will be a central coordinating framework for irrigation activities. This in tandem with the medium term plans which have put emphasis on the linkages between irrigation and food security. Secondly, the agenda seeks to increase farmer access to inputs and more specifically a fertilizer subsidy program for increased productivity (GoK, 2018a); establish national grain reserves and capitalise on public-private partnerships to reduce post-harvest losses among others. The Vision 2030 third medium term is anchored on the big four with a mandate to “Transforming Lives: Advancing socio-economic development through the “Big Four” in its implementation (GoK, 2018a). Fundamentally, food security attainment is a key goal of the ASTGS and as such the strategy incorporates the implementation of the agenda’s investment priorities.

Most of the policies developed to address the challenges and streamline the agricultural sector over the years have been relevant at the time of development. However, with changes over the years, some of the policy statements became irrelevant, obsolete and/or conflicting or inadequate (KARI, 2012). The Kenyan constitution that was enacted in 2010, for example, led to changes in most of the agricultural policies and other sectoral policies. This also applies to the planning frameworks that were developed before the enactment of the new constitution. Key informant interviews and focus group discussions reveal that, the Devolution Act has seen the agricultural function devolved and the MoALFI is the guide for the national agriculture sector. However, devolution also created conflicts that range from supremacy wars between the two levels of governments regarding issues such as input subsidies and marketing policy for selected crops to poor implementation of wider national development objectives. In addition to that, in devolving agriculture as a function, the county government has taken up the role of extension service provision which has led to poor agricultural service delivery in some counties hence hindering productivity, increasing food insecurity and aggravated poverty levels.

According to the Kenya Constitution 2010, the formulation, development and coordination of national policies is a function of the national government. However, policymaking is a function of both the national and county governments where the national government formulates and develops national policies with the participation of the counties while domestication and implementation is a county-level function. The problem requiring policy intervention is identified by ministry departments or agencies, academia, Think Tanks, Cabinet, Presidency, citizens and civil society organisations among others. This is done in line with international standard procedures as dictated in the ISO 9001:2008 guidelines. The genesis and magnitude of the problem, the population affected and possible solutions are drafted. Through a filtering process, agenda setting brings the relevant policies to the attention of government officials, which if successful, leads to the policy drafting process. Policy design, which involves, policy analysis, design and resource scheduling, results in the development of an effective course of action to reach the identified policy goals. All possible courses of action are assessed and the best is documented. This is a rigorous process and a very important one, which must be shared with relevant stakeholders for assessment and feedback. This process also requires lots of lobbying and provision of data upon which the policy can be justified. The draft policy document is then shared with the cabinet or county executive committee for approval. On approval, the draft is published and tabled in the respective legislative body (House or County Assembly) for scrutiny and further consideration. It can be approved with or without amendments and lobbying also happens at this stage. Once approved, the respective Speaker presents it to the Executive for formal endorsement (assenting), and subsequently, it is published as a White Paper. The Executive is required to inform the public of the likely effects of the policy.

2.2 Practical use of policy and planning frameworks

The sector development strategy ASDS and National Agricultural Investment Plan (NAIP) are based on the broad goal of attaining 6% growth in Agriculture, provided by the African Union’s CAADP. The NAIP
provides the broad objectives and priorities for the sector upon which subsequent policy and planning frameworks are based or revised to align with the national development objective. In response to Cognizance of the importance of the sector to overall growth and achievement of Vision 2030, the planning frameworks are divided into Medium Term Plans (MTP) I (2008-2012), II (2013-2017) and III (2018-2023) to monitor the performance and contribution to overall economic growth. The medium-term plans are also used to guide budget preparation by the planning department at the ministry and to inform allocation by the ministry of finance and the national treasury. Over time, a number of issues have been raised on the relevance, transparency and consistent use of the planning framework by the ministry planning departments and treasuries both at the county and national governments.

2.2.1 Adequacy of the planning frameworks

The existence of national and sectoral policies and planning frameworks are to be used as guiding frameworks to inform investment priorities by the Ministry of Finance and national treasury. As aforementioned, the agriculture sector ASDS and in recent time the ASTGS are the sectoral planning frameworks which mirror the national Vision 2030 and the Big Four Agenda on investment within the sector. The country’s MTPs are used as a yardstick on the progress of the set-out investment priorities in every sector and their contribution towards economic growth, improving food and nutrition security and poverty eradication. The vision 2030 economic pillar highlights the importance of the agriculture sector towards growth and in so doing, there are proposed projects and programs which if implemented will facilitate sectoral growth. The ASDS, on the other hand, is a domestication of the vision 2030 economic pillar on agriculture and it has the mandate to oversee implementation of sectoral flagship projects. These include: improving water resources and irrigation development to counter the over-reliance of agricultural production on rainfall by intensifying and expanding irrigation, rehabilitating and protecting water catchment areas and rainwater harvesting and storage, and developing Northern Kenya and other arid areas. About 80 per cent of the country’s land is ASAL and this necessitates a need to put more emphasis on increasing production of the ASAL to meet the rising demand for food. Further, the ASDS is in tandem with regional development objectives as outlined in the CAADP framework. The ASTGS on the hand is anchored on transforming the sector while incorporating the President’s Big Four Agenda on ensuring food and nutrition security for its citizens, the AU agenda 2063 and the Malabo commitments.

In Kenya, financing the sectoral objectives is dependent on the proposals and budgets submitted to the national treasury by the ministries, departments and agencies (MDAs). The sector working groups provide a thorough review of the proposals submitted to ensure they are aligned to sectoral investment priorities. The agriculture rural and urban development (ARUD) is the agriculture sector working group within the national treasury that oversees resource allocation to the sector is consistent, relevant and evidence-based. Further, planning is guided by the Budget Policy Statement (BPS) a document which sets out the strategic plan, priorities and policies that form a basis for the budgeting process at the county and national governments. Formulation of the BPS is a consultative process which draws stakeholders from different sectors to ensure that the prioritized policy goals mirror the national goals and medium-term plans. The medium-term investment plan (MTIP) within the sector has in previous years been formulated based on the ASDS and the CAADP compact with a main focus on Increasing productivity, commercialization and competitiveness; promoting private sector participation; promoting sustainable land and natural resources management; reforming delivery of agricultural services; increasing market access and trade; and ensuring effective coordination and implementation (Mabiso et al., 2012).

Despite the existence of elaborate national and sectoral frameworks, implementation of the aforementioned frameworks is highly dependent on coordinated efforts between the national, ministry and county governments. The Fourth Schedule of the Kenyan Constitution provides for
devolved functions in the agriculture sector while giving a mandate to counties to formulate and review policies and institutionalize regulatory frameworks which can enable efficient service delivery. Though clearly defined, posing a challenge is the weak linkages between the national and county investment priorities as seen in the formulation of mismatched regulatory frameworks (KIPPRA, 2018). Additionally, the formulation of such cross-cutting policies hinders services delivery at the two levels of governments. Secondly, though clearly defined in the Malabo declaration, funding to the agriculture sector by the county governments is still below the recommended 10% which has implications on the implementation of agriculture sector policies.

The existing planning frameworks at the national and sector levels can be domesticated by the county governments to inform investment priorities rather than the formulation of new frameworks. One such framework is the National Agriculture Sector Extension Policy (NASEP) which has instituted reforms in extension service provision (GoK 2010b). This includes privatization of farmers’ extension services providing a platform for county government involvement in public-private partnerships (PPPs). Secondly, the devolved system of governance provides an opportunity for harmonization and coordination between the two levels of government for impactful policy outcomes. Implementation of policies being a mandate of the counties, it is therefore critical to encourage the involvement of the counties for efficient implementation of national and sectoral projects and programs. Further, implementation requires the involvement of county-led initiatives by eliminating multiple levies across counties for agricultural produce to reduce the cost of food and enhancing large-scale production of food and negotiating for access to export markets depending on the individual county’s comparative advantage.

**2.2.2 Extent Evidence-based planning frameworks**

Kenya being a member of the African Union is committed to raising its national budget allocation to the agricultural sector to 10% per annum to drive agricultural growth and development (GoK, 2010a). The Ministry of Devolution and Planning and Treasury has the mandate to ensure a well-structured budget framework for policy and strategy implementation is in place and in line with the planning frameworks such as Vision 2030 and the MTPs. At the sector level, the Treasury provides budget ceilings for each sector to implement policies and strategies and the budget is dictated by the sector investment priorities and any emerging national plans and needs. Sectoral budget proposals are based on the Programme Performance Review (PPR) which is an assessment of the performance of the existing programs and projects within the agriculture sector. PPRs seek to provide evidence on the achievement of targeted outputs of projects and programs undertaken within the MDAs and ascertain if the medium term goals are met. This provides a basis for budgetary allocation to programs within the sector by the ministry of finance and national treasury. Sectoral PPRs rely on expenditure, targeted outputs and previous budget allocations. Among other indicators, the national treasury keeps track of both financial and non-financial, the progress of both domestically and externally financed and efficiency in the achievement of projects outcomes.

In light of all these, there is inadequate monitoring and evaluation framework to provide data on sector progress which is also used to inform investment by the government and the donor community. Sector ceilings inform the Medium Term budgetary Expenditure Framework (MTEF) process and are the basis for the development of work plans that identify priority actions for policy implementation. Stakeholder involvement in the budget-making process has been strengthened by the constitutional requirement of citizen participation in budget processes. Although forums are held for citizen participation in the budget process at both government levels, their participation in these forums has had little impact.
Provision of public participation in policy and planning frameworks provides an avenue to ensure sectoral policies and planning frameworks not only address the needs of the sector’s key players but also incorporated the views and needs of other stakeholders such as the donor community and private sector. Institutionalization of regulatory frameworks such as public participation policy and the Public Participation Act 2018 will strengthen the use of planning frameworks at the county and sectoral levels.

2.2.3 Consistent use of planning frameworks

Based on the devolved system of governance, implementation of sectoral planning frameworks is the role of the county government with assistance from the national government. This includes budgetary allocation as outlined in the CADDP Kenya compact and prioritization of development objectives in the ASDS and ASTGS. According to the Budget Watch 2018 report, review of the approved 2018/19 budget estimates for selected counties indicates a 6% allocation of the total budget to the sector, of which recurrent allocation is 39% while development outlays amounts to 61% (GoK, 2018c). The average allocation towards the agriculture sector for a majority of the selected counties is between 5% and 10% as shown in Figure 4. The average allocation towards the agriculture sector for a majority of the selected counties is between 5% and 10% as shown in Figure 4 which is below the commitment made by the AU head of states of 10% budgetary allocation. Although allocation is below the recommended target, analysis of the allocations indicate investment in interventions geared towards programmes and projects on promoting smallholder irrigation projects, environmental conservation efforts that include tree planting and soil conservation; supporting fruit farming and processing; provision of certified seeds at a subsidized rate; provision of farm inputs; establishing credit system; expansion of extension services; provision of storage and post-harvesting handling which is key ensuring food availability throughout the year and enhancing market access. These are consistent with national and sector development priorities such as the Big Four Agenda on achieving food security.

The sectoral planning framework is used in the budgeting process both at the county and national level which is initiated by the issuance of circulars by the treasuries at the two levels of government. The circulars provide guidelines for public participation in the budgeting process to ensure inclusion and transparency and secondly, it outlines guidelines for the budget process. The county government relies on Annual Development Plans (ADPs) tabled in the county assemblies by the county planning departments and policy dictates that the plans are made public within 7 days of tabling them before county assembles. The national government, however, relies on the medium term plans. Sector hearings at the national and county governments provide a platform for public participation and other stakeholders to give opinions on the sectoral budgetary allocations. The budget-making process is done in a regular and consistent manner where the budgeting process kick starts on 30th of August every year. Other than the budgeting process, use of the planning frameworks is succinctly emphasized in the medium-term expenditure framework where there is an assessment on sectoral performance based on the on-going programs and projected instituted based on the overarching sectoral objectives. Additionally, the MTEF process forms the basis for charting pathways for sector development based on the ASDS MTPs.

Figure 4: Share of the Agriculture Sector Budget to Total County Budget for Selected County Governments for FY 2018/19
Despite obvious concerted efforts both at the national and county governments, there exist gaps in the implementation of programs and projects by the county governments where counties formulate and initiate projects that are not in line with the planning frameworks. This has been further worsened by inadequate monitoring and evaluation system to track sector performance at the counties and national governments.

The ASTGS provides a framework for incorporation of the devolved system of governance for efficient delivery of agricultural services. The ASGTS avails an opportunity through JASSCOM and the council of governors to oversee domestication of flagship projects and programs for overall sectoral and national growth. At the county levels, CIDP if utilized provides a monitoring and evaluation framework that can be used to keep track of sector performance. This is critical in ensuring the implementation of county programs is done in a clear well-defined manner which is consistent with the national development priorities.
COMPONENT 2 – OPTIMISED ENABLING ENVIRONMENT

As aforementioned, the significance and role of the agricultural sector towards achieving the country’s development blueprint, Vision 2030, the AU 2063 development agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG’s) is an important one. To ensure the functioning of the system in delivery and implementation of policies, institutional frameworks have been put in place to promote efficient functioning of the sector towards poverty eradication, increasing productivity and promoting overall growth and development. This section discusses the presence or lack thereof of an enabling environment for optimal performance of the sector.

3.1 Complementarity of policies in creating the right enabling environment

The development of policies in the past mainly depended on the political will brought about by any new government. This is exemplified by the National Alliance Rainbow Coalition and the recent Jubilee government. However, with the enactment of a new constitution in 2010, this has stabilized the extent to which political influence on policies can go. The President and the ruling party still, however, have a significant influence on the development of sector policies. Despite having a ministry in charge of the sector, there are frequent changes in the appointment of ministers/Cabinet Secretaries (CS) and the Principal Secretaries (PS) who head the various subsectors, ministry and state departments. Other structures that support the government in the implementation of the agricultural policies include the Cabinet committee on Agriculture, the Parliamentary Committee on Agriculture and Rural Development (PCA, the Senate Committee on Agriculture (SCA), Council of Governors committee on Agriculture, Presidential Delivery Unit, and County Executive Committees at the county level among others.

The agricultural sector in Kenya has prioritized irrigation and development of the ASAL and Northern Kenya to promote productivity. Subsequent implementation and achievement of the projects will heavily rely on policies that create an enabling environment for sustainable water use and land use frameworks. The National Water Master Plan and the National Irrigation Policy frameworks in the ministry of Water and Irrigation are expected to propel the national vision and the sector objectives of increasing productivity by increasing the area under irrigation in ASAL region. This will play a major role in improving the livelihoods of the local community and nationally contributing to food security.

Land use policies in Kenya, cultural practices, urbanization and growth of cities have led to subdivision and conversion of agricultural land into residential, commercial and other uses. These alternative land uses have exacerbated conflict and disharmony over land use allocation and reduced agricultural productivity. It is therefore important that land is made available for different uses, for high production levels to be achieved and maintained and sustainability ensured. This policy is key in addressing land use issues such as soil erosion, declining soil fertility among others which are monumental in the productivity of the sector and overall performance.

A well-functioning agricultural extension service operated by the public and private sectors is one of the critical inputs required for increased agricultural productivity to transform subsistence farming into modern and commercial farming, attain food security, improve incomes and reduce poverty. It is, therefore, imperative that agricultural extension services are adequately funded, well-coordinated and regulated. Effective linkages between extension service providers (ESPs) and other stakeholders involved in technology development and provision of facilitating factors are essential. National Agricultural Sector Extension Policy (NASEP) takes a sector-wide approach and addresses key sectoral issues in the delivery of extension services. It gives guidelines on addressing and devising funding modalities, packaging of technologies, technical capacity building and research-extension-farmer

linkages, and application of ICT in Agricultural Knowledge Information System (AKIS) in general. It also offers guidance on the role of the private sector and its modalities of providing extension and other auxiliary services.

The vulnerability of agricultural production to climate change has been one of the biggest challenges to increased productivity. The sector is heavily reliant on rain-fed agriculture which in the wake of climate change variability such as fluctuating temperatures, heavy rainfall, hailstorms and droughts, exposes the small scale producers to risk and loss of crops and livestock thus threatening their livelihoods. The Kenya Climate Smart Agriculture Strategy has the mandate to promote climate change adaptation by producers, build the resilience of the agricultural systems and reduce emissions for improved food and nutritional security. The main objectives of the strategy are to: (i) enhance adaptive capacity and resilience of farmers, pastoralists and fisher-folk to the adverse impacts of climate change; (ii) develop mechanisms that minimize greenhouse gas emissions from agricultural production systems; (iii) create an enabling regulatory and institutional framework; and (iv) address cross-cutting issues that adversely impact CSA.

3.2 Institutional bottlenecks creating disincentives to agricultural investment

Most institutions that support small scale agricultural and private sector activities are either structurally weak or under-funded. For those that are membership-based, for example Kenya Association of Manufacturers, Kenya National Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Fresh Produce and Exporters Association of Kenya, Kenya Flower Council, Fish Producers and Exporters Association of Kenya, and the Kenya Private Sector Alliance, do not have internal capacity to analyse private sector constraints and how they are addressed in policy and the impacts to business, and also lack internal capacity to offer business development services that may have been offered through various policy objectives and strategies. This situation is made worse by the fact that for institutions funded under the public budget which could have filled these gaps, are under-funded or also lack capacity and therefore are not able to fully discharge their mandates.

Undefined institutional responsibilities: The agricultural sector is a multi-sector and multi-stakeholder sector that requires efforts from different players for efficient and effective service delivery and strategy implementation. However, the sector is dynamic and associated with multiple changes from time to time in terms of the directorates, authorities and interactions that hinder seamless coordination of the sector. This has been the case in terms of ministry composition. In 2016, the ministry had 5 directorates including the national land commission which was later shifted to the ministry of planning and Lands. Such undefined institutional responsibilities and roles hinder the functioning mechanism of the sector in terms of coordination of the stakeholders such as the private sector, donors and other development partners. Additionally, service delivery is slowed down by the back and forth movement of the said departments/institutions. On the other hand, such public institutions in many cases handle almost similar activities without complementing each other’s efforts. Such institutions include the Export Promotion Council, Export Processing Zones Authority and Investment Promotion Authority, regarding attracting export-oriented investments. There is, therefore, need to have a national strategy on investment and export promotion, which is centrally coordinated, so as to maximize the meagre resources available to the country. The agriculture sector actors led by the MoALFI are in the process of finalizing the “Agriculture Sector Growth and Transformation Strategy (ASGTS)” (GoK, 2018b) to guide the sectoral development agenda for the next 10 years (2018-2028).

Inadequate Technical and administrative capacity: Staff capacity in policy analysis, planning and development has remained a major challenge. Findings from this study indicate that the MoALFI has
inadequate staff capacity for policy development and coordination with little training on data handling and analysis for evidence-based policy formulation. There is also a general lack of expertise in policy analysis and interpretation at the county level. This has implications on the data collection, analysis and management for policy development, implementation and review. The importance of Capacity building has been highlighted in The Constitution of Kenya, Vision 2030, and various policies such as the Human Resource development, Livestock, draft Agriculture policy, Veterinary and National Oceans and Fisheries policies. The draft Agriculture policy, for instance, identifies the importance of skilled and creative human resource to stimulate sector development. The policy proposes the development of an effective human resource by formulating the standards for agricultural training and skills development; and promotion of investment in agricultural education, research and extension. In regard to institutions, some experience poor governance and deteriorating physical infrastructure coupled with obsolete equipment and machinery. The policy proposes the strengthening of sector institutions, establishing mechanisms for intra and inter-institutional linkages and provision of mechanisms for good governance (GoK, 2017a). Emphasis should be put on the need for capacity building to improve the policymaking process by wide stakeholder consultation, training and sensitization on policymaking and reviewing policies and legislation. Agriculture is dynamic owing to new technologies, innovations and products coupled with impacts of external factors such as marketing, access to credit and climate change. This dynamism necessitates that technical officers and other stakeholders be equipped continually with the necessary skills, knowledge and competencies.

Poor accountability mechanism: This is as a result of a weak monitoring and evaluation system. The agricultural sector in Kenya is broad involving other line ministries, development partners who are key in policy and strategy formulation and implementation, donors who supplement funding of the projects and strategies in the sector and the civil society among others. The research findings reveal that the sector relies on the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) to keep track of the sector performance formulated at the ministry of planning and devolution. The sector does not have a sector-wide M&E framework and therefore this has led to confusion in the sector. The systems that are operational are project based. There are no harmonized indicators to collect data that can accurately provide sector specific data. Worse still is the fact that contribution by other actors including NGOs and Private sector players in the sector cannot be measured and added to the national performance of the sector. At the county level, M&E units are not yet operational in some counties, and where they exist, they may not have the required skills and capacity. In counties that have established M&E units, their M&E reports are not well coordinated resulting in the use of different M&E definitions and concepts. A weak monitoring and evaluation system distorts the concept of accountability by the different stakeholders in the sector thus derails the achievement of sector goals.

Achievement of the set objectives in the sector is highly dependent on an enabling environment provided by consistent and non-conflicting policies that create synergistic effects. The government through its Vision 2030, the ASDS and the ASTGS have given priority to areas such as increasing agricultural productivity which requires policies that complement sustainable land use and water management. Findings from this study indicate the presence of an enabling environment that promotes the functioning of the sector’s investment priority while minimising conflicts with other sectors and ministries. However, a major challenge is the lack of a framework that ensures that sectoral policies are in line with other line ministries policies in terms of implementation timelines and frameworks for coordinated investment.
4 COMPONENT 3 – SUSTAINABLE IMPLEMENTATION

4.1 National system for the delivery of agricultural services

The Cabinet Secretary (CS) as the overall head of the Ministry provides guidance and oversees the implementation of the sector strategies, policies and plans. Being the link between the Ministry and Cabinet, the CS plays a leading role in ensuring optimum delivery of agricultural services such as extension service provision, marketing and promotion of the Ministry’s programmes/projects including resource mobilization. Further, the CS fosters collaboration with other ministries and Development Partners to implement inter-ministerial projects and initiatives. To ensure effectiveness, the CS cascades some of the roles to Principal Secretaries (PS) responsible for each of the five State Departments. Given the devolved nature of the sector, service provision is a prerogative of both the county government and the national government through the respective ministry and related government institutions. At the county level, the Council of Governors (COG) receives policy directives from the Cabinet/ cabinet secretary and relays them to the Governors. The Governors then implement these directives through their deputies and Members of the County Executive Committee (CEC) and Chief Officers in the ministry of agriculture. The national government has considerable authority over national policy issues, capacity building, finance and technical assistance, while county governments are responsible for priority setting, financial management, agricultural production and related extension services in their respective counties (MAFAP 2013). This was supposed to allow a better alignment of government actions and projects to the objectives and priorities.

The agricultural research system comprises public and private agricultural research institutions established under different legal and institutional frameworks. These institutions include KALRO, which has been elaborately described elsewhere in this report, universities -both public and private, Non-governmental research bodies (both local and international) and private companies are also involved in agricultural research. The universities are established under various Acts and charters and have faculties of agriculture and allied sciences that carry out agricultural research independently or in collaboration with other agricultural research institutions. There are also several regional and international research institutions undertaking agricultural research. These institutions have regional and international mandates and offer opportunities for enhancing and complementing the national agricultural research agenda. Overall, a sizeable pool of agricultural research institutions is managed by independent management boards or councils, with each institution planning and executing research programmes independently. The challenge is how to establish an integrated agricultural research system that is well balanced and directed towards addressing the diversity of national development goals and objectives in light of limited resources.

The extension system in Kenya is a product of gradual evolution in extension management practices, and the entry of the private sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and civil society players in response to changes in economic policies. Under the devolved system, the county governments are responsible for the provision of the services for the ministry. These changes have had implications on how the extension services are managed, approaches and methods are applied, key stakeholders are coordinated and linked, and on the most optimal way of financing extension service in the country. Other extension service providers include NGOs, community-based and faith-based organizations. The entry of these new players has helped fill the gap created by the reduced presence of public sector extension service. Several public training institutions offer services to the agricultural sector. These include universities, middle-level colleges and institutes, and farmer and pastoral training centres. Agricultural training institutions run by the private sector also offer general and specialized courses. Other public support institutions involved in human resource capacity building include a livestock-recording centre, a national beekeeping station, fish breeding and demonstration farms, sheep and
goat stations, livestock farms, agricultural mechanization stations and rural technology development stations (GoK, 2010a). These institutions provide specialized training to clients (farmers and extension personnel) and act as demonstration centres for improved technologies. The Agricultural Information Resource Centre (AIRC) and other resource centres, agricultural shows, field days, and open forums have been important sources of agricultural knowledge, information and technology.

Financial services are a prerequisite for sectoral development. Access to financial services and agricultural inputs by farmers is still a major challenge despite the fact that Kenya has a relatively well-developed banking system. Risks associated with agribusiness coupled with complicated land laws and tenure systems that limit the use of land as collateral make financing agriculture unattractive to the formal banking industry. After independence, the Government set up the Agricultural Finance Corporation to provide long-term credit to individuals and groups to purchase farms and to finance farm improvement, as well as seasonal credit for production. By providing suppliers with credit, cooperative societies also supported farmers. These organizations have been mismanaged and run down and are no longer important sources of finance for agriculture (GoK, 2010a). Today, farmers get credit mainly from cooperatives, NGOs and community-based lending institutions. Further, efforts towards availing agricultural inputs and credit to farmers have been made and are bearing fruit. MoALFI has initiated measures like the National Accelerated Agricultural Inputs Access Programme (NAAIAP), which is geared at enabling poor and vulnerable farmers to access free inputs for one acre one season and graduate into regular users later on. There have also been efforts to increase access to credit, including Kilimo Biashara, a collaborative effort between the GoK, Equity Bank and the International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD) through Alliance for Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA). The private sector and donors are key to financial investment for better service delivery.

Over the years, cooperatives have played a key role in marketing cash crops such as coffee, dairy products, pyrethrum, tea, livestock, fish, handicrafts and honey. Marketing of agricultural produce and products within the country is carried out by the private sector either as formal marketing companies or as brokers. National and regional markets have great potential to expand with better marketing infrastructure and quality assurance. The export markets mainly deal with raw commodities and have become stringent on issues of traceability, safety, sanitary and phytosanitary standards, and maximum residue limits. The government through KEPHIS ensures that agricultural produce for the export markets meets the Euro gap standards on phytosanitary standards and provides certification to facilitate easy access to global markets. The horticulture sub-sector is the largest export of cut flowers and other horticultural produce in the country. Institutional frameworks such as the Horticultural Crops Directorate (HCD) has the mandate to promote, develop and coordinate the production and marketing of horticultural produce. Further, to facilitate recognition of Kenyan products in international and regional markets, the Kenya government has engaged in trade agreements such as the free trade area in the East Africa region.

4.2 Capacity gaps, problems, challenges and lessons learnt

The presence of inappropriate policy and legal frameworks that are not fully supportive of private sector-led agricultural development in a liberalized economic environment poses serious challenges in the system. This is characterized by a weak institutional framework that involves minimum inclusion of the private sector, non-governmental organisation and farmer organizations which leads to poor coordination of the various actors following the liberalization of service delivery. Linked to this, is the poor performance of research and extension systems due to low Government investment, restrictions on staff recruitment, and weak research–extension linkages as well as lack of an enabling environment.
During the formulation of the strategy for the agricultural sector, ASCU was formed and its mandate was to ensure coordination between ministries and the county governments to ensure achievement of vision 2030. Within the sector, ASCU was to coordinate sub-sectoral budgeting and be a critical component of planning and implementation of strategic plans to ensure they are in line with national and regional development goals. However, following the collapse of ASCU due to poor working mechanism as a result of institutional rivalry and lack of buy-in, coordination in the sector has been taken up by JASCCM which is marred by a myriad of challenges including supremacy wars between the national and county governments on structure and function of the body.

Poor monitoring and evaluation system to keep track of performance within the agricultural sector at the national and county levels remains a challenge. A monitoring and evaluation system is a critical tool in sector performance management and planning of the ministry by ensuring that the short term goals and long term goals in the sector align to the overall national government development goals and the region’s goals. Monitoring and evaluation was a mandate of the ASCU through independent professional bodies. Lack of an elaborate monitoring and evaluation system has led to derailed policy implementation, lack of transparency and accountability of finished and on-going projects.

One of the key drivers of the agriculture sector is a functional agricultural extension service, access to credit, and adequate agricultural infrastructure among others. This requires competent, knowledgeable and skilled manpower that will respond robustly to these dynamic situations. However, some of the challenges identified by the two levels of governments are weak institutional capacity to deliver quality extension services, implement sector projects and lack of capacity to collect and report sector related data. Weak institutional capacity is attributed to deficiencies in determining training needs and in monitoring and evaluating the training undertaken, as well as high turnover of senior personnel, which lead to loss of institutional memory and change of priorities.

There are operational challenges such as in providing adequate capacities by the county governments. For example, although there are national government staff who have been working under various departments at the county level with adequate training and experience, it is not clear whether these staff were transferred to the county government or they were retained at the ministry level or whether the county governments recruited their own staff. There is need to conduct a capacity needs assessment to determine the capacity of the staff already employed at the counties as well as identify the gaps in terms of skills and number of staff capable to seamlessly implement activities of the sector.

There are poor linkages between and among research institutions such as universities, national research organizations and international organizations which have led to inadequate collection of evidence to inform policies and institutional frameworks for service delivery. Research institutions train personnel on policy research and analysis but there is little use of the research output to inform policy. This is mainly because some of the research priorities for such institutions as universities are not consistent with nationally identified investment priorities and strategies. There is a need to establish formal linkages between research institutions and the ministry to effectively communicate objectives and policy needs to be tackled through research.

The MoALFI at the national and county government level have the administrative and technical capacity to implement policy change. The Ministry is organized to deliver on policy reform as mandated by the government circular on ministerial roles. It has five (5) state departments responsible for crops, livestock, Agricultural Research & Extension, Fisheries & the Blue Economy and Irrigation development. The ministry is also responsible for the coordination of food security and nutrition policy. The state departments have technical units as well as administrative units aligned to responsibilities to deliver on the ministry mandates. This arrangement is informed by a strategic plan that assesses the mandate of the ministry and capacity needed to fulfil the mandates. The strategic
plans are developed periodically, within a period of five years or when a ministry mandate is modified before that period expires. At the national level, the main responsibility of the national government is policy development, capacity development and monitoring and evaluation. The technical departments are structured to effectively deliver on this mandate. Competent staff is hired based on the technical requirements for the job description. The recruited staff is helped regularly to develop skills through on the job training, planned workshops, tailor-made courses and seminars.

Each department has support and control systems that enhance the capacity for policy implementation. Regarding technical capacity for policy implementation, each department has deployed staff per needs assessment report. In this case, technical staff is deployed at the lowest administrative unit, the Wards, and provide an extension to agro-dealers in that Ward. Officers in Wards are supported by more qualified staff deployed at the sub-county, county and national level. Technical staff deployed in the different levels and units have acquired knowledge from their formal education which enabled them to qualify for the positions they hold and this enables them to deliver on the mandates. They are supported by technical manuals developed by respective units and availed in the departmental libraries and websites. There are also other sources of technical materials from other sources such as from NGOs, Research Organizations among others and are availed on request, donated or purchased.

There are administrative support systems at the sub-county, county and national levels that provide the necessary support for policy implementation. Regarding financial and procurement matters of policy implementation, there are adequate and accessible support and control systems of good quality. Despite the very comprehensive support and control systems including: Public Financial Regulations, Public Procurement Regulations, Public Service Act, and Anticorruption Act among others. Despite having these elaborate systems, there have been challenges over the years on how data is collected and reported and how it is channelled to the higher levels in the Ministry. The ministry lacks essential facilities such as computers, especially at the county, sub-county or ward level. The existing facilities are either inadequate or faulty and require frequent servicing. These could be attributed to instances of mismanagement and corruption.

Limited inter-sectoral coordination has led to conflicts and competing priorities in the utilisation of the agricultural resources critical for production such as land and water. This is dominant in crop and livestock production. The importance and significance of coordination in ensuring timely outputs and desirable outcomes in accordance with the MTPs cannot be overstated. Inter-sectoral coordination is critical in ensuring that subsequent priority setting is based on previous assessments. Budgetary decisions are based on the performance of sub-sectors which can be improved with sectoral harmonization. Poor coordination leads to conflicts and manifestation of selfish interest by the directorates thereby hindering the delivery of the objectives of agricultural development agenda.

A weak M&E system that inhibits progress tracking makes it difficult to measure the performance of completed and ongoing projects. M&E is a wider planning framework that measures the performance of the sector against other sectors to inform policies, strategies and budgetary requirement the sector. Additionally, M&E is important in donor-funded projects and sectors to inform the need for additional funding.

Financing of the agricultural sector programs and projects is a key component in the development of the sector. Expenditure trends in the financial years 2015 to 2017 indicate that the total sector allocation in the Financial Year (FY) 2014/15 was KES 56.46 billion which later reduced by 28 per cent to KES. 40.57 billion in the FY 2015/16. The reduction in allocation was due to the transfer of the Irrigation and Drainage Infrastructure programme to the then Ministry of Water and Irrigation. The sector allocation then increased by 23 per cent in the FY 2016/17 to KES. 49.96 billion (GoK, 2018a).
This was due to additional funding for the Strategic Food Reserves, clearance of Agricultural Development Corporation pending bills and purchase of drought-tolerant seeds; Fisheries Offshore Patrol Vessel, Kenya Coastal Development Programme and quality laboratories; and livestock drought intervention. Unstable institutional setting including the arbitrary transfer if sub-sectors from one ministry to another, creates discrepancies in the financing of the sector and provision of services by the sector.

At the county level, the departments were funded by respective ministries before the transition to county governments. County governments now independently come up with, and appropriate budgets for implementation of activities under their jurisdiction. County governments receive an allocation from the national government based on an agreed formula. They are also expected to raise their own revenues at their locales. Concerns arising from the funds allocated to the counties are that they may not be adequate to enable them to discharge the functions they are mandated to undertake. Conversely, the county governments either through the allocation of a larger share of their resources to recurrent expenditures or underfunding of certain sectors have led to underperformance as was predicted by Njagi et. al., (2014). Over 80% of the budgetary allocation to the county governments is spent on administrative needs such as salaries (recurrent) and less than 30% in is available for development (KNBS, 2018). Such low expenditure on development implies that the county government will have to rely on the national government for the development of the agricultural sector. Table 1 below shows the classification of expenditure by functions of the county governments from 2013-2017. There have been general increases in expenditure in most of the sectors including agriculture and a reduction in general public services over the years.

**Table 1: Classification of Expenditure by Functions of County Government 2013-2017**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Public Services</td>
<td>135,187.04</td>
<td>138,218.19</td>
<td>119,555.49</td>
<td>122,201.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Affairs</td>
<td>11,086.63</td>
<td>40,167.19</td>
<td>67,052.61</td>
<td>87,124.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General economic affairs</td>
<td>1,312.91</td>
<td>6,286.69</td>
<td>18,847.04</td>
<td>25,167.85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>2,876.45</td>
<td>14,199.65</td>
<td>11,199.44</td>
<td>14,819.98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>5,930.08</td>
<td>18,854.74</td>
<td>21,404.53</td>
<td>20,900.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other economic affairs</td>
<td>967.19</td>
<td>826.39</td>
<td>15,197.07</td>
<td>26,236.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection</td>
<td>873.72</td>
<td>5,277.16</td>
<td>13,734.13</td>
<td>12,993.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing and Community Amenities</td>
<td>3,532.56</td>
<td>6,997.36</td>
<td>16,749.89</td>
<td>29,175.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>8,492.22</td>
<td>54,871.70</td>
<td>70,732.25</td>
<td>69,406.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation, Culture and Religion</td>
<td>924.64</td>
<td>7,849.29</td>
<td>6,727.41</td>
<td>8,268.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,228.71</td>
<td>19,932.39</td>
<td>21,485.06</td>
<td>29,271.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Protection</td>
<td>71.95</td>
<td>176.70</td>
<td>978.85</td>
<td>1,158.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                     | 161,397.47| 271,309.98| 317,005.89| 359,997.11|

(Source: The National Treasury-IPMS, KNBS, 2018)

Implementation of projects and programs in the agricultural sector has been used as a benchmark on what practices can be replicated for greater service delivery and practices that need to be avoided. Some of the programs aimed at improved service delivery for increased productivity within the sector include: Fertilizer Cost Reduction Project: The project is meant to stabilize fertilizer prices and make fertilizers affordable to smallholder farmers especially during the period 2013-2017 and beyond; Establishment of a Disease Free Zone: The sector undertook measures to establish a coastal disease-free zone to facilitate access to livestock and livestock products that are competitive at the local, regional and international markets; Development of Arid and Semi-Arid Lands through irrigation expansion. This was to be achieved by expanding the already existing irrigation schemes both smallholder and publicly managed and put more land under irrigation in the ASAL region of Tana and
Athi River basins; National Agricultural and Rural Inclusive Growth Project (NARIGP) has a major focus on increasing agricultural productivity and profitability of targeted rural communities in selected counties.

Cross-cutting issues that led to the unsuccessful implementation of some components of the aforementioned projects include: Poor planning and formulation of strategies and objectives with little preliminary studies and reconnaissance have had negative impacts on the implementation of projects. On such example is the establishment of diseases free zones in the coastal regions. The commercial de-stocking component has not been viable due to long market distances, poor timing of interventions and lack of economies of scale. This has been made worse by lack of an existing dynamic marketing system to accommodate commercial destocking. Low stakeholder participation including the local community during the planning period leads to poor implementation as experienced in development of especially ASAL areas. This leads to low progress in sectoral development whose objectives are to increase the area under irrigation, food security and improved livelihoods.

The above shortcomings notwithstanding, there are “best practices” that are used to accelerate delivery in the agricultural sector. A number of the initiated projects are community-based with a focus on improving the livelihoods of the local community by supporting Community-Driven Development with a focus on identifying and implementing investments that improve the community’s agricultural productivity, food security, and nutritional status. There have been several projects that were initiated by development partners focusing on capacity building and promoting agricultural activities in collaboration with the government and the private sector working with farmers at the grassroots level that have been very successful. These collaborations need to be encouraged in all agricultural sector development activities.

5 COMPONENT 4 – COORDINATED INVESTMENT AND ACTION

5.1 Coordination and cooperation mechanisms within the agricultural sector and with other sectors

The agricultural sector is a complex with a wide number of sub-sectors, directorates and institutions working together to achieve food and nutrition security and at the same time contributing to overall national and regional growth and development. Review of available documents showed very little in terms of cooperation and coordination across ministries and within the agricultural sector. A need for coordination is a critical aspect to promote and ensure coordination and cooperation in sub-sector objectives and harmonization of the sector as a whole. Initially, inter-sectoral coordination was executed by ASCU an inter-ministerial secretariat that was formed to oversee the functioning of the Agriculture Sector in collaboration with the Thematic Working Groups (TWGs). ASCU became fully functional in 2006 with a mandate to oversee the coordination of the agricultural sector (GoK, 2010a).

However, despite the nobility of the institution, some of the weaknesses of ASCU included lack of reliable and solid monitoring and evaluation system. The challenges and weakness of ASCU resulted in its disbandment in 2014.

Before devolution in 2013, sectoral coordination was undertaken by the inter-ministerial Coordinating Committee (ICC) supported by sector working groups who provided the leadership for agriculture policy and strategy development, implementation and monitoring. Devolution brought about challenges in coordination of the sector both at the national and county level mainly due to the inability of the ASDS to capture devolved functions, agriculture being one of them. However, subsequent efforts have led to the establishment of the Joint Agriculture Sector Consultation and Cooperation Mechanism (JASCCM) in an attempt to improve coordination of strategy implementation.
between the national and county governments, in accordance with the Intergovernmental Relations Act.

At the county level, County Executive Committees (CECs) for agriculture have the responsibility for coordinating the implementation of ASDS and sector regulations at the county government level. The CECs from the 47 Counties have established a CEC Caucus for Agriculture to coordinate county issues in agriculture. Some of the key entities that oversee coordination in the sector include:

**MoALFI Executive Committee (MEC):** It is made up of the Cabinet Secretary for agriculture and five Principle secretaries for respective state departments. The role of the MEC is to provide cross-state Departmental policy, strategic direction, institutional restructuring and receive feedback on cross-departmental initiatives. At their discretion, the MEC meeting may involve other stakeholders from other governmental institutions, private sector, Development Partners and civil society organizations to inform decisions on sector development. MEC has the mandate to enhance internal consultation between the five State Departments and to agree on measures aimed at restructuring the institutional set-up of the Ministry. The working mechanism of the MEC has been made possible through the Sectoral (Agriculture) Working Groups (SWAGs) which are technical committees that draw representation from areas such as policy and standard, monitoring evaluation and communication, institutional capacity, research and extension, projects and inputs and youth teams to enhance the sector performance through joint action. The MEC may co-opt other members as deemed necessary to inform decisions pertaining to specific agenda points. It may also decide to conduct special meetings with the representation of MoALFI directors and key sector stakeholder constituencies, such as Director General (DG) AFA, DG KALRO, the private sector, civil society and Development Partners. This will ensure that the MEC in addition to its primary function as a platform for internal consultation also performs the function as a platform for the Ministry’s consultation with national sector stakeholders.

**Inter-ministerial Coordination Mechanism:** Prior to devolution, there existed an Inter-ministerial Coordination Committee (ICC). This brought together ten ministries relevant to the implementation of agricultural activities. This function is of utmost importance to facilitate joint planning and horizontal coordination. Modalities are being worked on to set up such a sectoral ministerial mechanism by borrowing from best practices from other countries in the region like Ethiopia which has a functional – Agriculture Transformation Agency (ATA).

**National Agriculture Coordination Unit:** This secretariat primarily acts as the direct link to the JAS and facilitates the functioning of technical committees at the national level. The MoALFI directorate level operations and initiatives are informed by technical inputs from key sector constituencies, such as county governments, other national institutions, private sector, civil society and Development Partners. Technical Directorates, therefore, establish stakeholder consultation mechanisms on an as-needed and ad hoc basis. This includes more regular platforms for directorate-level technical consultation with interested county governments as well as ad hoc, issue-specific platforms for consultation with a broader range of national sector stakeholders. These technical platforms also provide technical inputs to the SWAGs and County Commodity Clusters (CCCs) as needed.

The mechanism shown in Figure 5 responds to the requirements of the Kenya Constitution as stipulated in Articles 6, 174, 186, 187 & 189 and is anchored in law and the Intergovernmental Relations Act 2012 (13.2, 23).

*Figure 5: Intergovernmental Joint Agricultural Sector Coordination Mechanism*
Each level of Government has developed its own mechanism of coordination. This consultation and cooperation mechanism, therefore, focuses on the intergovernmental relations between the two levels of Government and is consistent with the Intergovernmental Relations Act 2012 (13). The mechanism is composed of: 1) Intergovernmental Forum (IGF) for Agriculture as the highest level of consultations between the two levels of government but which also has special sessions meant for a wider stakeholder consultation; 2) Joint Agriculture Sector Steering Committee (JASSCOM) is the main decision making organ in the sector; and 3) Sectoral working (Agricultural) groups (SWAGs) for intergovernmental technical consultations.

To serve this mechanism, there is an established operations office named – The Joint Agriculture Secretariat (JAS). The office has competitively hired officers covering the various Agriculture sub-sector areas and a CEO/coordinator. The office is located away from Kilimo house (the Ministry of Agriculture headquarters) and the COG Headquarters so as to maintain a measure of independence. The mechanism also provides coordination services to other common programs and projects in the sector. The Joint Agriculture Secretariat (JAS) is the operational secretariat that supports the Joint Agriculture Sector Consultation and Cooperation Mechanism (JASCCM), the organ that facilitates sector coordination by following up on resolutions made by the Sector Intergovernmental Forum (IGF) in Kenya.

The need for the establishment of consultation mechanisms depends on the exact sector specific set-up preferred in the individual counties. However, as nation-wide sector planning, monitoring and reporting depends on contributions from County Governments, and because County Governments are required to contribute to intergovernmental sector initiatives (e.g. policy initiatives), it is desirable that County Governments adhere to a set of minimum standards for county-level sector consultation to facilitate effective sector management at the county level and county engagement in intergovernmental consultation. These standards cover the governance, steering, secretariat, implementation and stakeholder outreach functions of the sector consultation.
The county governments have established a Council of Governors with a Council of Governors Agriculture Committee (COG-AC) as the highest levels of governance. They have also formed a County Executive Committee Member (CECM) Caucus of County Ministers of Agriculture and Chief Officers Caucus (COC Caucus). The COG, an executive committee for technical steering, facilitates consultations, coordination and communication. The COG has established a Council of Governors Secretariat. Counties make up half of the members of the SWAGs. Counties are advised to consider maintaining or establishing their own coordination mechanisms to support county level sector consultations, capacity building based on agreements reached by the SWAGs. On donor and government coordination mechanism, this has been made possible through the existence of the Agriculture and Rural Development (ARD). The ARD a donor working group provides a platform for donor-government engagement on policy issues and process including drawing from international best practice within the country. Further, the platform is a basis for financial and technical support towards agriculture-related projects and activities.

There are challenges in implementing the coordination structures in place. This is exacerbated by the un-defined coordination structures at the county level and undefined policy boundaries. One such challenge is the inadequate budget to ensure proper coordination mechanisms exist both at the ministry level and the county government. At the national level, formulation, development and coordination of policies is a role undertaken by the national government as provided for in the Kenyan Constitution 2010 and the county government’s mandate is to ensure domestication and implementation of the policies. However, despite the stated objectives of the national government, there is lack of definition of boundaries in policy functions. The formulation of the ASDS which is the umbrella policy for the sector did not incorporate devolution but it, however, provided a mechanism for sector coordination through the ASCU.

Successful implementation of agricultural programs and projects is highly dependent on mutually inclusive coordination and cooperation mechanism between the two levels of government, donors, development partners and other stakeholders critical to the sectoral development. While coordination is a complex process more so in the agricultural sector due to its wide network of stakeholder, it is also a panacea to sector development as it paves a pathway for decision making, creates a platform for transparency and coherence in policy formulation and implementation of strategies while at the same time ensuring harmonization of programmes. At the core of it, is devolution of the agricultural sector which has led to a weak coordination mechanism between the two levels of government to operate in tandem for efficient service delivery for the sector. Though still at the infancy levels, the country has the capacity to facilitate linkages between policy goals and implementation strategies that is inclusive. This is evidenced in the establishment of the coordinating mechanism, the Transformation Initiative (TI), the Inter-governmental Secretariat) (IGS) by MoALFI and the Council of Governors to respond to structural changes in the sector.
COMPONENT 5 – ACCOUNTABILITY FOR RESULTS

6.1 National Monitoring, Evaluation and Accountability System

Efforts were made to establish individual project- and programme-based M&E in the country in the 1980s and 1990s. Most development plans prepared during this period included a section on M&E (GoK, 2016). However, most of these M&E plans were prepared in response to donor demands, leading to a very specific project and programme evaluations. As a consequence of the dominance of donor requirements, the M&E reports produced were rarely shared with the intended project/programme beneficiaries (GoK, 2016). This was a major impediment in ensuring accountability and participation of stakeholders in these projects. Development of an integrated M&E system in Kenya began in 2000 with the implementation of the Interim Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (I-PRSP) 2000-2003. It was enhanced during the implementation of the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment Creation (ESRWEC), 2003-2007. The investment Programme for the ESRWEC recognised the important role of M&E in promoting accountability and enhancing good governance issues. This evolved and led to the creation of the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (NIMES) in 2004; and the creation of the Monitoring and Evaluation Directorate (MED) in the Ministry of Planning and National Development. With the introduction of NIMES, M&E has become an integral part of the policy formulation and implementation process at the national level. NIMES is used as a mechanism for tracking implementation progress for projects and programmes outlined in the MTPs. NIMES provides information that is used to prepare Annual Progress Reports (APRs) on implementation of MTPs. Each APR evaluates performance against benchmarks and targets that are set for each year for various sectors in the MTP. It provides important feedback to policymakers and the general public on the national government’s performance progress towards achieving various economic and social development policies and programmes set out in the MTP. For instance, the ASDS and the MTP (2013-2017), performance indicators and targets focus on Productivity Impact Indicator on the efficient use of resources to increase production, Livelihood Impact Indicator, which looks at how the productivity gains are influencing the wellbeing of the community and the Environmental Impact Indicator, that estimates the sustainability of the achieved gains (KALRO, 2017).

From the study results, there was no formally adopted M&E system by the MoALFI. It emerged that the ministry uses the NIMES framework reporting directly the specific indicators that relate to agriculture. The ministry also uses different M&E systems that are project based. At the county level, however, County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System (CIMES) has been adopted. According to GoK (2016), CIMES has been defined as an observation system for County Governors, County Executive Committee Members and other senior management staff within a county. It verifies whether the activities of each county’s priority project or programme are happening according to planning timelines and targets presented in the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP); and whether resources are being used in a correct and efficient manner.

Despite the presence of mechanisms to track performance at the national and sectoral levels, the sector lacks an overarching framework for M&E. The MoALFI working with National Treasury is finalising the National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy which will be the guiding framework on monitoring and evaluation activities. The policy recognizes the shortcomings of the existing M&E framework, NIMES such as: Lack of a clear legal and institutional frameworks for M&E; Lack of institutional mechanisms for integrating results of M&E into planning, policy, budgeting and other decision making processes whether at lower or higher levels; Emphasis on tracking inputs and outputs of resources rather than developmental outcomes and impacts; Inadequate or ineffective feedback mechanisms between governmental M&E systems at horizontal (e.g. sectoral or inter-ministerial) and vertical (i.e. between Counties and National Government) levels and between governmental, private
sector and civil society at all levels; and Untimely sharing of M&E results between the government, private sector and civil society actors.

The policy will provide an enabling framework for the monitoring and evaluation function in the public sector to facilitate achievement of the country’s development agenda. It is designed to guide implementation of the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation System, monitoring and evaluation capacity development and resource mobilization for monitoring and evaluation. The policy will harmonise monitoring and evaluation systems for all public projects, programmes and policies at all levels including the devolved structures. It is hoped that this policy will lead to timely and accurate reporting of progress and results at all levels and Strengthen capacity to effectively monitor and evaluate programmes/projects at all levels. This includes strengthening coordination of M&E systems in the country and promoting a culture and practice of M&E in the country as well as the dissemination, communication and use of M&E findings for improving policy and programme implementation and project performance. The efforts to develop a common M&E system for the agricultural sector have proven to be extremely demanding. It is clear that developing a sector-wide M&E system is in high demand by stakeholders at all levels, but it requires a huge effort. Development Partners and national coordination are required to ensure broad buy-in and to discourage the emergence of parallel systems (Chipeta et al., 2015). However, the metrics of performance monitoring measures and most targets have not been developed. There is need to develop agreed-upon indicators for measurement of sector performance as the traditional M&E structure was very informal and project-based as shown in Figure 6.

**Figure 6: Kenya Agricultural Sector Mutual Accountability Framework**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institutions/Stakeholders</th>
<th>Means of Tracking</th>
<th>Accountability Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Government</strong></td>
<td><strong>ASDS/NAIP</strong></td>
<td><strong>Joint Sector Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County Government</strong></td>
<td><strong>CAADP Results Framework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Peer Review</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Non-State Actors</strong></td>
<td><strong>National M&amp;E Framework</strong></td>
<td><strong>Joint Investment Fora</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Farmer Groups</strong></td>
<td><strong>SAAKS Node</strong></td>
<td><strong>Roundtables</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women Groups</strong></td>
<td><strong>Sector Review Mechanism</strong></td>
<td><strong>Media Fora</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Youth Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Donor Platforms</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Vulnerable Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ALC/REGs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Donor Partners</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>International Community</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: GoK, 2017c)

In terms of Capacities in place to support the system, MED is responsible for coordinating all government M&E activities. To do so effectively, MED has developed mechanisms and capacity for working with the various entities involved with data collection and analysis in the NIMES. It also provides leadership and coordination of the NIMES by ensuring that two vital sources of M&E information, namely Annual Progress Reports (APR) on the Medium Term Plan of Vision 2030, MED have faced several challenges during the implementation of NIMES. Due to delays in issuing APRs, they have not been used in the budget preparation discussions. Past APRs have observed some disconnect
between priority setting and planning processes within government agencies, which threaten the successful implementation of the MTPs.

At the county level, the governments are beginning to set up units/departments responsible for developing crucial systems needed for M&E, performance management, and statistical data collection. The counties face a number of challenges relating to the development and use of M&E systems. The draft M&E Policy and draft M&E Framework, which are crucial to the formalisation of the M&E structures have not yet been finalised. M&E units are not yet operational in some counties, and where they exist, lack the required skills and capacity. In counties that have established M&E units, their M&E reports are not well coordinated. M&E requires competent professionals in the public service. Although the guidelines for the CIMES handbook describes competencies needed for M&E staff, and steps that should be taken by the government such as to develop curricula and advanced training in M&E for use by local universities and other training institutions, not much has been achieved. In essence, a core M&E curriculum at university level needs to be defined in collaboration with the institutions, to serve as a basis for universities’ development of suitable M&E programmes. In-service training courses will need to be made available, tailored for different stakeholders and target groups, covering both awareness raising and in-house training programmes for managers and for M&E and other programme staff.

### 6.2 Functioning of the accountability system

The agriculture sector development strategy and the National Agriculture Investment Plan (NAIP) were developed with the aim of achieving the broad goal of 6% growth in Agriculture, provided by the African Union’s Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP). The NAIP provides the broad objectives and priorities for the sector upon which subsequent policy and planning frameworks are based or revised to align with the overall national planning framework and investment objectives and priorities. At the national and sector level, implementation of the ASDS and sector policies are being guided by the approved sector Medium Term Plan (MTP) and the respective policy implementation action plans that align to the country’s development blueprint, Vision 2030. Provided for under each strategic issue in the MTP, are the objectives, expected outputs and estimated budgets. The sector MTP is a process that involves all the technical departments and their units in proposing high yielding interventions during the medium term planning that will make the sector grow at 6% annually in order to add to general economic growth of 10% projected in line with Vision 2030 and CAADP framework (GoK, 2010b). Timely data collection, analysis and information dissemination by planning units in the Ministry of Devolution and Planning is a key element in the implementation of the medium-term plan that aligns to the agricultural sector.

To ensure the availability of timely and reliable data on economic growth and poverty reduction and on projects and programmes being implemented the national government through NIMES relies on sectoral data on specific indicators to keep track of implementation progress for investment programmes outlined in the MTP and CIDP and other projects and programmes financed by devolved funds, development partners and CSOs. The M&E system usually includes important social and economic indicators as well as targets used to monitor the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and key indicators related to economic growth. At the county government level, analysis of the CIDP is done through CIMES to show whether the resources spent on implementing CIDP investment programmes are leading to the intended outcomes, impacts and benefits for the county population. Subsequently, CIMES is able to provide essential feedback to the county budgetary allocation and execution processes, thereby ensuring that future county budget preparation and execution processes are tailored towards maximising their impact on achieving CIDP targets.
Data used as inputs in the M&E are sourced from surveys and administrative data collected and analysed by the county statistics office and other county departments, national government ministries and agencies such as KNBS located within every county. It is therefore important that each county government establishes strong linkage with statistics units that compile various types of data in the county (including statistics units located in the county planning department and in other relevant national government ministries and public agencies), to ensure that these institutions develop robust county statistical information databases that will provide a steady supply of reliable and timely statistics needed for monitoring and evaluation of the SDGs and other key performance indicators outlined in the CIDPs and investment programmes and projects financed by development partners and other devolved funds. The resulting annual performance reports are submitted to the CEC and Public Service Board to the County Assembly for consideration before being presented to The Intergovernmental Forum, the Council of Governors, the National and County Government Coordinating Summit and the Senate. The Performance Management System and M&E resultant reports are then made public. Devolved M&E, through the implementation of the Annual Development Plan (ADP), enables local accountability, local corrective action and local learning, resulting in the fast-tracking of local development and results.

Joint Sector Review (JSR) or JSR-like evaluations have also been used as tools to track the performance of the agriculture sector for greater accountability by all stakeholders involved. The role of the JSR process is to create a platform that is used to assess the performance of the Agriculture Sector in relation to the laid out objectives and plans and spearhead the Biennial Review process as outlined in the Malabo declaration 2014. Secondly, the JSR is important in assisting the government keep track of the sector performance and its trajectory towards the country’s overall objectives and development partner are meeting their pledges and commitment towards the implementation of strategies, policies and plans (GoK, 2017b). Notably, the JSR process serves a management tool to inform decision making on budget planning, the effectiveness of the monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in place and the need to make adjustments to existing policies and strategies to fit broader objectives. The Joint Sectoral Reviews were previously spearheaded by the Kenya Joint Assistance Strategy (KJAS) whose activities ceased in 2012. However, the MTPs and Vision 2030 has a provision for the establishment of a development cooperation mechanism to address the issues of mutual accountability based on targets, roadmap, and monitoring framework. Efforts are being made to develop a new guiding Performance Assessment Framework (PAF) that will form a basis for the implementation of the agreed on national and regional objectives. At the sector level, the PAF will be domesticated to guide semi-annual reviews.

The African union’s biennial review is a mutual accountability review process for African countries to keep track of their performance in the agricultural sectors by making use of the indicators provided in the scorecard to reaffirm their commitment to the CAADP country compacts. The Malabo thematic areas of performance include 22 performance categories from which country progress is measured against and 43 indicators used to keep track of agricultural growth and transformation. The African Agricultural Transformation Scorecard (AATS) has a benchmark of 3.9, in which Kenya scored 4.8. This implies that the country is on track in meeting her Malabo commitment in some of the thematic areas such as youth engagement in agricultural value chains which is aimed at increasing employment, size of irrigated land, farmer access to advisory services, and farmer access to financial services as agreed on in the CAADP compact. However, though it has surpassed the minimum benchmark, Kenya is still far from attaining some of the set goals of the Malabo declaration including public agriculture expenditure as a share of the total public expenditure which is still at a low 2.3%, attainment of food and nutrition security and fertilizer application rate per hectare of arable land is still low among others (African Union [AU], 2018).
6.3 Barriers to more effective accountability system

The Monitoring and Evaluation Department (MED) is in the process of formulating a National M&E Policy that will complement other Government policies in providing timely and regular information for evidence-based decision making geared towards achieving the Kenya Vision 2030 and the SDGs. The structure, functioning and organization of the monitoring and evaluation system have been one of the constraints to an effective and efficient M&E and targeted accountability for the agricultural sector in Kenya. This is reflected in the absence of an elaborate system in some sub-sectors and the ones that have a system, its functional ability is limited in terms of collection of information, analysis of data and dissemination of results within the sector and with the national government. Currently, the Agriculture and Food Authority (AFA) has been mandated to collect data for specific commodities and avail to different users. Considering that AFA is a new organization and coupled with the complexity of the agricultural sector, there is inadequate capacity for data generation, analysis and communication.

Inadequate capacity and lack of institutional support from management have rendered M&E less functional at the sub-sectoral level. A comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system requires adequate capacity in terms of staffing and provision of technical equipment necessary for task execution. Poor staffing has implications on timely delivery of monitoring and evaluation reports to the national government and DP for decision making. Capacity building is a prerequisite to an efficient result based monitoring and evaluation system. There is limited involvement of specialists in M&E engagements resulting in low-quality data that is rarely utilized to inform policy and recommendations. Such cases arise due to poorly designed M&E systems that are not able to comprehensively measure the identified indicators. This is exacerbated by the lack of incentive by management to have a well-functioning system to monitor performance. A well designed M&E system should be designed in a way that it is independent and free of control during the formulation and implementation process.

A key consideration for an efficient and effective result based system is the cost of implementation of project activities such as capacity in terms of staffing and technical equipment to ensure smooth running and successful implementation. The major challenge is an inadequate budgetary allocation for monitoring system and in some instances merging of monitoring activities with other project/program activities rendering monitoring process ineffective. The Kenyan constitution has a provision for funding of monitoring and evaluation costs in Kenya where the national government, the county and non-state actors set out 5% of their budgetary allocation for project monitoring and evaluation activities (Muinde, 2015).

One of the key challenges noted during stakeholder consultation is the fragmented nature of M&E systems in the sector. Implementation of accountability systems is done on individual projects without a clear outline of the indicators to be achieved from the input level to impact level indicators. Though, arbitrary, attempts are made to feed into the CIMES and the NiMES framework for consistency. The lack of a sector-wide monitoring and evaluation framework for the various projects and programs both at the national and county levels has limited the level at which sector performance review is done. Such inadequacies also hinder coordinated and efficient data collection, analysis, use, and communication. Given that monitoring framework measures achievements at the activity and output levels, while the evaluation framework measures achievements at the effect and impact level, without these, coupled with lack of capacity to provide indications of impact, outcomes and outputs achieved, it is impossible to measure achievements attributed by interventions or those from other sector players. Moreover, the management and partners cannot make decisions that will optimize the effects of the sector plans.
Lastly, there are inadequacies in capacity assurance across the departments apart from some that have integrated ISOs reflected in form of service charters. These are however human resource based quality assurance based indicators and not program-based quality assurance indicators. M&E units have not developed frameworks for quality assurance nor has external capacity been mainstreamed in the M&E framework. Monitoring is further strengthened by the annual performance contracting which involves external assessors. This is a comprehensive monitoring process that entails the development of individual targets, culminating into ministerial targets that are assessed by independent assessors at the end of each fiscal year.

In conclusion, financial resources for monitoring and evaluation should be estimated realistically at the planning stage. The M&E Framework document recommends that the management team responsible for project/programme preparation and implementation should provide for financial resources for M&E in their budgets. While it is critical to plan for monitoring and evaluation together, resources for each function should be catered for separately. Each project should have two separate budget lines for its monitoring and evaluation agreed in advance with partners. This will help the county government and its partners to be more realistic in budgeting. It will also reduce the risk of running out of resources for evaluation, which often take place at mid-term or towards the end of project/programme implementation. Human resources are critical for effective monitoring and evaluation, even after securing adequate financial resources. For high-quality monitoring and evaluation, there should be specific staff members whose time is dedicated M&E function. The practices of deployment of personnel for monitoring may vary among county governments. County governments could establish monitoring and evaluation units with specific terms of reference, skilled staff, work plans and other resources.
7 PROPOSED POLICY AND STRATEGIC RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 Overall policy and strategic recommendations

To be developed in detail after the validation exercise – Only draft and preliminary elements are provided here below

In order for the agricultural sector to move forward and achieve the set targets, the following need to be implemented:

Component One: Aligned Strategies
- Revise and finalize with the draft Agriculture Policy and have it clearly communicated to be the overarching policy document for the sector from which comprehensive sector strategies and programmes can be drawn from to drive the growth of the Agriculture Sector.
- Harmonize roles between different ministries, and other actors in the sector.
- Facilitate improved and informed dialogue on policy issues among government, donors, research community and civil society through organizing regular policy workshops and roundtables.
- Enforce the utilization of policies and planning frameworks in budgeting and implementation processes.
- Ensure strict implementation of the sector development plans and strategies in the sector.

Component Two: Optimised Enabling Environment
- Review the public-sector budgeting process and expenditure to align them to sector priorities, plans and frameworks with regard to the county, national, regional and international priorities and goals.
- Improve national capacity for policy analysis by building a cadre of well-trained policy analysts within relevant government agencies and to strengthen their links to a network of policy analysts in national research organizations and elsewhere.
- The ministry in conjunction with stakeholders should set up directorates and institutions in the sector with long term defined roles.

Component Three: Sustainable Implementation
- Enhance participation of all sector players in the entire process of planning, designing, implementation of agricultural sector plans, policies, strategies and frameworks.
- Establish a robust M&E system with indicators to track the progress of counties, national government and development partners in the implementation of investment priorities.
- Build the capacity of County governments in policy development, analysis, and implementation by strengthening its staff's technical and administrative capacity for policy implementation and implementation of agriculture sector activities, including reporting and mutual accountability.
- Develop and execute a code of conduct involving all sector players in implementing agricultural sector plans and priorities.

Component Four: Coordinated Investment and Action
- Strengthen the existing coordination and cooperation mechanisms within the sector, among sectors, and between the levels of governments (national and county), development partners and private sector and have these structures streamlined and gazetted by establishing and operationalizing a policy development and coordination organ with a clear mandate to improve coherence among policies and relative actions for policy implementation. This can be done through:
- Establishing a legally recognized central coordination unit for the ministry, stakeholders and other non-state actors for sector-wide coordination of policy frameworks.
- Re-energizing JAS and explore possibilities to domesticate these structures at counties.

Component Five: Accountability for Results

- Strengthen the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Systems (NIMES) and County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Systems (CIMES) to capture more indicators and actors relating to the agricultural sector.
- Restructure the NIMES and CIMES to capture sector indicators.
- Set up a formal and uniform operational framework for the 47 counties to keep track of the performance of the agricultural programs.
- Establish mutual accountability forums for all sector actors to deliberate on sector development.
- Improve and embed transparency and accountability mechanisms at all levels such as the country sector accountability forums, JSRs and BRs.
- Finalize and launch the National Monitoring and Evaluation Policy to provide an accountability framework.
7.2 Practical recommendations by priority and cost level

To be developed after the validation exercise – Only draft and preliminary elements are provided here below

Table 2: Recommendation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identified Gaps</th>
<th>Proposed interventions</th>
<th>Priority order (short, medium, long term)</th>
<th>Estimated cost</th>
<th>By whom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Component 1: Aligned Strategies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of an overarching agriculture sector policy</td>
<td>-Complete the Draft Agriculture Policy to be the overarching policy document for the entire sector. -Facilitate improved and informed dialogue on policy issues among government, donors, research community and civil society through the organization of regular policy workshops and roundtables.</td>
<td>Medium-term to long term</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The National Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fragmented institutional setting with actors in the</td>
<td>-Need for role harmonization between different ministries, and other actors in the sector.</td>
<td>Medium to long term</td>
<td></td>
<td>• National government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sector acting in silos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• County government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inadequate use of policies for planning.</td>
<td>-Enforce the utilization of policies and planning frameworks in budgeting and implementation processes. -Ensure strict implementation of the sector development plans and strategies in the sector.</td>
<td>Medium-term to long term</td>
<td></td>
<td>• The National Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The National Treasury and the Ministry of Agriculture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• The County Government</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Component 2: Optimised Enabling Environment

| Inadequate technical and administrative capacity in the implementation of policies and plans. | - Set up adequate dedicated staff time for policy implementation.  
- Improve national capacity for policy analysis by building a cadre of well-trained policy analysts within relevant government agencies and to strengthen their links to a network of policy analysts in national research organizations and elsewhere. | Medium to Long term |  
| • County government  
• National government |

| Undefined institutional responsibilities for the different sector players. | - Setting up directorates and institutions in the sector with long term defined roles. | Medium to Long term |  
| • Ministry  
• Other sector players |

### Component 3: Sustainable Implementation

| Inadequate infrastructure for policy implementation both at the county and national government | - Continuous strengthening of the technical, administrative and infrastructure capacity for county governments is needed for policy implementation and analysis | Medium to Long term |  
| • County  
• National government |

| Weak linkages between research institutions and the Ministry. | - Establish a formal framework to enhance linkages between research and development priorities for the sector.  
- Harmonize research activities to minimize duplication and ensure coordinated research activities.  
- Develop and execute a code of conduct involving all sector players. | Medium to Long term |  
| • Ministry of Agriculture  
• Academic institutions such as University of Nairobi, Egerton University  
• Research organizations such as KALRO, Tegemeo Institute |

<p>| Budgetary misallocation | - Develop mechanisms to keep track implementation of the programs and | Medium-term to long term |<br />
| • Donors such as the World Bank |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component 4: Coordinated Investment and Action</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supremacy wars between the county and national government.</td>
<td>- Establishment of an independent body to oversee implementation and investment of identified priorities both by the county and national governments.</td>
<td>Medium to Long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Strengthen the Intergovernmental coordination mechanisms.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Gazette and strengthen the capacity of the new sector Consultation and Cooperation Mechanism (JASCCM).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor coordination between donors and government</td>
<td>Existence of a donor coordination group on the agriculture sector that can provide a platform for various stakeholder engagement.</td>
<td>medium to long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Component 5: Accountability for Results</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak monitoring and mutual accountability systems.</td>
<td>- Restructuring of the National Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation Mechanism (NIMES) and County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation (CIMES) to capture sector indicators.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Establish mutual accountability forums for all sector actors to deliberate on sector development.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Improve and embed transparency and accountability mechanisms at all levels such as the country sector accountability forums, JSRs and BRs.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• County and national governments</td>
<td>• The national government • County Governments • Council of Governors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issue</td>
<td>Recommendation</td>
<td>Timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inconsistent use of the existing County Integrated Monitoring and Evaluation (CIMES) framework by the counties.</td>
<td>Finalisation of the National monitoring and evaluation policy to provide an accountability framework.</td>
<td>Medium term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor coordination in sectoral M&amp;E activities which are undertaken at the project level.</td>
<td>Establish a formal and uniform operational framework for the 47 counties to keep track of the performance of the agricultural programs.</td>
<td>Medium term to long term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NB: Data provided is indicative subject to validation in the stakeholder workshop.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution/organisation</th>
<th>Name(s) of interviewee(s)</th>
<th>Role of interviewee(s)</th>
<th>Date of the interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture &amp; Irrigation</td>
<td>Anne Onyango</td>
<td>Agriculture Secretary</td>
<td>22nd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council of Governors</td>
<td>Jacqueline Mogeni/Robert Kiteme</td>
<td>Chief Executive Officer</td>
<td>4th February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental Relations Technical Committee</td>
<td>Caroline Letipuru</td>
<td>Director Governance</td>
<td>21st January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RTI International</td>
<td>Dorcas Mwakio</td>
<td>Director Policy Institutional Capacity Building-USAID Project</td>
<td>31st January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Information Resource Center</td>
<td>Dr Isaiah Okeyo</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Technology Policy Studies Network</td>
<td>Ms Ruth Oriama</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amiran Kenya</td>
<td>Erick Nyabiba</td>
<td>Public Relations/Sales Officer</td>
<td>30th January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biovision International Trust</td>
<td>Alex Mutungi</td>
<td>Executive Director</td>
<td>22nd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Small Scale Farmers Forum (KESSF)</td>
<td>Justus Lavi</td>
<td>National General Secretary</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Institute for Public Policy Research and Analysis (KIPPRA)</td>
<td>Dr Mathew Muma</td>
<td>Senior Policy Analyst</td>
<td>22nd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Acre Fund</td>
<td>Amy Azania</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (SAKSS)</td>
<td>John Maina</td>
<td>SAKSS Coordinator</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegemeo Institute</td>
<td>Dr. Timothy Njagi</td>
<td>Research Fellow</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN Food Agricultural Organization (FAO) Kenya</td>
<td>Mulat Demeke</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer</td>
<td>18th January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Nairobi (Faculty of Agriculture)</td>
<td>Prof. Willis Kosura</td>
<td>Senior Lecturer</td>
<td>25th January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO)</td>
<td>Dr Cyrus Mbugua Githunguri</td>
<td>Senior Principal Research Officer</td>
<td>18th January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Dairy Board (KDB)</td>
<td>Margaret Kibogoy</td>
<td>Managing Director</td>
<td>1st February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA)</td>
<td>John Macharia</td>
<td>Country Director-Kenya</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Shadrack Mutavi</td>
<td>Senior Policy Officer</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (KeFAAS)</td>
<td>Peter Mwangi Gitika</td>
<td>Country Director</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyeri County Government</td>
<td>Henry Kinyua</td>
<td>CEC-Nyeri County</td>
<td>30th January 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institution</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture and Food Authority (AFA)</td>
<td>Beatrice Nyamwanu</td>
<td>Senior Programme Manager-Crops</td>
<td>1st February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Agricultural Secretariat (JAS)</td>
<td>Benson Mureithi</td>
<td>Coordinator</td>
<td>1st February 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African Technology Policy Studies Network (ATPS)</td>
<td>Ruth Oriama</td>
<td>Research Officer</td>
<td>23rd January 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### ANNEX 3: IDENTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF BUSINESS AND NON-BUSINESS ORGANISATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. United States Agency for International Development (USAID) | International NGO-1961 | Cross sectional | Donor | - Agriculture and food security  
-Democracy, human rights and governance  
-Economic growth and trade  
-Education  
-Environment and global climate change  
-Gender equality and women’s empowerment  
-Global health  
-Water and sanitation  
-Working in crisis and conflict | 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 Cross-sectoral level |
| 2. One Acre Fund | International NGO-2006 | Agribusiness | Donor | - Asset-Based Loans-Farmers receive high-quality seeds and fertilizer on credit, and we offer a flexible repayment system that allows them to pay back their loans in any amount throughout the loan term.  
-Delivery-deliver inputs to locations within walking distance of every farmer we serve.  
-Training- Farmers receive training throughout the season on modern agricultural techniques.  
-Market Facilitation- offer crop storage solutions and teach farmers about market fluctuations, so that they can time crop sales to maximize profits. | 1, 2, 3, 5 Collective enterprises |
| 3. Heifer International | International NGO-1944 | Livestock | Donor | -Facilitating Pro-poor wealth creating value chains by determining best value chain opportunities Identify, support and strengthen agri-enterprises, deploy capital and technology and mobilize values-based private sector partnerships.  
-Facilitating women empowerment by creating access to credit, basic productive resources, and technical training and market opportunities.  
-enhance food security by working with small-scale farmers to increase availability, utilization, and accessibility of food. | 1, 2, 3, 5 Collectives enterprises |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 4. Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services Kenya (KeFAAS) | 2015 Private Memb ership fee, donor | - Bring together agricultural advisory services (AAS) actors in Kenya and maintain a directory to the benefit of all stakeholders.  
- Linking AAS stakeholders in Kenya with CAADP processes and to other networks with similar goals such as the African Forum for Agricultural Advisory Services (AFAAS) and the Global Forum for Rural Advisory Services (GFRAS)  
- Promote the development of AAS networks at the regional, national, and district level. | 1,2,3,5 Farmer common interest groups |
| 5. Farm Africa | International NGO Agriculture Donor | -Cashew nut and sesame production and marketing- Farm Africa is working with Ten Senses Africa to breathe new life into Kenya’s cashew industry.  
-Fish farming- Farm Africa has been working in aquaculture since 2011, when we set up a network of aqua shops to help disseminate high quality equipment, feed and training for fish farmers.  
-Growing Futures- Farm Africa’s Growing Futures project works to equip young people in Trans-Nzoia, western Kenya with the skills and knowledge to successfully set up agricultural enterprises.  
-Urban gardening- Working with farmer groups and schools, helping young people and families to grow their own food and eat a reliable and nutritious diet. | 1,2,3,5 Collective enterprises |
-Policy advocacy | 1,2,3,5 Collective enterprise |
| 7. Action Aid International Kenya | International NGO-1972 Cross sectional Donor | -Empowering 90,000 women and girls living in poverty and exclusion to challenge violence and gain political participation at all levels  
-Promoting access and control over land and other productive resources for communities living in poverty | 1,2,3,5 Collective enterprises |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Enhancing the capacity of women and youth living in poverty and exclusion to hold public institutions to account for delivery of basic services  
- Humanitarian Programme: The programme establishes and maintains an efficient and coordinated system for managing natural or man-made disasters.  
- Livelihoods Programme: Develops poverty reduction strategies to empower Kenyans towards self-sustenance in all areas.  
- Gender and Development Programme: The programme promotes empowerment in men and women and facilitates equal participation and opportunity especially among the poor and vulnerable men and women in Kenya.  
- Capacity Building’ Programme: The programme seeks to promote efficiency and effectiveness of Caritas Kenya as it carries out her mandate while working with her partners both at the international and diocesan level.  
- Research, Communications and Advocacy Programme: the programme is engaging on SDGs advocacy, mainstreaming and implementation. | 1,2,35 Cross sectoral |
| 9. Solidaridad        | International NGO-1969                    | Agriculture | Donor  | - Training farmers in farming techniques that have less negative impact on people and the environment and lead to better products and higher yields.  
- Supporting producer organizations through capacity building and organizational strengthening.  
- Assisting producer organizations to get access to means of production, finance and markets. | 1,2,3,4,5 Stakeholder Forums- Network level |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 10. International Centre for Tropical Agriculture (CIAT)                           | International                            | Horticulture         | Donor   | - Develop technologies, methods, and knowledge that enable farmers in developing countries to enhance eco-efficiency in agriculture.  
- Reduce hunger and poverty, and improve human nutrition in the tropics through research aimed at increasing the eco-efficiency of agriculture.                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 1,2,3,5 Network                           |
| 11. International Centre for Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE)                  | International                            | Agriculture          | Donor   | - to help alleviate poverty  
- ensure food security and improve the overall health status of peoples of the tropics                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     | 2,3,4,5 Network                           |
- Aims to improve livelihoods through enhanced food and nutrition security, increase employment, and preserve natural resource integrity.  
- Capacity building of African institutions on biotechnology research                                                                                                                                                                                                                                    | 1,2,5 Network                            |
| 13. International Plant Nutrition Institute (IPNI)                                  | International NGO -2007                   | Cross sectional      | donor   | - Through cooperation and partnering with respected institutions around the world, IPNI adds its strengths to agronomic research, education, demonstrations, training, and other endeavours.  
- Best management practices for nutrient stewardship encourage the concept of applying the right product (source), at the right rate, at the right time, and in the right place.                                                                                                                   | 2,3,5, Cross sectoral-Network level       |
- Provision of services and agricultural inputs for commercial and small scale producers for increased productivity.                                                                                                                                                                                                                                         | 1,2,5 Individual farmers                 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 15. Alliance for a Green Revolution Africa (AGRA) | International NGO -2006 | Agriculture | Donor | - To increase the productivity and profitability of smallholder farming within 10-20 years through technological, policy and institutional innovations that are environmentally and economically sustainable.  
- To ensure market access for producers through reliable analytics enable the facilitating the development of networks of industry actors.  
- To strengthen the capacity of Farmer Organization for greater competitive advantage. | 1,2,3,4,5,6  
Stakeholder forums- network level |
| 16. Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA) | Faith based local organization-1993 | Cross sectional | Donor | - To increase the water and food security, and drive economic development of the rural population. We focus on improving water and food security, commercializing of the rural economy, and creating an environment that enables increased water and food security and economic growth.  
- Provide school fee assistance to run away or vulnerable girls, who are feeling threatened by FGM in their community.  
- Changing lives through building resilience to climate change effects by allowing families to establish diverse business and farming opportunities and give them a chance to earn consistent income no matter what the weather brings. | 2,5,6  
Cross sectoral |
| 17. Bio vision Africa Trust | International organization-2009 | Cross sectional | Donor | -To alleviate poverty and improve the livelihoods of smallholder farmers in Kenya and other African countries through supporting dissemination of information and knowledge on appropriate technology to improve human, animal, plant, and environmental health.  
- To sustainably improve the lives of the people in Africa while conserving the environment as the basis for all life. | 2,3,4  
Collective enterprises |
### 18. UN Food Agricultural Organization (FAO)

- **Type of Organization and Year established**: International NGO - 1945
- **Sector**: Cross sectional
- **Funding**: Donor
- **Types of activities**:
  - Supporting governments, producers, traders and other stakeholders to move towards the responsible use of antimicrobials in agriculture, thus helping reduce antimicrobial resistance in agricultural systems.
  - Supports implementation of a series of programs that are successfully supporting countries to develop and implement the policy frameworks and institutional arrangements needed to transform policy and create an enabling environment for agricultural development under climate change.
  - Addressing migration by gathering statistics and data on rural migration and its drivers, FAO aims at closing the knowledge gaps in order to support evidence-based policies, programs and investments.
- **Broad Functions and level of functioning**: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 Stakeholder forums - network level

### 19. World Food Programme (WFP)

- **Type of Organization and Year established**: International NGO - 1961
- **Sector**: Cross sectional
- **Funding**: Donor
- **Types of activities**:
  - Offers nationally-tailored technical assistance and capacity development to strengthen individual government capacities in food and nutrition security through an assessment process that is led by the partner government and other partners.
  - Provides services to the entire humanitarian community, including passenger air transportation through the UN Humanitarian Air Service, which flies to more than 250 locations worldwide.
  - Building resilience to disasters by investing in early-warning and preparedness systems – including supply chain management, logistics and emergency communications – that allow governments to prevent crises or respond quickly when they happen.
- **Broad Functions and level of functioning**: 1, 2, 3, 5, 6 Cross sectoral
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
- Promoting gender equality through household research, improving the status of women which has led to greater agricultural productivity and the fairer distribution of labor.  
- IFAD is dedicated to securing rural people’s access to productive resources and strengthening rural institutions and organizations which are key to rural transformation and sustainable poverty reduction efforts. | 1,2,3,5 Cross sectoral |

1=Demand articulation; 2= Network Building; 3=Knowledge brokering; 4= Innovation process management; 5=Capacity building  
6= Institutional innovation. *Most prominent functions of the organisation noted in bold (Adopted from: Kilelu et al., 2011)
### ANNEX 4: CHARACTERIZING INNOVATION INTERMEDIARY FUNCTIONS IN SUPPORTING AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT IN KENYA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Kenya Dairy Sector Competitiveness Program (KDSCP) (Managed by Land O Lakes) | International NGO - 2007 | Dairy | Donor | -Organizing the multi-actor National Dairy Taskforce as a platform for articulating issues that impede sector competitiveness  
- Stimulating and supporting (funding) capacity building of different actors (business development service providers-business development services, training institutes, Kenya Dairy Board,  
- Facilitating policy and regulatory change  
- Engaging the private sector actors in exploring product development  
- Program coordination (lead agency) | 1, 2, 4, 5, 6 Sub-sectoral (systemic) level |
- Facilitating capacity building for business development services (BDS)  
- Supporting dairy cooperatives as microenterprises | 1, 2, 4, 5 Collective enterprises |
| 3. EADD (East Africa Dairy Development Project) | Consortium (NGOs and Research institutes)-2007 | Dairy | Donor | -Conducting needs assessment and identifying challenges affecting smallholder dairy production and marketing  
- Facilitating formation of Dairy Business Associations and enhancing their management through capacity building  
- Stimulating and support (funding) capacity building of different actors (business development service providers e.g. artificial insemination, feeds, transporters dairy businesses  
- Linking with processors  
- Program coordination (lead agency) | 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 Collectives enterprises |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 5. Smallholder Dairy Commercialization Program (SDCP) | Ministry of Livestock Program-2007 | Dairy | Government / Donor Grant | -Facilitating market-oriented dairy enterprise development through private service providers to train on organization and enterprise skills  
- Providing technical support to smallholder dairy producers  
- Supporting market chain development  
- Supporting policy implementation  
- Program coordination (lead agency) | 1,4,5, 6 Farmer common interest groups |
- Facilitating access /dissemination of available technology (crop varieties) from research stations and private sector actors and peer exchanges  
- Organizing and supporting smallholder producers into commercial villages.  
- Facilitating training on technical (production and post-harvest) and non-technical (business skills)  
- Facilitating value networks of different actors with emphasis on public-private partnerships | 1,2,3,4,5 Farmer collective enterprise |
| 7. KHDP (Kenya Horticulture Development Program) (Managed by Fintrac) | Consultants-2005 | Horticulture | Donor | -Needs assessment and opportunity identification  
- Provides agronomic marketing, postharvest handling, and processing support for smallholders (both in-house capacity and in partnership with others)  
- Facilitate support for SPS compliance through training  
- Building partnerships  
- Program management | 1,2,3,4,5,6 Farmer collective enterprises |
| 8. Technoserve | International NGO-1973 | Agribusiness- Horticulture and Dairy | Donor | -Enterprise development through agro-industry analysis and strategic planning  
- Facilitating smallholder producer enterprise development by linking to business experts for training  
- Facilitating linkage formation among different actors along | 1,2,3,4 Farmer collective enterprises |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 9. Smallholder Horticulture Marketing Program (SHOMAP) | Ministry of Agriculture Program-2007 | Horticulture | Government/ Donor Grant | -Supporting production of select horticulture products with market potential by common interest groups 
-Transferring infrastructure development (access roads, collection centers and markets) to enhance market access of selected enterprises 
-Program coordination (lead agency) | 1,2,3,4,5 Farmer collective enterprises |
| 10. FPEAK – Fresh Produce Exporters Association Kenya | Producer Association-1975 | Horticulture | Members hip fees, Donor | -Facilitate technical training in production (on quality- safety and code of practice) 
-Auditing 
-Marketing information and facilitation 
-Lobbying and advocacy on sector policy and regulation issues | 1,2,3,4,5, 6 Individual and Farmer collective enterprises |
| 11. AgriProFocus | NGO Network-2009 | Agribusiness | Donor | -Facilitate a learning platform among agencies and individuals supporting agriculture enterprise development 
-Policy advocacy 
-Aim to link agribusinesses and research in order to match demand and supply of knowledge 
-Stimulating and facilitating decentralized (localized) market of capacity building services through a capacity development fund | 1,2,3, Network |
| 12. FIPS- Farm Input Promotion Services | Local Not for Profit company-2003 | Staples (maize, sorghum, etc.) | Donors | -Stimulate farmer demand for inputs (small pack fertilizer and seeds)- 
-Promote development of village-based agricultural advisors and input suppliers 
-Facilitate increased farmers’ access to and proper use of | 1,2,3,4,5 Individual farmers |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Organization</th>
<th>Type of Organization and Year established</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Funding</th>
<th>Types of activities</th>
<th>Broad Functions and level of functioning**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| AGMARK (Agricultural Market Development Trust) | Local NGO-2004 | Agro-input supply | Donor | -Facilitating access to agricultural inputs through support for rural agro-dealer network development  
- Stimulating commercialization of new varieties of seeds (inputs) by creating demand for the same  
- Facilitating training of agro-dealers on business management and technical and agronomic matters  
- Output market identification and facilitation (limited)  
- Policy advocacy on input subsidies | 1,2,3,4,5  
Agro-dealers (microlevel) |

1=Demand articulation; 2= Network Building; 3=Knowledge brokering; 4= Innovation process management; 5=Capacity building; 6= Institutional innovation  
*Most prominent functions of the organisation noted in bold (Adopted from: Kilelu et al., 2011)
ANNEX 5: STRUCTURE OF THE MOALFI AT THE NATIONAL LEVEL
ANNEX 6: STRUCTURE OF THE DEVOLVED MOALFI AT THE COUNTY LEVEL

[Diagram showing the structure of the devolved MOALFI at the county level, including roles such as Cabinet Secretary, Council of Governors, Governor, Deputy Governor, County Secretary, County Public Service Board, Deputy County Secretary, CEC Members Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries & Irrigation, Chief Officer Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries & Irrigation, Sub-County Administrators, and Ward Administrators.]