

= CGD POLICY BRIEF =

A Gender Analysis of NASEP

INTRODUCTION

Kenya's economy is largely agriculture based. The sector directly supports about 80% of the population, contributes 26% of the GDP, and 60% of the export earnings. Kenya's agriculture is mostly rain-fed and dominated by small-scale holders, who contribute 75% of the total output. Studies have shown that women are significantly more active in the agricultural sector contributing about 60% to 80% of labour in agricultural production, and work longer hours than men. They are mostly involved in production and small scale trade of domestic staples.

Research indicates that, agricultural policies affect men and women differently due to gender inequalities in access to and control of economic and social resources, information and decision-making. Despite the fact that women grow half of the world's food, a survey conducted by Food and Agriculture (FAO) indicates that 95 percent of agricultural extension services worldwide are directed at men.

Many policies have been developed and laws passed to guide extension service delivery. One of these was the Economic Recovery Strategy for Wealth and Employment

Creation (ERS). The Ministry of Agriculture (MoA) and the Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries Development (MoLFD) moved to operationalise the ERS by publishing the Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture (SRA). The SRA outlined the policies and institutional reforms that the government would implement in both the short and long terms, in the agricultural sector. It proposed thoroughgoing changes and reforms based on the principles of collective responsibility and inclusive participation of all stakeholders to attain accountability, transparency, efficiency, effectiveness and impact in the management of the agriculture sector.

Key among the proposed changes was the reform of the extension service system to create a more effective linkage between research, extension and farmers as the ultimate beneficiaries. Other policies include: the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper, the Kenya Rural Development Strategy, the National Agriculture Sector Extension Policy (NASEP) and the National Agriculture Sector Extension Policy Implementation Framework (NASEP-IF). Despite all these efforts, extension service delivery in Kenya is gender biased. It is



against this background that the Centre for Governance and Development (CGD), through the Economic Governance Programme (EGP), developed the 'Engendering the Provision of Agriculture and Livestock Extension Services in Kenya' project. One of the objectives was to analyse the National Agriculture Sector Extension Policy (NASEP), and its existing and proposed implementation frameworks, to come up with policy recommendations that would promote gender sensitivity in the provision of extension services. This involved analysing the policy and implementation frameworks and meeting with policy makers in the various Agriculture Sector Ministries (ASMs).

This Policy Brief examines NASEP focussing on its development, how it addresses gender issues, its strengths, potential challenges in implementing it, and recommendations to make it a gender sensitive policy.

Background to the development of the National Agriculture Sector Extension Policy

Historically, extension services in Kenya began with settler and commercial farming systems where the farmers accessed technical knowledge, credit and subsidized inputs. However, the targeting changed after independence to indigenous farmers who accessed information and education on extension services. This was through Farmers and Pastoralist Training Centres (FPTCs) where the focus was on Whole Farm Extension Approach (1960s) and Integrated Agricultural Development (1970s); as well as Farming Systems, Trainings and Visits (1980s and 1990s). These approaches were top down, prescriptive in nature and demanded high human, capital and financial resources.

The government therefore introduced the Focal Area Approach and Farmers' Field Schools with extension service providers

operating up to the sub-location level to encourage farmer participation. However, these were soon to be undermined by the introduction of the Structural Adjustment Programs in the 1990's. This led to reduction in numbers of service providers to one per 1,000 farmers compared to the previous one per 400 farmers – leaving many areas and farmers underserved.

Currently, extension services in Kenya are provided free of charge to smallholder farmers. There is now cost-sharing between the public and private sector. Full commercialization in the private sector has seen the establishment of private sector companies, cooperatives and parastatals for specific commodities such as coffee, tea, sugar cane, dairy etc. The biggest challenge to this approach has been the absence of a regulatory body to provide benchmarks and codes of ethics to guide operations, including monitoring and evaluation of impact of the facility.

The government formulated the National Agriculture Extension Policy (NAEP) and the National Agriculture and Livestock Extension Programme (NALEP)–Implementation Framework (IF) to address the weaknesses of extension service delivery. NAEP and NALEP-IF coordinate the management and facilitation of decentralized extension service delivery in the country. NALEP underlined the importance of clientele participation, especially decision making by women on farm matters, and demand – driven extension system. It also recognized the role of the private sector in pluralistic extension and set out modalities for commercialization and privatization of extension services through, formation of Common Interest Groups (CIGs).

However, a review of NAEP became necessary due to its limited success emanating from, inadequate institutional arrangements, limited ownership, lack of a legal framework,

lack of goodwill and commitment among some of its top managers, and the slow flow of resources. Besides, the review of NAEP was intended to make it compliant with the broad emerging issues articulated in the Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture (SRA). The birth of NASEP is therefore, a response to SRA which calls for improved and pluralist extension services delivery.

An overview of the Provisions of the National Agriculture Sector Extension Policy

NASEP, is a sector-wide policy, comprising the following Agriculture-Sector Ministries (ASMs): Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries Development, Cooperatives, Lands, Environment and Natural Resources, Forestry and Wildlife, Water and Irrigation, Regional Development and Local Authorities and more recently, the Ministry of Northern Kenya as the well as Private Sector. The policy paves way for more efficient and effective provision of extension services by embracing pluralism in extension service provision and better coordination and regulation of services delivered by different service providers, thus contributing to the goal of the Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture (SRA).

Under NASEP, extension services to subsistence producers and to groups of smallholders will continue to be provided by the government but, where such services shall have been commercialized, they will be contracted out to the private sector on a competitive basis. Services and clientele will be categorized to determine which services will remain free and which clients will continue to receive free extension services. Most free extension services will be provided by non-governmental organizations, faith-based organizations and other private organizations or individuals.

The policy provides for the establishment of an Extension Regulatory Body (ERB) which will be in place to register and license Extension Service Providers (ESPs), while a code of practice will be developed, to include principles governing choice of extension methods, approaches and content. The ERB shall require ESPs to be members of a relevant professional association, which shall be guided by a participatory monitoring and evaluation framework.

Formulated as rights-based policy, NASEP shall have an institutional framework in place to oversee clients' demands. The framework will ensure ESPs are accountable to clientele for the quality of the services they deliver. Also established is the Agricultural Sector Development Fund (ASDF), to fund provision of extension services, research, education, training and agricultural development facilitating factors that respond to clientele demands. Operating at district level, the fund will attract proposals for funding from by ESPs in collaboration with groups of extension clientele. The proposals shall include mainstreaming of cross-cutting issues such as gender, natural resource management and HIV&AIDS in their extension packages.

Services delivered on demand to individuals producing at subsistence level, and are not in a group, will be provided at a cost to encourage group approach for cost effectiveness. However, deliberate efforts will be made to reach out to the most vulnerable members of the communities at no cost to the client.

The Government will remain responsible for providing extension services. The services could either be contracted out or delivered by public sector extension personnel. These services, among others, include those dealing with: natural resources management, HIV & AIDS and malaria, environmental management e.g. pollution control, gender

and youth programmes, human rights and governance, conflict management, policy education/publicity-including lobbying and advocacy and food and nutritional security.

The policy also indicates that extension service delivery is affected by a number of cross-cutting issues, such as sustainable environment, gender, youth, HIV/AIDS, drug abuse, human rights, water resource use, natural resource management, and conflict mitigation. With regard to this, the policy indicates that ESPs will disseminate gender-sensitive technologies and interventions and influence development of gender-sensitive technologies.

ESPs will also link extension clientele with other stakeholders on education and awareness creation on different rights as well as change of attitudes on gender relations in the community. The ESPs will influence mainstreaming of gender issues in schools and training institutions curricula targeting the youth, in and out of school, to help mould them as future farmers and agribusiness entrepreneurs.

NASEP points out that knowledge, information, skills, physical and financial resources, and appropriate institutions are critical elements in the empowerment process. It further indicates that a demand-driven extension system requires that the clientele have a strong voice in deciding priorities and the authority to hold ESPs accountable for the quality and effectiveness of the service they deliver.

NASEP outlines the importance of promoting client based institutions. An important step in doing this is through formation and strengthening of Common

Interest Groups (CIGs) in all locations. Individual producers in a location will be mobilized to form CIGs or cooperatives, while existing CIGs will be strengthened through curricula and guidelines for CIG capacity building approved by stakeholders' fora.

ESPs will disseminate gender-sensitive technologies and interventions; influence development of gender-sensitive technologies

The policy seeks effective ways of representing the views of grassroots stakeholders. This is in the whole process of micro-project formulation, work plan formulation and decision making organs. It is envisaged that promotion of diversification in enterprises and investments will enable clientele to afford extension and other agricultural services.

STRENGTHS OF NASEP

Sector-wide approach:

Compared to NAEP and NALEP – IF, which focused mainly on the Ministries of Agriculture and Livestock Development, NASEP has adopted a sector-wide approach which addresses all sectors related to agriculture. Ministries to benefit from NASEP are Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries Development, Cooperatives, Lands Environment and Natural Resources, Forestry and Wildlife, Water and Irrigation, Regional Development and Local Authorities and recently the Ministry of Northern Kenya as well as the private sector.

Institutional arrangements:

NASEP-IF has proposed relevant institutional and administrative arrangements under which the Policy shall be operationalised. These mechanisms were not defined under NAEP and NALEP. This is detailed in the Agricultural Sector Coordination Unit (ASCU) which spearheads the implementation of SRA.

Stakeholder ownership:

NASEP is rights-based. Under it, the approaches being used for delivery of extension services are varied, needs-based and encourage right to choice and therefore higher participation and stakeholder ownership of policies and arrangements that seek to extend the provision of extension services. This is an opportunity for women to access services that are specifically designed to meet their needs

Legal framework:

NASEP provides for establishment of a regulatory framework which shall monitor registration and quality of service delivery

by ESPs. The regulatory body requires that ESPs belong to a professional body which facilitates, monitors and supervises this role. The oversight body would register and renew licenses of ESPs based on clientele appraisals. Those who do not meet the requirements would be struck off the list.

The presence of a regulatory body is important in ensuring that extension service provision is not gender biased.

NASEP provides for establishment of a regulatory framework which shall monitor registration and quality of service delivery by ESPs

Resources mobilization strategy:

NASEP-IF has provided for how resources shall be mobilized for specific activities in support of its implementation. Further, the Implementation Framework clarifies roles of specific stakeholders in the delivery of extension services and how both the ESPs and extension

clientele can access and make use of the available resources.

Networking and Collaboration:

NASEP-IF is very strong on research, capacity building needs-based training. This motivates the ESPs as well as the clientele. NASEP-IF further draws from the strengths of research institutions, colleges and universities in capacity building and training.

POTENTIAL CHALLENGES OF NASEP IMPLEMENTATION

A gender neutral policy vision:

Already, one of the reasons why NAEP was revised relates to critical challenges in terms of lack of goodwill and commitment among some of its top managers. Since the current vision of NASEP is non-committal in terms of gender equality, it is likely to bring on board similar mistakes which made NAEP unpopular.

The NASEP vision currently reads, “Kenyan agricultural clientele demand and access appropriate quality extension services from the best providers and attain higher productivity, increased incomes and improved quality of livelihoods.”

Gender neutral policy objective:

While it is appreciated that each individual ASMs and other stakeholders such as ESPs shall develop individualized mission statements to align with the NASEP vision, the key objective is neither engendered (hence no gender specific indicators may be developed) nor time-bound.

It reads, “To empower the extension clientele through sharing information and imparting knowledge, skills and changing attitudes so that they can efficiently manage their resources for improved quality of livelihoods.”

Unsystematic logical framework:

A logical framework serves a specific and defined purpose in program implementation. Lack of the same for a policy of the magnitude of NASEP sends a warning signal that monitoring impact would be difficult and instead, the policy will end up registering mere statistics of activities. Instead, NASEP should have clear quantitative and qualitative benchmarks / indicators against which to monitor its results and impact, and more so its impact on gender mainstreaming.

Lack of a reference model:

Absence of a model/standard reference curriculum on cross-cutting issues for agriculture sector – whereas each ESP and other stakeholders will domesticate their content messages, a standardized curriculum from which to align these messages is absolutely necessary. This will account for reduced conflicting messages to agricultural clientele. It will also ensure that messages are gender neutral.

Literacy Levels:

At the grassroots, the literacy levels of women especially remain a thorny issue in the wake of increased demand for research-oriented clientele linkages. Most female clientele are illiterate, making it difficult to access relevant and appropriate information on extension service provision. ICT knowledge is lacking, thus denying clientele the advantages that come with the use of computers.

Assumptions and Risks:

Implementation of any activity should provide space for an anticipated eventuality. The NASEP – IF assumes that everything shall be smooth sailing.

TOWARDS ENGENDERING THE NATIONAL AGRICULTURE SECTOR EXTENSION POLICY

Based on the foregoing review of NASEP, and the gender issues identified thereof, and recognizing that the policy has already been forwarded to Parliament, there is urgent need to make it gender sensitive before it is adopted for implementation. The main areas of concern are:

The NASEP Vision

It is observed that a vision which embraces gender mainstreaming principles will most likely enlist support of management to guide gender sensitive programming and implementation. Gender mainstreaming principles to be considered when constituting a gender sensitive vision include equity, equality and building vital partnerships, strengthening of women's capacities and upholding human dignity. Consequently, it is proposed that the NASEP vision be re-written to read as:

“Kenyan agricultural female and male clientele exercise greater gender equality to demand and access quality extension services from appropriate providers and for high productivity, increased incomes and improved quality of livelihoods by 2015”.

NASEP Objective

Formulated to support sector specific missions, the Policy objective should be Specific, Measurable Achievable, Realistic and Time – bound (SMART) to clearly provide for development of indicators. Currently, the policy objective provided reads like an activity. The same should be engendered and re-written to read;

“Improved quality of livelihoods for male and female extension clientele through imparting knowledge, sharing of information and skills and changing attitudes for efficient management of resources by 2015”.

Logical framework:

NASEP-IF should be reviewed so as to come up with a systematic Logical Framework,

clearly showing key result areas, quantitative and qualitative indicators / benchmarks of the policy; means of verification and assumptions / risks. The Log Frame shall then facilitate development of performance contracts for ESPs and outcome indicators on cross cutting issues. This will then be a monitoring and evaluation tool for NASEP.

Standard curriculum:

ASCU should facilitate the development of a standard reference curriculum / guideline on cross-cutting issues for the agriculture sector. This will make it easier for specific ESPs and other stakeholders to align their content messages aimed at reducing delivery of conflicting extension messages to the agricultural clientele.

Capacity building:

ASCU should facilitate identification of a strategy to enable clientele in rural areas, especially poor and illiterate women, to access technological linkages for enhanced learning and exposure.

Resource mobilization:

ESP and other stakeholders should facilitate extension clientele to come up with community-based local resources mobilization strategies. These will be more sustainable and shall complement the finance linkages provided by ESPs.

Assumptions and risks:

There is need to tailor and enhance emergency preparedness capacity building for extension clientele. This will be useful in situations of disasters, for example, arson and floods which can easily destroy property belonging to farmers. This will take care of unexpected outcomes and impact of occurrences such as the one of the post -2007 election violence.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS BY ASM STAKEHOLDERS

A stakeholder consultative meeting convened by CGD and involving some ASMs identified pertinent extension service concerns which informed the provision of additional recommendations which, if implemented, would make NASEP attractive. The concerns raised by the stakeholders include:

Financing of ESPs

NASEP does not clearly identify who would finance ESPs as plans were afoot to extend the reach of extension services.

Position of NASEP

NASEP is not clear on how it integrates Vision 2030, nor does it explain how it should address environment-related issues.

Transition

NASEP is not clear on the transition plan from government-funded extension service provision to private sector-driven service provision. The policy needs to provide for training of all-round ESPs who can serve extension clientele in all possible areas.

The stakeholders provided the following additional recommendations:

Inclusiveness

There is need to involve representatives from each of the participating ministries for wider input and programme ownership. Specifically, the Ministry of Finance should also be brought on board, in addition to all other requisite ministries. Moreover, the Ministry of Agriculture cannot provide electricity to the rural areas / service arid areas with water.

Value addition

To bolster the objective of value-addition to agricultural commodities, NASEP should include processing industries and to be more specific on the aspects of commercialization and marketing.

In addition, the policy should emphasize on the whole chain of production, marketing as well as value addition.

Orphaned and neglected crops

Emphasis should also be laid on the emerging crops and livestock as well as neglected / orphaned crops and livestock.

Budget

NASEP-IF should provide for a budget which puts emphasis on cultivation of more agricultural land especially Arid and Semi Arid Lands (ASAL) through use of improved technology. Currently, only about 20 percent of the country's cultivable land is under utilization. The need for NASEP to define clearly how the farmer accesses funds to pay for services becomes critical, especially in the context of wrong levies being imposed on extension clientele by ESPs.

Political good will

The success of the NASEP largely depends on political good will, hence the need for Parliament to be inducted on the policy before its adoption and also for ownership as a tool to fight household poverty. The government should establish and strengthen facilitating factors like farmers banks to ensure sustained economic empowerment and effective implementation of the policy. And that most of these facilitating factors should be in ASALs and accessible to the vulnerable groups (poor, disabled, marginalized).

"This publication is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of Centre for Governance and Development (CGD) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the U.S. Government, USAID, Pact or Pact Kenya."

