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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The main aim of this baseline survey was to apply the CPI profiling methodology on selected Farmer Organisations (FOs) in Tharaka Nithi and Embu Counties with a view to establish their capacity development needs. This would enable GRADIF-K to develop and operationalize an appropriate and flexible capacity development interventions to empower 132 FOs targeted by the project ‘Enhancing Capacities of Farmer Organizations in Eastern Kenya (ECAFO). The exercise was informed by the earlier Capacity exercises undertaken through the GRADIF-K’s NRM Project which recommended further and in-depth studies and interventions on the Capacities of the FOs.

The profiling study was conducted in 4 Sub-counties namely Tharaka North, Tharaka South and Chuka Igamba Ng’ombe (in Tharaka Nithi County) and Mbeere (in Embu County). A sample size of 40 FOs out of a population of the targeted 132 FOs was surveyed using structured questionnaires designed to capture eight capacity indicators namely; Accountability, participation, professional capacity, income diversity, strategic potential, Production Management, marketing and advocacy. The study identified the following cross-cutting capacity strengths and gaps in the surveyed FOs

Accountability
The selected FOs performance was fairly good on accountability indicator having attained a score of 67%. In general, majority of the surveyed FOs have properly constituted executive committees are legally registered and do have constitutions. However, they need to improve on their performance evaluation of the executive committee, internal audit systems and record keeping.

Participation
The FOs attained a score of 71% which means they have realized commendable achievements in terms of youth and women representation in leadership positions of the organisations. Members of the FOs participate in decision making and activities of the organisation through various channels such as monthly and annual meetings and training events. However, it was observed that men are grossly under-represented in FOs activities. Their exclusion in the activities of the FOs is a serious capacity gap.

Professional Capacity
On professional capacity, the FOs also performed fairly well recording a score of 69%. The score indicates that the majority of the FOs has attained a minimum education qualification of primary school. However, they have inadequate access to training in a variety of fields such as management and leadership, basic recordkeeping, financial management, post-harvest handling and business-planning which impair their ability to realise their productive potential. There is a need for specialized training to empower the leaders in these fields.
Income Diversity
The FOs covered in the survey obtained a modest score of 57 percent for income diversity indicator. The FO members specialize in more than one livestock and crop type which is important in reducing the exposure of farmers to common external shocks. However, majority of the FOs have limited sources of funding and low external financial assistance. Enormous capacity improvements are therefore necessary to diversify sources of income to reduce the high dependence on membership fees and initiate activities that will generate alternative income.

Strategic Potential
The FOs generally have serious capacity needs associated with strategic potential. The strategic potential indicator obtained a score of 27% which reflects poor business planning due to the fact that many of the FOs have little or no strategic, business, and investment plans in place. This is a serious capacity gap that needs to be addressed.

Production Management and Marketing
The FOs performed poorly on production management and marketing strategy indicators recording 14% and 15% scores respectively. The poor scores are due to the fact the FOs do not follow the aggregation logic of collective action. They do not fully take advantage of economies of scale to access agricultural finance, procure inputs, offer storage and transport facilities to their members and neither do they promote the produce of their members or offer no assistance to their members to negotiate favourable prices. These results suggest that more should be done towards improving productivity, access to markets and business planning in order to improve organizational efficiency which consequently leads to improved trickle down benefits to individual small holder farmers.

Advocacy
The advocacy realized an indicator value of 48 per cent. This underscores the need for FOs to improve their lobbying methods and increase their lobbying frequency in order to enlarge and strengthen their network.
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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Briefs about GRADIF-Kenya Foundation

GRADIF-K is a Public National Community Development Foundation founded in the year 2007 to support the improvement of life of disadvantaged and marginalized community groups in selected poverty stricken and resource scarce areas in Kenya focusing more on rural areas and urban slums. To promote effectiveness, wide reach and sustainability of projects/programs, GRADIF-K works with organized, legally registered community groups, structures and institutions of learning in the implementation of age-appropriate, rights based, gender sensitive, cultural responsive and environmentally friendly community based poverty reduction programs. All of the GRADIF-K programs are geared towards contributing towards the Kenya’s Vision 2030 goals, realization of Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) and Education for All (EFA), all in contribution to the realization of the wellbeing of children and other key targeted groups in Kenya. The key broad areas of our work include; Citizen Participation and Governance, Social Protection, promotion of Economic Livelihoods and Organizational capacity development. GRADIF-K has gained wide experience in the implementation of outlined projects in the past 8 years where above projects in various counties in Kenya with commendable results. Over time, GRADIF-K has developed healthy and cordial working relationships with the relevant Government of Kenya departments, Community Based Development groups including, CBOs, FBOs, Youth groups, development partners including development agencies and nongovernmental organizations, learning institutions and community technical resource persons in the implementation of all programs. GRADIF-K invests heavily in capacity development of grassroots organization to enhance the impact as well as a key strategy to the sustainability of the supported initiatives. GRADIF-K has a regional field office in Chuka town that supports projects in Tharaka Nithi, Embu and Meru Counties.

Vision and Mission:

GRADIF-K has adopted two sets of Mission statements to steer its focus moving forward. Our vision of the society we serve: Empowered society actively engaging in sustainable development. The vision of our esteemed organization: A champion for sustainable development of grassroots communities in Kenya. GRADIF-K’s mission is to facilitate the empowerment of grass root marginalized communities through advocacy, capacity development, partnership and networking so that they can actively engage in sustainable development guided by equal opportunities for all.
1.2 Background on GRADIF-K EFACO Project:

Smallholder farmers in SSA and particularly in Kenya face formidable challenges that adversely affect their productivity and farm incomes. One of such challenges is the high transaction costs that constraints the growth of smallholders. The aggregation of smallholder farmers into farmer organisation (FOs) has been considered as a powerful way of dealing with high transaction costs and other numerous challenges that inhibits farming in the region.

Farmer organisations (FOs) play an important role in the development of rural areas in SSA, particularly in the areas of sustainable agricultural production, market access and sales, financial services and advocacy. In addition, they provide a platform for collective bargaining of credit, input supplies and delivery of marketable surpluses (World Bank 1975). Nevertheless, the expected impact of FOs is undermined by daunting capacity constraints that they face. For example, they are characterized by weak leadership and human capital, poor business models, donor dependency, lack of market orientation, low women and youth representation, low membership and inadequate technical skills (AFRICRES, 2012). In Kenya very little efforts have been put in place to build the organizational and operational capacities of the Farmer Organizations (FOs) to enable them provide effective services to their members and strengthen the voice for agricultural reforms and enactment of favorable policies (GRADIF-K, 2014)

In Kenya, the Grasssroots Development Initiatives Foundation-Kenya (GRADIF-K) with support from AGRA is implementing the project ‘Enhancing Capacities of Farmer Organizations in Eastern Kenya (ECAFO)’. The project seeks to strengthen the capacities of selected 132 Farmer Organizations (FOS)/groups in Tharaka Nithi and Embu Counties to enable them provide effective and quality services to their members who are mainly Small holder Farmers as well as empower them to effectively define and articulate “real” needs for services and products in the agricultural system. As a part of the project, GRADIF- K commissioned a profiling study of the FOs in the two counties in March 2015.

1.3 ToRs for the Profiling Study

The key objective of the study is to apply the CPI profiling methodology on selected FOs in Tharaka Nithi and Embu Counties in order to identify their capacity development needs. The specific objectives are to apply the profiling framework on selected FOs in order to establish:

- **Membership** – this will include an analysis of current members by groups, network affiliation, gender and age. The statistics will help to develop a capacity building strategy based on the population statistics and trends of past members
- **Capacity gaps** - This analysis will entail the use of the Capacity Performance Index (CPI) of the FOs that will facilitate the determination of the groups’ stage of development in order
to customize the relevant capacity building models that can help the group enhance service delivery to members.

- **Service delivery** - This analysis will entail reviewing the services that FOs offer to members, related costs if any and the efficiency of providing these services.

## 2. METHODOLOGY

This section discusses the approach adopted in profiling the FOs. It discusses the study sample and the profiling indicators for the FOs.

### 2.1 Sampling and Data Collection Methods

The profiling study was conducted in 4 Sub-counties namely Tharaka North, Tharaka South and Chuka Igamba Ng’ombe (in Tharaka Nithi County) and Mbeere (in Embu County).

A sample size of 40 FOs out of a population of 132 FOs targeted by the project was selected for the study. Of the 132 FOs targeted by the project 70% are from Tharaka Nithi County and the rest from Embu County.

Table 1: Spatial Distribution of Selected FOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Sub - County</th>
<th># of FOs Selected</th>
<th># of Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tharaka Nithi</td>
<td>Tharaka South</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tharaka North</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Igamba Ng’ombe</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embu</td>
<td>Mbeere</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data collection was achieved through field surveys by qualified and trained enumerators using structured questionnaires for focus group discussions. The structured questionnaire for profiling FOs was designed to capture at least eight indicators, namely; **Accountability, professional capacity, income diversity, strategic potential, Production Management, marketing, participation and advocacy** which are particularly relevant in the African context. The indicators were adopted from AAFRICRES (2011) model and AGRITERRA (2010, 2011). The FOs were drawn randomly from a database of farmer organizations working with GRADIF-K in the region. A total number of 420 members of FOs participated in the FGD’s as shown in Table 1. These eight dimensions were broken down into indicator attributes intended to facilitate profiling and teasing out subtle differences between nascent, growing and mature FOs. Table 2 presents an overview of the indicators with their respective indicator attributes.
### Table 3: Profiling Indicators for FOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME OF INDICATOR</th>
<th>INDICATOR ATTRIBUTES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1. ACCOUNTABILITY**   | - FO has an executive committee  
- The committee consist of at least five people  
- There is a performance evaluating system for the executive committee  
- Decisions are made in a participatory nature  
- The FO is registered in the country  
- FO has a constitution  
- Members have access of the constitution  
- FO has registration records  
- FO has training records  
- FO has aggregation records of harvesting forecast,  
- FO has Purchase and sales records  
- FO has financial records  
- FO has a functional/operational bank account  
- FO has an Internal auditor/internal audit team |
| **2. PARTICIPATION**     | - FO keeps members’ profile and activities information  
- FO has youth in its leadership positions  
- FO has women in leadership positions  
- FO carries out annual general meetings  
- FO arranges training for members  
- FO members meet at least once every month |
| **3. PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY** | - FO has the following people with primary school qualification  
  a. Chairperson/President  
  b. CEO / Manager/Secretary  
  c. Treasurer  
- FO has a skilled human resources manager  
- FO staff have access to further training opportunities |
| **4. INCOME DIVERSIFICATION** | - FO has more than one source of funding  
- FO charge membership/registration fee  
- FO receive external income  
- The size of membership increased by 10-15% in the past 2 production seasons  
- FO specialises in more than one crop production  
- FO specializes in more than one livestock production |
| **5. STRATEGIC POTENTIAL** | - FO has a vision and a mission statement  
- FO has the following business plans:  
  a. Production plan |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT</th>
<th>FO assist members in soliciting agricultural finance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO collectively buy inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO monitor quality of collectively sourced inputs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO has production management committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. MARKETING</td>
<td>FO collectively market members’ produce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO provides storage facilities for members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO has linkages with an aggregating centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO provides collective transport to the market for its members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO sells members' produce collectively</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO provides members with marketing information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO arranges contractual marketing arrangements for members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. ADVOCACY</td>
<td>FO is known outside its operational area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO is known within its operational area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO has a network of more than 2 organisations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FO participates in lobbying</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig 1: Kapesa Self Help Group from Igamba Ng’ombe County Pose For a Photo During Field Meetings
2.2 Analytical Approach for Computation of Profiling Indicators

A slight modification of the AFRICRES (2011) profiling model, a derivative of the AGRITERRA (2010, 2011) model was used in this study. The calculation of CPI scores involved three steps namely the scoring, normalization and determination of the CPI score as shown in Box 1. The indicators were then converted to percentages and analyzed using various descriptive statistics tools such as tables and graphs. The analysis included Classification of FOs Based on CPI Score as in Box 2. The scores are described as either Excellent, Good, Fair or Poor as in box 3.

**Box 1: Calculation of CPI Scores**

**Stage 1: Scoring**
Scoring follows score of 1, 0.5 or 0
- Reward an FO for full compliance = 1
- Reward an FO for partial compliance = 0.5
- Penalize an FO for non-compliance = 0

**Stage 2: Normalisation**

\[ \text{Normalised score (NS)}_l = \frac{1}{q} \sum_{i=1}^{q} S_i \times 100 = \text{where } l = 1, 2, \ldots, q \]

**Stage 3: Capacity Performance Index (CPI) for each questionnaire**

\[ (CPI) = \frac{1}{j} \sum_{j=1}^{8} NS_j \text{ where } j = 1, 2, \ldots, 8 \]

**Box 2: Classification of FOs Based on CPI Score**

Source: Own compilation
Level 3 - Very Capable A-(70-74%), A+ (75-79%), A++ (80%+)
Level 2 - Capable B-(60-64%), B+ (65-69%)
Level 1 - Not Capable D (49% &below), C-(50-55%), C+ (56-59%)

Box 3: Capacity Performance Index ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score (%)</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over 80</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 61</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 40</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 40</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. PROFILING OF FARMER ORGANISATIONS

This chapter analyses the results of the profiling study of FOs in the 4 sub-counties. The analysis covers the following key elements: background of FOs in the respective county, discussion of the key profiling indicators and the overall capacity indicators of FOs, and provides highlights on the key capacity gaps and opportunities for FOs. The chapter is structured around the four counties and so the analysis is presented on an indicator by indicator basis.

3.1 Context of FO’s in the study Areas

The baseline study was carried out in 4 sub-counties: Tharaka South, Tharaka North and Igamba Ng’ombe sub counties in Tharaka Nithi County and Mbeere sub-county in Embu County.

Tharaka Nithi County is one of the poorest Counties in Kenya with high illiteracy rates among the adult population who are mainly small holder farmers. It is located in the Eastern Province of Kenya and borders Meru County on the East, Mwingi and Mbeere to the South, Meru South to the West and Meru North and Central districts to the North (Figure 2 & Figure 3). It has a population of 62,887 and receives annual rainfall of 300mm – 500mm. The dominant crops cultivated by farmers are sorghum, millet, cowpeas, green grams and pigeon peas. Embu County is located in Eastern Kenya and borders Tharaka Nithi to the South. Mbeere Sub-County which was the targeted study areas in Embu County consists of Mbeere North and Mbeere South which have a combined population of 242761 persons occupying an area of 1795 km². The annual rainfall is 640 – 1495mm. The dominant crops found in this sub-county include
fruits like Mangoes, melons, paw paws and passion fruits. The main food crops grown by small scale farmers grown include maize, beans, green grams, cowpeas, pigeon peas; black peas and millet are seasonally grown there. Miraa is also a cash crop grown in this sub county.

The two counties have similar challenges. They are in Arid and semi-arid areas sharing similar climatic conditions. 65% of inhabitants’ population lives below poverty line. The two counties depend mainly on cereal crops as their major source of livelihoods but due to lack of capacities on production and management, farmers who contributes 90% of the agricultural produce in these areas continue to register low yields and continuous losses post-harvest losses. There are no major initiatives from either the Government or development partners to address the challenges facing the FOs.

**Figure 2: Embu County Map**

**Figure 3: Tharaka Nithi County Map**

Source: http://www.kenyampya.com/
3.2 Results per Capacity Area

3.2.1 Accountability

The attributes which determine the accountability indicator were categorized into three groups for ease of analysis as follows:

I. Legal compliance: legal registration of the FO, constitution, members access to the constitution
II. Performance Evaluation and audit systems: Presence of an executive committee, its composition, its performance evaluating system and internal audit system
III. Records Keeping: Records of registration, meetings, trainings, harvesting forecast, purchase & sales; financial records and an operational bank account for the FO.

Legal Compliance
FOs must operate as entities with the autonomy of making and implementing decisions governed by the regulatory bodies in the areas they operate. They, therefore, have to be formally registered if they have to operate as unique entities. Constitutions and bylaws provide guidelines on how operations are done in organizations. In the case of FOs, these rules should enhance a culture of accountability as well as transparency. Constitutions and bylaws should stipulate how leaders are selected as well as their roles and responsibilities. Furthermore, members of the FO should have access to the FO’s constitution and or its by-laws.

Figure 4 shows that the sampled FOs performed exemplary well in terms of legal compliance attaining scores of 100% (Tharaka South), 88% (Tharaka North), 88% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 83% (Mbeere) for registration and 100% (Tharaka South), 88% (Tharaka North), 100% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 88% (Mbeere) for constitution. This indicates that majority of the FOs surveyed are legally registered with the authorities and have constitutions. The constitutions guide the appointment of the members of the Executive Committee as well as their respective roles in the Committee. Majority of the FOs members also reported having access to the constitution as indicated by a score of 75% for Tharaka South, 100% for Tharaka North, 63% for Igamba Ng’ombe and 71% for Mbeere. However, members still need to be helped to fully understand the contents of the constitutions. A few of the FOs also need to update their registrations.
Performance Evaluation and audit Systems

The study established all the FOs surveyed had executive committees in place as indicated by a score of 100% for each of the four sub-counties (Figure 5). A typical executive committee of FOs has an average of 5 members (comprising the chairperson, vice chairperson, Secretary, Vice Secretary and the Treasurer) majority of which are women and young people.

The FOs scored very poorly for the internal audit attribute which attained score of 25% for Mbeere and 0% for the rest of the sub-counties. The performance evaluation attribute that measures the extent to which the performance of the leadership is evaluated posted mixed results. FOs in Tharaka South and Mbeere performed dismally recording scores of 20% and 33% respectively for this attribute. This implies that a large majority of the FOs in these sub-counties do not have adequate or proper accountability systems for their leaders. FOs in Tharaka North and Igamba Ng’ombe performed relatively better with a score of 50% and 63% respectively. This implies that FOs in these sub-counties do some due diligence with respect to assessing performance of their executive committees relative to set objectives. When there are differences between actual performance and the set objectives, members discuss ways and means of dealing with them.
The Internal audit and performance evaluation attributes for FOs are critical capacity areas that need to be strengthened across all the FOs.

**Records Keeping**
Record keeping is one important dimension for judging whether an FO is performing well or not. Keeping and updating records enables the FOs to track and benchmark their progress. These records include among others; member registration records, meetings and training records, aggregation records of harvesting forecast, purchase and sales records and financial records (asset register, membership subscription records and income and expenditure statements).

The study revealed that most FOs keep fairly good membership/registration, subscription and meeting records but generally perform poorly on other types of records such as basic accounting records, purchase & sales records and harvest aggregation forecast records (Figure 6). For example the registration records attribute attained a high of 100% for Tharaka South, 100% for Tharaka North, 100% for Igamba Ng’ombe and 96% for Mbeere. Conversely, for harvesting forecast records, the FOs recorded a low of 0% for Tharaka North, 4% for Mbeere 8% for Tharaka South with Igamba Ng’ombe performing relatively better at 50%. While the low score for the latter is attributable to absence of collective marketing, the poor performance on other records is mainly due to lack of adequate capacity.
The study also revealed that majority of FOs surveyed had functional bank accounts. This attribute posted a score of 75% for Tharaka South, 100% for Tharaka North, 75% for Igamba Ng’ombe and 75% for Mbeere.

Critical Capacity Gaps:
- Performance evaluation and audit systems for EC
- Record keeping- especially such as basic accounting records, purchase & sales records and harvest aggregation forecast records
- Understanding of the constitution

Overall Accountability Capacity Indicator
The performance of surveyed FOs against the accountability indicator was above average for each of the sub-county as indicated by scores of 66% (Tharaka South), 77% (Tharaka North), 77% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 64% (Mbeere) for the overall capacity (Figure 6). This reflects a scope for capacity strengthening of the FOs on the various attributes of the accountability indicator.
3.2.2 Participation

Participation in FOs activities is an important component for organizational development. Disaggregating participation through gender enables policy planners and developmental experts to make tailor made efforts which lead to improved organizational efficiency. Given the role that women play in African agriculture, it is imperative to assess their participation in FO activities as well as leadership positions. Furthermore, youth play a significant role in intergenerational skills transfer which is an important element of FO sustainability. Therefore, their participation in FO activities and leadership positions is also equally important.

Figure 8 also shows that with regard to gender representation in FOs activities, the majority of FOs surveyed are dominated by women membership. Women comprise 45%, 77%, 92% and 77% of FOs membership in Tharaka South, Tharaka North, Igamba Ng’ombe and Mbeere respectively. Conversely, except for Tharaka North, men are very poorly represented in the FOs, accounting for 23%, 8% and 23% of total FOs membership in Tharaka South, Mbeere and Igamba Ng’ombe respectively.
With regard to leadership roles, Figure 9 below indicates that participation of Youth and Women in FOs leadership was very good. For women, the attribute scored 100% in Tharaka South, 100% in Tharaka North, 75% in Igamba Ng'ombe and 100% Mbeere. In terms of Youth in leadership, the FOs scored 75% for Tharaka South, 75% for Tharaka North, 100% for Igamba Ng’ombe and 58% for Mbeere. The channels of participation of members in the FOs activities include monthly meetings, annual general meetings and training events. For example the monthly meetings attribute posted a high of 100% score for each of the sub-counties except Igamba Ng’ombe which posted 75%
Overall Participation Capacity Indicator

The overall performance of the FOs on the participation indicator was good. Scores of 72%, 63%, 75% and 76% were attained for Tharaka South, Tharaka North, Igamba Ng’ombe and Mbeere sub-counties respectively as shown by figure 10 below.
Serious capacity gaps were identified in the exclusion of men in FOs activities and in the ability of FOs to organise training for members. These shortcomings need to be addressed.

3.2.3 Professional Capacity

The professional capacity indicator reflects the capacity of the FO executive members to professionally carry out their mandate in delivering services to their members. Any organisation requires visionary leadership to perform well. This can be complimented by a management that is capable of communicating its vision to fellow members as well as external stakeholders. Furthermore, the leaders should have skills that are necessary for the relevant positions they occupy in the FOs. The professional capacity indicator was measured by using educational level and access to further training attributes.

Figure 11 below indicate that the performance of the FOs on basic education qualification of the executive members ranged from 75% - 100%. This implies that the majority of leadership of FOs had at least a primary school education qualification. Conversely access to training opportunities recorded poor scores of 33%, 0%, 38% and 8% for Tharaka South, Tharaka North, Igamba Ng’ombe and Mbeere respectively (Figure x).

These results indicate that although most of the FOs executives have basic education qualification, their access to training in critical areas such as management and leadership, basic
recordkeeping, basic financial management, post-harvest handling and business-planning is inadequate, which impairs their ability to realise their productive potential. These findings suggest the need for capacity building programmes to improve on the managerial ability of the FOs in all the target areas.

The overall score for professional capacity was 77%, 72%, 66% and 64% for Tharaka South, Tharaka North, Igamba Ng’ombe and Mbeere sub-counties respectively (Figure 12).

![Figure 12: Professional Capacity Indicator](image)

### 3.2.4 Income Diversification

The income diversification indicator captures the ability of FOs to generate resources which can be used to offer a variety of economic and social services to their members. For instance, in members-funded FOs, this indicator highlights whether all members are up to date in terms of subscription and payment of membership fees as well as the active membership trends.

Figure 13 shows that the majority of the FOs surveyed largely rely on their own sources of income, such as membership and subscriptions fees for sustenance, a fact which augers well their self-reliance and sustainability. This is reflected by high scores of 98% (Tharaka South), 100% (Tharaka North), 100% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 100% (Mbeere) for the membership fee attribute.
A large majority of the FOs have limited sources of funding as indicated by scores of 35% (Tharaka South), 25% (Tharaka North) and 21% (Mbeere). Igamba Ng’ombe performs much better for the same attribute as shown by a score of 63%. Similarly Tharaka South, Tharaka North) and Mbeere FOs performs poorly with regard to access to external finance as shown by scores of 15%, 25% and 17% respectively which is attributed to high interest on bank loans, other stringent requirements including the need for collateral, loan phobia amongst small holder farmers and inability of FOs to link their members to financial institutions. The low scores for external financing also suggests that, although a number of national and international agencies are working with farmers to improve their farming practices, very few directly fund operations of FOs. This may also reflect the inability of FOs to attract funding by submitting acceptable or attractive business plans which reflect severe capacity constraints. Igamba Ng’ombe recorded a score of 63% for the access to external finance attribute which indicate that the majority of FOs in the sub-county have access to finances from other sources such as banks, government, devolved funds (e.g Uwezo fund, Women Enterprise fund) and development NGOs.

The surveyed FOs members specialize in more than one livestock and crop types which is important in reducing the exposure of farmers to common external shocks. This is indicated by a score of 55% (Tharaka South), 63% (Tharaka North), 100% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 100% (Mbeere) for crop diversity and 35% (Tharaka South), 63% (Tharaka North), 100% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 100% (Mbeere) for livestock diversity. In this study, the main crops and livestock...
produced include sorghum, green grams, cow peas, pigeon peas, maize, soya beans, cattle and goats.

Overall income diversity Capacity Indicator
The overall score for the income diversity indicator was 53% (Tharaka South), 43% (Tharaka North), 77% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 59% for Mbeere (Figure 14)

Capacity building efforts should be directed towards:
- FOs strengthening to attract more membership.
- Training farmers on financial literacy
- Linking farmers to financial institutions and other sources of finance such as NGOs and devolved government funds
- Training FOs executive on business planning

3.2.5 Strategic Potential

The strategic positioning of an FO involves a number of elements such, its vision and missions, business planning and internal management. An FO vision statement should spell out the overall goal that it wants to achieve in a specified period of time while the mission statement can be classified as the strategy to achieve the desired goal. The two should guide the managers of FOs
along the path to achieve their organizational goals. In addition, FOs should be capable of producing their own strategic documents such as business plans, production plans, marketing plans and investment plans.

The study revealed that a significant number of the FOs had some sort of Vision and Mission statements in place, as indicated by scores of 78% (Tharaka South), 38% (Tharaka North), 50% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 63% (Mbeere) for this attribute (Figure 15). However, the majority of the FOs did not have production plans, business plans and investment plans. For example the production plans recorded a low of 15% (Tharaka South), 13% (Tharaka North), 25% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 4% (Mbeere). Marketing plans obtained 0% (Tharaka South), 13% (Tharaka North), 25% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 0% (Mbeere).

**Figure 15: Attributes of the Strategic Potential Indicator**

Overall Strategic Potential Capacity Indicator
The study revealed rather low scores of 27% (Tharaka South), 28% (Tharaka North), 38% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 17% (Mbeere) for the strategic potential indicator which implies that very few FOs take the development of business, strategic and Investment plans seriously. (Figure 16)
The poor strategic potential of the FOs compromises their ability to achieve their organizational goals and to attract financing and other support for their members. The findings imply that the FOs seriously lacks the ability to develop strategic, business and investment plans. There is need to put measures in place to strengthen the strategic potential of all the FOs to help them succeed in meeting the needs of their members.

### 3.2.6 Production Management

Most agricultural value chains start with access to good quality inputs at the right time, place, form and quantity. Following the aggregation logic of collective action, FOs should, therefore, play an important role in collective soliciting or assisting members in accessing agricultural finance, collective procurement of inputs and collective quality control of procured inputs. If the management processes are executed properly, members can benefit from the economies of scale associated with bulk buying.

The surveyed FOs scored very poorly in most of the production management attributes. In terms of assisting members in soliciting agricultural finance, the FOs recorded lows of 5% (Tharaka South), 0% (Tharaka North), 38% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 0% (Mbeere). Tharaka North FOs posted worst results having scored 0% scores for every attributes of this indicator (Figure 17).
Regarding monitoring of inputs quality, Tharaka South FOs scored 0%, Igamba Ng’ombe 0% and Mbeere 8% while Tharaka North achieved a commendable 75% (Tharaka). Similar scores were recorded for collective buying of inputs. For the production management committee attributes, the FOs obtained 0% (Tharaka South), 0% (Tharaka North), 13% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 4% (Mbeere).

**Figure 17: Attributes of the Production Management Indicator**

![Bar chart showing attributes of production management capacity indicator for Tharaka South, Tharaka North, Igamba Ng’ombe, and Mbeere.](image)

**Overall Production Management Capacity Indicator**

The FOs overall performance on this indicator was poor as indicated by scores of 3% (Tharaka South), 0% (Tharaka North), 50% (Igamba Ng’ombe) and 5% (Mbeere) for the indicator (Fig. 18).
It is important to underscore that for all attributes of this indicator, Igamba Ng’ombe FOs largely out-performed all the other FOs and therefore there is need to identify best practices and lessons learned in production management for replication and scaling up during project implementation.

The poor performance of other sub-counties on this attribute is due to absence of collective marketing (see 3.2.7) and lack of production management capacity amongst the FOs. These are critical capacity gaps that need to be addressed.

3.2.7 Marketing

Agricultural marketing covers a broad range of services involving the transfer of agricultural produce from the farm to the consumer. The marketing indicator assesses the level at which an FO performs marketing functions for its members. These includes among other things collective storage; value adding to primary produce, collective transportation of members’ produce to the market, collective selling of members’ produce, provision of market information and market contract arrangements.

As the Figure 19 illustrates, most of the surveyed farmer organisations are struggling in providing marketing services to their members. All the FOs apart from those from Igamba Ng’ombe Sub-county, performed very poorly in all the attributes of this indicator. For example, the FOs obtained 0% (Tharaka South), 25% (Tharaka North), 4% (Mbeere) while Igamba Ng’ombe achieved 75% score for the collective marketing attribute. Very few FOs provided storage facilities to their member, with the attribute recording scores of 5% (Tharaka South), 0% (Tharaka North), 25% (Mbeere) and 0% (Igamba Ng’ombe). This scenario limits the ability of members to control the flow of farm produce into markets and, as a result, increases post-harvest loses and weakens bargaining power on output prices. This problem is further compounded by the inability of FOs to provide transportation for their members, with Tharaka South, Tharaka North, and Mbeere each recording a low of 0% and Igamba Ng’ombe 75%. Members of the FOs, therefore, have to resort to individual means of transporting farm produce which may be costly and cumbersome. This may, thus, limit the volume of produce carted to the market. Majority of the FOs also do not organise contract arrangements, they do not provide market information to their members and neither do they add value to primary products.
Overall Market Capacity Indicator

The overall market capacity indicator scores for most of the FOs were very poor i.e. 3\% (Tharaka South), 4\% (Tharaka North), 7\% (Mbeere). Igamba Ng’ombe recorded a marginal score of 48\% (Figure 20)

---

**Figure 19: Attributes of the Marketing Indicator**

**Figure 20: Market Capacity Indicator**
The market capacity indicator scores recorded by the FOs, especially in Tharaka South, Tharaka North and Mbeere reflects a grave capacity challenge in using FOs as channel for improving market access for smallholder farmers. Therefore, the FOs need to improve in all attributes of the market indicator i.e. production planning, collective storage; value adding to primary produce, collective transportation of members’ produce to the market, collective selling of members’ produce, provision of market information and market contract arrangements.

It is noteworthy once again that for all attributes of this indicator, Igamba Ng’ombe FOs largely out-performed all the other FOs and therefore there is need to identify best practices and lessons learned in collective marketing for replication and scaling up during project implementation.

3.2.8 Advocacy

Advocacy in FOs aims at influencing public policy and resource allocation within the environment they operate. This requires networking skills within the agricultural value chains. This enables FOs to establish business contacts, learn the dynamics within their industry which facilitates win-win relationships. This indicator seeks to quantify the outreach of FO activities, its ability to network and its ability to participate in price and policy lobbying.

Figure 21 indicates that the activities of the FOs in Tharaka South, Igamba Ng’ombe and Mbeere are known beyond their local vicinities. They scored a commendable rating of 95%, 100%, and 92% respectively for popularity within their operational areas and 65%, 63% and 92% respectively for popularity outside their operational areas. Tharaka North FOs scored 0% and 38% for the same attributes. The FOs in Tharaka North, Igamba Ng’ombe and Mbeere obtained 80%, 0%, 50% and 21% for networking and 3%, 0%, 50% and 17% for the lobbying attributes respectively.
Overall Advocacy Capacity Indicator

The overall score for the advocacy capacity indicator was above marginal values for Tharaka South, Igamba Ng’ombe and Mbeere which recorded 61%, 66% and 55% respectively while Tharaka North posted the worst result of 9% (Figure 22)
Although the FOs in Tharaka South, Igamba Ng’ombe and Mbeere have performed relatively better than Tharaka North in terms of outreach and networking strategies, the need for strengthening the advocacy capacity of the FOs cuts across all the sub-counties, as indicated by the generally low scores especially for lobbying and networking attributes.

FOs can significantly expand their network if they intensify their efforts using methods such as agricultural shows, workshops and radio and TV-presentations to reach a wider audience. Additional gains can be realized if the lobbying capacity of all the FOs is strengthened.

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.1 Overall Capacity Profile of FOs

Figure 23 provides the results of the overall capacity profile of all the FOs for the four sub-counties combined. The following cross-cutting capacity strengths and gaps can be observed:

Accountability
The selected FOs performance was fairly good on accountability indicator having attained a score of 67%. In general, majority of the surveyed FOs have properly constituted executive committees are legally registered and do have constitutions. However, they need to improve
on their performance evaluation of the executive committee, internal audit systems and record keeping.

Participation
On participation the FOs attained a score of 71% which means they have realized commendable achievements in terms of youth and women representation in leadership positions of the organisations. Members of the FOs participate in decision making and activities of the organisation through various channels such as monthly and annual meetings and training events. However, it was observed that men are grossly under-represented in FOs activities. Their exclusion in the activities of the FOs is a serious capacity gap.

Professional Capacity
On professional capacity, the FOs also performed fairly well recording a score of 69%. The score indicates that the majority of the FOs has attained a minimum education qualification of primary school. However, they have inadequate access to training in a variety of fields such as management and leadership, basic recordkeeping, financial management, post-harvest handling and business-planning which impairs their ability to realise their productive potential. There is a need for specialized training to empower the leaders in these fields.

Income Diversity
The income diversity indicator for the FOs covered in the survey obtained a modest score of 57 percent which indicate that some FO members specialize in more than one livestock and crop type which is important in reducing the exposure of farmers to common external shocks. However, majority of them have limited sources of funding and low external financial assistance. Enormous capacity improvements are therefore necessary to diversify sources of income to reduce the high dependence on membership fees and initiate activities that will generate alternative income.

Strategic Potential
The FOs generally have serious capacity needs associated with strategic potential. The strategic potential indicator obtained a score of 27% which reflects poor business planning due to the fact that many of the FOs have little or no strategic, business, and investment plans in place. This is a serious capacity gap that needs to be addressed.

Production management and Marketing
The FOs performed poorly on production management and marketing strategy indicators recording 14% and 15% scores respectively. The poor scores are due to the fact the FOs do not follow the aggregation logic of collective action. They do not fully take advantage of economies of scale to access agricultural finance, procure inputs, offer storage and transport facilities to their members and neither do they promote the produce of their members or offer no assistance to their members to negotiate favourable prices. These results suggest that more
should be done towards improving productivity, access to markets and business planning in order to improve organizational efficiency which consequently leads to improved trickle down benefits to individual small holder farmers.

Advocacy
The advocacy realized an indicator value of 48 per cent. This underscores the need for FOs to improve their lobbying methods and increase their lobbying frequency in order to enlarge and strengthen their network.

4.2 Classification of FOs Based on CPI scores

Figure x below illustrates the capacity performance index for the FOs in each of the Sub counties. The figure indicate that the CPI value for Tharaka South, Tharaka North, Igamba Ng’ombe and Mbeere were 45%, 36%, 62% and 43% respectively.

A classification of the FOs based on their capacity to provide services to their members show that on average, the surveyed FOs in Tharaka South, Tharaka North and Mbeere are in level 1 (not capable) whereas FOs in Igamba Ng’ombe are in level 2 (Capable). None of the sub-counties were classified in level 3 (very capable)
4.3 Recommendations for Improvement

The following recommendations need to be implemented in order to improve the capacity of FOs in the study areas to be able to fully utilise collective bargaining to assist smallholder farmers:

- **Identification of capacity gaps of individual FOs**: The profiling study has identified key capacity needs of all FOs that were included in the study. In order to be able to address their needs effectively, it is important to identify the gaps for each FO. In this way, it will be easy to provide the kind of assistance that addresses their individual needs; a one size fits all approach would not be successful;

- Identification of capacity strengths of FOs: First, the capacity indicators have shown that not all FOs are weak in certain areas. In fact some FOs have demonstrated a number of capacity strengths which can benefit others. All FOs with capacity strengths need to be identified and classified according to their capacity strengths so that they can be used to assist those that have capacity needs in the same areas; such peer-capacity building can be effective.

- Matching and linking FOs and with Service Providers (SPs): It is important to also conduct a mapping of SPs and classify them based on Capacity strengths. Once the FOs and SPs have been classified according to their capacity strengths and the FOs have also been grouped in line with their capacity gaps, it is necessary to match two groups and link them up such that FOs that are weak in basic bookkeeping are linked with SPs that offer such support or their peers that have capacity in this area.
- Peer-capacity building: It is important to identify the FOs that can serve as “role models” for others and use them to strengthen their peers, perhaps by way of mentoring and coaching. In this regard, best performing FOs will also be used as a form of SPs. This can be facilitated through exchange-visits.
- Support to service providers: In some areas some SPs have capacity gaps which warrant that they also receive support to improve their ability to assist FOs. Giving SPs such support will maximize their impact on FOs.

The specific capacity gaps per indicator for the surveyed FOs and proposed interventions are shown in table 3 below.
### Table 3: Specific Capacity Gaps and Proposed Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNTABILITY &amp; PROFESSIONAL CAPACITY</th>
<th>Capacity Strengths</th>
<th>Capacity Gaps</th>
<th>Proposed Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Majority of the FOs are legally registered, have constitutions and executive committees</td>
<td>FOs lack performance evaluation mechanism for their leaders</td>
<td>Strengthening FOS capacities in accountable leadership and management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FOs executive committee have at least primary education qualification</td>
<td>Inadequate skills in record keeping such as financial records purchase &amp; sales records etc</td>
<td>• Training in leadership, good governance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inadequate understanding of the constitution among FOs members</td>
<td>• Training on change management and succession planning on leadership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Executive committee has no access to training in areas such as management and leadership, basic recordkeeping, basic financial management, post-harvest handling and business-planning</td>
<td>• Building skills on accountability and transparency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop skills on: Record keeping, Financial management, Resource allocation, Resource mobilization, Business-planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Develop monitoring and evaluation skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Support FOs to establish internal audit systems and performance evaluation systems for their leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Educate members on their constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate FOs linkages with training providers such as NGOs, Government and the private Sector for long-term service provision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Facilitate exchange visits and mentoring among FOs leaders</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARTICIPATION</th>
<th>Capacity Strengths</th>
<th>Capacity Gaps</th>
<th>Proposed Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High level of youth and women representation in FOs leadership positions. High level of FOs members participation in decision making and activities of their organisations</td>
<td>Men are grossly under-represented in FOs activities. The FOs have inadequate capacity to organise training for members</td>
<td>• Develop capacity of FOs leadership to mobilize and motivate membership. The capacity development needs are - Mobilisation skills, skills to nurture commitment among member and team building skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Strengthen networking and lobbying capacity of FOs to attract training opportunities for their members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Employ strategies to promote participation of men in FOs activities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### INCOME DIVERSIFICATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Strengths</th>
<th>Capacity Gaps</th>
<th>Proposed Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| FOs rely mainly on membership contributions as their source of income which is good for their sustainability and self reliance. Majority of the FOs members are active, make their contributions regularly. FOs members specialises in more than one crop and livestock production which enhances their resilience to external shocks | FOs have limited funding sources and access to external finance which compromises their capacity to offer economic and social services to their members FOs have inadequate capacity to write acceptable or attractive business plans for funding | • Train FOs executive on business planning and/or proposal writing  
• Train FO members on financial literacy and record keeping  
• Train and sensitize on savings and credit schemes  
• Strengthen skills in revolving funds management contribution  
• Link FOs to financial institutions and other sources of finance such as NGOs and devolved government funds e.g Youth Fund  
• Support FOs to identify income-generation activities for financial sustainability. |

### STRATEGIC POTENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Strengths</th>
<th>Capacity Gaps</th>
<th>Proposed Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Majority of FOs have no clear Vision and Mission</td>
<td>FOs seriously lack the ability to develop strategic documents such as strategic plans, production plans, business plans and investment plans</td>
<td>Develop capacity building of FOs in Visioning, strategic and business planning</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT & MARKETING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Capacity Strengths</th>
<th>Capacity Gaps</th>
<th>Proposed Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Severe lack of production management capacity amongst the FOs. The FOs don’t soliciting or assisting members in accessing agricultural finance, collective procurement of inputs and collective quality control of procured inputs. The FOs don’t have production management committees | Improve FOs Capacity building in Production Management  
- Train FOs on Good Agronomic Practices  
- Facilitate access to productivity enhancing technologies | Promote continuous Learning and Innovation Amongst the farmers and FOs:  
- Foster farmer-to-farmer extension programmes  
- Establish farmer business schools and demo gardens  
- Promote FOs learning platforms/networks  
- Promote FOs participation in exchange studies and trade fairs  
- Provide FOs with pamphlets on production and marketing Promote FOs linkages to service providers in areas such as extension and credit  
Provide FOs with regular and up-to-date information about available opportunities and services offered by other partners |}

A grave capacity challenge in using FOs as channel for improving market access their members. They FOs don’t perform marketing functions for their members.  

Improve the entrepreneurial and collective marketing capacities of FOs and their participation in value chains:  
- Train in entrepreneurship skills  
- Sensitize the FOs on the value chain marketing approach  
  - Train on collective marketing: Production planning, collective storage; value adding to primary produce,  
  - Collective transportation of members’ produce to the market, collective selling & Market contract arrangements  
- Support FOs to identify market opportunities for their produce and to develop buyer relations and contracts  
- Support development of systems to provide farmers with timely market information
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVOCACY</th>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Capacity Gaps</th>
<th>Proposed Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Strengths                            | Majority of the FOs are weak in networking and lobbying. | Majority of FOs activities are well known beyond their local vicinities | Strengthening FOs capacities in lobbying and networking to influence input and output markets:  
- Train FOs in evidence based advocacy and lobbying to influence policies and structures  
- Build FOs networking skills to enable them to establish business contacts and learn the dynamics within their industry  
- Improve networking through FOs participation in agricultural shows, workshops and radio and TV-presentations to reach a wider audience. |
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## 6. LIST OF APPENDICES

### Appendix 1: Capacity Performance Index Per Sub-County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INDICATORS + ATTRIBUTES</th>
<th>Tharaka South</th>
<th>Tharaka North</th>
<th>Igamba Igombe</th>
<th>Mbeere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive committee</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive committee (EC) has at least 5 people</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance evaluating system for EC</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO is registered in the country</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has a constitution</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members have access of the constitution</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO keep member registration records</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO keep meeting and training records</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregation records of harvesting forecast,</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO keep Purchase and sales records</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO keep financial records</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has a functional/operational bank account</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has an Internal auditor/internal audit team</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO keeps members’ profile and activities infor</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has youth in its leadership positions</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has women in leadership positions</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO carries out annual general meetings</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO arranges training for members</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO members meet at least once every month</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Capacity</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has more than one source of funding</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO charge membership/registration fee</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO receive external income</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of membership increased by 10-15 in the past 2 production seasons</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income diversification</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has more than one source of funding</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO charge membership/registration fee</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO receive external income</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The size of membership increased by 10-15 in the past 2 production seasons</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO specialises in more than one crop production</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO specializes in more than one livestock</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INDICATORS + ATTRIBUTES</td>
<td>SUB-COUNTY SCORES (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>production</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic potential</td>
<td>27% 28% 38% 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has a vision and a mission statement</td>
<td>78% 38% 50% 63%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production plan</td>
<td>15% 13% 25% 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing plan</td>
<td>0% 13% 25% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investment plan</td>
<td>15% 50% 50% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Management</td>
<td>3% 0% 50% 5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO assist members in soliciting agricultural finance</td>
<td>5% 0% 38% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO collectively buy inputs</td>
<td>5% 0% 75% 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO monitor quality of collectively sourced inputs</td>
<td>0% 0% 75% 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has production management committee</td>
<td>0% 0% 13% 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>3% 4% 48% 7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO collectively market members’ produce</td>
<td>0% 25% 75% 4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO provides storage facilities for members</td>
<td>5% 0% 25% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has linkages with an aggregating centre</td>
<td>5% 0% 13% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides collective transport to members</td>
<td>0% 0% 75% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO sells members' produce collectively</td>
<td>0% 0% 88% 8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO provides members with marketing information</td>
<td>13% 0% 50% 33%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO arranges contractual marketing for members</td>
<td>0% 0% 13% 0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>61% 9% 66% 55%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO is known outside its operational area</td>
<td>65% 0% 63% 92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO is known within its operational area</td>
<td>95% 38% 100% 92%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO has a network of more than 2 organisations</td>
<td>80% 0% 50% 21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO participates in lobbying</td>
<td>3% 0% 50% 17%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPACITY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS</td>
<td>45% 36% 62% 43%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix 2: List of Participating FOs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBCOUNTY</th>
<th>GROUP NAME</th>
<th>PARTICIPANTS</th>
<th>FEMALE</th>
<th>MALE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tharaka North</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Gatunga Business W. G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Four In One Shg</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Tegemeo Youth Group</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Kithanje S.H.G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>29</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tharaka South</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Mutethia W.G</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Red Eagles Youth</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Utumi W.G (Mithigine)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Kathaanga W.G (Gakirwe)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Upendo (Gachaine)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Gakurungu PWDs</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Gakirwe W.G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Wendani Ndederera</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Kuga na Kurutha S.H.G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Kigama S.H.G</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Wamiuka S.H.G</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>2M4k Welfare Group</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Gakiminte S.H.G</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Kiraro S.H.G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Imani</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Kaimenyi</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Umoja Farmers S.H.G</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Kithama S.H.G</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Kamukunya</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Tumaini Tunyai W.G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>190</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IGAMBA NG’OMBE AREA</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Kapesa S.H.G</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Kinyweri S.H.G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Kawira S.H.G</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Kajuki Traders</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>56</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EMBU-MBEERE COUNTY</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Songa Mbele S.H.G</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Wendani S.H.G</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Ngararigeri</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Ishiara Winners w.G</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Wendo Women Group</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Qty</td>
<td>Unit</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Kamutua S.H.G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Miriteni W.G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Muungano W.G</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Kabuguri Cotton S.H.G</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Mwivoko W.G (Ngunga)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Mwithuriri S.H.G</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Mbangua W.G</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>145</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Grand total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>420</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>