

**SMALL SCALE COFFEE FARMERS
PROJECT**

EVALUATION REPORT

**By: Nereah Makau
DEVERN Research and Development Consultants**

NOVEMBER 2008

Table of Contents

| | Page |
|--|-----------|
| Abbreviations ----- | 4 |
| Executive Summary ----- | 5 |
| 1.0 Introduction ----- | 8 |
| 1.1 BEACON ----- | 8 |
| 1.2 Vision ----- | 8 |
| 1.3 Mission ----- | 8 |
| 1.4 Core Values ----- | 8 |
| 1.5 Key stakeholders ----- | 8 |
| 2.0 Building East Africa Community Network ----- | 9 |
| 3.0 The Evaluation Results ----- | 9 |
| 3.1 The Purpose ----- | 9 |
| 3.2. The Time and Scope of the evaluation ----- | 10 |
| 3.3 The Respondents ----- | 10 |
| 3.4 Limitations ----- | 11 |
| 4.0 Methodology ----- | 11 |
| 5.0 The Evaluation Results ----- | 12 |
| 5.1 The Project ----- | 13 |
| 5.1.1 Project Design/Planning Process ----- | 13 |
| 5.1.2 Project Goal ----- | 13 |
| 5.1.3 Specific Objectives ----- | 14 |
| 5.1.4 Project Activities ----- | 15 |
| 5.1.5 Project Results/Outcomes ----- | 15 |
| 5.1.6 Capacity to track the implementation of project activities ----- | 16 |
| 5.1.7 Networking and Collaboration with other stakeholders ----- | 17 |
| 6.0 Coffee Farmers/Respondents ----- | 17 |
| 6.1. Problems of Coffee Farmers before BEACON came to the scene ----- | 17 |
| 6.2 How coffee farmers dealt with their problems ----- | 19 |
| 6.3 Categories of coffee farmers who have benefited from the project ----- | 20 |
| 6.4 Respondents first involvement with BEACON ----- | 21 |
| 6.5 Changes that have occurred in their lives since they got involved with BEACON ----- | 21 |
| 6.6 How the respondents involvement with the project benefited other coffee farmers ----- | 22 |

| | | |
|------------|--|-----------|
| 6.7 | Respondents involvement in BEACON’s trainings and conference ----- | 22 |
| 6.8 | Respondents challenges in applying knowledge learnt ----- | 23 |
| 6.9 | Verification of the project’s impacts ----- | 23 |
| 6.10 | Respondents views on BEACON’s work with coffee farmers ----- | 25 |
| 6.11 | What the respondents consider as BEACON’s strengths And weaknesses ----- | 26 |
| 6.12 | Respondents understanding of BEACON’s Role with coffee farmers ----- | 26 |
| 6.13 | Respondents understanding of the role of NCA in the project----- | 27 |
| 6.14 | Respondents views on BEACON;s implementation process ----- | 27 |
| 6.15 | Respondents future plan in coffee farming ----- | 27 |
| 6.16 | Impacts of the project’s contribution and significance to Kenya ----- | 28 |
| 6.17 | Respondents views on project’s sustainability ----- | 28 |
| 6.18 | Respondents proposals on what BEACON should include in its future plans ----- | 29 |
| 7.0 | Conclusions ----- | 29 |
| 8.0 | Recommendations ----- | 30 |
| 9.0 | Appendices ----- | 33 |
| 9.1 | Appendix 1: List of participants ----- | 33 |
| 9.2 | Appendix 2: Questionnaire ----- | 34 |
| 9.3 | Appendix 3: Interview Schedule ----- | 41 |

ABBREVIATIONS

BEACON Building East Africa Community Network

AWC Africa Woman and Child Feature Services

CBOs Community Based Organizations

CoDF Coffee Development Fund

CBK Coffee Board of Kenya

KESMECFA Kenya Small and Medium Coffee Farmers Association

KESCOGA Kenya Small Coffee Growers Association

NGOs Non-Governmental Organizations

NCA Norwegian Church Aid

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Introduction

In 2006, BEACON, African Woman and Child (AWC) Features Services and Norwegian Church AID (NCA) jointly initiated a coffee project to contribute towards the promotion of trade justice in the coffee sector and to subsequently enhance the dignity of small scale coffee farmers. In the last two plus years, BEACON has therefore endeavored with the financial support from NCA to carry out the project through: advocacy and lobbying relevant national decision makers to allow increased participation of coffee farmers in policy formulation and implementation, creating general awareness on reforms in coffee sector, mobilizing and empowering small scale coffee farmers through capacity building through training.

The Evaluation exercise

In September 2008, BEACON commissioned an evaluation to be conducted to assess the contributions that it had made through the coffee project. The exercise took place from 1st to 12th September in Bungoma, Kisii (Nyamira) Bomet/Sotik, Nyeri, Muranga and Kiambu districts respectively, with a total of 106 coffee farmers (twenty interviewed individually and 86 during Focus Group Discussions).

Methodology

Four methodologies were used during the exercise. The assignment began with a consultative meeting between the consultant and BEACON team on 15th September, 2008, followed by literature reviews of various project documents which facilitated the develop of data collection tools. Interviews (with both BEACON staff and the farmers) and focus group discussions were used to gather relevant data.

Data collected from the field was collated and used for analysis and report writing. The first draft report was submitted to BEACON team on 17th October, 2008 for comments/feedback. Their inputs were provided in a meeting held on 21st October at BEACON offices and were later used to make the second draft report. On 13th November, the second draft was presented to coffee farmers for validation at a debriefing meeting held at Sportsview Hotel, at Kasarani in Nairobi. After the presentation of the findings, the participants accepted the report as true reflection of what was discussed with the respondents. The final draft was completed thereafter and submitted to BEACON.

The Evaluation findings

In terms of project designing, the findings established that there were still challenges in this area because the project had to be planned on annual basis. Achievement of the project's overall goal was found to be still along way to go, however, in terms of project purpose, significant strides had been made. In terms of specific objectives, at least 50 % had been achieved, compared to 80% achievement of the planned activities. The team however was not able to establish with certainty the extent of the efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation.

Staff members' ability to track implementation of the project activities was found to be an area of challenge as well because very few staff members were involved in the project. Subsequently, most of monitoring of project activities seemed to have taken place at national and regional levels. Project documentation in some instances were also found wanting. This was observed more in the proposal documents.

There was however clear evident that BEACON's coffee project with small scale farmers was a timely intervention, thus had met some felt needs among the small coffee farmers. A great hope among the coffee farmers has thus been raised since then.

The time of farmers' involvement with the project varied, for some, the involvement started the same year BEACON began its operations, for others it was as late as this year (2008). Since they began participating in BEACON's project, respondents reported that they have observed some changes in their lives. Some reported better farm management, increased awareness on coffee policies and reforms, increased desire to involve in coffee farming and increased appreciation of coffee farming as a potential source of income among others. Similar changes were also reported to have occurred among other coffee farmers (second generation of beneficiaries) who had benefited from those who had initially received training from BEACON.

Since the main focus of the project during the project period was mainly on capacity building, lobbying and advocacy, awareness creation and mobilization of coffee farmers. Although the project was reported to be far from being sustainable, however, from the findings, it was evident that good ground had been covered in building the foundation from where more work could be done with the small scale farmers in future.

As a way forward, the following were highly recommended among others:

- ❖ There was need to facilitate KESCOGA to register as soon as possible.
- ❖ BEACON should endeavor to scale up its training programmes through those who had been trained earlier since many farmers have not yet been reached.
- ❖ Training on gender mainstreaming should continue as a major focus to reduce gender disparity that has continued in the programme.
- ❖ BEACON should make efforts to strengthening coffee societies to come up with credible systems and structures that will facilitate their members to benefit from

government reforms within coffee sector. Consideration of employing qualified personnel in key positions to manage the societies is highly recommended. This should actually begin with KESCOGA as a role model.

- ❖ Farmers should be facilitated to access loans to buy farm inputs. Since CoDF seems to have a good package for the improvement of coffee trees, BEACON and KESCOGA should lobby the government to relax the stringent conditions to allow more farmers to access loans through this service.
- ❖ BEACON should correct the perception that it is a coffee buying company or a financier of coffee farmers.
- ❖ Confusion on the role of NCA should be corrected.
- ❖ The issue of marketing should be at the core in the future discussions between farmers, the government and BEACON. Effort to identify market outlets should be given a priority.
- ❖ KESCOGA officials should stop creating unnecessary expectations among the coffee farmers.
- ❖ Capacity building for project staff on project planning, monitoring and reporting is highly recommended.
- ❖ Part of BEACON's role should focus on monitor implementation of coffee policies by the government authorities and to continue to lobby the government to allow farmers to participate in the development of policies and in decision making.
- ❖ Lobbying and advocacy authorities and coffee buyers at internationally level should be the domain of NCA since it is well placed to do so.
- ❖ Additional staff members are needed to man the project. In particular, BEACON should consider employing a professional staff to coordinate the project to the grassroots.
- ❖ Lobbying and advocacy authorities and coffee buyers at internationally level should be the domain of NCA since it is well placed to do so.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 BEACON

Building Eastern Africa Community Network is a forum of churches and church based organizations in East and Horn of Africa. BEACON was formed in 1996 as a Trust to build the capacity of churches and church based NGOs on advocacy and influencing policy formulation on good governance, economic justice and peace.

To help them play these critical roles effectively has also been able to accompany both churches and church based NGOs as well as NGOs and Community Based Organizations in advocacy on economic justice issues, Gender and HIV/AIDS mainstreaming, Research and documentation.

Being a facilitator, BEACON thus works in collaboration with churches, church based organizations, NGOs and Community Based Organizations.

1.2 Vision

An empowered, prosperous, independent and God fearing society of East and Horn of Africa

1.3 Mission

To enhance and improve the capacity of peoples in the East and Horn of Africa to facilitate them to play a central role in building of a just, peaceful, Participatory and Sustainable society

1.4 Core Values

The following core values guide the work of BEACON;

- ❖ Justice, Equity and Peace
- ❖ Good Governance
- ❖ Empowerment
- ❖ Participation
- ❖ Love

1.5 Key stakeholders

BEACON collaborates closely with the following stakeholders:

- ❖ Local/grassroots Communities Based Organization.
- ❖ National and Local Government Institution.
- ❖ Regional and National Non-governmental Organizations.
- ❖ Churches, Church based organizations and other religious bodies.

2.0 BEACON'S INVOLVEMEN IN THE COFFEE SECTOR

BEACON's idea to engage in the coffee sector came into being in 2005 when it started involving in Kenya coffee industry with African Woman and Child (AWC) Features Services. Prior to this, NCA which is the main funding agency of the project, had earlier participated in a campaign in Norway in 2002 when concerns were raised in a report by Robert Chutha, on the way coffee houses were exploiting Kenya coffee farmers. After the launch of the campaign and publication of another report by Liv Torress entitled "Coffee and Ethics", both NCA Oslo and NCA Nairobi expressed desire to follow up the work started in 2002, hence the decision to involve with coffee farmers in Kenya through partnership with BEACON.

The initiative eventually began as a joint venture between Norwegian Church AID, BEACON and African Woman and Child (AWC) Features Services in 2006 from an economic justice and governance perspective. BEACON on its part saw this as an opportunity to make contribution towards the promotion of trade justice in the coffee sector and subsequently to enhance the dignity of small scale coffee farmers. In the last

two plus years, BEACON has endeavored with the support of NCA to carry out the project through: advocacy and lobbying relevant national decision makers to allow increased participation of coffee in policy formulation and implementation, creating general awareness on reforms in the coffee sector, mobilizing and empowering small scale coffee farmers through capacity building.

3.0 THE EVALUATION

3.1 The Purpose

The purpose of the evaluation was to assess the contributions that BEACON had made during the implementation of the coffee project in the plan period. Specifically, the evaluation exercise was to:

1. Assess the extent to which the project met its set objectives.
2. Assess the relevance of the project as BEACON's priority to its goal and purpose.
3. Assess the level of ownership of the project design, implementation and outputs.
4. Review the project's supporting systems and structures to determine areas of their strengths and weaknesses.
5. Assess the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of the project implementation.
6. Assess the level of performance of the funding agencies (NCA and AWC
7. Feature services).
8. Assess the level of networking between BEACON, funding agencies and other key stakeholders in the coffee sector.
9. Assess the effectiveness of BEACON in terms of planning, ability to track the implementation of the project activities and reporting.
10. Assess the impact of the project, in terms of its contribution and significance in Kenya.
11. Assess changes that have been brought about by the project.
12. Assess the level of sustainability of the project.
13. Document lessons learnt by identifying what worked and what did not work and to propose how BEACON could use these for its future interventions.
14. Make recommendations on areas for improvement and future interventions.

3.2 Time and Scope of the evaluation

The evaluation was conducted in the month of September 2008. The field work was carried out from 1-12th September in Bungoma, Kisii (Nyamira) Bomet/Sotik, Nyeri, Muranga and Kiambu districts respectively.

The evaluation covered the project period from January 2006 to August 2008.

3.3 The Respondents

A total of 106 coffee farmers participated in the interviews. Out of this twenty (20) were interviewed individually, while 86 participated in Focus Group Discussions. The breakdown of the numbers from the regions was as follows:

Table 1: Areas of interviews and number of the Respondents

| Area | Interviews | Focus Group Discussions |
|----------------|------------|-------------------------|
| Bungoma | 3 | 10 |
| Kisii/Nyamira | 5 | 32 |
| Bomet/Sotik | 5 | 10 |
| Nyeri | 2 | 8 |
| Muranga | 3 | - |
| Kiambu/Gatundu | 2 | 26 |
| Total | 20 | 86 |

In terms of gender, 18 of the respondents interviewed individually were men and only two were women, while in the focus groups the representation was 63 men and 13 women, indicative of unproportional involvement of men and women in the coffee sector. In terms of age, the majority (14 or 70%) of the individual respondents interviewed were within 43 years and above age-bracket, while those between 31 and 36 years and those between 37-42 years age brackets were two and four respondents respectively.

Data on educational background revealed that most of the respondents had either secondary or college level education, with a total of 8 respondents in each case. Those who indicated that they had primary level education were 4 in number.

Similar age groups and level of education mentioned above were also observed among the people who participated in the various focus groups.

The evaluation team also established that most of the respondents who participated in the evaluation in Bugoma, Kisii and Bomet were mainly small scale coffee farmers, compared to those interviewed in Nyeri, Muranga and Kiambu who consisted of both small and medium coffee farmers.

Data also revealed that among the 20 respondents who had been interviewed individually, the majority (17 or 85%) had less than 2.5 acres of coffee farms. Only three had more than 2.5 acres of coffee, namely 5.6, 8 and 14 acres respectively. The team however was not able to establish the acreage among those in focus groups because of the large number involved.

3.4 Limitations

Time assigned to carry out the exercise was limited. Thus, the assessment team was only able to be in one place per day but with limited contact hours with the respondents because of the distance they had to cover to reach venues. The weather also posed a challenge during the field visits, since it was rainy season in most of the areas visited.

Furthermore, because of time constraint, the assessment team was not able to conduct interviews with representatives from collaborating organizations or stakeholders.

4.0 METHODOLOGY

The assignment began with a consultative meeting between the consultant and BEACON team on 15th September, 2008. At this meeting, the consultant was taken through the Terms of reference (TOR) of the assignment. Issues to do with logistical arrangements and terms of engagement were also clarified.

Literature review of related reports was carried out to get better insight on what had been planned and implemented. From the literature review, the consultant was able developed data collection tools, namely: a structured questionnaire and an interview schedule which were used to collect relevant information from the respondents.

Data collected from the field was collated to order the information in preparation for the analysis. From this exercise, a number of tables were developed (including frequencies and percentages) and used to analyze the data.

The first draft report was submitted to BEACON team on 17th October, 2008 for comments/feedback. Their inputs were provided in a meeting held on 21st October at BEACON offices and were later used to make the second draft report. On 13th November, the second draft was presented to coffee farmers for validation at a debriefing meeting held at Sportsview Hotel, at Kasarani in Nairobi. After the presentation of the findings, the participants accepted the report as true reflection of what was discussed with the respondents. The final draft was completed thereafter and submitted to BEACON.

5.0 THE EVALUATION RESULTS

The evaluation results provide the findings gathered from interviews with BEACON staff, literature reviews and interviews and focus group discussions with the respondents. Sections 5.1.1 -5.1.7, focus on the finding on the project's: objectives, design/planning process, supporting systems and structures, efficiency and effectiveness on the implementation process, BEACON's capacity to track the implementation of project activities and reporting, networking and collaboration with other stakeholders.

Sections 6.0- 6.18 on the other hand focus on the following discussions:

- ❖ Problems of coffee farmers before BEACON came into the scene, how farmers dealt with them, the extent to which the project addressed these problems and who had benefited most from BEACON' intervention.
- ❖ The respondents' first involvement with BEACO, changes that had occurred as a result of their involvement with the project and how this has benefited other coffee farmers.

- ❖ What respondents had learnt from BEACON's training workshops and conferences and challenges they faced in their efforts to apply what they had learnt.
- ❖ Verification of the project's impacts.
- ❖ The respondents views on BEACON's strengths and weaknesses.
- ❖ The respondents understanding of the role of BEACON and NCA in the project.
- ❖ The project's contribution and significance to Kenya.
- ❖ The respondents' future plans.
- ❖ The respondents views on the project's sustainability and
- ❖ What BEACON should include in its future interventions.

The discussions on the findings end with conclusions and recommendations. Below are the detailed discussions of the findings.

5.1 THE PROJECT

5.1.1 Project Design/Planning Process

The project had begun with a preliminary assessment in 2005. From this, BEACON reported that it was able to identify issues that informed its first project plan; however, direct link between this information and the development of the actual project plan was not clear then and even in the subsequent plans of 2007 and 2008. However, what was clear was that the project plans were developed on yearly basis. Although this approach allowed coffee farmers opportunity to discuss their needs or problems with BEACON, it was not inclusive since it was done more at national and provincial levels mainly with officials of the coffee societies. Needs assessments should have been be carried with coffee farmers at the grassroots to get better insight on the status of farmers. In future, such an approach proceed planning process.

Although planning of the project activities on annual basis may have been necessitated by the fact that it was still at its maiden stage, plans for the next phase should be long term. BEACON should therefore emulate what KESMECFA committee members have done by coming up with its own strategic plan for the next three years to help it consolidate what has already bee done in the last project period.

5.1.2 Project Goal

Analysis of the project document of 2006 and 2007, revealed that BEACON's project overall goal statements for the two years were not the same, a point which demonstrated confusion on what really was the project goal. In 2006 for example, the project goal was stated as: *to empower small scale farmers through capacity building and accompanying them in lobbying and advocacy with an aim of promoting Economic Justice in the Coffee industry in Kenya*". In the view of the team, this should have been project purpose (to be accomplished that year and not long term). In comparison, the statement goal for 2008 (which was found to be the same as that found in NCA's 2007 project summary annual

logical framework matrix), was defined as: *to achieve a reform of the Kenyan Coffee sector, that ensures increased equity and sustainable livelihoods for small scale farmers and coffee pickers*". This reads like an overall goal, whose achievement as expected was not yet close to what had been realized on the ground. Being an overall goal, it will take many years and collective efforts from other actors as well, to ensure increased equity and sustainable livelihoods for small scale farmers. What BEACON had done so far, is to set into motion, a move towards that end.

Confusion of terminologies was also observed in BEACON's project documents. What should be project overall goal, in some of the project documents were being referred to as project's Vision. Such mix ups should be avoided in future.

5.1.3 Specific Objectives

Within the project period, BEACON had set out to specifically:

- ❖ Identify gaps and imperfections at every link in the production/supply chain that inhibit the maximization of returns to the producers.
- ❖ Create awareness on existing coffee policies.
- ❖ Lobby the relevant government ministries for increased participation of coffee farmers in policy formulation and implementation.
- ❖ Empower and mobilize small scale farmers through accompaniment and capacity building for (a) society and cooperative managers and (b) for KESMECFA officials.
- ❖ Agree on actions to be taken on the way forwards for the coffee industry.

By the time of the evaluation, these objectives had been achieved at varying degrees. For instance, the identification of gaps and imperfections in the production/supply chain had been done more at awareness level during capacity building training workshops. Efforts to create awareness on the existing coffee policies had also been done as confirmed by the activity reports and the respondents. Lobbying the relevant government ministries in terms of policies was only realized when coffee farmers successfully lobbied the Minister of Agriculture to gazette the rules for second window option of marketing in July 2006 after the National Round Table Conference.

Other efforts to lobby the government took place mainly during the regional workshops with different government representatives from: Coffee Development Fund (CoDF), Coffee Board of Kenya (CBK), National and Provincial Cooperatives. BEACON had also made significant efforts to build the capacities of societies and cooperative managers, as well as KESMECFA officials on policies and other pertinent issues in the coffee industry during the national and regional workshops. The extent of lobbying the government to increase farmers' participation in policy formulation was neither clear nor evident.

On the whole, however, the assessment team established that at least 50% of the above objectives had been achieved by the time of the evaluation.

5.1.4 Project Activities

Since the year 2005, reports show that BEACON was able to carry out a number of activities in line with its plans and objectives. From the data collected, over 80% of these activities had been implemented by the time of the evaluation, however, level of efficiency, effectiveness and timeliness of implementation process was difficult to determine from the reports since the plan documents were not clearly articulated.

From the various activities reports, it was however clear that, in the year 2006, BEACON had held a two-day National Round Table Coffee Stakeholders Conference, at Desmond Tutu Ecumenical Centre, from 4th -5th May to discuss pertinent issues affecting coffee farmers and to come out with ways to improve the sector. Towards the end of 2006, BEACON held a training workshop on 6th-7th December for small coffee growers at Bounty Hotel in Nairobi. It was in this meeting, when gender mainstreaming within the coffee sector was discussed for the first time by an expert.

In 2007 period, two Regional meetings (sharing forums) were convened for coffee farmers. The first was a meeting for farmers from coffee growing districts in central province, which was held in Thika town, at Thika Youth Pastoral Centre from 24th -25th July 2007. The second meeting was held on 16th -17th October, the same year, at Polyview Hotel in Kisumu City for coffee farmers from Nyanza, Rift valley and Western provinces. Sensitization meetings were reported to have taken place in Maragua, Bungoma and in Kisii districts the same year. From 6th- 10 May 2007 BEACON organized one exposure visit to Uganda for Kenya coffee farmers. The visit was as a result of experience sharing among coffee farmers from East Africa region during the World Social Forum earlier in the year.

From the interviews, the evaluation team also established that the above activities were indeed carried out and that a number of the respondents were direct beneficiaries. For example, 15 out of 20 of the respondents indicated that they had attended at least one workshop or meeting organized by BEACON. Similar reports were received from a number of respondents who participated in focus group discussions.

5.1.5 Project Results/Outcomes

BEACON's work with coffee farmers had generated a number of significant results. Among them were:

- ❖ Gazzeting of the coffee rules and operationalization of the second window marketing model after a group of farmers presented a memorandum to the Minister of Agriculture in 2007, as already been mentioned above.
- ❖ Promotion of "second window" concept for marketing among small scale coffee farmers.

- ❖ The creation of Kenya Small and Medium Coffee Farmers Association (KESMECFA) -a national coffee stakeholders forum- and development of its constitution and a three year Strategic Plan of 2009-2011.
- ❖ Increased interaction of small scale coffee farmers with relevant government institutions, especially during national and provincial training workshops.
- ❖ A bit of increased understanding on significance of gender in coffee sector among those who had attended training workshop in Nairobi on 6th -7th December 2007 and other farmers who were later trained by the contact farmers.
- ❖ Increased awareness among societies officials(or contact farmers)on coffee policies and results of reforms in coffee sector.
- ❖ Enhanced experience sharing among coffee farmers from different regions in the country and outside.
- ❖ The realization that a lot still needed to be done in the area of capacity building.

5.1.6 Capacity to track the implementation of the project activities and reporting

Due to the number assigned to the project, monitoring or follow up of contact farmers at their constituencies seemed to pose a challenge for BEACON staff. As a result, most of the monitoring tended to take place at the national and regional forums and not at the grassroots level.

In terms of documentation, two scenarios appeared from the analysis of the project documents. First, the team found BEACON's proposal documents wanting. The proposal documents (except for the one of 2008) had neither dates nor page numbers. The same problem was noticed with one other progress report that had no title, date or page numbers.

Good documentation however was observed in various activities reports, namely:

- ❖ The National Round Table Coffee Stakeholders Conference, 4th -5th May 2006.
- ❖ National Coffee Farmers Training Workshop, 6th-7th December 2006.
- ❖ Coffee Farmers Regional Workshop, 24th -25th July, 2007.
- ❖ Understanding the Coffee Reform Agenda and Its Implications on Coffee Production and Marketing, 16th -17th October, 2007.BEACON-KESMECF.
- ❖ Strategic Planning Meeting, 7th-9th May, 2008.

5.1.7 Networking and Collaboration with other stakeholders

This is one of the areas where BEACON demonstrated its strength. During the project period, BEACON was able to network and collaborate with a number of stakeholders as follows:

- ❖ At the initial stages of the project, it was able to work closely with proponents of fair trade like Robert Chutha and with WAC Features Services particularly during the preparation for the National Stakeholders Conference.

- ❖ Through the project period, it collaborated with NCA as a funding agent, but which occasionally provided logistics whenever necessary, hence the realization of what has been achieved to date.
- ❖ Through its networking and collaboration with the Coffee Board of Kenya, farmers were sensitized on coffee market regulations and opportunities that existed in the market and the best model to use for marketing. Through their advice, coffee farmers came to realize that they could register their own associations.
- ❖ Through its networking and collaboration with Coffee Research Foundation, farmers were able to received trainings on the best practices on coffee farming and management.
- ❖ Through its networking and collaboration with Coffee Development Fund department, farmers came to know more about the benefits of the fund and areas legible for funding.
- ❖ Through its networking and collaboration the Ministries of Agriculture and Cooperatives, the farmers successfully lobbied the government officials to pass rules that governed second window model.
- ❖ When farmers wanted to register their association, KESKOGA, the Ministry of Agriculture gave them a letter of recommendation to the Registrar of Societies to register.

6.0 COFFEE FARMERS/RESPONDENTS

6.1 Problems of Coffee Farmers before BEACON came into the scene

When the respondents were asked to mention three key problems that coffee farmers had experienced in their areas before BEACON came into the scene, they painted a gloomy picture, characterized by rampant trade injustices, corruption, lack of appropriate skills on farm management, constant struggles to get coffee to the factories and transport challenges. As table 2 below shows, specifically the problems were: low payments, lack of information about sale of their coffee, mismanagement/corruption in coffee societies, marketing and lack of farm inputs due to high costs, were therefore frequently mentioned among others.

Table 2: Key problems that coffee farmers faced prior to the BEACON project

| Key Problem | No. of Respondents | Percentage |
|--|--------------------|------------|
| 1. Low payments | 13 | 21.7 |
| 2. Funds to: buy farm inputs(fertilizers, spray, hire labor during harvest, to develop the farm etc) | 11 | 18.3 |
| 3. Mismanagement of coffee societies/corruption in coffee societies | 10 | 16.7 |
| 4. Problem of middle men/exploitation | 2 | 3.3 |
| 5. Poor management of coffee diseases | 3 | 5.0 |

| | | |
|--|-----------|---------------|
| 6. Lack of information on proper farming methods | 10 | 16.7 |
| 7. Transport/coffee factories are far | 7 | 11.7 |
| 8. Poor infrastructure | 3 | 5.0 |
| 8. Weak coffee societies | 1 | 1.7 |
| Total* | 60 | 100.00 |

* Multiple responses (possible answers up to 60 answers)

Responses from focus groups discussions provided the same list of challenges. In addition to these the respondents also mentioned lack of extension services, knowledge on the value of coffee as a source of income and knowing the real price of coffee they sold.

Later, when the individual respondents were asked to mention problems they had personally experience before BEACON came, here again similar challenges were highlighted, but with lack of appropriate knowledge on farm management topping the list with 27% respondents, in addition to apathy towards coffee farming, mentioned by 6.8% of respondents.

Who were the most affected with the problems mentioned above? According to 14 out of 20 or 72.1% respondents, small scale farmers with their families felt the impact of these problems more. Comparatively, 2 other respondents reported that it was coffee societies and their members, one said that it was both small scale and medium scale coffee farmers while 2 others mentioned medium coffee farmers. Numbers withstanding, this data demonstrates that problems in the coffee sector do affect both small scale and medium coffee farmers alike, but comparatively, the former category of farmers have felt the pinch the most.

6.2 How did coffee farmers deal with these problems?

Out of their frustration, some farmers decided to uproot their coffee trees or simply neglected (abandoned) their coffee farms, while others intercropped to get food for their families. Occasionally, farmers would report their grievances to the relevant authorities with little or no action taken. In an effort to get appropriate information on better methods on coffee farming, others would invite experts to train them on various skills. A few were reported to have made attempts to get loans from the government to fund their coffee activities.

Needless to say, despite their numerous challenges, in most cases, no organizations turned up to help them out with their problems as reported by 16(80%) of the respondents. Only 2 or 10% of the respondents reported that some organizations had come to their assistance as coffee farmers. The two foregoing views were also reported during the focus group discussions.

But even where organizations had made attempts to work with coffee farmers, they tended to give more focus (mostly on short term basis) on the provision of: variety of coffee seeds, loans for farmers to buy farm inputs or trainings on better farming methods. On the other hand, government extension services were hardly there, if they were, the services they provided were not adequate.

From their testimonies, it was evident that the coming of BEACON was timely because it filled a gap that had existed for quite awhile. Comparing BEACON with the other organizations, the feeling of the respondents was that none of the other organizations had taken strategies of lobbying, advocacy and sensitization of farmers on coffee policies like BEACON.

However, the extent to which BEACON had addressed the problems of coffee farmers was viewed differently by the respondents. For the majority (12 out of 20 or 60.0%) of the respondents, what BEACON had done to date, was minimal, indicative that more was still needed, particularly in the areas of marketing, farm inputs and capacity building of farmers at the grassroots among others. In contrast to the foregoing view, some respondents were of the opinion that the coffee programme had encouraged farmers to get together for fight for their rights, helped some to increase production level after learning about value addition, while those whose farms were doing well were reportedly offering extension services voluntarily to their fellow farmers.

At a person level, in addition to the points above, some respondents also reported that as a result of the programme:

- they had been empowered having gained new knowledge on alternative marketing model, value addition and about CoDF (reported by 13 respondents)
- they were made aware of other services available to coffee farmers reported by 2 respondents)
- they have gained hope in coffee farming reported by one respondent

6.3 Who among coffee farmers have benefited most from BEACON's coffee project?

17 or 44.7% respondents stated that it was the men who had benefited the most from the programme. These evidently, were predominantly small scale farmers (mentioned by 16 or 42.1% respondents), demonstrating that BEACON's efforts to break gender biasness in coffee sector had not yet realize desired results.

The general practice in most families as found by the assessment team was that women and youth were mainly used as laborers particularly in: planting, weeding, manuring, spraying, picking, and taking coffee to society factory and pulping. Occasionally women were also used to pay casual labourers, collect payments from the factory, supervision workers and in decision-making. Such opportunities however were not reported in the case of the youth.

Reports from respondents indicated that the way the youth have been used in the family coffee farms had resulted in their dislike towards coffee farming and even killed their desire to take up as a source of income.

As the respondents said, some of the ways to help youth to take more interest in coffee farming would be to pay them for their labour from the sale of the family coffee. In addition to this, they further proposed that the youth should be:

- ❖ given a few coffee stems of their own to grow;
- ❖ sensitized on the importance of coffee;
- ❖ provided with loans to start their own nurseries;
- ❖ involved in decision making, especially on how to use the monies earned from the parents coffee;
- ❖ given their own coffee farms and
- ❖ given opportunity to go for training, workshops and seminars

Table 3: Who had benefited most from BEACON's Programme

| Who has benefited the most | Number | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|------------|--------------|
| 1. Women | 1 | 2.6 |
| 2. Men | 17 | 44.7 |
| 3. Small scale coffee farmers | 16 | 42.1 |
| 4. Medium coffee farmers | 1 | 2.6 |
| 5. No answer | 3 | 7.9 |
| Total | 38* | 100.0 |

*Multiple responses

6.4 Respondents First involvement with BEACON

The first time the respondents began their involvement with BEACON varied as data gathered showed. For some, the involvement started the same year BEACON began its operations, for others it was as late as this year (2008). As table below 4 shows, this has been an ongoing process.

For the majority of the respondents however, the first involvement began when they either attended stakeholders' conference or training workshops that had been organized by BEACON. Others came in as secondary beneficiaries after attending meetings that had been organized by society officials who were the first beneficiaries of BEACON's training workshops or seminars.

Table 4: The first time the respondents got involved in BEACON's program

| Year started | Number | Percentage |
|--------------|--------|------------|
| 1. 2005 | 2 | 10.0 |
| 2. 2006 | 5 | 25.0 |

| | | |
|--------------|-----------|--------------|
| 3. 2007 | 9 | 45.0 |
| 4. 2008 | 3 | 15.0 |
| 5. No answer | 1 | 5.0 |
| Total | 20 | 100.0 |

6.5 Changes that have occurred in their lives since they got involved with BEACON

Judging from the answers given to the question above, there was a strong indication that some changes had occurred among farmers who had been directly and indirectly involved in the coffee project. According to 17 or 42.5% respondents, their interest in coffee farming had significantly increased. This was partly attributed by some to the hope that sooner or later they would be able to sale their coffee again as small scale farmers and partly as a result of the belief that if this happens, coffee will become their main source of income as before. Improved management of coffee farms (reported by 8 or 40%of the respondents) was said to be as a result of the training they had received. Among the 8, some reported some reporting high coffee yields from their individual farms.

Others (three respondents) had become more aware of what is happening in coffee growing areas and in the sector at large. In addition to these, some respondents reported that they had gained new knowledge on coffee policies, received information on the reforms that had taken place in the coffee industry and how coffee prices have been manipulated in the market middle men.

From the focus group discussions, respondents also highlighted some significant changes that BEACON had brought by working with coffee farmers. In particular, they reported that the project had:

- ❖ Improved coffee meetings in the area, evidenced in the quality of coffee being produced.
- ❖ Initiated the formation of KESCOGA.
- ❖ Helped to improve attitude of people towards coffee farming.
- ❖ Changed their coffee farming methods due to increased knowledge on better coffee farming methods as a result of the trainings they had received.
- ❖ Helped people to begin to appreciate coffee faming as a potential source of income in the area.

6.6 How respondents' involvement with the project helped other coffee farmers

After their trainings and sensitization through BEACON's programme, most respondents reported to have gone back and replicated the training they had received among their neighbors or members of their societies during their general meetings. Occasionally, they would also talk to women and youth during their meetings and to members of the community at the chief *barazas*. On the other hand, neighboring farmers who had seen what they (respondents) were doing would voluntarily visit their farms to

learn the new skills. In this way other farmers were able to benefit from BEACON's programme. As a result, such farmers were reported to have improved quality of their coffee trees; some have been able to determine their own coffee prices in the market, while others decided to use coffee farming as a source of income, something they had not done before.

6.7 Level of respondents' involvement in BEACON's Training, Conferences or Seminars

From the one-to-one interviews, 15 or 75% respondents indicated that they had been involved in BEACON's conferences or seminars. Significant numbers in the various focus groups also reported to have attended at least one meeting or training that had been organized by BEACON.

From these meetings or trainings, the respondents learnt many things. For example, 27.3% indicated that they had learnt about coffee management and 24.3 about marketing. Other learnings, though less frequently mentioned included learning about: the importance of lobbying and advocacy, coffee as an Income Generating Activity (IGA), value addition, responsibility sharing (i.e. gender aspect in coffee farming), how societies are mismanaged and how some farmers misuse loans they borrow for their farm activities.

What difference has this knowledge made in their lives? Answers to this question once again showed that the learnings from conferences or seminars had empowered the farmers, therefore some to have:

- ❖ Become epitome of knowledge in coffee farming among their peers.
- ❖ Improved quality of their coffee trees.
- ❖ Become advocates for rights of coffee farmers.
- ❖ Embraced coffee farming as an IGA.
- ❖ Made other coffee farmers to respect farming.
- ❖ Revived their coffee farms.
- ❖ Experienced improved relationships among their family members.

6.8 Respondents Challenges in applying knowledge learnt from BEACO's trainings workshops or conferences

12 or 60.0% of the respondents were frank to report that they had experienced some challenges in their efforts to implement what they had learnt from training workshops or seminars, compared to 4 or 20.0% who said they had not. The most frequently mentioned challenges were lack of funds, negative attitude of some farmers toward change being proposed by the project, high cost of inputs and to some extent, inadequate labour. The least mentioned reasons (indicated by at least one respondent in each case) were:

- ❖ delays in payment
- ❖ lack of pulping machine

- ❖ gender bias
- ❖ un-enabling political environment

6.9 Verification of the project's impacts

In an effort to establish the extent of the impact the project had made, the assessment team had provided a number of statements for the respondents to register their *agreement or disagreement* as shown on table 5 below. According to the information received, there was general agreement among the respondents that BEACON's programme, had to some extent:

- ❖ Helped coffee farmers to get better understanding of issues surrounding coffee industry in Kenya.
- ❖ Motivated coffee farmers to network and collaborate with one another both as a group or individually.
- ❖ Helped to increase networking and collaboration among organizations involved in the struggle for small scale coffee farmers (though more still needs to be done in this area).
- ❖ Made coffee farmers more aware of existing policies on coffee production.
- ❖ Made some coffee farmers improve level of their production (but not yet significantly in most cases) after educating/sensitizing them.

Comparatively, not much ground has been covered in the following areas:

- ❖ Empowering coffee farmers to lobby and advocate for their reform agenda.
- ❖ Helping coffee farmers involved to take part in decision making process.
- ❖ Getting informed about issues that affect them internationally.
- ❖ Identifying opportunities in the market chain and as a result, facilitated them to take advantage of such opportunities.
- ❖ Empowering coffee farmers to lobby and advocate for their reform agenda.
- ❖ Helping coffee farmers involved to take part in decision making process.

Table 5: Views on the impact of BEACON's programme

| Statement | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Disagree (3) | Strongly Disagree (4) | Don't know /NA (5) |
|--|--------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| | Total no. | Total no. | Total no. | Total no. | Total no. |
| 1. I have attended at least one workshop/meeting organized by Beacon | 15 | | | 2 | |
| 2. Beacon's programme has helped coffee farmers to get a better understanding of issues surrounding coffee industry in Kenya | 4 | 13 | | | 3 |
| 3. Due to Beacon programme, coffee farmers in this area have been able to | 8 | 7 | 2 | | 3 |

| | | | | | |
|---|----|---|---|---|---|
| network and collaborate with each other | | | | | |
| 4. Networking and collaboration among organizations involved in the struggle for small scale coffee farmers has increased because of the programme | 6 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 5. Through Beacon education/sensitization, small scale coffee farmers have been able to improve level of their production | 6 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 5 |
| 6. Since Beacon began work in this area, coffee farmers have seen a significant change in their level of production | 4 | 5 | 5 | 1 | 5 |
| 7. Beacon has helped coffee farmers in this area to identify opportunities in the market chain and facilitated to take advantages of such opportunities | 1 | 6 | 7 | 1 | 5 |
| 8. Coffee farmers have been helped to get involved in decision making process as result of their involvement with Beacon | 2 | 5 | 5 | 3 | 5 |
| 9. Beacon has played key role in advocacy and lobbying on behalf of small scale farmers | 4 | 7 | 3 | | 5 |
| 10. The programme has empowered coffee farmers to lobby and advocate for their reform agenda | 1 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 6 |
| 11. Coffee farmers are now well informed about issues that affect them locally, nationally and internationally | 1 | 7 | 7 | | 5 |
| 12. I am now more aware of policies on coffee production because of Beacon | 10 | 5 | | | 5 |

6.10 Respondents Views on BEACON's work with coffee farmers

Perception of people towards BEACON work with coffee farmers varied depending on how well they were informed about the organization. Those who had direct contact/involvement had better view of what the organization was trying to do with the farmers compare to those who did not.

Those who had direct contact/involvement with BEACON reported that:

- ❖ People were happy with BEACON and therefore wanted to be part of the work they were doing so as to improve their own coffee production and returns from it.
- ❖ People had welcomed the work of BEACON in their areas.
- ❖ Farmers were looking forward to get loans from BEACON to acquire pulping machines.
- ❖ Farmers felt that BEACON was there for their good/benefit. For example, that BEACON was there to facilitate trainings for coffee farmers.

Despite the above views however, there was still a strong feeling that BEACON was still not well known by most of coffee farmers in many areas. Some of them confess during the interviews that they were hearing about BEACON for the first time. Because of the

foregoing, the prevailing view was that, there was need for BEACON to go down to the farmers where they are and replicate the trainings there. In expressing this view, one respondent said: “BEACON should come to us. We are seeing BEACON for the first time, except for what we have heard from those who have attended their seminars. More visits for training, to help us improve our coffee quality and quantity”.

Echoing the same sentiment, another farmer put it this way: “BEACON should get on the ground to, reach more farmers through trainings and demonstrations, and develop extension staff who can reach more farmers. This request had been given to BEACON before but has not been acted on”.

6.11 What the respondents considered as BEACON’s Strengths and Weaknesses

The greatest strength of BEACON, for 10 or 43.5% of the twenty farmers interviewed was in building the capacity of coffee farmers through training or education. Others listed: its ability to partner with NCA (2 respondents), ability to look for market outlets for farmers (one respondent), creating linkages/networks (two respondents), coordinate its work (one respondent) and in organizing table conferences (one respondent).

BEACON’s weaknesses according to the respondents, as table below shows were perceived in: its weak financial base, not being very visible or felt in a significant way yet at the grassroots, failure to provide financial assistance to coffee farmers and inability to get financial assistance from the government to do its work.

Table 6: BEACON’s Weaknesses according to the respondents

| Weaknesses | Number | Percentage |
|---|---------------|-------------------|
| 1.Has low financial base | 4 | 20.0 |
| 2.Has not reached the grassroot level well | 3 | 15.0 |
| 3.Does not give financial assistance to coffee farmers | 3 | 15.0 |
| 4.Getting financial assistance from the government to do its work | 1 | 5.0 |
| 5.No answer | 9 | 45.0 |
| Total | 20 | 100.0 |

6.12 Respondents Understanding of BEACON’s Role with coffee farmers

Were they aware of the role of BEACON? To this question, fourteen (out of 20) or 70% of the respondents answered in the affirmative, three others in the negative and another 3 did not respond. Sampled answers from focus group discussions defined BEACON’s role as follows:

- ❖ To encourage and empower coffee farmers and to give them knowledge on how to improve their coffee.
- ❖ To improve the payment of coffee farmers.

- ❖ To strengthen coffee farmers.
- ❖ To buy coffee from the farmers.
- ❖ Helping small scale coffee farmers to improve their livelihoods.

From the above answers, it emerged that there was still some misunderstanding on the role of BEACON which needs to be corrected.

When they were asked if BEACON had played its role effectively, 11 or 55.0% of the respondents answered in the affirmative, indicative that they had the right perception of what BEACON had set out to do in the coffee sector, while 3 (or 15%) answered in the negative. The rest either did not know (1 respondent) or did not answer (5 respondents).

6.13 Respondents Understanding of the role of NCA's in the project

There was also evidence that the role of NCA in the project was not well understood by most people, thus had causing confusion among coffee farmers. According to the prevailing view in the field, NCA like BECAON was described as project implementer. This view might have emerged as a result of some direct contacts made with some farmers groups by NCA personnel that in the recent past. There is therefore need to correct this notion before it brings total confusion beyond what was observed in the field.

6.14 Respondents views on BEACON's Implementation process

Respondents' views on how BEACON works, or implements its programme activities on the whole, was termed as "good", particularly because it encourages farmers not to give up.

The approach was also considered good not only because it had a vision to promote fair trade in the coffee sector, but also to increase the knowledge of coffee farmers on farm management in order to improve quality of their coffee yield. Working with representatives of committees of societies was specially commended by some respondents because this was considered strategic. It was however observed that this approach was not as yet well understood by most farmers.

6.15 Respondents' future plans on coffee farming

14 or 48.3% respondents indicated that they wanted to improve quality and quantity of their coffee. 8 or 27.6% others wanted to increase acreage of their coffee farms or add the number of coffee trees planted. In addition to these, as table 7 below shows, a few other respondents indicated that they would like:

- ❖ To change the variety of their coffee trees.
- ❖ Look for market for their coffee (hopefully with the help of BEACON).
- ❖ Get more knowledge on coffee farming.
- ❖ Fight for better payments for their coffee internationally.
- ❖ Encourage others to grow more coffee to earn more when the price improves.

Table 7: Respondents future plans

| Future Plans | Number | Percentage |
|---|---------------|-------------------|
| 1. Improve quality and quantity of my coffee | 14 | 48.3 |
| 2. increase acreage of my coffee farm/add more coffee trees | 8 | 27.6 |
| 3. change the variety of coffee grown (e.g. Ruiru 11) | 2 | 6.9 |
| 4. Look for market | 1 | 3.4 |
| 5. Get more knowledge on better methods on coffee farming | 1 | 3.4 |
| 6. fight for better payment internationally | 1 | 3.4 |
| 7. Encourage others to grow more coffee to increase their earning | 1 | 3.4 |
| 8. No answer | 1 | 3.4 |
| Total * | 29 | 100.0 |

*** Multiple responses**

6.16 Impact of the project's contribution and significance to Kenya

It goes without say that the assessment that BEACON conducted in the coffee sector in 2005, made some significant contribution in providing new insights on what had been going on in the coffee industry in Kenya from a historical perspective. Documentation of the history of coffee in Kenya and the state of the coffee sector showing how the pricing of coffee had adversely affected the livelihoods of the farmers and their families, how coffee is processed and auctioned, operations of primary coffee societies and cooperatives, role of coffee millers and what the government had done in the area of liberalization and reforms in the coffee sector, form very useful reading for Kenyans who have keen interest in the coffee industry. More studies in this area are therefore highly recommended.

6.17 Respondents' Views on the Project's Sustainability

According to 12 out of 20 (or 60%) of individual farmers interviewed, although BEACON's activities had to some extent helped coffee farmers to get together to fight for their rights or helped them to increase level of their of production (value addition), the prevailing view was that since the project has only been in operation for less than three years it was far from being sustainable. Therefore, BEACO, NCA and the farmers themselves need to continue working together, particularly in the area of capacity building, information sharing and in developing farmers skills on farm management.

6.18 Respondents' proposals on what BEACON should include in its future plans

Views on what BEACON should consider in its future plans hinged on four areas. Respondents stated that they would like BEACON to:

- ❖ Offer more training.
- ❖ Help farmers look for more market outlets.
- ❖ Build capacity of KESCOGA and other coffee societies for effective service delivery.
- ❖ Facilitate farmers to get variety of coffee seeds.
- ❖ Facilitate farmers to access loans to buy farm inputs.

Within this premise, the farmers also proposed that BEACON should consider: scaling up its training programme, decentralize its activities for its presence to be felt at the grassroots level, facilitate farmers who had been trained to reach others, organize more exchange visits regionally and internationally, use media more to educate the coffee farmers, train more women and youth, and to pay frequent visits to coffee farmers in their farms.

7.0 CONCLUSIONS

- ❖ The coffee project is relevant and is in line with BEACON's mission and has been well received by both contact farmers and those they have been able to sensitize because it is addressing their felt needs. The project plans however, continued to be developed on annual basis, which should change.
- ❖ Although the first phase of the project was too short a period (i.e. less than three years) to mobilize farmers nationally and to bring them to the level where they could address major challenges they are facing effectively, however, good ground has been covered in building the foundation from where more work to could be done with the small scale farmers in the next phase.
- ❖ Project sustainability at the moment is still like a mirage in the distance. For this reason, there is need for BEACON to plan its next programme activities carefully keeping in mind that they are still building bridges in coffee sector, which if strategically and systematically done, will help small scale coffee farmers' rise to the level of their dignity in future. In the mean time, small scale coffee farmers will continue to grapple with their problems, however, this time around those who have been involved with BEACON project have now better understanding of their rights and increased knowledge how to handle some of issues at hand better compared to those who have not been sensitized or trained.
- ❖ A great hope has also been created in the hearts of small scale coffee farmers as a result of BEACON and NCA initiative. The fire behind this hope should therefore be kept alive to avoid a relapse into apathy among coffee growers.

- ❖ Desire for coffee farmers to speak in one voice as an entity has been heightened by the formation of KESCOGA, thus the role of this association needs to be well understood by both officials and members alike.
- ❖ Project documentation requires improvement.
- ❖ Roles of BEACON and NCA seem not to be well understood by most farmers, hence the need to clarify this.

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

From the foregoing discussions of the findings, the evaluation team makes the following recommendations:

- ❖ There is need to facilitate KESCOGA to register as soon as possible because the recruitment drive and launch of its proposed plan are on the hold. Farmers already own KESCOGA as attested by one the respondents who said “we have the ground. We have the support and willingness of the farmers. Once we have the Association, we will have many more farmers joining us and others taking up coffee farming”.
- ❖ BEACON should endeavor to scale up its training programmes because many farmers have not yet been reached by those who had been trained earlier. The demands for such trainings are still very high, but necessary if coffee farmers have to attain improved “quantity and quality” philosophy.
- ❖ Since there is high demand for Ruiru 11 seeds, there is need to facilitate coffee farmers to access these.
- ❖ BEACON should insist on increased participation of women and youth in the various project activities to reduce gender disparities that have continue in the programme. One way of doing this, is to make a concerted effort to bring in more women in its trainings, meetings and exchange visits programmes and to develop specific activities that would target women and youth. Furthermore, sensitization of KESCOGA leaders on the importance of gender mainstreaming in the coffee sector gender should continue as well as other coffee farmers.
- ❖ Efforts should be made by BEACON to strengthening coffee societies to come up with credible systems and structures that will facilitate their members to benefit from government reforms within coffee sector. Consideration of employing qualifies personnel in key positions to manage the societies is highly recommended. This should actually begin with KESCOGA as a role model.
- ❖ The relevance of BEACON will only last if its visibility is enhanced at the grassroots level, otherwise it might turn out to be a benefit of the few. It is therefore recommended that more of its work be taken to the grassroots.
- ❖ Since the cost of farm inputs have become too expensive for an average farmers, BEACON should make effort to link coffee farmers to existing financiers to access them funds for procurement of farm inputs. For the improvement of coffee trees CoDF package could be targeted. To facilitate this, it is recommended that

BEACON and KESCOGA should lobby the government to relax the stringent conditions to allow more farmers to access loans through this service.

- ❖ BEACON should correct the perception that it is a coffee buying company or a financier of coffee farmers. If such views are left to continue among the coffee farmers, they will ruin the good relationship that has been created in the last few years of its operation.
- ❖ Confusion on the role of NCA should be corrected and made clear to the farmers. NCA should desist from getting direct contact with farmers and let BEACON do so unless necessary.
- ❖ The issue of marketing should be at the core in the future discussions between farmers, the government and BEACON, since hopes for marketing their coffee is what made most farmers stop destroying their coffee trees when BEACON came into the scene.
- ❖ Effort to identify new opportunities in the sector in terms of funding and linking coffee farmers to them should also be enhanced in the next phase.
- ❖ There is need to stop KESCOGA officials from creating unnecessary expectations among the coffee farmers. Because of this, it is recommended that before it rolls out its plan, BEACON should hold several meetings with members to give proper induction on the role of KESCOGA. This should be part of BEACON's activity plan.
- ❖ BEACON should encourage KESCOGA officials, members and other coffee societies to remind united in order to protect their rights as a unit, going contrary to this may make them more vulnerable.
- ❖ Capacity building for project staff on project planning, monitoring and reporting is highly recommended.
- ❖ BEACON's role should focus on monitor implementation of coffee policies by the government authorities as it continues to lobby the government to allow farmers to participate in the development of policies and in decision making.
- ❖ Additional staff members are needed to man the project. In particular, BEACON should consider employing at least one more professional staff to fully coordinate the project from national, regional to the grassroots levels.
- ❖ BEACON should have a three year Strategic Plan to help it consolidate what has already been done in the last project phase.
- ❖ BEACON should continue to conduct research in the coffee sector in order to bring out new knowledge on current issues/status. Areas of concentration should however be determined in consultation with coffee farmers.

9.0 APPENDICES

9.1 Appendix 1: List of respondents –Individual interviews

1. George K. Wafula
2. Michael W. Wanyonyi
3. Andrew K. Wanani
4. Zacharia Oponyo
5. Stanlye Nyaberi
6. Zachary O. Aranda
7. Charles Ndemo
8. Andrew Mogong
9. Richard Langat
10. Richard Korir
11. Wilson Chepkwony
12. Steve Mibei
13. William Kipsang
14. Janet Mugathi
15. john G. Maina
16. Mary Muthoni
17. Peter M. Njoroge
18. Walter Wmbui
19. Joseph K. Mungai
20. Michael M. Gatune

2. Focus Group Discussion –Total were 86

9.2 Appendix 2: Questionnaire

IDENTIFICATION

District _____

Division _____

Location _____

Interviewer's Name _____

Name of the respondent _____

Date: _____

1. PROBLEM OF COFFEE FARMERS BEFORE BEACON CAME TO THE SCENE

Q1. Mention 3 key problems of coffee farmers in this area?

Q2. Who are affected the most?

Q3. How have they been dealing with their problems?

Q4. Are there organizations in the area that have been helping coffee farmers to deal with their problems?

1. YES _____

2. NO _____

Q5. If YES, who are they (List their names)

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

Q6. What activities have they been carrying out with the coffee farmers?

Q7. What have been key achievements from these activities?

1. BENEFICIARIES PARTICIPATION

Q8. How long have you been in coffee farming business?

Q9. How big is your coffee farm?

Q10. How did you come to know about Beacon' programme?

Q11. When did you start to participate in their programme?

Q12. How have you been involved with Beacon?

Q13. How much coffee were you producing before Beacon came into the scene?

Q14. How much are you producing now? _____

Q15. Mention at least 2 changes that have occurred in your life since you started to get involved with Beacon

1. _____

2. _____

Q16. How has your involvement in Beacon's programme helped other coffee farmers?

Q17. Have you been involved in seminars/conference organized by Beacon?

1. YES _____ 2. NO _____

Q18. If YES, what did you learn from these meetings?

Q19. If YES, what difference has this made in your life as a coffee farmer?

Q20. Are there any challenges you have faced in an effort to implement what you had learnt from these meetings?

1. YES _____ 2. NO _____

Q21. If YES, mention at least 2 of them

1. _____
2. _____

Q22. Describe your agreement and disagreement to the following statements. **(Tick the appropriate box)**

| Statement | Strongly Agree (1) | Agree (2) | Disagree (3) | Strongly Disagree (4) | Don't know (5) |
|--|--------------------|-----------|--------------|-----------------------|----------------|
| 1. I have attended at least one workshop/meeting organized by Beacon | | | | | |
| 2. Beacon's programme has helped coffee farmers to get a better understanding of issues surrounding coffee industry in Kenya | | | | | |
| 3. Due to Beacon programme, coffee farmers in this area have been able to network and collaborate with each other | | | | | |
| 4. Networking and collaboration among organizations involved in the struggle for small scale coffee farmers has increased because of the programme | | | | | |
| 5. Through Beacon education/sensitization, small scale coffee farmers have been able to improve level of their production | | | | | |
| 6. Since Beacon began work in this area, coffee farmers have seen a significant change in their level of | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| production | | | | | |
| 7. Beacon has helped coffee farmers in this area to identify opportunities in the market chain and facilitated to take advantages of such opportunities | | | | | |
| 8. Coffee farmers have been helped to get involved in decision making process as result of their involvement with Beacon | | | | | |
| 9. Beacon has played key role in advocacy and lobbying on behalf of small scale farmers | | | | | |
| 10. The programme has empowered coffee farmers to lobby and advocate for their reform agenda | | | | | |
| 11. Coffee farmers are now well informed about issues that affect them locally, nationally and internationally | | | | | |
| 12. I am now more aware of policies on coffee production because of Beacon | | | | | |

3. CHALLENGES

Q23. Mention at least **3** key challenges you were facing before you began to work with Beacon?

1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

Q24. To what extent has Beacon dealt with these problems?

4. ADDRESSING COFFEE FARMERS NEEDS

Q25. To what extent has Beacon project met the needs of coffee farmers?

Q26. In your opinion, who among the beneficiaries have benefited most from Beacon's programme with coffee farmers in this area? (Tick as many as applicable)

1. Women _____

2. Men _____

3. Small scale farmers _____

4. Medium coffee farmers _____

Others (please specify) _____

Q27. Have you been involving the youth in your family in coffee farming?

1. YES _____

2. NO _____

Q28. If YES, how have you been involving them?

Q29. If NO, why have you not involve them?

Q30. In your opinion, how can the youth be helped to take interest in coffee farming?

Q31. Have you been involving female members of your household in coffee farming?

1. YES _____

2. NO _____

Q32. If YES, where have you involved them the most?

Q33. Why?

Q34. If NO, why?

Q35. Apart from those directly involved in Beacon programme, are there other farmers who have expressed desire to participate in the programme because of what they have seen or heard about the programme?

1. YES _____ 2. NO _____

5. IMPLEMENTATION PROCESS

Q36. Comment on the way Beacon works with coffee farmers

Q37. In your opinion, where are the strengths of Beacon?

Q38. Where are its weaknesses?

Q39. Mention at least 2 areas where you would like Beacon to improve in

6. ROLE OF BEACON

Q40. Are you aware of the role of Beacon with coffee farmers?

1. YES _____ 2. NO _____

Q41. If YES, is Beacon effective in playing its role?

1. YES _____ 2. NO _____

7. FUTURE

Q42. What are your future plans with your coffee farming?

Q43. Mention at least 2 things you would like Beacon to include in its future programme with coffee farmers

1. _____
2. _____

8. DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Q44. Gender

1. Female
2. Male

Q45. Age

1. Below 18 years
2. 19-24 years
3. 25- 30 years
4. 31 – 36 years
5. 37-42 years
6. 43 and above

Q46. Level of Education

2. None
3. Primary
4. Secondary
5. College
6. University

9.3 Appendix 3: Interview Schedule (for Focus Group Discussions)

- Q1. When did you begin to work with BEACON?
- Q2. What challenges were you facing before BEACON came in this area?
- Q3. Has BEACON been able to address these problems?
- Q4. What are your comments about the work of BEACON with coffee farmers?
- Q5. What significant changes has BEACON brought in coffee farming in this area?
- Q6. Do the coffee farmers understand the work of BEACON?
- Q7. What is the perception of the people in this area towards BEACON's work with coffee farmers?
- Q8. How many of you have attended workshops/seminars organized by BEACON?
- Q9. For those who have attended how, many times have attended these meetings?
- Q10. Since you began your involvement with BEACON, have you been able to pass the knowledge you have learnt to other coffee farmers in your neighborhood?
- Q11. If YES, how many have you educated?
- Q12. What are they currently doing with the knowledge they have gained from you?
- Q13. Are there other organizations working with coffee farmers in this area?
- Q14. If YES, how would you compare their work with that of BEACON?
- Q15. How are women in this area involved in coffee farming activities?
- Q16. Why are they involved in these activities?
- Q17. How are the youth in this area involved in coffee farming?
- Q18. What significant lessons have you learnt from your involvement with BEACON?
- Q19. What would you recommend BEACON to do in its future work with coffee farmers in this area?
- Q20. Do you have any other comments?