



**HAND IN HAND**  
EASTERN AFRICA

**LIND INVEST ELDORET  
COMMUNITY UPLIFT PROJECTS**

**BASELINE REPORT**

**BY**  
**MONITORING, EVALUATION AND LEARNING TEAM**

**AUGUST, 2021**

## Table of Contents

ACRONYMS.....	3
<i>Definition of terms.....</i>	3
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	4
BACKGROUND .....	6
Introduction.....	6
About the project.....	6
Purpose of the baseline .....	6
Methodology of the study.....	7
STUDY FINDINGS .....	7
Respondent demographics.....	7
Income Sources .....	8
Net Monthly Enterprise Income.....	10
Enterprise, market and value chain analysis .....	11
Savings and credit accessibility .....	13
Average monthly savings.....	14
Access to business loans in the last 12 months.....	15
Source of the loan .....	15
Financial resilience.....	15
Ability to borrow money needed to grow business .....	16
Social return on investment/social capital .....	17
Access to economies of scale and wider markets.....	19
Women's economic empowerment.....	20
Motivation for joining the project.....	21
Conclusions and Recommendations.....	23
Conclusions.....	23
Results Framework.....	23
Recommendations .....	26
The MEL plan attached indicates the summary findings against set indicators.....	28

## ***List of Tables***

<i>Table 1: Respondents' Characteristics.....</i>	7
<i>Table 2: Enterprise Ownership.....</i>	8
<i>Table 3: Primary Income source sectors .....</i>	9
<i>Table 4: Secondary Income sources.....</i>	9
<i>Table 5: Enterprise Income.....</i>	10
<i>Table 6: Points of sale for respondents .....</i>	12
<i>Table 7: Respondents hired labor.....</i>	12
<i>Table 8: Own decision making on enterprise variables.....</i>	12
<i>Table 9: Own decision on enterprise variable: Sector.....</i>	12
<i>Table 10: Own decision on Enterprise variable: Cost .....</i>	13
<i>Table 11: Own decision on enterprise variable: Investment.....</i>	13
<i>Table 12: Own decision making on enterprise variable: Income.....</i>	13
<i>Table 13: Savings practice .....</i>	14
<i>Table 14: saving channels.....</i>	14
<i>Table 15: Average monthly savings.....</i>	14
<i>Table 16: Access to business loans in the last 12 months.....</i>	15
<i>Table 17: Loan sources.....</i>	15
<i>Table 18: Financial resilience; source of money.....</i>	16
<i>Table 19: Ability to borrow money needed to grow business.....</i>	17
<i>Table 20: Ability to start up their business or find employment without assistance.....</i>	17
<i>Table 21: benefits drawn from being a member of a self-help group.....</i>	18
<i>Table 22: Ability to manage finances as SHG member.....</i>	18
<i>Table 24: Available local advice.....</i>	18
<i>Table 25: Local advice agencies.....</i>	19
<i>Table 26: Entrepreneur and local authority interaction.....</i>	19
<i>Table 27: Women participation in decision making.....</i>	20
<i>Table 28: Disaggregation of female and male respondents to women's decision-making.....</i>	21
<i>Table 29: Decisions on borrowing or saving money.....</i>	21
<i>Table 30: Motivation for joining the project.....</i>	22

### ***Acronyms***

BRO- Branch Relationship Officer

MEL- Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning

HIH- Hand in Hand

KCSAP – Kenya Climate Smart Agricultural Program

Ksh- Kenya Shillings

MFI – Micro Finance Institution

LT- Long term

CBO- Community Based Organization

### ***Definition of terms***

**Value chain** – a business model that describes the full range of activities needed to create a product or service.

**Value chain actors** – Actors are all the individuals or organizations, enterprises and public agencies related to a value chain

**Casual labor**- is hired by the hour or day or for the performance of specific tasks

**Temporary employment** - is an employment situation where the working arrangement is limited to a certain period of time based on the needs of the employer e.g. fixed contracts

**Permanent employment** - A state where an employee works for an employer and are paid directly. They also have other benefits.

## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Background

The Lind Invest project, a community uplift project implemented in Eldoret, Uasin Gishu County. The project aims to improve the social and economic well-being of 7,500 residents of Eldoret. It seeks to diversify their livelihoods and income amongst residents of Uasin Gishu County (Eldoret) through sustainable entrepreneurship and societal recognition. This is a 36-month project funded by Lind Invest.

### The project seeks to contribute to the following results:

**Outcome 1:** Increased income through facilitating climate resilient enterprises and sustainable jobs creation

**Outcome 2:** Improved agricultural production and productivity through sustainable and climate resilient agricultural practices

**Outcome 3:** Strengthened micro enterprises through enhanced value addition and market and financial linkages

**Outcome 4:** Increased women's economic empowerment

## Impact: Improved social and economic well-being of 7,500 residents of Eldoret

LT1: Increased income through facilitating climate resilient enterprises and sustainable jobs creation

LT2: Improved agricultural production and productivity through sustainable and climate resilient agricultural practices

LT3: Strengthened micro enterprises through enhanced value addition and market and financial linkages

LT4: Increased women's economic empowerment

ST1: Increased capacities to save, borrow, and repay among SHG Members

ST3: Increased access to credit /savings for business growth by SHG Members

ST2: Increased economic activity and improved business practices among SHG Members

## **Summary Findings**

Assessment on members' enterprise activities revealed that about (34%) engage in agriculture as their main income source; 19% in the food sector and 15% in the service sector. The remaining are distributed in various sectors. Further, above half (57%) undertake agriculture as their secondary income generating activities. On average, the monthly gross income from members' enterprise activities stood at Ksh. 11,511 at baseline with business costs at Ksh. 5,249 and therefore a total gain of Ksh. 6,832. Main enterprise made significant contribution to the profits compared to secondary and tertiary enterprises.

On savings, 88% of members surveyed indicated that they save; with slight difference found in saving status between male and female members whereby more male save compared to female members. Of those who save, majority represented by 74% do so via the group channel, which seems to be preferred by women (90%) more than men (80%). The least used channel for savings as mentioned was the bank/MFI at 73%. Analysis revealed that overall, members' average monthly savings stood at Ksh. 1,717 at baseline with female members saving slightly more than their male counterparts.

Asked whether they had taken any loans within the previous 12 months prior to the survey, slightly more than a third (68%) of those interviewed mentioned the affirmative while the rest said they had not accessed any loans during the same period. Of those who had borrowed, a significant percentage (83%) had taken loans from their respective self-help groups. Close to a half (48%) expressed ability to borrow some of what is needed for business growth whereas slightly more than a third (35%) mentioned having the ability to borrow all the money they need for business growth.

Level of decision making among women was found to be high. Of the total number of women interviewed, about 99% indicated that they are part of decision making at the household including making large household purchases like cattle, visiting a relative or friend; either solely or jointly with spouse or another household member. To increase income, increase savings and be able to access a loan topped the list of what motivate members to join the project.

In conclusion, the indicators are measurable to a great extent, and specific recommendations has been provided on the measurement framework as well as programmatic.

---

## **BACKGROUND**

---

### **Introduction**

Agriculture is the mainstay of the county promoting food security and improved nutritional status for the residents. However, the sector has continued to be plagued by numerous challenges including high cost of inputs which have turned many farmers especially maize farmers to other economic activities hence declining productivity leading to potential food insecurity. Post-harvest management has also been a challenge, leading to losses and low profitability. Therefore, if the county is to fully exploit its potential for agricultural production and hence food security, the problems affecting the sub-sector needs to be addressed.

According to the Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS) 2015/16, the population living below poverty level in the County is 41.0 per cent which translates to around 465,000 persons. Some of the root causes of poverty in the County include; limited economic diversity in the County as majority of the population is dependent on agriculture, over reliance of the majority of the rural population on their own subsistence farming for their own food as well as incomes, limited opportunities for employment, inadequate access to credit, disempowered groups especially women and youths who have limited access to property and incomes as well as lack of relevant skills amongst the youths to enable them participate in the labor market<sup>1</sup>.

### **About the project**

The Lind Invest project, is a community uplift project implemented in Eldoret, Uasin Gishu County. The project aims to improve the social and economic well-being of 7,500 residents of Eldoret. It seeks to diversify their livelihoods and income amongst residents of Uasin Gishu County (Eldoret) through sustainable entrepreneurship and societal recognition. The 36-month project funded by Lind Invest, strives to achieve three main outcomes: increase resident's income through facilitating climate resilient enterprises and sustainable jobs creation; improve agricultural production and productivity through sustainable and climate resilient agricultural practices; and strengthen micro enterprises through enhanced value addition and market and financial linkages.

### **Purpose of the baseline**

The baseline study was commissioned internally to help the project understand the basis of the various project indicators. The baseline was to provide data to help the project set progressive and achievable targets within the project period.

---

<sup>1</sup> County Integrated Development Plan, 2018-2022, Uasin Gishu County. [Resource - Maarifa Centre \(cog.go.ke\)](http://Resource - Maarifa Centre (cog.go.ke))

## **Methodology of the study**

The study design adopted a mixed method approach where both quantitative and qualitative data was collected among beneficiaries. The main methods used include focus group discussion, key informant interviews and researcher administered quantitative questionnaire. The study design was non-experimental pre-intervention with some sampled members being in the project (n=106) and others (n=383) without. The respondents who were not part of the project were identified with support from project staff, to some they had done outreach activities but were not yet part of the project; and to others, they were identified because they managed micro/small scale enterprises. The total sample size was 500 respondents, however the study achieved 489 (98%) response rate; with female at 374 (76.5%) and male at 115 (23.5%).

---

## **STUDY FINDINGS**

---

### **Respondent demographics**

Of those interviewed, a majority at 76.5% (374) were women while the 23.5% (115) were men. The mean age of those reached was found to be 42 years and the median age stood at 40 years with the youngest and oldest participant age being 20 and 79 years respectively. The survey also revealed that adults and respondents from rural setting formed the majority of the baseline survey participants represented by 55%, peri-urban with 41% and urban at 4%. Analysis on education level revealed that above half (55%) have gone through post primary (includes vocational (1%), secondary (39%), college (12%) and University (3%)); with 45% attaining pre and primary level qualification. Being cognizant of the levels of education and the fact that rural population form the majority of the beneficiaries, training approach should embrace more practical elements such as use of demonstration sites, role plays, exchange visits and relevant field examples to enhance understanding and adoption of the promoted agricultural practices coupled with entrepreneurship skills.

*Table 1: Respondents' Characteristics*

<b>Characteristic</b>	<b>Frequency (n)</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
<b>Gender</b>		
Female	374	76.5
Male	115	23.5

<b>Age Category</b>	<b>Frequency (n)</b>	<b>Percent (%)</b>
Adult	367	75
Youth	122	25
<b>Setting</b>		
Rural	269	55
Peri urban	201	41
Urban	19	4
<b>Highest Education Level Completed</b>		
Pre-primary	31	7
Post primary, vocational	6	1
Primary	179	38
Secondary	181	39
College	58	12
University	13	3
Adult literacy	1	0.2

### Income Sources

Assessment on members' enterprise activities revealed that 89% (n=434) have enterprises. Of these, 88% (n=385) have one (1) enterprise, 11% (n=49) have two (2) enterprises and 1 (n=2) have three enterprises.

*Table 2: Enterprise Ownership*

<b>Do you have an enterprise?</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
No	11.50%	10.43%	11.25%
Yes	88.50%	89.57%	88.75%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

About (34%) engage in agriculture as their main income source; 19% in the food sector and 15% in the service sector. The remaining are distributed in various sectors as indicated in table 3.

A respondent from an FGD indicated;

*"Poultry keeping, dairy farming, wheat horticulture (agriculture) are the activities people engage in this region for a long time now".*

Others mentioned include retail shops, boda boda, barbershops, boutique shops, money transaction shops (M-Pesa) and salons.

*Table 3: Primary Income source sectors*

Variable	Sub-Sector	Frequency	Percentage
Agricultural Sub-Sectors	Animal sales, Bee keeping, Dairy farming, Livestock, Poultry keeping and other Agricultural Areas like Crop Farming, bee keeping etc.	166	33.95%
Artisan Sub-Sectors	Knitting, Weaving and Others like Repairing Shoes and welding	7	1.4%
Clothing Sub-Sectors	New clothing sales, Used clothing sales, Used shoes sales and others like Hawking and Tailoring	24	4.9%
Construction Sub-Sectors	Masonry and Brick Making etc.	3	0.6%
Food Sub-Sectors	Bakery, Fish Monger, Cereals and etc.	92	18.81%
Manufacturing/processing sub-sectors	Welding, Furniture making Fruit Making etc.	7	1.43%
Service sub-sector	Barber, Beauty Salons, Cobbler, and Electricians etc.	76	15.54%
Retail sub-sector	Charcoal Sales, Cloth and dress Making, Firewood Sales etc.	39	7.96%

Further, above half (57%) undertake agriculture as their secondary income generating activities. 12% in service sector, 8% in food sector and retail is 6%. The rest are distributed in clothing and construction.

*Table 4: Secondary Income sources*

Variable: Secondary Source of Income	Frequency Distribution	Percentage
<b>Agriculture n= 49</b>	28	57.14%
<b>Clothing n= 49</b>	2	4.08%
<b>Construction n= 49</b>	1	2.04%
<b>Food n= 49</b>	4	8.16%
<b>Manufacturing/Processing n=49</b>	2	4.08%
<b>Retail n=49</b>	3	6.13%
<b>Services n=49</b>	6	12.24%
<b>Others n=49</b>	3	6.13%

Main enterprise made significant contribution to the income compared to secondary and tertiary enterprises. A proportionate 10% of the respondents at least have a secondary income source

whereas about 99% of respondents do not have tertiary sources of income and only relies on either the primary or secondary sources. This points to some level of diversification though not sufficient to cushion the members against uncertain economic shocks.

### **Net Monthly Enterprise Income**

On average, the monthly gross income from members' enterprise activities stood at an average of Ksh. 11,511 at baseline with business costs at an average of Ksh. 5,249 and therefore a total profit margin of Ksh. 6,832 from the main enterprise. The secondary enterprise average gross income is Ksh. 8,742 and the mean costs is Ksh. 5,238. The profit margin is Ksh. 3,504. Tertiary enterprise average income is Ksh. 1,750 and the mean costs is Ksh.750. The profits are Ksh. 1,000.

On primary (main) income (n=434), 35% (n=151) earns above average (Ksh. 11,511), with the average income of Ksh. 26,418/= as on secondary enterprise (n=52); 18% (n=9) of the monthly income earners are earning above the average (Ksh. 11,511), with an average income of Ksh. 32,714/=. An indication that those earning below the average are many with quite high margins from the average.

Analysis by gender indicated that males earned slightly high revenue compared to females across all income sources. However, females spend slightly less on the business costs.

Overall, the main enterprise made significant contribution to the profits compared to secondary enterprises. Detailed breakdown is provided in the table below.

*Table 5: Enterprise Income*

	Gender	Income Source			Mean
		Main (n=432)	Secondary (n=52)	Tertiary (n=2)	
What was the total revenue you earned from your MAIN enterprise in the LAST MONTH of NORMAL operation?	Female	11,034	8,694	1,750	7,159
	Male	13,053	8,833	0	7,295
	<b>Average</b>	<b>11,511</b>	<b>8,742</b>	<b>1,750</b>	<b>7,334</b>
What were the total business costs of your MAIN enterprise in the LAST MONTH of NORMAL operation?	Female	5,272	3,424	750	3,149
	Male	5,175	8,666	0	4,613
	<b>Average</b>	<b>5,249</b>	<b>5,238</b>	<b>750</b>	<b>3,746</b>
<b>Profits</b>	Female	5,785	5,270	1,000	4,010
	Male	7,878	167	0	2,682
	<b>Average</b>	<b>6,832</b>	<b>3,504</b>	<b>1000</b>	<b>3,588</b>

## **Enterprise, market and value chain analysis**

The respondents indicated that agriculture is common because majority have land for farming. This includes for livestock keeping and crop growing. Majority may not be doing this for business but for household consumption. However, because of needs that emerge, they sell some of the produce to address the needs.

Youth male were likely to be involved in boda boda (motorcycle) business as youth female engage in salons and boutiques. It was also noted that male attitudes towards other businesses is negative as they either seek white collar jobs or transport sector jobs like drivers. Majority are involved in environment cleaning as this is a focus area for the county and they do pay."

*"Generally, we can say men are not good in business, women do better than them. They can engage in farming, keeping like two to three cattle"*

FGD participant, Temesi group.

The study sought to understand why they chose the sector of their enterprises. About seventy-five (74.9%) percent of the respondents indicated that they chose their current main source of income due to market availability (total addressable market, County and village markets). For the case of local client availability (demand) (serviceable available market, actual fit, people and not companies), 69.1% of the respondents stated that they chose their main source of income in those sectors due availability of clients/actual buyers. Only 35.5% of respondents opined that they chose their main source of income due to product availability. Some 4.4% stated they had passion for what currently bring for them income.

The study further wanted to know where they sell their products and services. From the analysis, 83.2% of the respondents sell their products to the individual customers. Only 16.8% stated that they do not sell their products to the individual customers, but have institutions and hospitality service providers like hotels. 42.9% of the respondents sell their products directly to the market while 57.1% do not take their products to the market. Respondents who use retailers and wholesaler were only 34.1%. Very few individuals (7.1%) stated that they have other means of selling their products, particularly using Facebook and Twitter platforms, which then allows them to reach people outside their operation zones.

The study also established where/who bought their products. 23% sell to different value chain actors, as middle men are presented by 31% as those indicating other (end customers) were 61%. Value chain actors contextually are understood as people involved in transporting the goods, and the retailers in town markets. Middle men are understood as people who buy goods from the farm with declared intention to go and sell then come pay the farmer once the goods are sold.

Observably, 61% make sales to end clients, these materially are neighbors and likely the farmers do sell themselves on the market. The value chain actors' engagement is generally low, probably because it has not been strengthened by the County, VC actors themselves, and may also be a negative previous history with some of the actors/nodes.

*Table 6: Points of sale for respondents*

	Female		Male		Total	
	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes
Value chain actors	75%	25%	82%	18%	77%	23%
Middle men	71%	29%	59%	41%	69%	31%
Other (end customers)	40%	60%	38%	62%	39%	61%

The study also sought to understand if the entrepreneurs had hired any laborer in their business. Casual laborers were hired at 28%, temporary employees at 7% and permanent ones at 1%.

*Table 7: Respondents hired labor*

	Female		Male		Total	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Casual	27%	73%	32%	68%	28%	72%
Temporary	6%	94%	11%	89%	7%	93%
Permanent	1%	99%	3%	97%	1%	99%

### **Enterprise related agency and decision making**

*Table 8: Own decision making on enterprise variables*

	Female	Male	Grand Total
No	2.11%	1.94%	2.07%
Yes	97.89%	98.06%	97.93%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

The study sought to understand if entrepreneur made their own decision with respect to sector, cost, investment and usage of income. The table below indicates the choice of enterprise sector a member seeks to invest in. For those whose response were yes, were further asked to specify in which areas.

***On sector, 54% make their own decisions.***

*Table 9: Own decision on enterprise variable: Sector*

Sector	Female	Male	Grand Total
No	45%	50%	46%
Yes	55%	50%	54%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**On cost, 80% make their own decisions.**

Table 10: Own decision on Enterprise variable: Cost

Cost	Female	Male	Grand Total
No	17%	29%	20%
Yes	83%	71%	80%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**On investment, 65% make their own decisions.**

Table 11: Own decision on enterprise variable: Investment

Investment	Female	Male	Grand Total
No	35%	38%	35%
Yes	65%	62%	65%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

**On usage of income, 84% make their own decisions.**

Table 12: Own decision making on enterprise variable: Income

Usage of income	Female	Male	Grand Total
No	18%	9%	16%
Yes	82%	91%	84%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

The findings indicate above average decision making power in all sectors sought, however, on cost, investments and usage of income, represents a higher percentage. Females are equally well represented in all interest areas. On enterprise sector selection appears to be the most consulted, and therefore this could speak to various factors including market availability, demand, product inputs cost and availability, return on investment, commercialization or subsistence uses.

### Savings and credit accessibility

On savings, 88% of members with enterprises surveyed indicated that they save; with slight difference found in saving status between male and female members whereby more male save compared to female members. Of those who save, majority represented by 83% do so via the group channel, which seems to be preferred by women (89%) more than men (66%). Women generally, congregate in small groups that seeks to empower them economically, which is not the same case with men. The least used channel for savings as mentioned was the Sacco at 5.1% with female at 13% and male at 33%.

*Table 13: Savings practice*

		<b>For those with enterprises, do you practice saving?</b>		<b>Total</b>	
		No	Yes		
Respondent's gender	Female	2	338	340	
	Male	2	92	94	
Total		4	430	434	
% %		1	99	100	

*Table 14: saving channels*

<b>Where do you save</b>	<b>Female</b>		<b>Male</b>		<b>Percent</b>		<b>Grand Total</b>
	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>No</b>	
Home (n=430)	41	297	15	77	13.0	87.0	100
Group (n=403)	277	37	58	31	83.1	16.9	100
Bank/MFI (n=393)	37	271	26	59	16.0	84.0	100
Sacco (n=393)	10	298	10	75	5.1	94.9	100
Other (n=393)	16	292	11	74	6.9	93.1	100

Other includes mobile applications like M-Shwari, KCB-Mpesa etc. the applications allow a person to save and make a profit of about 5% - 7% annually.

### Average monthly savings

Analysis revealed that overall, members' average monthly savings stood at Ksh. 1,717 at baseline with female members saving slightly more than their male counterparts. Sacco with only 20 respondents saving through it, was found to be a channel where little was saved compared to other channels while the SHG take the lead in terms of majority using it. Home (13%) and bank (17%) channels had the highest averages with few accessing them.

*Table 15: Average monthly savings*

<b>Savings Channels</b>	<b>Amount saved in the last month</b>		
	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>
Home (n=56; 13%)	2,157	3,213	<b>2,440</b>
Group (n=335; 84%)	1,366	903	<b>1,288</b>
Bank/MFI (n=63; 17%)	2,871	2,317	<b>2,643</b>
Sacco (n=20; 5%)	1,540	1,000	<b>1,270</b>
Others (n=27; 7%)	1,047	808	<b>945</b>
<b>Average (n=430)</b>	<b>1,796</b>	<b>1,684</b>	<b>1,717</b>

## Access to business loans in the last 12 months

Asked whether they had taken any loans within the previous 12 months prior to the survey, slightly less than a third (30%; (32% female and 24% male)) of those interviewed mentioned the affirmative while the majority said they had not accessed any loans during the same period.

*Table 16: Access to business loans in the last 12 months*

	Male		Female		<b>Average</b>
	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percent</b>	
Yes	28	24%	121	32%	30.5%
No	87	76%	253	68%	69.5%

## Source of the loan

Of those who had borrowed, a significant percentage (55%) had taken loans from their respective self-help groups with 41% borrowing from the other financial service providers such as Sacco, MFIs, banks and mobile application.

*Table 17: Loan sources*

<b>Where did you borrow your loan from?</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Total</b>
SHG	62.8%	21%	<b>55%</b>
Sacco, MFI, Bank or mobile application	33.9%	71%	<b>41%</b>
Family, friends	2.5%	0%	<b>4%</b>
Others specify	0.8%	7%	<b>2%</b>
Total	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

FGD respondent indicated,

*"we borrow money from our group since we do table banking though we have saved so little and not everyone can access it, that is why you have come in to educate us so that we can grow even more. we borrow as little as two thousand or three thousand to help our business"*

## Financial resilience

Respondents asked about their ability to cushion against an emergency that may require up to KES. 8,000; 49% indicated a possibility to get the amounts while 49% indicated not possible to acquire the amount. More females (35%) than males (13%) exuded confidence in dealing with financial emergency.

For those who felt it is possible, only 44% (n=239; F=173, M=66) (F: 47%, M: 35%) can draw such an amount from the savings, as 27% (F: 24%, M: 38%) indicated sourcing the same from working, 4% from borrowing from the bank/MFI, 13% borrowing from SHG, 6% would sell assets and 6% borrow from family and friends. This reflects the nature of enterprises the members have, they are either not consistent in providing income, or they do not save consistently (i.e. 5 months with same amount as average); or other factors like low business costs or other household needs.

*Table 18: Financial resilience; source of money*

Possible sources of Money	Female	Male	Total
Borrowing from a bank, employer, or private lender	4%	3%	4%
Other specify	0%	0%	0%
Family, relatives, or friends	6%	7%	6%
Borrowing from SHG	14%	11%	13%
Selling assets	5%	6%	6%
Savings	47%	35%	44%
Money from working	24%	38%	27%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Ability to borrow money needed to grow business

Asked about their ability to borrow money needed to grow their businesses, close to a half (47%) expressed ability to borrow **some** of what is needed whereas only (8%) mentioned having the ability to borrow **all** the money they need for business growth. Both male and females appeared to have equal borrowing ability as evident by cumulative proportions of 57% males and 55% females reporting ability to borrow some or all the money needed for the business. 25% mentioned not being able to borrow any money needed for their business. This is so as a result of the demands set by loan systems and in SHGs, one must have saved with the group as defined in specific constitution, often a minimum of three times. 20% do not want to borrow money for business probably because they are self-sufficient or they have had bad experiences with borrowing in the past.

Those with negative previous experiences especially MFIs and bans, the collateral is heavy and most do not have title deed or car logbook; some of the microfinances do sell your properties if you default from making payments.

*Table 19: Ability to borrow money needed to grow business*

How far do you feel that you are able to borrow the money you need to grow your business?	Female n=370	Male n=114	Total
Able to borrow all the money I need for my business	9%	8%	8% (n=41)
Able to borrow some of the money I need for my business	46%	49%	47% (n=227)
NA - I don't want to borrow money for my business	19%	22%	20% (n=97)
Not able to borrow the money I need for my business	26%	21%	25% (n=119)

### **Social return on investment/social capital**

The study further sought to understand the social capital generated among respondents as a basis of establishing measurable factors for future analysis of the return on investment.

The data collected provides understanding of how respondents gain their economic and social confidence and representations in community. This data helps to identify the increased economic and social well-being that entrepreneurs benefited from being member of social organizations (SHGs, CBOs) and participating in the project.

We asked the respondents if they could start up a business or find employment at the moment without Hand in Hand assistance. Of these, 51% indicated they would as 49% could thought they would not initiate their own enterprises or seek employment at the moment.

*Table 20: Ability to start up their business or find employment without assistance*

		Female	Male	Total
<b>Do you have an enterprise</b>	<b>No</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>55</b>
In your own opinion, could you start up a business or find a job at the moment?	No	19	3	22
	Yes	24	9	33
<b>Do you have an enterprise</b>	<b>Yes</b>	<b>331</b>	<b>103</b>	<b>434</b>
In your own opinion, could you start up a business or find a job at the moment?	No	143	43	186
	Yes	188	60	248
	<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>374</b>	<b>115</b>	<b>489</b>

The respondents were asked to identify which benefits they draw from being part of a SHG.

*Table 21: benefits drawn from being a member of a self-help group*

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Male</b>		<b>Female</b>		<b>Total</b>	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Easy access to loans	65.2%	34.8%	76.4%	23.6%	73.8%	26.2%
Financial literacy e.g. debt management	71.4%	28.6%	64.6%	35.4%	66.2%	33.8%
Investment guidance (financial inclusion)	59%	41%	62%	38%	61%	39%
Trainings/business advisory support includes business support/mentorship	51%	49%	55%	45%	53%	47%
Other	17%	83%	6%	94%	8%	92%

For those who listed other indicated the following reasons

- Am not a member of any group (11)
- Community support for social, emotional benefits (10)
- See if I can improve my living standards (4)
- Women are honest and serious about development (1)

The respondents were further asked if they felt their participation in table banking activities has changed their ability to manage their money. A total of 94.6% affirmed that those activities made better their financial management abilities, with a marginal 5.2% recognizing no change in their financial management skills.

*Table 22: Ability to manage finances as SHG member*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
Made better	95.97%	89.72%	94.57%
Made worse	0.27%	0.00%	0.21%
No change	3.76%	10.28%	5.22%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

The study wanted to identify if the respondents could seek advice from any agency within their neighborhood, with respect to enterprises or other as may apply. 15% disagree, as 10% neither agrees nor disagrees and 75% agree that such an agency can be accessed and provide the advice.

*Table 23: Available local advice*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
Neither agree/disagree	10.24%	7.08%	9.50%
Strongly disagree	4.31%	6.19%	4.75%
Disagree	8.89%	17.70%	10.95%
Agree	51.21%	40.71%	48.76%
Strongly agree	25.34%	28.32%	26.03%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Access to economies of scale and wider markets**

To further identify the sorts of agencies alluded to above, the study asked who these agencies could be. A self-help group at 78% was the most recognized unit/agency to provide such services. Others (7%), institution (5%), organization (3.6%), cooperative (3%) and farmer groups (1.9%) were also identified.

*Table 24: Local advice agencies*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
CBO	0.35%	0.00%	0.28%
Cooperative	2.13%	6.41%	3.06%
Farmer group	1.77%	2.56%	1.94%
Institution	4.61%	6.41%	5.00%
Organization	3.19%	5.13%	3.61%
Other (specify)	7.09%	10.26%	7.78%
SHG	80.85%	69.23%	78.33%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

The study also sought to understand the level of interaction or relationship between entrepreneur and the local authority. The majority at 79% did not recognize any support from the local authority.

*Table 25: Entrepreneur and local authority interaction*

<b>Category</b>	<b>Female</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Grand Total</b>
Great extent	5.39%	5.45%	5.41%
Little extent	7.55%	16.36%	9.56%
No support at all	80.59%	72.73%	78.79%
Very great extent	0.00%	3.64%	0.83%
Very little extent	6.47%	1.82%	5.41%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>100%</b>

The particular support that was offered by the local authority for those who indicated it existed includes;

- Security
- Markets built
- Cleaning of the environment
- Collection of garbage
- County government provides them with planting seeds
- Creation of infrastructure e.g. roads

## **Women's economic empowerment**

### Decision making/women agency

To measure this attribute, focus was put on participation of women in decision making majorly at the household level. Key questions asked included determining own healthcare, making large household purchases, doing housework (cooking, laundry, taking care of children, etc...) as well as visiting family and relatives.

### Women Members who participate in decision making

Level of decision making among women was found to be high. Of the total number of respondents (n=489), about 85.4% indicated that they are part of decision making at the household either solely or jointly with spouse or another household member. More women participation is in visiting family and friends represented by 98.4% as indicated in the table below.

A respondent is quoted indicating;

*"There are things you have to consult with him, but for small scale business like salon you can do on your own although you have to disclose the source of capital because if you take the loan they ask for the next of kin in case you default, so you have to disclose". FGD participant".*

To a great extent men are involved on decisions made by women through open discussions, but women indicated they are greatly involved in most decisions in the households. This is a norm for the larger communities in the area. Women often are expected to make decisions in the household as men contribute to decisions that affect major investments.

*Table 26: Women participation in decision making*

Who in your family usually has the final say on the following decisions?	<i>Jointly (spouse &amp; self)</i>	<i>Respondent and other household member jointly</i>	<i>Self</i>	<i>Spouse only</i>
Determining your own health care	38%	2%	58%	2.0%
Making large household purchases	62.4%	4.3%	31.8%	2.2%
Visiting family and relatives	48.7%	20.5%	29.2%	1.6%
Doing housework (cooking, laundry, taking care of children, etc...)	21.3%	25.4%	44.6%	8.8%

*Table 27: Disaggregation of female and male respondents to women's decision-making*

	<i>Jointly (spouse and self)</i>		<i>Respondent and other household member jointly</i>		<i>Self</i>		<i>Spouse only</i>	
	Female (n)	Male (n)	Female (n)	Male (n)	Female (n)	Male (n)	Female (n)	Male (n)
Determining your own health care	150	36	9	1	207	78	8	0
Making large household purchases	220	85	19	2	124	28	11	0
Visiting family and relatives	186	52	69	31	113	30	6	2
Doing housework	83	21	92	32	197	21	2	41

The respondents were also asked who in their family makes decisions on where to borrow or how to save money. 98% indicated a joint decision making with 33.5% being self. The study did not measure the head of the household as a possible variable to correlate with decision making and determine inequality levels; however, this is an indicator to demonstrate agency among women.

*Table 28: Decisions on borrowing or saving money*

Category	Who in your family decides where to borrow or how to save money?"
Jointly (spouse and self)	58.5%
Respondent and other household member jointly.	5.9%
Self	33.5%
Spouse only	2.0%
<b>Grand Total</b>	<b>100%</b>

### **Motivation for joining the project**

To increase income, increase savings and be able to access a loan topped the list of what motivate members to join the project as indicated in the table below. The least motivating factors mentioned included the member being compelled to join when the group majority decides to join. This points to a key focus area of ensuring that members reap sufficient benefits from the project especially on the areas identified including increasing income, savings and credit access.

*Table 29: Motivation for joining the project*

<b>What is your motivation for joining this program?</b>	<b>%</b>
Increase my income	27.40%
Increase my savings	26.80%
Be able to access a loan	16.10%
Meet people	14.90%
Learn about enterprises and its development	12.50%
My group is joining so I am too	0.60%
Other (please note)	0.60%
Not sure	0.60%

---

## Conclusions and Recommendations

---

### Conclusions

In conclusion, all the outcome indicators that were measurable at the baseline were measured conclusively. Proposals have been made where there is need to adjust the indicators or remove. Here below are specific conclusions and recommendations.

### Results Framework

#### **IMPACT: Improved social and economic well-being of 7,500 residents of Eldoret**

##### ***[IM a] % of sample residents in Eldoret reported on their economic confidence and practices***

The indicator identifies the independence of beneficiaries in facilitating their income generation, being confident in producing their products, applying required techniques and approaching the defined markets.

##### ***[IM b] % of residents in Eldoret reported on their social confidence and practices***

The indicator identifies that the beneficiaries are confident to represent themselves at different levels (household, value chain, community), act independently and practice their social representation and leaderships.

#### **OUTCOME 1: Increased income through facilitating climate resilient enterprises and sustainable jobs creation**

##### ***[LT 1a]: % increase in sampled members' average monthly net enterprise income***

This indicator exhibited some average high amounts, however, the branch team during validation attributed this to a bias. The bias was brought about by the fact that few members had been onboarded, and since this was a new branch, the referral system works best on inward-outward approach. This is where the groups within town are first targeted based on guidance from ministry of social development. Such groups are then assessed and recruited. Therefore, majority of the respondents are based around town and may have varied income sources due to the variability of the enterprise sources. Consequently, (n=383) are not members of HIH and may have also affected the income levels. This may be slightly different from rural and peri-urban areas around Eldoret. However, we agreed that this will form the basis of the income levels, so we can have deliberate efforts on enhancing enterprises considering the various sectors.

The data disaggregation focused on male and female, as perceived that enterprise characteristics including seasonality and entrepreneur personalities may render comparisons less reliable, which can be addressed through a research in action approach, and not a cross sectional assessment.

The key challenge remains that entrepreneur's practices including accurate record keeping, may under or overestimate the income.

Considerable must be put in place to ensure entrepreneurs keep records; and the project to consider a longitudinal approach to documenting income from enterprises; which can be addressed manually or by technology, based on entrepreneurs' capacities.

**[LT 1b] SHG member enterprise survival rates at 12 months [M/F]**

Increased income through enterprise and job creation must be facilitated in the long run, which help improve economic and social well-being of members sustainably. This indicator also makes sure the sustainability approach of the project.

**[LT 1c] % of members [M: F] with (i) the capacity to deal with a financial shock, (ii) without borrowing money or selling assets**

Capacity to deal with a financial shock: the indicator is measurable, the current position been a strong indication of empowerment among entrepreneurs. The project team alluded to the initial bias indicated in LT1.

**OUTCOME 2: Increased agriculture production and productivity through sustainable and climate resilient practices**

**[LT 2a]: % of members adopting climate resilient practices in their enterprises**

This indicator aims to understand the current situation in agricultural production and climate risks in the area. From which, the project tailors their interventions, providing required technical training on climate resilient practices. The proportion of members adopting the practices will enhance the possibilities of increased income, reduced production risks and formed sustainable production as market requirements.

**[LT 2b]: % farmers who report increased production (unit, quality, scale)**

This indicator seeks to identify the importance of adoption and practice of sustainable and climate resilient agriculture production, reducing climate risks and securing market development analysis and meeting market requirements. The indicator also seeks to understand the importance of business and finance management capabilities in segmenting markets, market actors, performing cost & benefit analysis, in order to secure sustainable income and scale up enterprises though increased production supplies and improved production quality by producing massive volume and synchronous quality.

**OUTCOME 3: Strengthened micro enterprises through enhanced value addition and market and financial linkages**

**[LT 3a]: # of entrepreneurs maintaining their business profiles**

The indicator strengthens the capabilities of enterprises in managing financial management, doing cost and benefit analysis and developing business development plan in order to profile their business in accountable and creditable manners, increasing their ability to access mainstream financial institutions.

**[LT 3b]: # of entrepreneurs engaged in profitable value addition nodes**

The indicator seeks to engage more entrepreneur in value addition nodes, from which they will benefit from producing more value added products, receiving/delivering more value added services and expanding their markets. A value chain approach may depict stronger impact, which can be based on market value chain analysis or grey literature review; in comparison to the County and KCSAP priority value chains.

**[LT 3c]: # of buyer agreements secured by Members' CBOs**

The indicator seeks to understand the strength of CBOs in accessing commercial businesses through formal contracts. This indicator is currently at zero (0), however, more focus around interventions focused on this may contribute to a positive mark among its members.

**OUTCOME 4: Increased women's economic empowerment**

**[LT 4a]: % of women who have their own source of income**

The indicator is measurable. The current status is high among female and therefore, may provide difficulties in attributing efforts to the interventions promoted even if we score 100% at the end line. Therefore, the project team must focus on enhancing existing enterprises to create sustainable jobs.

**[LT 4b]: % of women who participate in decision making**

Since this indicator is the strongest measure for women empowerment, qualitative data points to structural bias in productive areas including strategic decisions and control of resource for decision making at both the household and community levels. Women decision making power has been strongly highlighted in reproductive functions, however, the bias that exists remains and therefore the current status may not be a true position of gender equality among respondents. There is still need to focus on gender empowerment activities, and the technical team to review the aspects that contribute to gender empowerment that are measurable.

**Short-term outcome 1: Increased capacities to save, borrow, and repay among SHG**

**[ST 1a] Average personal savings of SHG Members through their savings groups**

This indicator is achievable considering that 84% of those with enterprises already save in SHGs. However, since this data is system captured, it has to be reviewed periodically to ascertain that the system picks correct data against a sample of SHG records.

## **Short-term outcome 2: Increased economic activity and improved business practices among SHG Members**

**[ST 2a] # of enterprises [M: F] created/enhanced**

**[ST 2b] # of jobs created by members' enterprise activities**

**[ST 2c] # of SHG members [M:F] who apply key business practices**

**[ST 2d]: % of members who are part of a CBO**

CBOs are driving economic benefits by enhanced collective voice and actions and improved market accessibility, while only 1% of respondents are CBOs' members. Therefore, the project can aim to increase interventions around CBO formation, value chain driven agendas in CBOs and its management. This result is achievable considering that the measurable variables are enterprises, jobs, practices or skills adopted and the participation in CBOs as a way to access to market.

## **Short-term outcome 3: Increased access to credit /savings for business growth by SHG Members**

**[ST 3a] % of SHG M: F members who have access to the credit / savings they need to grow their business**

**[ST 3b]: # of financial institutions linked**

The indicators facilitate the accessibility of beneficiaries to financial institutions, which provide them with loan opportunity, not only to expand their business but also to formulate their sustainable business development.

A representable sample of 30% who had taken a loan from various sources, shows that access to loans may work if strengthened. The desire that more people can access mainstream sources will arguably be an increase in income or business growth.

## **Recommendations**

The study findings draw a number of positives in the target group, as well as challenges that this project should aim to address or contribute towards addressing them.

Observably, majority of the respondents have enterprises, this therefore indicates that the project must aim to create a difference in income change through strengthening the enterprises rather than establishing new ones. The interventions should focus primarily on diversification and intensification and technical support; as a catalyst to financial resilience, but also a positive reputation when such entrepreneurs face the micro financial institutions seeking a loan.

Agriculture been a key income generating activity, intentionally, the project must aim to adapt a value chain approach for those already working in agriculture enterprises as producers, but also in other nodes. Climate resilient practices, that forms part of the last module in the core model,

must be considered to be trained early, in order to enhance the adoption of green practices in member enterprises.

While the sample size of men was less across the groups, there is need to strengthen male participation in SHGs, to enable them create a platform they can leverage as resource for learning, mentorship, and loan access.

The project should keep strengthening their delivery approaches through refresher trainings, demonstrations and other good practices. The return on investment is a catalyst for effective performance and therefore staff must be at par to generate the good results.

The number of respondents in a CBO set up are extremely few, an opportunity for Hand in Hand to mobilize, and optimally train on CBO formations, their benefits and link them together to set up an effective CBO as an exit strategy. Sustainably, SHGs operating in a CBO set up will grow and be in existence longer; and consequently create a lasting impact in the growth process.

Gender focused interventions are key to ensure participation of both gender is appraised objectively. Participation in decision making is high but failure to measure the aspects of control has an effect on overall decision making agency.

**The MEL plan attached indicates the summary findings against set indicators**

Result Area	Indicators	Baseline	Targets	Comments
<b>Impact:</b> <b>Improved social and economic well-being of 7,500 residents of Eldoret</b>	[IM a] % of residents in Eldoret reported on their economic confidence and practices			TBD end line
	[IM b] % of residents in Eldoret reported on their social confidence and practices			
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Increased income through facilitating climate resilient enterprises and sustainable jobs creation	[LT 1a] % increase in sampled members [M: F] average monthly net enterprise income	KES. 6,832 (M: KES. 7,878; F: KES. 5,785)	30% increase	
	[LT 1b] SHG member enterprise survival rates at 12 months [M/F],	NA	70%	TBD end line
	[LT 1e] % of members [M: F] with (i) the capacity to deal with a financial shock, (ii) without borrowing money or selling assets	i. 49% ii. 44%		Project team to set target
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Improved agricultural production and productivity through sustainable and climate resilient agricultural practices	[LT 2a] Proportion of members adopting climate resilient practices in their enterprises	Not measured		
	[LT 2b] % of farmers who report increased production (unit, quality, scale)	Not measured		Planned for field visit in November
<b>Outcome 3:</b> Strengthened micro enterprises through enhanced value addition and market and financial linkages	[LT 3a]: # of entrepreneurs maintaining their business profiles			
	[LT 3b] # of entrepreneurs engaged in profitable value addition nodes	Not measured		Planned for November
	[LT 3c] # of buyer agreements secured by Members' CBOs			
<b>Outcome 4:</b> Increased women's economic empowerment	[LT 4a] % of women who have their own source of income	88%		Project team to set target
	[LT 4b] % of women who participate in decision making	85.4%		Project team to design productive targeted interventions
SHORT-TERM OUTCOME 1 Increased capacities to save, borrow, and repay among SHG Members	[ST 1a] Average personal savings of SHG Members through their savings groups	KES. 1,717		Project team to set target

<b>Result Area</b>	<b>Indicators</b>	<b>Baseline</b>	<b>Targets</b>	<b>Comments</b>
<b>SHORT-TERM OUTCOME 2</b> <i>Increased economic activity and improved business practices among SHG Members</i>	[ST 2a] # of enterprises [M: F] created / enhanced /expanded	0		88% of respondents have enterprises
	[ST 2b] # of jobs created by members' enterprise activities			
	[ST 2c] % of SHG M:F members who apply key business practices	0		
	[ST 2d] #of SHG M:F members who are part of CBOs	Less than 1% (0.28%)		A key focus area of interest for exit
<b>SHORT-TERM OUTCOME 3</b> <i>Increased access to credit /savings for business growth by SHG Members</i>	[ST 3a] % of SHG M: F members who have access to the credit / savings they need to grow their business	8%		Those who can borrow all money required for business (8%). 47% can borrow some.
	[ST 3b]: # of financial institutions linked			
<b>OUTPUT 1</b> # of community-owned Self-Help Groups provide platforms for savings and peer support	[OP 1a] # community-owned Self-Help Groups provide platforms for savings and peer support	0	125	
	[OP 1b] # [M:F] of SHG Members enrolled	0	2500 (80% F)	
	[OP 1b] Member drop-out rate	0		
<b>OUTPUT 2</b> XX SHG members trained and equipped with the capacities to run profitable enterprises	[OP 1c] % of SHG members who graduate the HiH core training	0	90%	
<b>OUTPUT 3</b> XX SHG members have increased access to credit / savings	[OP 3a] XX Average amount available to Members to borrow through their SHG	0		Not to set targets
	[OP 3b] % of SHG members accessing credit [SHG / EIF / Other]	30%		Project team to set target
<b>OUTPUT 4</b> # of members empowered to form CBOs	[OP 4a] # of SHG M: F Members trained on CBO formation	0		
	[OP 4b]# of SHG Members taking part in market linkage engagements / events	0		

