



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

PARTNERSHIP FOR SAFE POULTRY IN KENYA (PSPK) PROGRAM

REGIONAL POULTRY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

November 2010

This publication was produced for review by the United States Agency for International Development. It was prepared by Winrock International.

PARTNERSHIP FOR SAFE POULTRY IN KENYA (PSPK) PROGRAM

REGIONAL POULTRY STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

DISCLAIMER

The authors' views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect the views of the United States Agency for International Development or the United States Government

I. INTRODUCTION

Partnership for Safe Poultry in Kenya (PSPK) is a pilot project funded by USAID. The goal of the project is *safe poultry production and marketing systems that incorporate freedom from HPAI and other poultry diseases; generating high levels of income for smallholder families.*

PSPK contributes to USAID's goals for food security, economic growth, and health by:

- Enabling food insecure families to increase incomes and diversity diets through poultry production
- Increasing poultry sector productivity and access to safe poultry products which serve as an important source of protein and iron for rural households
- Targeting women (as primary poultry producers) and thereby supporting their role in facilitating food security and nutrition for the whole household
- Addressing USAID/Health priorities for avian and pandemic influenza (API), including: improving country-level planning and preparedness, increasing public awareness, and helping countries manage outbreak response and implement improved biosecurity practices

PSPK uses an integrated approach which links poultry sector stakeholders with experienced experts from the U.S. and East Africa. These experts provide volunteer technical assistance to address constraints and opportunities for poultry sector development in Kenya and across the overall East Africa region. Fifty-eight percent of the project's target group are women.

The project, initiated in April 2009, obtained a one year extension in March 2010, to consolidate achievements made in the first year of implementation and also explore opportunities for replicating the initiative regionally. For purposes of regional replication, two key activities were planned: value-chain assessments and a regional workshop/tour.

A. Value Chain Assessments

Value chain assessments (VCAs) were conducted to illustrate opportunities for poultry sector competitiveness in Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Uganda. VCA reports were synthesized to provide a regional perspective for making the sector competitive. Mr. Greg Sullivan, an internationally renowned value chain expert, was engaged by PSPK to assist in conceptualizing and drafting the methodology for data collection, terms of reference (TOR), and time frame for the country specific VCAs to ensure consistency of VCA reports produced by each local consultant. This also facilitated effective comparisons during preparation of regional report. Three local consultants, Dr. Raymond Mnenwa from Tanzania, Dr. Roseline Nyamutale from Uganda and Dr. Gezahegn Ayele from Ethiopia were engaged to undertake VCA studies in their respective countries using the framework developed.

B. Regional Workshop/Tour

A regional workshop/tour was conducted to share experience and materials from PSPK implementation in Kenya as well as to provide an overview of the regional VCA results to a key value chain actors from the targeted regional countries. The workshop enhanced poultry sector stakeholder partnerships in the region to facilitate replication of the experiences. The local VCA consultants made presentations of their VCA findings to the poultry actors in the regional workshop and obtained feedback. The purpose of the presentations was to help various country actors internalize the opportunities and constraints present in different countries and how PSPK experiences and materials shared could be relevant and useful.

II. REGIONAL STAKEHOLDER WORKSHOP

A. Objectives of the Workshop

- Share lessons, materials, and models from PSPK with key partners from Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Uganda
- Share VCA reports generated by local consultants and provide an opportunity to for actors from each country to deliberate together on findings and next steps
- Mobilize key value chain actors toward discussing and mapping out way forward for their respective countries

B. Selection of Participants

During the fact finding mission PSPK team identified a host in each country that would help PSPK organize the VCA studies and the regional workshop. In Ethiopia, the USAID mission linked PSPK to Dr. Laikemariam. In Tanzania, Tanzania Association of Women Leaders in Agriculture and Environment (TAWLAE) served as the lead facilitator, while in Uganda it was the Association of Uganda Professional Women in Agriculture and Environment (AUPWAE). PSPK recommended that 10 representatives from each country be invited to participate in the regional workshop; VCA consultants in each country were guided to recruit workshop participants from the following categories: smallholder farmers raising local birds, smallholder farmers involved in hatcheries, smallholder farmers raising broilers or layers, producer association representatives, feed millers, traders/service providers, universities, agricultural research institutes, livestock production departments, veterinary departments. In total 28 participants attended from Ethiopia, Uganda, and Tanzania; only 8 of the anticipated 10 participants attended from Ethiopia.

C. Workshop Program

The regional stakeholder workshop included two days of structured presentations and discussion and three days of field site visits in Kenya the week of October 11-15, 2010.

On the opening day of the workshop, participants were introduced to the workshop objectives and expectations. The morning sessions included an overview of the PSPK program and a discussion of partnership activities with various sector stakeholders including the Kenya Poultry Farmers' Association (KEPOFA), other farmer groups, Association of Kenya Feed Manufacturers (AKEFEMA), traders, Ministry of Livestock Development (MOLD), Nairobi City Council, universities and research institutions, and PDVS. Representatives from each partner group acted as facilitators to discuss activities with PSPK to date. During the afternoon sessions, participants were given an overview of the Kenya National Poultry Improvement Plan (KNPIP), and the Kenya Poultry website. Dr. Lilian Kirimi, with TEGEMEO, provided a brief overview on consumer behavior and quality attributes using a case study of poultry products from smallholder poultry farmers. Participants were introduced to the financial model developed by a PSPK volunteer and used the case of a producer group to demonstrate their experience with the model. Finally, Dr. Kaberia described the importance of the VCA studies in poultry development for Tanzania, Uganda and Ethiopia.

On day two of the workshop, the group traveled to the Western Region to visit the farm of the Star Ladies Women Group. Star ladies group is one of the groups PSPK is working with as a demonstration farm. Prior to PSPK assistance, the group had acquired a loan to go into poultry keeping but due to high mortality rates on their farm despaired and resulted to personal property of the group members to repay the loan. PSPK implemented the 8 biosecurity practices on the farm and now the group is doing very well and back on their feet.

On the third day, the group tour continued with farm visits to Kondole Women Hen Group, and Millennium Village. The group is one of those that have been successful in not only implementing the biosecurity practices but also whose members have been using the financial model and they now have over 2000 chickens among them. They have also been involved in production of day old chicks which they sell. The group has been participating in the Agricultural Society of Kenya shows and has won a number of awards.

Participants also visited the farm of Farmers Chicken Centre, a trader that has signed contracts with three demonstration groups to supply the chicken and eggs.

At the Great Lakes University of Kisumu (GLUK) the participants were able to see the University poultry farm as was set out by PSPK volunteer Dr. Joseph Orban and the feed mill which is manufacturing the feeds for the indigenous chickens. During the tour, a microfinance group ADOK Timo joined the participants and was able to share with them what they were doing with PSPK groups. Participants returned to Nairobi at the end of the day. On the final day of the workshop, participants convened again for a half day to recap the tour objectives and notes from the field visits, and the VCA consultants each provided an overview of the value chain assessment reports from Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Uganda. Participants then broke out into smaller groups by country, and the VCA consultants facilitated discussions on country-specific issues emanating from the value chains and how best the PSPK model could be used, and on developing action plans for using the experiences, materials, and models obtained in the workshop and tour of PSPK activities in Kenya.

D. Outcomes of the Workshop

I. Sharing Experiences

The participants were asked to review the field trip based on the questions presented to them in a plenary session. Following is a summary of the responses.

a) What did you see?

- Different women groups focusing on different issues on poultry production
- Biosecurity measures, which are key in the poultry production chain
- The groups are organized, particularly on disease control
- Locally made brooder being used
- University linkage and its response to community needs
- Market linkages and the financial model working for groups
- All groups are practicing biosecurity norms and they take this issue very seriously
- The way the farmers are trained to train others is effective
- A system of working together objectively
- Ownership among the groups: two ownership approaches
- Good feed knowledge and open sharing of information
- Promotion of indigenous chicken
- Creation of more linkages in the face of the existing good linkage along the poultry value chain
- Work to improve the feeds
- Issue of record keeping well articulated
- Sustainability through linkages with the government and finance institutions
- Networking among groups, as is the case with Kondole Farmers' Group

b) What did you learn?

- Business planning in place
 - Imparting knowledge through partnerships
 - Marketing through collection/aggregation
 - Management of local and exotic breeds
- Partnerships increase efficiency but the roles of each partner have to be clearly spelt out
- Feeds are economically formulated using various available food stuffs
- How the university has transferred technology to the farmer
- Use of simple hatchery techniques
- Clear exit strategy involving, for instance, the government and other stakeholders
- Innovations by the farmers as shown by the Millennium Village Farmer group in the use of local materials and the application of knowledge learnt to design even poultry houses
- How to reduce mortality through the practice of biosecurity measures
- How to build on the strengths of the existing groups

c) How can you apply what is learned in your respective countries?

- Production of pocket friendly feeds for any of the production scenarios
- More training in biosecurity
- Simple techniques of hatching chicks
- Issue of partnership in achieving results
- Linking farmers to financial institutions
- Application of new production technologies in improving production/productivity
- Application of cost benefit analysis in production
- The idea of the whole value chain
- Adoption of biosecurity measures and the general poultry production practices. curriculum is necessary

d) What challenges did you observe?

- Getting hatching eggs to run the incubators economically
- Under-utilization of capacities within the value chain
- Over involvement with other value chains as shown by Kondele Group going into rabbit, turkey and goat rearing
- Micro-finance organizations still unwilling to lend money to poultry farmer groups
- Baseline data required to chart the way forward and measure achievements
- The issue of breeding

2. Country Action Plans

Participants from each country were provided time during the last day of the workshop to work together in a focused country group in order to develop initial action plans for implementing lessons learned from the workshop and tour. See **Annex A** for relevant country action plans.

3. Participants' Evaluation

Participants were asked to evaluate the workshop and tour. Overall 43% of participants rated the achievements of the workshop as excellent, and 57% rated achievements as good. Other, detailed responses are summarized below.

a. What did you like most about the study tour?

Participants indicated that they were impressed with many aspects of PSPK work in Kenya including value chain analysis, business plan and financial model, integrated networking among concerned stakeholders, biosecurity practices and how they were helping farmers, feed formulation, improved chicken housing, brooding using locally made brooders, mixing feeds in a local and economical way, and the involvement and organization of women. **John Kaijage** (Tanzania) commented that, “issues of record keeping as well as the linkage or the value chain that exists and how the poultry products go from the production to the marketing levels are impressive.” Participants highlighted the fact that PSPK was working with small farmers and training them on biosecurity, while at the same time working on exit strategies in advance to help eliminate dependency on donor funding. **Ally M. Ngendello** (Tanzania) said, “the issue of disease management at the household level was a big learning point and I will practically disseminate to the farmers I work for.” **Dr. Gezahegn Ayele**, Ethiopia group leader noted, “The business planning [financial] model, which we have not even had in our country’s poultry production, is very impressive. Also worth acknowledging is the demo area in chicken management and production especially at Kondele Women Traders’ Group.

In general, the workshop and tour were overwhelming well received, and noted that they appreciated the time consciousness employed during the workshop as well as the accuracy and detail of presentations. Many participants applauded the organization/enthusiasm of the demo poultry farmers, the sharing of experience with farmers on challenges and solutions, and noted they were impressed at how the poultry groups exhibited new technologies on poultry rearing. Some participants were impressed with the way the delegates (VCA consultants) from the other three countries presented the findings of the VCAs reports. **Mary Liwa**, Tanzania group leader, noted “it was really wonderful to get the chance to learn from the Kenyan cases. This would never happen if you [Winrock] did not struggle to connect us.” Similarly, **Harriet Muloki**, Uganda group leader stated that, “it was a good opportunity in sharing experiences and lessons on the best practices on poultry marketing, feeding and vaccination. Thanks to the PSPK team and other colleagues for a successful tour. It was a wonderful tour and I pray that it yields fruits.”

Participants also appreciated seeing examples of the poultry value chain in Kenya, including established markets, processing/slaughtering techniques, local bird rearing, commitment of ADOK Timo microfinance, and the operation of Great Lakes University of Kisumu (GLUK).

b. What didn’t you like about the study tour?

Some participants said the field visits were tiresome and the journey from Nairobi to Kisumu was too long, while others said they would have liked more time to visit other areas including Naivasha (where Kenya Agricultural Research Institute (KARI) is located, Kericho, and Nakuru. Some participants felt that the relevant governments from each country should have been represented because of the common issues concerning poultry production. Other issues noted were that too much attention was focused on indigenous breeds, integrated farming (poultry, rabbits, goats, etc.) was not discussed, that there was no discussion of space constraints faced by many smallholder producers.

c. Suggest ways of improving on future stakeholders study tour

Some participants suggested that more time should be scheduled for the activities, and that activities be more streamlined, e.g. visiting one sample group from each category of stakeholders – one farmer group, one processor, one research institution, one trader. Participants suggested that future tours should incorporate comparative cases, e.g. medium and large scale producers to compare with the production of smallholders, visits to demo groups with varying levels of adoption to demonstrate varying levels of success, and visits to farms in both urban and rural areas. Some individuals suggested that visits to research institutions working on indigenous chicken be included. Some participants felt that farmers should also be given an opportunity to undertake study tours to Ethiopia, Tanzania, and Uganda for better understanding of poultry farming. Participants

recommended that Winrock help bring technology (using the PSPK model) to the other participating countries, and they concurred that there should be continued exchange of experiences between countries to strengthen the regional poultry sector. **Eunice Mukai**, PSPK demo farmer, noted that “it was a good experience networking and sharing information and experience...if they [regional participants] work hard to do the same, we shall engage in poultry business together. One participant from Tanzania said she could invite me to Tanzania to train other poultry farmers.”

ANNEX A. COUNTRY ACTION PLANS

ETHIOPIA COUNTRY TEAM

Qn. 1: What do you think is relevant from PSPK that would be important in making poultry (firms) sector in your country competitive?

The Ethiopian team vouched for the establishment of networking and partnership among key stakeholders, paying more attention to local chickens, establishing a financial model to suit their scenario, and creating exit strategies.

Qn. 2: From the VCA, suggest ways and opportunities that PSPK model would contribute to making the sector competitive?

To make sector competitive, the focus would be put on small scale producers and farmers, government entities, collectors at village/market level, processors and feed millers, and input suppliers, among others.

Qn. 3: Discuss and develop action plans for using the experience, materials, and models obtained.

The action plans would entail creating awareness among partners, creating partnership models, holding workshop with key stakeholders and addressing issues relevant to the poultry sector.

The action plan would comprise stakeholders from government institutions, NGOs, the private sector, different associations, and university and research centers in Addis Ababa and surrounding regions. The participants suggested this to take place as soon as possible.

Qn. 4: How you could support initiation of similar program to PSPK?

The support would start with the existing small scale poultry farmers and entail the implementation of biosecurity measures, commercializing the sector, establishing a business plan with a bankable financing model, as well as training of key stakeholders (cross cutting issue). This would target small scale farmers, millers, processors, multiplication centers, research centers/universities, NGOs, as well as government organizations. This would take place soon as possible in Addis Ababa and the surrounding regions.

TANZANIA COUNTRY TEAM

Qn. 1: What do you think is relevant from PSPK that would be important in making poultry (firms) sector in your country competitive?

The relevant PSPK aspects are training in biosecurity and general animal husbandry practices, partnership with existing partners and groups, the business plan (financial model and record keeping), linking financial institutions to key actors, linking research with actors, and the use of value chain approach.

Qn. 2: From the VCA, suggest ways and opportunities that PSPK model would contribute to making the sector competitive?

To make the sector competitive, facilitating training in biosecurity and poultry husbandry, promoting establishment of value chains, enhancing partnership among value chain actors, facilitating the review of poultry policies as well as assisting in the development of organizations in the subsector would be of the essence.

The existing opportunities include the increasing demand for poultry products, the large number and types of indigenous chicken, the pro-disadvantaged groups, who form a large proportion of the population, limited taboos on poultry consumption, the improving policy environment, the availability of abundant raw materials for processing feeds and many key players (government, international organizations, CBO, NGO, microfinance institutions, research institutions).

Qn. 3: Discuss and develop action plans for using the experience, materials, and models obtained.

The day old chick (DOC) production would be carried out at the hatcheries in Dar-es-Salaam, Dodoma, and Singinda in January. The Ministry in charge of livestock development would embark on a nationwide production of technologies, training of key stakeholders, information provision as well as putting in place policy and standards to govern the sector from January 2011. Feeds production and training of volunteers would be carried out in Kibaha and Dar-es-Salaam.

Other activities to be undertaken would include technology transfer, value chain development and training in biosecurity, coordination, extension and gender.

Qn. 4: How you could support initiation of similar program to PSPK?

The Tanzanian team suggested the formation of the PSPT (Partnership for Safe Poultry in Tanzania) team in Dar-es-Salaam, the development of the poultry chain model to be implemented by PSPT.

UGANDA COUNTRY TEAM

Qn. 1: What do you think is relevant from PSPK that would be important in making poultry (firms) sector in your country competitive?

The relevant aspects of PSPK to Uganda would be to address biosecurity, enhance partnerships among all stakeholders in the value chain, quality feeds, financing, training and marketing.

Qn. 2: From the VCA, suggest ways and opportunities that PSPK model would contribute to making the sector competitive?

The existing opportunities include regional and local demand, existing poultry groups, availability of technical personnel and raw materials, and the availability of government and NGO support.

But, the challenges include poor quality feeds and their high cost, disorganized markets, diseases, inadequate supply of day old chicks (DOC), insufficient knowledge and information on poultry management, expensive and adulterated veterinary drugs, as well as inadequate funds.

The solutions to these may include: labs for feed analysis, knowledge and training on feed formulations, establishment of a regulatory mechanism for the industry, promoting investment in feeds production, promoting the production of various raw materials, providing an inventory of raw materials, and investing in storage facilities.

For the disorganized poultry markets, there is a need to set up appropriate infrastructure for poultry marketing, strengthening and promoting group production and marketing, and strengthening marketing information systems on chickens, chicken products, and inputs.

The disease risk can be tackled through stakeholder sensitization on biosecurity practices and the development and dissemination of guidelines and procedures on biosecurity at all levels.

Inadequate DOC supply can be tackled through provision of information on the source of DOC production, finance information to prospective DOC investors, regional DOC production centers, availing adequate information on housing, as well as providing training in appropriate chicken management practices.

Proper regulation channels can be used to address expensive and adulterated drugs, whereas linkage of stakeholders to finance institutions could address the issue of inadequate funds.

Qn. 3: Discuss and develop action plans for using the experience, materials, and models obtained.

The plans entail developing materials and manuals for appropriate feed formulation for local and exotic birds, lobbying for the enactment of feeds bill, lobby for gazettement of areas for poultry in main markets starting December 2010 through to May 2011.

The plans would also involve developing the biosecurity guidelines, linking DOC investors to finance institutions, and creating an inventory of existing agricultural finance institutions.

What	Where	When	Who
Feeds			

Develop materials and manuals for appropriate feed formulation for local and exotic birds	Kampala	December 2010	AUPWAE
Lobbying for enactment of feeds bill	Kampala	January 2011	Rose Omaria and Juliet Sentumbwe
Markets			
Lobby for gazetted areas for poultry in main markets	Nakasero	May 2011	Nakasero Market Poultry Traders Association
Train in Biosecurity			
Develop lines of biosecurity guideline	Kampala	February 2011	traders, farmer organizations, extensions workers, AUPWAE
Promote Production of DOC			
Link DOC investors to finance institutions	Kampala, Mukono	May 2011	AUPWAE, Kisakye Rebecca, and Racheal Kibirige
Provide Finance Facilities to Poultry Farmers			
Make inventory of exiting agricultural finance institutions	Kampala, Mukono	February 2011	AUPWAE

Qn. 4: How you could support initiation of similar program to PSPK?

The support initiatives would entail creating an inventory for at least five existing poultry groups, training groups on biosecurity practices, identifying key stakeholders in the sector, conducting feed analysis of key millers, and providing an inventory of raw materials in all five regions of Uganda.

Other initiatives would include sensitizing farmer groups in marketing, partnering with governments officials under the NAADS (National Agricultural Advisory Services) at the district level to train farmers, as well as signing agreements with farmers to sell chicken to select traders in Nakasero Market, Kampala.

What	Where	When	Who
Make inventory of at least 5 existing poultry groups	In all the 5 regions	December 2010	AUPWAE
Train groups on biosecurity issues	In the 5 regions	March 2011	AUPWAE, Uganda participants at the PSPK Workshops
	Maska - 3 groups; Kyebando and Nsangi in Kampala - 2	February 2011	Kibirige, Katende

	groups; Gayaza – 1 group Mukono - 10 groups		Kisakye Rebecca
Identify key stake holders in the sector	In the 5 regions	December 2010	AUPWAE, Uganda par
Feed analysis of key feed millers	In the 5 regions	June 2011	Namulonge, Makerere, MAAIF, Harriet
Provide an inventory of raw materials	In the 5 regions	December 2010	AUPWAE, Uganda participants at the PSPK Workshop
Marketing	Sensitize farmers in group marketing	February 2011	Kibirige, Katende, and Kisakye Rebecca
Partnerships	Partner with government officials under NAADS at the districts to train farmers	February 2011	AUPWAE, Kibirige, Katende, and Kisakye Rebecca
	Sign agreements with farmers to sell chicken to identified traders in Nakasero Market	March 2011	AUPWAE, Kibirige, Katende, Kisakye Rebecca, and Manisulu

ANNEX B. WORKSHOP PARTICIPANT LIST

No	Name	Email Address	Telephone Number
Ethiopia			
1	Dr. Gezahegn Ayele	ayeleg2002@yahoo.com	+251 911216935
2	Ms. Genet Endale	endale-genet@yahoo.com	+2519111938171
3	Mr. Sintayehu Teshome	visitsinte@gmail.com	+251911124411
4	Ms. Alemtsehay Alemaw		+251910167528
5	Mrs. Bisrat W/Mariam	bwoldemariam@yahoo.com	+251911405073
6	Mr. Alemayehu Amare Tadese	alexunder1971@yahoo.com	+251911960141
7	Mr. Mekonnen G/Egziabher	mekonnenge@yahoo.com	+251911695213
8	Abebe Mengiste	abe-meng@yahoo.com	+251911186797
Uganda			
9	Grace Bogere	bogere.grace@yahoo.com	+25671239144
10	Ms. Kisakye Rebecca		+256712833936
11	Gerald Katende		+256712833947
12	Racheal Kibirige	rachealkibii@yahoo.com	+256782554346/701322304
13	Robert Matsiko	robertmatisiko@numafeeds.com	+256782888464
14	Mukangula Mansoor	mabsenterprises@gmail.com	+256774651158
15	Dr. Roselline Nyamutale	rosellinek@yahoo.com	+256772635069
16	Dr. Rose Omaria	omaria.rose@gmail.com	+256772590108
17	Dr. Juliet Sentumbwe	juliesenty@gmail.com	+256772584598
18	Dr. Harriet Muloki	mhnabirye@yahoo.co.uk	+2567726016223
Tanzania			
19	Mary Liwa	maryliwa@yahoo.com	+255754360215
20	Ester Ludovic K.	easther-ji@hotmail.com	+255755205309
21	Mr. Manases Mrindwa	mauwa56@hotmail.com	+255784646381

22	Prof. Madundo Mtambo	madundo@yahoo.com	+255754525286
23	Raymond Mnenwa	krmnenwa@yahoo.com	+255754584044
24	John Kajage	kaijage2000@yahoo.com	+255754532073
25	Anza A. Kirenga	anzaamenkirenga@yahoo.com	+255754446997
26	Ally M. Ngendello	mngendello@yahoo.com	+255754397209
27	Julius Mabele	juliusmabelle@gmail.com	+255655949843/767949843
28	Happy E. Kisamo	atenatalloyd@yahoo.com	+25575493314/719459545
Kenya			
29	Pius Makau	pmmakau21@yahoo.com	+254724344020
30	Eunice Musyoka	beneagroserve@yahoo.com	+254727675689
31	Fredrick Aila	onyango@yahoo.com	+254722314765
32	Francis Karin	karin@tegemeo.org	+254722634862
33	Titus Kariuki	titus.kariuki@equitybank.co.ke	+254725521557
34	Shirley Swai	cw_nyambura@yahoo.com	+254720132619
35	Dorothy Nyamai	dorothynyamai@gmail.com	+254722904615
36	Dr. Mungai	jammhu@yahoo.com	+254722921249
37	Dr. Bonface Kaberia	bkaberia@winrock.or.ke	
38	Thomas Junne Kaudia	tkaudia@winrock.or.ke	+254717528211
39	Joshua Masinde	jmasinde@winrock.or.ke	+254710232124
40	Shirley Swai	sswai@winrock.or.ke	+254721815665/7177528210
41	Bjarne Christensen	bjach@mespt.org	+254723277200