



RESEARCH PROGRAM ON
Climate Change,
Agriculture and
Food Security



Inades-Formation



Report of the Innovations Screening and Vetting Meeting Held at Agricultural Information Center, KARI Kabete on 29th and 30th April 2013

Compiled and Edited by

Juma Nicholas, Makonge Righa and Teresiah Ng'ang'a

**With support from the Vetting Committee (Kimenju John, Kamau Geoffrey, Rose
Kipyego, Munuve Julius and Mureithi Grace)**

**This innovation identification and vetting process was supported by Virtual
Livelihood schools of Africa-Kenya (IIRR)**

1. Introduction

A two-day participatory workshop was held to screen and vet innovations from all over Kenya. The workshop was held at the Agricultural Information Center (AIC), KARI Kabete between 29th and 30th April 2013. The main aim of the workshop was to select innovations that would be showcased during the Eastern Africa Farmer Innovation Fair (EAFIF) on 28 and 29 May 2013. The vetting team was composed of 8 people from the PK membership and research and development sectors (See Annex 1) institutions. Prior to the vetting workshop, an agenda was set and an innovation vetting form (See Annex 3) containing the criteria for evaluating the innovation applications together with a database of the submitted innovations. The innovation database was sent to members of the vetting committee prior to the workshop to provide ample time to individually analyze the submitted innovations as well as the vetting criteria.

2. Workshop organization

The workshop had two sections. On the first day, screening, vetting and selecting the innovations was conducted. On the second day, follow-ups on the selected innovations and developing guidelines to be used by the documentation team was done. On the second day, also, a script detailing important information about the innovations was developed including key notes to be considered by the documentation team. The guideline will also support the innovation committee in ensuring and monitoring that the necessary information on the innovations is captured. However, it was agreed that the documentation team should use their own professional discretion in the field to ensure creativity and objectivity in their work.

3. Methodology

Each member of the committee individually assessed and scored each individual application, using the discussed vetting criteria. The committee then discussed and selected the innovations based on the individual assessments and scores. This was done in bunches of 10. Where necessary, phone calls were made to the innovators to clarify on issues concerning the innovations. Additional follow-ups were done for the selected innovations including developing scripts of the innovations and guidelines to support the documentation team specifically during the field visits.

In scoring the innovations, each member graded the innovations on a scale of 1-5 (where 1 represented low and 5 represented high) based on seven criteria outlined in the vetting form (See Annex 3). The criteria used were originality of the innovation, relevance with respect to addressing short term challenges and providing long term solutions, technical viability, economic viability, environmental viability, social viability and upscaling/commercial viability. For the applications that lacked sufficient information, a “-” (dash) was to be given, until further clarifications were made by the entire committee. For those applications that were deemed as very poor in a particular category, a “0” (zero) score was to be awarded.

Once each member assessed and graded the innovations, the scores were tabulated to get the total score for each innovation and an average of each innovation was then

calculated by adding the scores of all the committee members and dividing by the number of committee members. This final average was placed on the scoreboard as and ranked and discussions held to further scrutinize the innovations before selecting the innovations

4. Innovation screening, vetting and selection process

I. Call for applications

A call for innovations was done and this was shared with Prolinnova Kenya partners and various stakeholders including government departments, posted on websites and facebook and applications submitted to the EAFIF organizing committee.

A total number of 60 applications were received via email, social media (mainly Prolinnova Facebook and Twitter Page) and hand-delivered. Those applications received after the vetting process was completed were included in Prolinnova Kenya's innovation database.

II. Screening and vetting

A discussion of the evaluation criteria was done and a consensus was reached on the assessment of the applications based on each criterion. In addition, other pivotal guidelines were also considered to support the committee in reaching a consensus. For instance, with regards to originality of the innovations, the committee agreed that some innovations may be new to a particular area, but old in another or, alternatively, the innovations may be old in a new way. In such instances, it was agreed that, using professional discretion, such innovations would be considered as being original. However, such considerations were case-specific and still had to be reviewed based on the criteria outlined in the vetting form.

Once the scope of assessment and grading was set, 5 random innovations from the databases were collectively assessed and graded by the committee to ensure all committee members were conversant with the vetting process. Thereafter, the committee members individually assessed the innovations and then jointly discussed the scores, made further inquiries (in applications that necessitated clarifications), and joint selection done.

III. Innovations selected

A total of 28 innovations were selected of which the top 15 will be comprehensively documented in the form of publications (a booklet) and video clips. (See Annex 4).

A member of the vetting team will accompany the documentation team during the field visits to the innovators to support the documentation team and also the innovators in preparing their innovations for the EAFIF. This will also provide a forum to further assess the innovations.

4. Recommendations from the meeting

Below are the major recommendations:

- More information on the innovations should be obtained before the documentation team embarks on the field visits and develop a script to guide the team. This will make it easier for the documentation team to better understand the innovations before going to the field
- Follow-ups should be done on the other innovations in the database that were not selected. This is crucial as some farmers may have great innovations yet they do not know how to appropriately explain themselves in writing as was required in the application process.
- Due to the short notice some key sectors were not represented in the vetting committee e.g. agribusiness and agricultural financing. Therefore, future committees should strive to include more professionals from the various agricultural and development sectors.
- More time should be allocated for the entire innovation identification process starting from the call for innovations to their selection. This way, each stage receives ample time thus encouraging overall efficiency of the process.
- Periodic assessments, monitoring, evaluation, reporting and documentation should be increasingly done on the innovations such as those that received support from the Local Innovation Support Fund (LISF) project and other related entities.

5. Key lessons learnt in the vetting process

- A dynamic team is important in the vetting process as this helps other understand what the farmer could be doing, also checks or confirms if what is being discussed is an innovation or not.

6. Key challenges

- A lot of time is needed for a common understanding among the team on what is innovative about the innovation.
- Some applicants did not clearly document or explain their innovations thus making it difficult for the vetting committee to appropriately assess or grade their innovations.

APPENDICES

Appendix I: List of Attendance

No	Name	Organization
1	Grace Mureithi	INADES-Formation
2	Julius Munuve	Ministry of Agriculture, Machakos
3	Rose Kipyego	International Institute of Rural Reconstruction (IIRR)
4	Makonge Righa	World Neighbors
5	Dr. Geoffrey Kamau	KARI Headquarters
6	Prof. John W. Kimenju	University of Nairobi (Kabete Campus)
7	Teresiah Ng'ang'a	Prolinnova Kenya
8	Juma Nicholas	Prolinnova Kenya

Appendix II: Tentative Programme for the Workshop

Time	Monday	Tuesday
8.30am – 9.30am	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduction of participants • Objectives of the workshop 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recap of Day 1's activities and confirmation of Day 2's agenda
9.30am – 10.30am	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification and commencing of the screening and vetting process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Follow ups/ Clarifications on the selected innovations
10.30am – 11.00am	TEA/COFFEE BREAK	
11.00am – 1.00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening, vetting and selection of innovations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creation of Guidelines for the documentation team
1.00pm – 2.00pm	LUNCH BREAK	
2.00pm – 4.00pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening, vetting and selection of innovations 	Scripting and finalization of the guidelines
4.00pm – 4.30pm	TEA/COFFEE BREAK	
4.30pm – 6.30pm	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Screening, vetting and selection of innovations • Agenda setting for Day 2's Activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conclusion of the Workshop. • A.O.B • Departure

Appendix III: Innovation Vetting Form



Eastern African Farmer Innovation Fair (EAFIF) 28 – 29 May 2013, Nairobi *Innovation Vetting Form*

1. _____ Reference number:

2. _____ Innovators name:

3. _____ Innovation title:

4. Is there an innovation in the application: Yes..... No.....

5. If yes describe the innovation:

6. Thematic area: Crop management
 Animal Husbandry Marketing Processing
 Water and soil conservation Social institution innovation Tree/forest management

7. Region: Coastal Lake Victoria basin Highlands ASAL

Evaluation of Application

Criteria	Rating (1- low, 5- high)	Remarks
Originality (Locally evolved/developed using local knowledge/skills)		
Relevance (address immediate challenges and provides long term solutions)		
Technical viability (easily modified/use of available or accessible resources)		
Environmental viability (ecological sustainability)		
Economic viability (cost effective in terms of time and resources)		
Social acceptance (can be accepted by society/conforms to societal norms)		
Up scaling/commercial viability (Can be widely replicated/adapted)		
Total rating		

Date: _____

Screened by:

Appendix IV: Selected innovations

No.	Name of Innovator	Title of Innovation	Area
1.	Martin Kyengo	A Homemade Windmill Connected to a Solar Power Battery	Machakos County (Kalama Division)
2.	Simon Musila	Growing of Finger Millet Through Seedlings	Machakos County (Kalama Division)
3.	Daniel Kivyuvi	Efficient Techniques of Reducing Evaporation of Harvested Run-off Water in ASALs	Machakos County (Kalama Division)
4.	Michael Makuthu	Antiaflatoxin and Grain Preservation Apparatus	Kitui County (Kitui Central and Makueni)
5.	Christine Kilonzi	Sex Predetermination of Chicks	Kitui County (Ithumbi Division)
6.	Elijah Ngahu Mwathi	GreenhousePro Mobile App	Nairobi County (Kasarani Estate)
7.	De Jakes Olendo	Hybrid Beehive	Kisumu County (Nyando District, Kaokok Village)
8.	Joe Ouko (Nyandago Farmers Group)	Lofoda Goat Meal	Kisumu County (Pap-Onditi Village)
9.	Musungu Henry (Kala Kala Self-Help Group)	The "Achak" Dairy Meal	Busia County (Bujumba, Butula District)
10.	Paul kisiangani Nyongesa (Galaxy United Youth Group)	Micro-algae Spirulina production, processing and marketing for improved rural livelihoods among smallholder farmers	Kakamega County (Shimalavandu Market Area)
11.	Ronald Nyangaka	Innovative Fireplace Incubator	Kisii County (Kiboro Location, Boronyi Sub-Location)
12.	Gerald Kibugi	GreenhouseDIY (Greenhouse Do It Yourself)	Kajiado County (Ngong Area)
13.	Michael Kibue	Market Access Centre For Reduction Of Transaction Costs	Kajiado County (Kiserian Livestock Market and Slaughterhouse)
14.	Jack Rware	Jack2 Farmer-bred Avocado	Embu County (Kigari Village)
15.	Rahab Githumbi	Mixed Rearing of Turkeys and Indigenous Chicken	Laikipia County (Kahuruko Village, Sipili Location)
16.	Nahashon Muriithi	Organic soil conditioner and pest repelant	Mount Kenya (West Region)
17.	Lawrence Matolo	A Multipurpose organic absorber	Machakos (Kalama And Mwala Divisions)
18.	Anolei Women Dairy Camel	Empowering Pastoral Women	Isiolo County

	Cooperativ e society	Producers and Traders in the Kenya Camel Milk Value chain	
19.	Samuel Musya Mulunzya	Spring Jembe for Effective Ploughing in the Farm	Mwingi County (Kivui)
20.	Dorothy Mulili	Special chicken Feed for Improved Production	Machakos
21.	Veronica Makau	Sisal detergent	Machakos
22.	Maurice Wanyonyi	Land Reclamation Through Innovative Gardening Technique	Likuyani District (Wekhomba Village)
23.	C/O John Wambua, KARI Katumani	Use of Rain Gauge to Make a Farm Cropping Decision	Makueni and Machakos Counties
24.	Ruth Wandera	Foodwarmers for Egg Hatching	Elugulu-Butula
25.	Michael Makuthu	Portable Domestic Vegetable Grower	Kitui County
26.	Sasima Women Group	Banana Lotion	Namasa Village (Mabusi Location in Bungoma County)
27.	Caroline Anyona	Indigenous Salt(munyu mkheleka)	Butula District Western Province Busia County
28.	Pamella Anyango	Earthpot Cooling and Preservation System	Elugulu-Butula