



**UNIVERSITY OF NAIROBI**  
**AFRICAN WOMEN STUDIES CENTRE**  
**WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT HUB**  
**P.O Box- 30197-00100    Tel: 0204918217**  
**Email: [weehub@uonbi.ac.ke](mailto:weehub@uonbi.ac.ke)    Web: [www.weehub.org](http://www.weehub.org)**



---

## **INCUBATION PROJECT MEETING.**

### **WEBINAR REPORT**

**PREPARED BY**

**BRENDA KEMEI**

**DATE: 6.12.2021**

## Introduction

Following an earlier meeting with Techno Serve, the UON WEE Hub convened another working committee meeting to agree on the Incubation model to adopt, the selection criteria, sampling of businesses, agree on the major indicators and agree on the timelines for a draft survey and instruments. The virtual meeting was held on 6<sup>th</sup> December 2021 at 3.00pm, with an attendance of 6 participants (*see annex 1*). The meeting began at 3.15pm.

## Choice of the incubation model

The presentation on the choice of the incubation model was done by Dr.Kitiabi. She began by doing a recap of the incubation models she had presented in the earlier meeting so that a choice could be made on the model to be adopted. She gave a broader description of the SIDA model which she said appeared more appropriate. She further noted that information on what Techno Serve intended do would then be incorporated. The intent would be to come up with our own model in the end. She gave a summary of the three models thus:

- a) **The M4P SDC WEE Framework also called the Swiss Agency for Development and Corporation M4P Framework** The model seeks to make markets work for poor women and men. This is the most popular model that has been advanced and many people are using it including Techno serve.
- b) **WEE Main components of an incubation program or model.**  
Developed by World Bank, the model has two main components;
  - Access to resources depends on access to training, work options and access to money.
  - Access to power agency depends on self-confidence, making decisions and time.
- c) **PSD –WEE Strategic results framework incubation model**  
Dr. Kitiabi observed that this is a logical model that lays out pathways of change for a WEE incubation programme.
- d) **WEE main components of the SIDA WEE incubation program/model**

SIDA is a Swedish Development Agency. She pointed out that that the model argues for the elimination of structural gender inequalities in the labor market, reducing women's unpaid work and improving sexual and reproductive health services. The model has these four elements that are important:

- The entrepreneurship and private sector development, which means it seeks to remove barriers to female entrepreneurship and promote inclusive financial services and trade policies.
- To promote infrastructure development that reduce tedious household work.
- Mentorship through women entrepreneurship programmes that support each other.
- Enhancement of sector policies that include, a business enabling environment, linkages to microfinance, training and access to land and property.

Dr. Kitiabi noted that the team had felt that this was the closest model to the Kenyan situation and it could be adopted and improved on. It was agreed that the four components could be turned into the objectives of the incubation Project. Access to remuneration for women in agriculture and

redistribution of unpaid work, providing affordable childcare and working with men and women to remove gender stereotypes were also added to the four components already mentioned. She was of the view that the first 3 points would be addressing issues prioritized in the hub's research. All the four components would be applicable in unpaid work which is covered in cluster three of the hub's research areas.

## **Plenary**

Having ended her presentation, Dr. Kitiabi requested the participants to give their comments.

### **Mrs. Muriithi**

She was in agreement that the SIDA WEE incubation program/model could be adopted as the initial model.

### **Dr. Kitiabi**

She said that that the model could be adopted and as the team meets with Techno serve they could think of remodeling it or elements from the other three models could be added or their own.

### **Mrs. Muriithi**

She said that Techno Serve have their own model what would be done is to enrich it.

### **Dr. Kitiabi**

She said that the SIDA model could be adopted and then they could go and discuss with Techno Serve to make it better.

### **Dr. Mbithi**

She wanted to know whether the mentorship element would be residential meaning that the women entrepreneurs would be allowed to access the incubation facilities for mentorship purposes.

### **Dr. Kitiabi**

She said that it included all the above but in the SIDA model, they were using women entrepreneurs supporting each other. For example one who is doing well could be allowed to mentor the others. In other words self-mentorship was used within the program. But for our case, mentorship opportunities would be created. She said that the mentorship program would be shaped to fit the businesses.

### **Dr. Mbithi**

She noted that the women who accessed AGPO or CGS for example could be used to mentor other women so that the others could access such funds.

### **Dr. Kitiabi**

She observed that there would be a lot of cross interaction between the clusters. Enhancing sector policies would also be across the clusters e.g having a business enabling environment the linkages to microfinance, access to land and property which is a major resource to get financing. She also sought to know about the other components which were very specific to the other clusters for instance, women accessing remuneration for their work in agriculture and redistribution of unpaid care work between men and women.

### **Dr. Mbithi**

She wanted to know how accessing remuneration for work in agriculture and redistribution of unpaid care work between men and women would be measured in an incubation programme.

## **Prof. Kabira**

She emphasized that the project would not deal with the agricultural sector unless it is an agri business. Land for example can only be dealt with as a resource to get access to funding for

businesses. She lay emphasis on the need to be clear on what is to be done around redistribution of unpaid care work between men and women.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

She pointed out that the model sought to shift the care responsibility from the woman to and make it a shared responsibility.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She wanted to know how that would be done and which activities in the model would lead to that shift in responsibility.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

Giving an example of the situation in Canada, she said that instead of the woman paying for the child to be taken to a childcare centre, it becomes a shared responsibility so that the man also contributes in the payment of child care. Childcare becomes a household responsibility so that the business is not affected.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She sought to know what the incubation programme would do so that men would start paying for childcare.

**Mrs. Mureithi**

Commenting on that she said that the men could be made to understand that care work is work and needed to be costed and remunerated. On childcare she said that for young women, Techno Serve provided affordable childcare within the training facilities. So the team would decide what would work for the incubation and what may not work.

**Prof. Kabira**

Building on Mrs. Muriithi's argument and Dr. Mbithi's question, she said that the daycare centre may be available when the women are in the incubation centre but once they go home to continue with their businesses they won't have a daycare Centre. She noted that there is a daycare centre both in Namanga and Busia where this could be tested because the vision was to see whether having a daycare centre would impact on gender norms.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

In her view, this would therefore improve the business.

**Prof. Kabira**

She suggested putting it there and in brackets put 'selected cases' since it was not possible to start daycare centres in all the 18 counties. Busia and Namanga could be put in brackets. She also proposed that unpaid care work could be included as part of the curriculum for the training. Moreover, the women in the daycare facilities could be given an opportunity to share their experiences and women with children would be asked to bring them to the childcare facility. Men could also be invited as an aspect of the curriculum.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

She thought that made sense and involving men would make them understand the impact of unpaid care work. She highlighted the need to understand whether women were benefiting from farm produce brought by their husbands for the women to sell in their shops giving an example of a family owned business in Mombasa where the man would bring goods from the farm to be sold at the shop by the woman.

**Prof. Kabira**

Responding to Dr. Kitiabi, she said that they would need to understand which ones are women's, or family businesses when doing the survey. This she said would be part of the selection process.

Those details would be worked on later. She underscored the need to concentrate on how women's businesses would fare once they were incubated.

### **Dr. Kitiabi**

She observed that the model required one to do the redistribution. The businesses would be looked at to see where they fit to the program.

### **Prof. Kabira**

She was of the opinion that all the details would be dealt with in the survey e.g autonomy in decision making, business ownership etc.

## **The selection criteria and sampling**

Dr. Kitiabi gave a summary of the background of the selection criteria.

She listed the indicators for growth as:

- increased work force size
- Diversification/new business
- Increased networks,
- Increased annual turn over
- Increased capital investment and asset base

It was suggested that the ILO indicators and those from the document on Kinangop which is with Ruth or Waswa were to be added to make them comprehensive because the indicators were not complete.

### **Selection criteria**

Dr. Kitiabi took the participants through the selection criteria, the target group, which were women in formal and informal businesses and successful women groups which could be gotten from the affirmative action fund groups these could be shared by the leader for cluster one.

**The sample size** was 360/456 but in the last meeting it was 360/240. From the 15 counties the final would be 240 given there would be attrition.

- 70% will be micro enterprises
- 20% will be small enterprises
- 10% medium enterprises

The project aimed to grow the MSMEs by 20% 10% and 2% for micro, small and medium enterprises.

### **The sampling technique**

This was to be a multi stage stratified sampling where stratified random and purposive sampling would be used.

**The study** is a longitudinal study

The business has to be visible should be a temporary or permanent structure.

The participating businesses are those that are 2.5 years old in order to monitor the growth of the business.

### **Counties**

The counties were 18 were chosen Based on ranking on the following indicators:

- ✓ Overall poverty estimates,
- ✓ Dependency ratio,

- ✓ Labour force participation and
- ✓ Gross County product.

The counties the hub does not have a project were as follows: Turkana, Samburu Lamu Bomet, Machakos and Meru

It was important to justify why the counties that the hub had no projects had to be chosen.

Within the cluster with Wajir were West Pokot, Samburu and Marsabit, Samburu was picked because Technoserve had a project there.

From strata 1 Turkana was picked because Techno Serve had good working groups and good working relationship with the county government.

Vihiga was replaced with Uasin Gishu because Techno Serve had work going on there.

Kisii was replaced with Lamu because Technoserve had a big project there.

Bomet in place of Siaya because Techno serve had good relationships there.

Kilifi was picked because Techno serve had ongoing work there.

Machakos was picked because they have very women groups known for their creativity.

Meru was picked because the good uptake of CGS and high level performance of women groups

Kisumu because Techno serve has ongoing work there.

Nyeri was added because of the high level of AAF utilization

Turkana, Samburu Lamu, Bomet Machakos, Meru Lamu Nyeri are not in the WEE Hub list

There was need to retain the national outlook from the choice of the clusters. Some of the counties were retained because that is where the partners have the greatest investments The selection was not solely dependent on Techno serve because there were other partners. For example Techno serve is not in Busia and Kajiado the partner is CCGD. And we also have entrepreneurs from the UON incubation centre headed by Prof. Kinoti. The would be monitored to see how the businesses are growing.

### **Possible Partnerships**

The main partner in terms of implementation is Techno Serve with other partners. The partnership would be built on as the project is conceptualized. The team would have financial and trade partners. State corporations that fund women and state departments. Government, and private sector funding and donor funding and AAF including CGS.

### **Schedule for the Survey**

It was agreed that the above survey would form the baseline then after 5 months the indicators would be observed for 2.5 years. Monitoring will be done to measure the growth of the businesses in all dimensions The indicators would then be beefed up.

### **Dr. Mbithi**

She was of the view that the mentorship could involve women who had benefited from the affirmative action programs like AGPO, CGS, UWEZO fund etc

### **Prof. Kabira**

She noted that when the justification of the study was being discussed, it was evident that there was no women specific incubator, she wondered why a women only incubation centre could not be established.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

She said that that was the reason they were getting involved; to develop a women focused incubation center.

**Prof Kabira**

She observed that this incubation centre takes in to consideration the issue of change of gender norms which is different from running an incubation centre where men are the beneficiaries. She said that the hub was trying to test whether a women's only incubation centre would work. She proposed that the Busia project could be used to try and see if an incubation centre with childcare centre will work.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

She said that it is only in Kenya where there was no women specific incubation centre but they were in South Africa, Egypt and Mauritius.

**Prof. Kabira**

She wanted to know how the women only incubation centres in South Africa, Egypt and Mauritius were different from the others

**Dr. Kitiabi**

She responded that they were focused on women

**Prof. Kabira**

She inquired on the differences in the curriculum offered.

**Dr.Kitabi**

She said that the curriculum might not be different but it just modeled to fit the women in business. But she said that that they had to find out

**Prof. Kabira**

She indicated that the spirit of the program was finding what works for WEE, getting information on what works for women's businesses and replicating what has been found to work. E.g if women incubation centres are found in Egypt and South Africa, there was need to study them as well to see if they could work in Kenya.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She added that that was why initially they thought of BIAWE which was a starting point of something happening. It could be tested, implemented and monitored to find out how it works. So that if it works the government could be told implement it. She said that the beginning point is what works e.g in South Africa we could study the parameters the activities and say we are going to implement the same in Kenya to test if it works in Kenya. Then if it works we have the information that it improved women's live from this point to the other.

**Prof. Kabira**

She felt that the team needed to look at the examples from South Africa and Egypt as they thought about the survey. Two research assistants could be asked to look at the two projects.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

She felt that the literature review done had already covered women incubation centres. And that was then the reason they were focusing their project on women that's where a gap exists.

**Dr Mbithi**

She said the projects which were working would be implemented but the model that is adopted would be piloted in Kenya and then after 2.5 years it would be up scaled.

**Prof. Kabira**

She said that the model being adopted was the SIDA model.

**Dr. Mbithi**

Sought to know if that was the SIDA model used in SA and Egypt.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

She said that they were to find out but the most important aspect of an incubation in her opinion, were the activities offered. The activities would tell the model they are using. The review of literature had not covered South Africa. She was in agreement with Prof. Kabira on looking at one or two other areas to see what they were doing.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She opined that that could be piloted in Kenya with the 360 women.

**Prof. Kabira**

She said that the assistant researchers could be asked to give that information in one week but the survey instruments could be developed once the concept is agreed on.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

She was of the opinion that the team can agree on the timeline of the survey then proceed to have a meeting with Techno Serve so as to enable the process to move forward. She felt that everything including the selection criteria had already been done.

**Prof. Kabira**

In her opinion, the team was not yet ready to start on the survey and there was need to agree on the objectives of the survey because the hub is the leader in the project and the hub was implementing it with Techno Serve who would look at the tools the team would have developed. She noted that the hub had agreed with Technoserve on the businesses to work with and they would develop a joint curriculum with them, their role was clear. She lay emphasis on the need to agree on the survey before meeting with Techno Serve.

**Dr. Kitiabi**

She was of the view that the team already knew what the survey was all about since they had been discussing it.

**Mrs. Muriithi**

She said that that the progress made was good and the team needed to move on noting that the model had been agreed on, the indicators and progress being made was good.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She was of the opinion that the discussion was progressing well from the presentation by Dr. Kitiabi, the models that exist had been described and one may find that in South Africa and Egypt these models are used or a hybrid of any of this and the team was not far from it. She indicated that for all the hub's projects there is a beginning point which is a policy that is going on, a best practice, something working which is tested and up scaled or something that is working then it is piloted and up scaled. She said that she liked the way had contextualized the project because that brought in the logical thinking of the project or the theory of change. The beginning point is a policy which is then evaluated and up scaled for implementation backed by data, statistics and information that has been collected. She noted that all that had been done was useful but it was important to see what the beginning point would be. The models shared were most likely being used in the countries mentioned or some elements in them. She was of the view that a hybrid of



that could be taken and tested or piloted in our country. According to her, piloting is done then after 2 and a half years it will be upscaling based on the available information and the measurement that had been obtained in the 2.5 years. She also highlighted the need to develop the indicators which needed to be captured in the survey. The survey she noted, was about capturing the key indicators to form the baseline. The businesses being incubated could be observed that at the beginning women were at a certain level on a certain indicator but after training them mentoring them and connecting them with the other women and after treating them to this kind of a system, this is where they are 2.5 years later. She thought that the indicators were not completely defined.

**Prof Kabira**

Concurring with Dr. Mbithi, she said she had put Kinangop because of the indicators that were shared by Ruth's team. They were measuring the intrinsic power of women, issues of autonomy, decision making and those in the investment document some of which were borrowed from ILO etc.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She questioned the preparedness of the team to go to the field to carry out the survey. She drew the attention of the team on the discussion around the size of the respondents but she felt the team was a little far from the survey because they did not have the instruments and the indicators had not yet been refined and that needed to be done. These, she said would form the baseline indicators which would be monitored throughout and then the instrument, the questionnaire and then run with that. She said that the indicators and the instruments were not complete.

**Prof. Kabira**

She wondered whether it would be possible to brainstorm on the issues being discussed if a meeting was organized with Techno Serve. She noted that that they had discussed where the team was going, the entrepreneurs the process to be used to get them, how many they are, where they are working and so on. But the intellectual part of the research was supposed to be done by the hub. The only thing the team could do was to write to them confirming the countries agreed on, the indicators to enable them put together the information on how to mobilize the people in the counties for the survey.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She observed that since the team had a lead researcher already, Techno serve could be invited to help mobilize people in the counties since they already work there.

**Prof. Kabira**

She noted that the team could prepare a draft survey instrument which could be discussed with Technoserve. She said the team could communicate with Techno Serve on where the hub was going to work so that they could begin mobilizing the entrepreneurs for the survey. Since the survey will be done with about a thousand people she wondered if KNBS would be involved.

**Dr. Mbithi**

In her response, she said that the whole research team needed to be involved, Dr. Kitiabi, Dr. Wakibi and Prof. Kinoti and Mrs. Muriithi. However she felt that since there were 18 counties and 1000 people to be in the survey.

**Prof. Kabira**

She observed that the numbers would not be the same because it would depend on the population and the number of entrepreneurs.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She said that on a rough estimate is about 55 people in each county but that was an average. That means in one county we may have 10 and in another one we may have 95. She therefore said it may not be necessary to use the KNBS.

**Prof. Kabira**

She requested Dr. Mbithi or Mrs. Mureithi to ask Dr. Wakibi and Mrs. Murethi to give us selection criteria in each county how many people. She observed that they were adding indicators on the section on selection of counties. Dr. Wakibi needed to be informed that the 18 counties had been confirmed and could be requested to give a selection criteria.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She felt that as the people that are involved in the study, Dr. Wakibi needed to be guided on the characteristics of the kind of entrepreneurs the team wanted. e.g. the number, 2.5 year-old businesses etc. She said that due to a random selection used in a previous survey, women's businesses ended up being left out.

**Prof. Kabira**

She was of the view that Techno Serve could be asked to provide information on the entrepreneurs they were dealing with in each county.

**Dr. Mbithi**

Said that would be a small number because Techno Serve would only tell the businesses they were working with but if the team could take a sample from that it could be much easier.

**Prof. Kabira**

She said that they could be interviewed.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She indicated that the selection criteria would then be straightforward because it would be the businesses Techno Serve are working with, if they are more than 100, then 55 could be randomly selected.

**Prof. Kabira**

She said that Prof. Kinoti would give the number of women entrepreneurs that they had incubated Which may not be more than 100

**Prof. Kinoti**

She said that they were dealing with about 100 women and they could consolidate and provide the data and the counties they are from if the businesses they are in are women led.

**Prof. Kabira**

She said that Techno serve may not have women businesses in all the counties. They could therefore be asked to give the list of women entrepreneurs they have trained in 18 counties and the list that Prof. Kinoti has. The entrepreneurs the hub's teams have been working with from different parts of the country.e.g those from the AAF,were among the 1000 to be interviewed.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She said that that could be purposive sampling because the choice would be based on our own criteria; those women incubated by the school of business, those the hub has worked with and those Techno serve are working with.

**Prof. Kabira**

She said that the majority of those that will be interviewed are from Technoserve, those trained by the school of business and beneficiaries of AAF funds. This is where the 360 businesses to incubate will be selected. Further, women in the non-traditional businesses like manufacturing, engineering, road construction industry those who could be sourced from KEPSA could be involved.

**Dr.Mbithi**

She said that she knew of a lady doing manufacturing at KAM.

**Prof. Kabira**

Proposed involving women who have benefited from CGS.

**Prof. Kinoti.**

She wanted to confirm the areas of non-traditional businesses they would get the women to interview from.

**Prof. Kabira**

She mentioned engineering and road construction industry the good thing if the team could have people who can access AGPO.

**Mrs. Mureithi**

She said she could remember Jerusha in the road construction industry

**Pro. Kabira**

She said Prof Kinoti and Mureithi could deal with the selection process and sharing the information with techno serve and Dr. Kitiabi was to be asked complete the model.

**Mrs. Mureithi**

She was of the opinion that Prof. Kinoti and Dr. Mbithi could work on the selection process because Prof. Kinoti has data on the incubatees from the UON school of business.

**Prof. Kabira**

She said that Dr Mbithi was playing a guiding role and since an agreement had been reached on the criteria, Techno Serve would be requested to provide the number of entrepreneurs to be interviewed in the 18 counties. If there are only 2 in Samburu then there would be no need to go there or one person could be sent to go to Samburu to interview them or they could be invited to come. If there were 50 in Nairobi, they could be told there are 50 on CGS and they could be asked to give the other fifty if 100 were to be interviewed. She added that Techno Serve might not have anybody in Bomet but the researchers might have some people there. Njeri Karuru could be asked to provide the entrepreneurs who could be followed up for incubation to come up with the 1000. They would not be told they are being incubated since it would depend on the survey.

**Dr. Mbithi**

She said that once the people were identified then there was need to ask if the data needed would be quantitative or qualitative. There may be need to identify a few of them for narratology or key informant interviews in Samburu because from the women's experiences mentors could be identified.

**Prof. Kabira**

She expressed satisfaction at the prospect of identifying partners.

## **Way forward**

1. Dr. Kitiabi was given 2.5 days to refine the paper on the selected incubation model and ensure the indicators are comprehensive so that they capture all the aspects of WEE especially those relating to entrepreneurship, incorporating literature review on women incubation projects from South Africa Mauritius, Egypt and BIAWE and include indicators from the document on the Kinangop project which is with Ruth or Waswa the tools will be developed thereafter.
2. Two researchers were identified to carry out a literature review on best practices from women incubation projects. Brenda Akoth was given 6 days to look at incubation projects in South Africa, Egypt and Mauritius and 3 days for Brenda Kemei to look at the BIAWE project. Both would share the information in the next meeting.
3. Prof. Kinoti, Mrs. Murithii and Dr. Kitiabi were given 1 day each to have a meeting with Techno serve to share what had been done and agree on the 1000 women entrepreneurs for the survey. Since Techno Serve will be the main incubating partner, they would be requested to give the list of women entrepreneurs they are working with from the 18 counties. Prof. Kinoti was requested to provide the women entrepreneurs incubated by UON school of business while Njeri Karuru The lead researcher for cluster one project two, Affirmative Action Funds and Dr. Meroka for project three, Credit Guarantee Scheme, would be requested to provide the entrepreneurs who can be followed up for incubation. Rebecca will coordinate the mobilization of women entrepreneurs from the organization she is working with.
4. Prof. Kinoti and Mrs. Murithii were each given 2 days to prepare a draft paper giving an overview of the policy and regulatory framework related to entrepreneurship and develop the selection criteria.
5. Prof. Kinoti and Mrs. Murithii suggested that they would consult Dr. Mbithi to identify the selection criteria for a broader eye view before the meeting with Techno Serve.
6. After the next meeting, the tools can be prepared for the survey. A decision will be made on whether to work with KNBS or the Hub's researchers to develop the tools.
7. The survey is scheduled for the second week of January and the report is expected by end of February
8. The next meeting will be held on 15th December 2021.

## **Annex 1**

### **Participants**

1. Prof..Kabira
2. Prof. Kinoti
3. Dr.Mbithi

4. Mrs Rose Murithii
5. Rebecca Kuthera
6. Brenda Kemei