FERTILIZER CONSUMPTION AND FERTILIZER USE BY CROP (FUBC) IN KENYA

Study Conducted For Africafertilizer.Org

By Edwin Oseko and Tom Dienya

September, 2015

Contents

List of Tables	iv
List of Figures	iv
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	v
CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION	1
1.1 Introduction	1
1.2 Objectives of the Study	2
1.3 Study Methodology	3
1.3.1 Approach and conceptual framework	3
1.3.2 Development of Study Tools	4
1.3.3 Indicators selection	4
1.3.4 Areas covered under the Study	5
1.3.5 Data Collection Methods	6
1.3.6 Data Management and Analysis	6
1.3.7 Limitation of study	7
CHAPTER TWO: FERTILIZER MARKET IN KENYA	8
2.1 The Fertilizer Market	8
2.2 Fertilizer Trade in Kenya	8
2.2.1. Major Fertilizer importers	8
2.2.2. Fertilizer production	9
2.2.3. Major Distributors	9
2.2.4. Wholesale and Retailers	
2.2.5 Other important stakeholders in the fertilizer industry	10
2.3. Fertilizer Prices	11
CHAPTER THREE: SWOT ANALYSIS OF METHODOLOGIES USED IN KENYA TO C UTILIZATION DATA	OLLECT FERTILIZER
3.1 The main data sources	13
3.2 Methodologies and tools used for data collection	15
CHAPTER FOUR: STUDY RESULTS AND MAIN FINDINGS	

	4.1 Crop Production in Kenya	19
	4.2 Types of Fertilizers Used in Kenya	20
	4.3 Fertilizer apparent Consumption	20
	4.4 Fertilizer application Rates	22
	4.5 Fertilizer Use By Crop (FUBC)	25
	4.5.1: Fertilizer Use By Crop by type of fertilizers for all crops in 2013	1
	4.5.2: Fertilizer Use By Crop by type of fertilizers for all crops in 2012	3
	4.5.3: Fertilizer Use By Crop by type of fertilizers for all crops in 2011	5
	4.6 Fertilizer application rates for all crops	7
	4.7 Fertilizer application rates for AFFA crops	9
	4.8 Fertilizer Use By Nutrients FUBC	9
C	HAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS	12
	5.1. Dealing with missing data/ data gaps	12
	5.2 Proposed changes to support data collection and management	12
	5.3 Cost-effective ways if collecting real consumption and FUBC data	13
	5.4. Concluding Remarks	13

List of Tables

Table 1: Items considered for development of Conceptual Framework	3
Table 2: Main fertilizer importing companies in Kenya in year 2013	8
Table 3: Quantities of Fertilizer Procured by Government of Kenya	9
Table 4: National Area, Crop Production and Yield for 2011- 2013	
Table 5: Top ten most utilized fertilizers in Kenya	20
Table 6: Apparent Consumption of Fertilizer in Metric tons	21
Table 7: Tegemeo Panel Study Fertilizer application rates	22
Table 8: Kenya Recommended Fertilizer Application Rates	22
Table 9: Factors influencing fertilizer use by crop	
Table 10: Total quantity of fertilizer used by Crop in 2011-2013	
Table 11: Fertilizer use by crop per nutrient	10

List of Figures

Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for developing the Fertilizer Consumption study for Kenya	4
Figure 2: Fertilizer value chain for Kenya	10
Figure 3: Fertilizer retail price trends in 2011	11
Figure 4: Fertilizer retail price trends in 2012	12
Figure 5: Fertilizer retail price trends in 2013	12

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AFO	African Fertilizer Organization
ASAL	Arid and Semi-arid Land
ARM	Athi River Mining Company
BAT	British American Tobacco
CRF	Coffee Research Foundation
DAP	Di-ammonium Phosphate
EAC	East Africa Community
EAGC	Eastern Africa Grain Council
IFDC	International Fertilizer Development Centre
IDF	Import Declaration Fees
CAN	Calcium Ammonium Nitrate
CIF	Cost, Insurance and Freight
FTWG	Fertilizer Technical Working Group
FUBC	Fertilizer Use By Crop
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
KALRO	Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization
KEBS	Kenya Bureau of Standards
KEPHIS	Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services
KIPPRA	Kenya Institute of Public Policy and Research Analysis
KTDA	Kenya Tea Development Agency
MALF	Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries
MDG	Millennium Development Goal
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MIS	Market Information Systems
MT	Metric Ton
NAAIAP	National Accelerated Agricultural Input Access Programme
NCPB	National Cereals and Produce Board
NPK	Nitrogen Phosphate Potassium
SSP	Single Supper Phosphate
TSP	Triple Super Phosphate
VAT	Value Added Tax
ToR	Terms of Reference

CHAPTER ONE: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1.1 Introduction

The Kenyan economy is largely agriculture based with the sector accounting for 26% of the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and 65% of the export earnings. The sector indirectly contributes 25% of the country's GDP through agro-processing, marketing, and other related services. Agriculture provides approximately 70% of informal and 18% formal employment. The agricultural sector is not only important for economic development in the country but is also expected to deliver other regional and global commitments. One such commitment is the achievement of the first Millennium Development Goal (MDG1) on poverty and hunger. Indeed, Kenya Vision 2030 has identified the agricultural sector as one of the key sectors to deliver the 10% annual growth rate envisaged under the economic pillar (GoK, 2008, Kenya Vision 2030). To achieve this growth, transforming smallholder agriculture from subsistence to an innovative commercially oriented and modern agriculture is critical.

Fertilizer policy in Kenya

In an effort to boost food security status, Kenya targets to increase fertilizer consumption to 50kg/ha from the current 31kg/ha by the year 2015. This is envisaged to increase production and crop productivity to ensure food security and income at farm level for the small scale farmers (who make over 80% of the farming community in the country). The increased use of fertilizers is a key factor and this is in line with the Abuja Declaration of 2006 which acknowledges that; *"Fertilizer is crucial for achieving an African Green Revolution in the face of a rapidly rising population and declining soil fertility"*.

Kenya has developed a draft fertilizer policy which is at advanced stage of conclusion. The draft policy sets guidelines for institutionalization of soil fertility management in agriculture and related sectors to arrest the declining trend in soil fertility and ensure increased land productivity. The specific objectives of the policy include promotion of efficient and sustainable use of natural resources (soil and water), provision of framework for developing and applying appropriate soil fertility management techniques, and facilitation of prioritization of soil fertility improvement in national programs.

The Draft policy proposes a fertilizer regulatory directorate to be based at the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries headquarters. Moreover, institutions such as Kenya Agricultural Research Organization (KALRO), Kenya Plants Health Inspectorate Services (KEPHIS), and Government Chemist, commissioner of Mines, Ministry of Trade and Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS) will be closely involved in fertilizer matters.

Kenya is also involved in the drafting of the East African Community (EAC) Fertilizer Policy which will eventually lead to the EAC Fertilizer Act and Regulations. The team working on drafting of the EAC Fertilizer Policy has come up with priority areas which need regional harmonization and is now working on the draft fertilizer policy. The proposed areas of policy harmonization address the inefficiencies in fertilizer access, price setting, marketing and regulations. The main themes are:

- a) Taxation: Ensuring that agricultural inputs are tax free, harmonizing other taxes such as Withholding Tax (WHT) and Value Added Tax (VAT) in all the Partner States.
- **b)** Targeted subsidies to support to Resource Poor Farmers: EAC Partner States have agreed to put in place the following mechanisms to address the challenges associated with subsidies:
- c) Each Partner State to design a harmonized food insecure household inputs support facility;
- d) Each State to develop a harmonized tool for identifying food insecure households to benefit from the scheme.
- e) To ensure accessibility to the inputs, the support system must be farmer centered
- **f)** Privatization / Liberalization: All Partner States to embrace full liberalization to support private sector participation.
- g) Importation and infrastructure: To minimize fertilizer prices, there is need for policies in the EAC to facilitate the importation and storage of large quantities of fertilizers. There should also be appropriate financing mechanisms available for the establishment of fertilizer storage facilities especially in member states where these are lacking. These facilities have the advantage of reducing retail prices for the smallholder farmers.
- **h)** Policies to improve and increase fertilizer use: In particular, smallholder farmers should have credit access to purchase agricultural inputs and crop insurance to protect their investments in the event of crop failure.
- i) Registration of fertilizers, importers and distributers: In order to reduce trade and access related barriers, procedures for registration of fertilizers, importers and distributers need to be harmonized. This would make it possible for a fertilizer entity that has been registered in one partner State to be exempted from the same registration procedures in the rest of the Partner States.
- **j)** Institutional structure, mandate and roles: Need for Partner State to establish Fertilizer Management Authority to facilitate coordination, regulations, fair play and fertilizer quality controls.
- **k)** Acts/Laws: Need to harmonize all legal instruments related to fertilizer marketing, distribution, storage, pricing, etc.
- Fertilizer standards: Fertilizer grades, mark labelling, fertilizer classification, packaging, fertilizer contents (Formulation) i.e., ratios, fertilizer quality including moisture content, heavy metal; handling and storage.
- **m)** Procedures: Fertilize sampling and testing, importation and exportation, manufacture, registration of new fertilizers.

1.2 Objectives of the Study

- To provide best estimates of the real fertilizer consumption and Fertilizer Use By Crop (FUBC) statistics for Kenya.
- To assist in designing a cost-effective framework for estimating consumption and FUBC.

1.3 Study Methodology

1.3.1 Approach and conceptual framework

The methodological approach adopted was guided by the Terms of Reference (TORS) for the study that required estimation of actual fertilizer nutrients used by type and by crop type.

Table 1 summarizes the broad items that were used in developing the study concept, the reason for choice of the items as well as the key variables considered under each item. Figure 1 shows the conceptual framework used in the study.

Concept	Reasons	Key variables
development item		
Fertilizer Supply	Knowledge of quantities of available	Import, local manufacturing and
	fertilizer	blending
Apparent	Knowledge of broad trends of	Local distribution, exports
consumption	fertilizer utilization	
fertilizer		
Fertilizer use by	To determine spread of fertilizer	County estimated fertilizer use
regions (counties)	demand and application; to	data; regional/localized fertilizer
	generate average fertilizer	application rates
	application rates (based on local	
	practices)	
Fertilizer utilization	To establish actual fertilizer	Crop area planted; area applied
by crops	quantities by type used by specific	with fertilizer, average fertilizer
	crops	application rates by crop types
		and by region
Fertilizer nutrients	To establish fertilizer nutrients	Fertilizer types used by each crop
utilization	annual uptake by each crop	annually

Table 1: Items considered for development of Conceptual Framework



Figure 1: Conceptual Framework for developing the Fertilizer Consumption study for Kenya

1.3.2 Development of Study Tools

The main tools that were used in this study included the following

- a) Official introductory letters and official notes for request of data from public and private institutions as well as large scale, commercial farms.
- b) Data collection Checklist. These were simple forms with list of data items required. The forms were mainly prepared to be filled in by county field extension officers. Key informant checklist was developed to generate data from key informants.
- c) Data collection questionnaires. The questionnaires were developed both for administration and filling in by enumerators as well as for institutions' and individuals' own filling to provide information.

1.3.3 Indicators selection

Fertilizer Imports and Production indicators

Data under this category looked at quantities of fertilizers by type annually imported, manufactured or blended in Kenya by the major players in the fertilizer industry.

Distribution level indicators

The indicators included fertilizer quantities by type distributed to farmers by state corporations that support farmers (e.g. Kenya Tea Development Agency (KTDA), private companies dealing with contract farming involving fertilizer supplies (e.g. BAT), and fertilizer given to farmers through government subsidy programme and other projects.

Regional and Farm level fertilizer use indicators.

The regional indicators looked at the quantities of fertilizer by type used for planting of top five most important crops in the Counties known for crop production as well as average (typical) localized fertilizer application rates for various crops. The farm level indicators looked at crops types that use most of the fertilizers according to average local application rates. This targeted data provided by local extension staff, farmer groups/associations and data from state corporations.

1.3.4 Areas covered under the Study

The data was obtained from farmers in the major crop production agro-ecological zones. To get the data, the Counties were categorized into Arid and Semi Arid Lands (ASAL) as well at the high and medium rainfall areas (see figure 2). In Kenya, there are 7 Counties that are 10% arid; namely Turkana, Moyale, Marsabit, Isiolo, Wajir, Mandera, and Garissa. No substantial fertilizer-dependent crop production takes place in these Counties and thus were not included in the study. In terms of area size, the 100% arid Counties occupies 56% of the total land mass. The next category is the Counties with 85-100% aridity. These Counties, which constitute 21% of total land



mass, include Kitui, Makueni, Tana River, Taita Taveta, Kajiado, and Samburu. In these Counties, fertilizer-dependent crop production is mainly carried out in the irrigation schemes, which are mostly managed by the National Irrigation Board as well as government State Corporations. In this category of Counties, data was mainly obtained from the major irrigation schemes. Within ASAL, the last category is those that are 50-85% arid, representing 8% of the total land mass. In these Counties, some portions or Sub-counties (Districts) may be arid while other portions are not arid. The Counties in this category include Machakos, Mwingi, Tharaka Nithi, Laikipia, West Pokot, Baringo, Kwale and Kilifi. In these Counties, the survey process involved delineating and separating the arid portions at administrative level. These arid portions or Sub-counties were left out of the study due to lack of substantial fertilizer-depended crops. Data for the study in these counties were therefore collected only in the Sub-counties with medium to high rainfall. For the remaining

Counties that are classified as medium to high rainfall areas, data was collected through survey reports. The Counties include Kisumu, Siaya, Homa Bay, Kisii, Nyamira, Migori, Busia, Kakamega, Bungoma, Uasin Gishu, Trans-Nzoia, Bomet, Nandi, Narok, Kericho, Nakuru, Elgeyo Marakwet, Nyandarua, Kiambu, Murang'a, Kirinyaga, Nyeri, Meru, Embu, Mombasa and Lamu.

1.3.5 Data Collection Methods

The following are the data/information sources and collection methods used in the study:

Review of documentary evidence- This considered research publications on agro-ecological zones; crops grown in various zones; soil and weather patterns of the zones; and recommended fertilizers and application rates for each zone and by crop variety based on national field extension guide bookⁱ.

Collection of secondary data- These data were obtained from existing crop production as well as fertilizer supplies and distribution reports available at the headquarter office of the State Department of Agriculture, County Agricultural Offices, private farms, farmers associations, among others. Other secondary data were obtained from fertilizer study reports from multilateral organizations (FAO statistics), and research institutes like Tegemeo (2009, 2006ⁱⁱ)ⁱⁱⁱ and KALRO (2006) ^{iv}as well as data from regulatory bodies such as KRA and KEPHIS^v. Substantial data was obtained from reports of State Corporations (details in appendix 1) as well as private companies that deal with crops production in Kenya.

Collection of primary data- This involved receiving data from different fertilizer stakeholders.

Farm level crop production data: For farmers operating privately, data covered top 5 crops grown in each County that use fertilizer, planted crop area in 2011, 2012 and 2013; average estimated Ha planted by small and large scale farmers; types of fertilizers used as basal as well top dressing material; average fertilizer application rates in Kg per Ha, and average quantities of fertilizer type applied per Ha per crop based on long-term application rates provided by local field extension officers. Appendix 2 shows example of Meru County and the excel sheet used to estimate the fertilizer consumption by crop.

Agro-dealer survey: a structured questionnaire was administered by enumerators through mailing as well as face to face interview.

Key informant interviews: in the fertilizer industry: semi-structured questionnaire was used to obtain data either through email or telephone interviews. The questionnaires were also posted to some of the key informants.

1.3.6 Data Management and Analysis

Primary data collected from households and agro-dealers were entered, cleaned, analyzed and stored using excels spreadsheet. Descriptive methods of analysis were used showing the frequencies, proportions, means and where necessary the mode and the spread. Statistics were generated for each fertilizer type used for each crop by County and conversion of fertilizer types into fertilizer nutrients used by each type for each type of key crop per county.

1.3.7 Limitation of study

Despite the great success in implementing this, a few limitations/obstacles were observed and should be reported to allow the results of this study to be interpreted within these confines. The main limitations of this study stem from the low response rate from the industry. There were many cases of unwillingness to participate, non-response or delayed response to requests for information by players in fertilizer and output markets. Due to lack of actual field surveys (data captured past years), it was not easy to establish actual sampling sizes, thus the study had to rely on proxy sample sizes reported by those who collected data. Due to time and financial constraints, the study team could not interview sufficient numbers of key informants. Following devolution process, challenges in getting corporation and support was not amongst some County officials leading to many cases of incomplete or missing information.

CHAPTER TWO: FERTILIZER MARKET IN KENYA

2.1 The Fertilizer Market

Most of the fertilizer used in Kenya is imported from various countries in Europe, United States of America, South Africa and North African countries. Only 10,000 MT of Single Super Phosphate (SSP) are manufactured in the country by KEL Chemicals Company based in Thika town. In 2013, it was estimated that the apparent fertilizer consumption in the country was 665,373 MT comprising about 37 fertilizer types. Over 95 percent of these fertilizers was used for crop production, with about 5% used for fodder and pasture production.

2.2 Fertilizer Trade in Kenya

2.2.1. Major Fertilizer importers

There are about 64 importers of fertilizers to Kenya but the most active are 18. The 18 importers supply supply fertilizer to both the large scale and small scale farmers. Most of the imported fertilizer (70%) arrives arrives as bulk cargo (not bagged), the greatest challenge is therefore in adulteration and sale of underweight fertilizer which mainly occurs during bagging and re-bagging. Some 20 - 25% of fertilizer that fertilizer that leaves the port is re-bagged mainly at the retailer level due to the high demand of fertilizer fertilizer in smaller units.

Table 2 shows list of main fertilizer importing companies in 2013.

IMPORTER	QUANTITY (MT)	%SHARE
Yara East Africa	169,416.0	24.7
Mea Ltd	120,032.0	17.5
Export Trading Limited	92,393.0	13.5
Kenya Tea Development Agency(KTDA)	64,697.0	9.4
Turbo Highways	62,390.0	9.1
Louis Dreyfus Commodities Ltd	34,284.0	5.0
Ministry Of Agriculture	27,493.0	4.0
National Cereals and Produce Board(NCPB)	23,954.0	3.5
Devji Meghji Bros Ltd (DMBL)	23,355.0	3.4
Elgon Kenya Limited	17,644.0	2.6
Supplies And Services Limited	16,026.0	2.3
Afriventures	12,564.0	1.8
Amiran Kenya Limited	2,793.0	0.4
Athi River Mining(ARM)	2,542.0	0.4
Agroexim Agencies	2,375.0	0.3
British American Tobacco(BAT)Limited	1,275.0	0.2
Others	13,194.0	1.9
TOTAL	686,427.0	100.0

Table 2: Main fertilizer importing companies in Kenya in year 2013

Source: KRA

2.2.2. Fertilizer production

Local fertilizer blending in Kenya is done by MEA Limited and Athi River Mining (ARM) Company. These companies have a capacity to blend up to 100,000 and 30,000 Metric tons of fertilizer per year respectively. The blends from these companies are either soil or crop specific. For example blends from ARM, popularly known as Mavuno fertilizers, contain eleven elements including trace elements. The feedstock for fertilizer blending is imported while other materials are found locally. The imported materials include Diammonium Phosphate (DAP), Murate of Potash (MOP), Urea as well as trace elements such as Zinc, Manganese, Copper, Boron and Molybdenum. The locally available materials used in blending include Gypsum and limestone. In order to enhance quality of blended fertilizers, the Kenya Bureau of Standards (KEBS) has developed a code of conduct for fertilizer blenders that should be followed strictly by all blenders.

2.2.3. Major Distributors

There are three main types of fertilizer distribution channels serving the farming community in Kenya. The first is the commodity-based interlinked input-credit-output marketing systems typified by the Kenya Tea Development Agency (KTDA) fertilizer distribution model. In this system, farmers, especially smallholders, are given credit in form of physical farm inputs purchased in bulk by supporting agency that also distributes the fertilizer to supported farmers. The other fertilizer distribution system involves network of private, independent importers, wholesalers, and retailers operating on a demand and supply basis. Distributors in this system are estimated to be 8,000 agrodealers working with about 3,000 wholesalers and retailers. The third distribution category involves Government procurement of fertilizer, distribution and sale of fertilizer to targeted needy farmers at subsidized prices under the fertilizer price stabilization plan. Under this arrangement, governments distribute fertilizers to farmers through NCPB which has 180 NCPB depots countrywide. Table 3 details the quantities of fertilizer procured and supplied to farmers under the fertilizer subsidy programme while Figure 2 gives a summary of fertilizer imports and distribution channels in Kenya.

Financial Year	Quantity Procured	Treasury allocation for
	(MT)	Fertilizer Procurement
		(Kshs. M)
2009/2010	16,624	758
2010/2011	96,000	2,995
2011/2012	94,155	3,320
2012/2013	66,276	3,150
2013/2014	171,750	3,900
Total	444,805	14,123

Table 5. Qualitities of refulizer Frocured by Government of Keny	Table 3	: Quantities o	f Fertilizer	Procured b	y Government	t of Kenya
------------------------------------------------------------------	---------	----------------	--------------	------------	--------------	------------

Source: State Department of Agriculture; Agribusiness Directorate



Figure 2: Fertilizer value chain for Kenya

2.2.4. Wholesale and Retailers

There are about 800 agro-dealers (farm inputs stockists) in major cities, towns and market centers that sell fertilizer on wholesale and retail basis. The stockists keep up to 500 bags of various types of fertilizers, with large volumes stored mainly during the planting seasons. These type of traders play a very crucial role in the fertilizer value chain by ensuring that fertilizers are accessible to the farmers. Some stockists have been trained by various projects on fertilizer storage and management, as well as farmers' education on fertilizer use (Okello *et al*, 2010^{vi}).

2.2.5 Other important stakeholders in the fertilizer industry

To ensure fertilizer quality, fertilizer analysis is undertaken largely by government institutions and to a smaller extent, private laboratories. Those in the public category include:

- National Agricultural Research Laboratories (NARL) at Kabete, Nairobi
- Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services (KEPHIS) laboratory at Nairobi
- Mines and Geological Department laboratory
- Kenya Bureau of Standards Analytical Laboratory
- The Government Chemist

The private laboratories include:

- SGS LABS (K), Nairobi
- GMP/ACCL LABS, Nairobi

- INTERTEK, Nairobi
- Crop Nutrition Laboratory Services Ltd, Nairobi
- Polucon Services (K) Ltd, Laboratory Department, Mombasa
- MEA Ltd Nakuru

2.3. Fertilizer Prices

Fertilizer utilization is highly dependent on prevailing fertilizer prices. In Kenya, fertilizer prices witnessed period of general increasing prices between 2007 to 2011. According to Future agricultures (2008^{vii}), the price increases were influenced by several global factors including increased fertilizer demand due to higher food prices and increased use in biofuel production. Moreover, supply was affected by increasing energy costs (which are particularly important in producing nitrogenous fertilizers), the introduction of export tariffs on some fertilizers (for example by China in April 2008), and capacity limits in expanding production to meet rising demand – particularly for phosphate rock.



Figures 3, 4 and 5 show the fertilizer retail cost trend in Kenya in 2011, 2012 and 2013, respectively.

Figure 3: Fertilizer retail price trends in 2011



Figure 4: Fertilizer retail price trends in 2012



Figure 5: Fertilizer retail price trends in 2013

CHAPTER THREE: SWOT ANALYSIS OF METHODOLOGIES USED IN KENYA TO COLLECT FERTILIZER UTILIZATION DATA

3.1 The main data sources

Data type	Main data source	SWOT	
		elements	
1. Data on Imported	Kenya Revenue Authority	Strength	i) Have legal authority to access data;
and exported	(KRA), Kenya Bureau of		ii) Have good records of inputs inflows and
fertilizers	Statistics, Kenya Bureau of		outflows;
	Standards		iii) Easy means of getting data
		Weaknesses	i) KRA: mix up of various fertilizers with non-
			fertilizers
			ii) Importers evading taxes change inputs
			codes and names
			iii) Data not given frequently; delays lead to
			difficulties of sorting out mixed fertilizer
			codes
		Opportunities	i) Training of officials on identification of
			ii) Timely deta access to case certing of mixed
			fortilizars:
			iii) Attaching a trained agricultural statistician
			to work with institutions such as KBA to
			handle agricultural inputs statistics:
			iv) Use of relevant computer software to help
			in automating data analysis and validation
		Threats	i) Few staff availability to undertake extra
			duties of data management;
			ii) Lack of fertilizer quality control and
			imports/exports regulatory framework
2. Data on blended	Private companies	Strength	i) Data fairly accurate;
fertilizers	undertaking fertilizer		
	blending and sales	Weaknesses	i) Difficulties of getting data from some
			companies due to fear of competition
			ii) Some blends have complex nutrient
			mixtures hence difficult to classify;
		Opportunities	i) Almost all companies are in Nairobi, hence
			easy to access:
			ii) Liaison with association members to
			enhance data collection;
		Threats	i) Lack of legal framework controlling data
		meats	provision to government.
			ii) Low awareness by managers of some
			companies on the value of data provision to
			the government.

2 Data an fartilizar	i) State Corporations given	Strongth	i) Accessible and reliable data where the
S. Data on rentinzer	n State corporations given	Strength	and reliable data where the
distribution and			government or state corporation is directly
uptake by farmers	development of a specific		involved in provision of fertilizers to farmers;
	crop e.g. lea, coffee;		ii) Easy way of getting data through published
	government of Kenya, private		reports;
	traders, wholesalers and		iii) Ease of estimating fertilizer consumption
	retailers		by crops due to good farmer records, et tea
			and coffee
		Weaknesses	i) Many state corporations have poorly
			trained agricultural statistics officials;
			ii) Difficulties of accessing historical data due
			to poor data archiving practices
		Opportunities	i) Introduction of modern technology to
			enhance data collection and dissemination;
			ii) Mass training of officers on simple
			techniques of fertilizer data use estimation
			iii) Support by officials from Kenya Bureau of
			Statistics with relevant experiences;
		Threats	i) Recent merger of some state corporations
			leading to lack of clarity of data sources;
			ii) Government changes of fertilizer subsidy
			system to avoid direct purchase and supply
			may lead to limited access to data.
			-,
4. Data on actual	i) County Extension offices,	Strength	i) Large number of extension officers
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength	i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots;
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records:
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility:
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods v) Officers at HO office handling revenant
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods v) Officers at HQ office handling revenant statistics are few and very busy
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods v) Officers at HQ office handling revenant statistics are few and very busy ii) Eventioned crops and activitience officient
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses Opportunities	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods v) Officers at HQ office handling revenant statistics are few and very busy i) Experienced crops and agribusiness officers
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses Opportunities	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods v) Officers at HQ office handling revenant statistics are few and very busy i) Experienced crops and agribusiness officers deployed at County and Sub-county level
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses Opportunities	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods v) Officers at HQ office handling revenant statistics are few and very busy i) Experienced crops and agribusiness officers deployed at County and Sub-county level assisting with data validation
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses Opportunities	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods v) Officers at HQ office handling revenant statistics are few and very busy i) Experienced crops and agribusiness officers deployed at County and Sub-county level assisting with data validation ii) Introduction of modern technology to
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses Opportunities	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods v) Officers at HQ office handling revenant statistics are few and very busy i) Experienced crops and agribusiness officers deployed at County and Sub-county level assisting with data validation ii) Introduction of modern technology to enhance data collection and dissemination;
4. Data on actual fertilizer used by crop and by regions	i) County Extension offices, national government offices	Strength Weaknesses Opportunities	 i) Large number of extension officers responsible for data collection at grassroots; ii) Ease of getting some accurate data from farmers' or cooperatives' records; iii) Cheap way of data collection and management i) Field officers heavy work load ii) Inadequate funds to support elaborate field mobility; iii) Lack of skills on fertilizer use data collection methods iv) Lack of proper sampling and survey methods v) Officers at HQ office handling revenant statistics are few and very busy i) Experienced crops and agribusiness officers deployed at County and Sub-county level assisting with data validation ii) Introduction of modern technology to enhance data collection and dissemination; iii) Mass training of field officers on simple

			iv) Support by officials from Kenya Bureau of Statistics with relevant experiences;
		Inreats	i) Poor cooperation by field officers in the devolved Counties;
			ii) Aging field extension staff
			iii) Inadequate staff deployed to handle
			statistics at HQ office
5. Data on fertilizer	Research institutions such as	Strength	i) Data tends to be accurate
consumption rates,	KALRO, Agricultural		ii) Data sources fairly accessible
fertilizer use by soil	Universities such as Tegemeo	Weaknesses	i) Lack of consistency in data supply
types and other	Institute		ii) Difficulties of accessing soft data
secondary data		Opportunities	i) Enhanced stakeholders' collaboration
			ii)
		Threats	i) Inadequate stakeholders' collaboration
			ii) Few institutions dedicated to data
			collection and dissemination

3.2 Methodologies and tools used for data collection

Type of data	Brief description of	SWOT	
collection	Methodology and tools	elements	
	used		
1. Estimation of	i) Raw data on imported,	Strength	i) Easy method of calculating fertilizer
apparent fertilizer	manufactured, blended or		use;
consumption data	exported fertilizer is		ii) Ease of getting data from government
	obtained annually through		established institutions;
	regulatory bodies such as		iii) All key players captured, no sampling
	KRA or from published		required
	reports prepared by	Weaknesses	i) Need for detailed cleaning and
	agencies involved.		validation of the data from array of
	ii) Raw data is cleaned to		experienced stakeholders
	remove non-fertilizer		ii) Data does not include carryover
	data.		stocks;
	iii) Apparent consumption		iii) Statistics does not reveal fertilizer
	is calculated by deducting		used by crop type
	amount exported from	Opportunities	i) Identifying persons dealing with such
	amount imported or		data in the institutions involved and
	manufactured.		training them on how to record fertilizer
			data to minimize wrong entries;

		Threats	 ii) Improving definitions of fertilizers to help differentiate non-fertilizers; iii) Attaching a trained agricultural statistician to work with institutions such as KRA to handle agricultural inputs statistics; iv) Use of relevant computer software to help in automating data analysis and validation i) As economy grows and use of fertilizer increases, more cleaning and validation required;
			 ii) Challenges of getting experts who know all types of fertilizer to assist in data cleaning
2. Data on	i) Letter written to private	Strength	i) Tools easy to develop;
fertilizer imports	companies involved		ii) Accurate data where response is given
and exports	together with NCPB, KTDA, BAT, etc. ii) Questionnaires given to be filled in by the concerned agencies iii) Enumerators hired to take up the letters and questionnaires to the companies and get back results	Weaknesses Opportunities	 i) Not all companies giving ready data leading to need for several visits; ii) High cost of hiring data collectors; iii) Data collection can be affected by timing of event, eg in this case, data was being collected near December holidays when many firms where not in full operations i) Enhanced stakeholders collaboration; ii) Data can be obtained better if more
			time and prior notice is given; iii) Application of modern technology to enhance data collection and management iv) Explaining purpose of survey to enhance good understanding
		Threats	i) Lack of legal framework to support data provision;
3. Fertilizer use by	I) Letter written to county	Strength	I) Large number of extension officers
crop data	offices requesting for		responsible for data collection at
estimation	data; simple form given to		grassroots;
through public	be filled in by counties to		ii) Easiest way to get data from farmers'
	provide data.		records;

agricultural	ii) Field officers given time		iii) Cheap way of getting data
extension staff	to collect data and ask for	Weaknesses	i) Many field officers not understanding
	any clarification.		work details due to lack of training
	iii) Data from counties		ii) Low response rates due to lack of
	submitted to national		motivation;
	office through emails.		iii) Lack of good office records on farm
			inputs in general;
		Opportunities	i) Introduction of modern technology to
			enhance data collection and
			dissemination;
			iii) Training of field officers on simple
			techniques of fertilizer data use
			estimation
			iv) Support by officials from Kenya
			Bureau of Statistics with relevant
			experiences:
		Threats	i) Cooperation by field officers in the
			devolved Counties:
			ii) Officers demanding for large amounts
			of money due to difficulties of accessing
			data
			iii) Risks of naving field officers but no
			work done
4. Fertilizer use by	i) Letter written to	Strength	i) Private companies have accurate data:
crop data	Managers of private	ouengen	ii) There are relatively few companies:
estimation	companies or state		are concentrated in Nairobi hence easy
through private	corporation requesting for		access:
institutions and	data; simple form given to		iii) Cheap way of getting data
state corporations	be filled in by farm	Weaknesses	i) Some private companies not willing to
giving fertilizers to	managers to provide data.		cooperate
farmers	ii) Farm/operations		ii) Low response rates leads to more time
	managers given time to		needed for follow up hence;
	collect data and ask for		iii) Data collection approach should
	any clarification.		consider timing, ie not close to Charismas
	iii) Data submitted to		Holidays when most office managers are
	national office through		out in holiday
	hired enumerators or		
	emails	Opportunities	i) Awareness creation on importance of
			sharing data with government;
			ii) Data can be obtained if request is
			made in time;

	Threats	i) Lack of legal framework to enforce
		provision of data by private sector;
		ii) Limited budget to support elaborate
		survey

CHAPTER FOUR: STUDY RESULTS AND MAIN FINDINGS

4.1 Crop Production in Kenya

Kenya produces a wide range of crops that use various types of fertilizers. The main food crops are categorized into cereals and pulse crops (maize, wheat, rice, sorghum, millet; beans, chick pea, beans, cow pea and green gram), roots and tuber crops (potatoes, cassava, yams, sweet potato) and oil crops (ground nuts, sunflower, sesame). The main cash crops include tea, coffee, sugarcane, tobacco, pyrethrum, and sisal. Kenya also produces several horticultural crops as well as flowers, both for consumption and also for export. Besides commodity crops, Kenya also produces a wide variety of seeds. The national area, production and average yields of specific crops in the country from 2011 to 2013 is summarized in Table 4.

		Year 2011		Year 2012			Year 2013		
Сгор	Ha	Production- MT	Yield MT/Ha	На	Production- MT	Yield MT/Ha	Ha	Production- MT	Yield MT/Ha
Maize	2,131,887	3,376,862	1.6	2,159,321	3,749,880	1.7	2,123,138	3,592,688	1.7
Wheat	131,509	268,482	2.0	148,703	444,374	3.0	131,309	485,847	3.7
Beans	1,048,435	551,406	0.5	1,058,941	644,597	0.6	1,083,885	813,259	0.8
Rice	22,966	91,055	4.0	30,206	140,565	4.7	36,949	154,010	4.2
Sorghum	254,125	159,877	0.6	223,800	166,627	0.7	222,015	1,592,337	7.2
Millet	111,304	76,118	0.7	118,378	74,888	0.6	88,049	641,024	7.3
Cowpeas	197,980	81,534	0.4	214,492	113,803	0.5	192,345	1,226,822	6.4
Green Grams	159,910	70,225	0.4	376,831	183,649	0.5	174,320	796,750	4.6
Pigeon peas	138,708	7,588	0.1	286,423	178,780	0.6	144,218	731,831	5.1
Sweet Potatoes	66,971	859,549	12.8	66,971	859,549	12.8	63,598	1,150,359	18.1
Cassava	69,169	893,122	12.9	69,169	893,122	12.9	72,482	1,111,951	15.3
lrish Potato	119,598	1,470,562	12.3	119,598	1,470,562	12.3	126,243	1,565,054	12.4
Cocoa Yam	9,644	117,113	12.1	9,644	117,113	12.1	11,148	114,540	10.3
Tomatoes	20,339	434,161	21.3	21,874	444,860	20.3	23,866	494,037	20.7
French Beans	3,755	30,649	8.2	4,227	33,519	7.9	4,528	38,398	8.5
Snow peas	1,979	11,566	5.8	2,014	11,772	5.8	2,470	16,538	6.7
Garden Peas	9,456	44,326	4.7	10,704	46,112	4.3	13,782	60,855	4.4
Spinach	4,651	46,767	10.1	4,651	46,767	10.1	4,784	74,782	15.6
Cabbage	17,950	490,020	27.3	19,251	503,357	26.1	25,334	762,263	30.1
Kales	27,681	332,188	12.0	28,735	366,770	12.8	28,564	398,535	14.0
Carrots	4,090	76,945	18.8	3,690	169,424	45.9	5,052	235,056	46.5
Onions	6,750	96,908	14.4	7,043	96,922	13.8	7,730	123,331	16.0
Banana	54,266	1,140,201	21.0	58,003	1,207,841	20.8	60,154	1,375,516	22.9
Mango	51,653	543,662	10.5	43,777	520,032	11.9	46,980	581,290	12.4
Passion Fruits	3,687	39,567	10.7	3,743	39,567	10.6	4,377	62,207	14.2
Oranges	5,941	61,030	10.3	5,941	61,030	10.3	7,494	99,432	13.3

Table 4: National Area, Crop Production and Yield for 2011-2013

Lemons	1,015	10,658	10.5	965	9,132	9.5	1,135	16,381	14.4
Pineapples	6,290	120,972	19.2	3,743	39,567	10.6	6,290	120,876	19.2
Melons	4,707	107,347	22.8	2,121	36,075	17.0	2,006	35,082	17.5
Flowers	12,880	102,360	7.9	13,112	108,306	8.3	12,165	103,770	8.5
Seeds	14,350	46,793	3.3	15,849	52,984	3.3	12,133	29,160	2.4
Coffee	109,795	65,446	0.6	108,716	47,233	0.4	108,220	68,978	0.6
Теа	124,145	112,239	0.9	190,600	169,400	0.9	198,657	98,138	0.5
Sugar Cane	213,610	5,822,633	27.3	213,710	5,822,633	27.2	213,780	5,822,633	27.2
Tobacco	14,828	22,539	1.5	14,380	20,707	1.4	15,025	15,927	1.1

Source: State Department of Agriculture; Crops Directorate

4.2 Types of Fertilizers Used in Kenya

Kenya farmers use a wide variety of inorganic fertilizers for production of different crops. The fertilizers used in large volumes are those applied to food crops, horticulture and industrial crops. Table 5 shows the top ten most important fertilizers used in Kenya as well as the group of crops on which the fertilizers are applied.

Fertilizer type	Estimated apparent	Main crops fertilizer used on
1. Di-Ammonium phosphate (DAP)	267 988	Cereals, horticulture
2. Urea	111,123	Cereals, sugarcane
3. CAN	99,898	Cereals, horticulture, coffee
4. NPK 26:5:5	63,966	Теа
5. NPK 25:5:5S	25,185	Теа
6. NPK 23:23:0	20,819	Cereals
7. Calcium Nitrate	16,056	Flowers and vegetables
8. Ammonium Sulphate	15,930	Rice
9. NPK 17:17:17	13,288	Coffee and fruits
10. Muriate of Potash (MOP)	6,014	Fruits and sugarcane
TOTAL	640,267	

Table 5: Top ten most utilized fertilizers in Kenya

Source: Kenya FUBC Study Results, 2015

4.3 Fertilizer apparent Consumption

The apparent fertilizer consumption is deduced from quantities of annual imported fertilizers compared to annual fertilizer exports. Table 6 shows Kenya's apparent consumption of major fertilizers by type in Metric Tons between 2011 and 2013. Di-Ammonium Phosphate (DAP), Urea and CAN are the most apparently consumed fertilizers followed by various blends of NPK, Calcium Nitrate and Ammonium Sulphate.

Table 6: Apparent C	onsumption of	Fertilizer in I	Metric tons
---------------------	---------------	-----------------	-------------

Fertilizer Type	2011	2012	2013
Phosphate rock	6,550	2,241	4,578
Ammonia, anhydrous	26	21	56
Ammonium Hydroxide	179	64	136
Magnesium Nitrate	53	50	692
Magnesium Sulphate	1	352	108
Potassium nitrate	1,646	1,685	995
Organic material, total		104	346
Urea	27,295	63,480	111,123
Ammonium sulphate	9,294	13,181	15,930
Ammonium nitrate	395	96	23
Calcium ammonium nitrate	131,363	53,000	99,898
Sodium nitrate	24	16	9
Calcium nitrate	10,371	7,843	16,056
Calcium Cyanamid		21	
Urea and ammonium nitrate solutions			
Other straight nitrogen	491	215	85
Superphosphate	754	749	596
Superphosphate above 35%	486	3,825	552
Potassium chloride (Muriate of potash)	1,887	4,410	6,014
Potassium sulphate	718	1,134	1,202
Other Straight Potash			
NPK complex >10kg			
NPK 26 5 5	70,372	64,215	63,966
NPK 25 5 5 + 5S	6,499	21,605	25,185
NPK 17 17 17	4,406	10,217	13,228
NPK 25 5 10	5,000		5,000
NPK 27 6 6 + 2S	2,055		4,980
NPK 14 14 20 + 1.5MgO + TE	3,737	4,072	2,975
NPK 20 10 10		18	2,140
Other NPK	6,432	23,334	1,809
Other NPK Unknown grades	3,607	4,411	
Diammonium phosphate (DAP)	176,531	125,344	267,988
Monoammonium phosphate (MAP)		677	878
Other nitrogen & phosphates	19,458	11,954	20,813
compounds(NPK 23:23:0 &NPK			
20:20:0)			
Other nitrogen & phosphorus			16
compounds			
PK compounds	159	121	22
NK compounds other than Potassium	3	21	466
nitrate			
TOTALS	493,572	424,794	665,373

Source: Kenya FUBC Study Results, 2015

4.4 Fertilizer application Rates

Study results from extension officers and other stakeholders showed that in Kenya, fertilizer application rates is highly influenced by farmers' level of education, levels of crop profitability, historical practices (such as introduction of fertilizer use in the region by colonial governments), soil types and farmers' adoption of modern farming practices. According to Tegemeo Institute (2009), fertilizer dosage rates is widely affected by Agro-regional positioning of the farmers. Table 7 shows average farm households' fertilizer dosage or fertilizer application rate established per Agro-Regional Zones through panel study of sampled farmers by Tegemeo Institute.

Fertilizer Doze Rates (Kgs/acre)				
Year	1997	2000	2004	2007
Marginal Rain Shadow	26.1	31.7	33.4	28.6
Central Highlands	105.9	121.4	103.2	96.1
Western Highlands	30.4	44.5	51.1	46.7
High Potential Maize zone	63.4	62.8	66.9	70.9
Western Transitional	37.4	69.8	51.6	54.4
Western Lowlands	59.3	42.5	9.8	18.7
Eastern Lowlands	27.5	13.8	11	16.5
Coastal Lowlands	18.1	2.3	4.5	5.6
Overall Sample	64.8	72.1	64.8	63.2

Table 7: Tegemeo Panel Study Fertilizer application rates

Source: Tegemeo (2009)^{viii}

The fertilizer use recommendations were last developed in the 1980's under the Fertilizer Use Recommendation Project (FURP). Since then occasional recommendations are provided through the Kenya Agricultural and Livestock Research Organization (KALRO). A follow up verification exercise was done under the Fertilizer Extension Project (FEP) in early 1990's. More recently in 2014 through the NAAIAP project, recommendations were made for maize and other food crops such as potatoes, beans and peas in 164 sub counties.

Within the Ministry of Agriculture, field extension officers follow Field Extension manual that indicates recommended rates of fertilizer for various crops in Kenya. The fertilizer rates Table 8 shows recommended application rates of most fertilizers by crops based on the Field Extension Handbook published in 2012.

Table 8: Kenya Recommended Fertilizer Application Rates

CROP TYPES	Planting	Top Dressing	Others Recommended
	Recommended	Recommended Rates	Rates Kgs/Ha
	Rates Kgs/Ha	Kgs/Ha	
BARLEY- Normal	DAP- 90	CAN- 300	
		ASN- 90	
BARLEY- Malting	DAP- 90	CAN- 180	
	MAP: 100	ASN- 90	

	1		
MAIZE	DAP: 150-200	CAN: 250	
	TSP: 150	UREA: 150	
	Mavuno: 150		
	NPK: 23:23:0- 200		
WHEAT	New land (virgin)	NPK 11:52:0 -130	
	2 nd year crop	D.A.P 130	
	3 rd year crop	D.A.P 109	
	4 th year crop	D.A.P 87	
	Over 4 years	NPK 20:20:0 200	
RICE	DAP: 100	SA: 180	Nursery: DAP: 160
	NPK 17:17:17 -100	CAN: 100	
	NPK 23:23:0 100		
MILLET	DAP: 120	CAN: 125	
	MAP: 180		
SORGHUM	DAP: 120	CAN: 100	
	MAP: 180		
	NPK 23:23:0 100		
BEANS	DAP : 200		
	NPK 23:23:0: 200		
	NPK 17:17:17: 200		
COW PEAS	DSP: 100	CAN: 150	
	TSP: 80	UREA: 100	
	NPK 20:20:20: 150		
IRISH POTATO	DAP: 500		
BEET ROOT	DAP: 300		
BRINJALS /EGG	NPK 23:23:0: 120		
BROCCOLI	DAP: 500		
CABBAGE	DAP: 250	CAN: 250	
CARROTS	DAP: 200	CAN: 200	
	DSP: 220		
CUCUMBER	DSP: 200		
FRENCH BEANS	DAP: 200	CAN: 100	
GARDEN PEAS	TSP: 200	CAN: 150	
KALES	DSP: 500	CAN: 200	
	TSP: 250		
LEEKS	DAP: 250	CAN: 125	
LETTUCE	TSP: 200	CAN: 125	
	DSP: 400		
ONIONS	DSP: 400	CAN: 300	
	TSP: 200		
	DAP: 150		
SNOW PEAS	DAP: 250	CAN: 200	
TOMATO	DSP: 200		
	TSP: 100		
	DAP: 100		

AVOCADO	Age of tree	CAN	(g/tree)	TSP(g/tree)			
	1-3yr	S	120	120			
	, 4-5yr	s	220	450			
	, 6-7yr	S	450	650			
	Over 8yrs		650	650			
BANANA	DAP: 200		CAN: 3	00			
	NPK 23:23:0	: 150					
CITRUS	Age of tre	ee CA	N (g/tree)) TSP(g/tree)			
	1-3yrs		200	300			
	4-5yrs		400	450			
	Over 6-7yr	S	600	750			
MANGO	Age of tr	ee (CAN (g/tre	ee) TSP/DAP	(g/tree)		
	1-3yrs	;	240	150			
	4-5yrs	;	400	500			
	Over 6-7y	S	400	1000			
PASSION FRUITS	TSP: 200	CA	AN: 300				
_	DAP: 200						
PINEAPPLES	DAP: 500	U	JREA: 200				
	NPK: 23: 23:	0- 250					
	SA: 200						
MELON	TSP: 200	CA	N: 250				
	DAP: 200						
COFFEE (Coffee Res	earch Founda	tion)					
Recommended type	es of nitrogen	fertilize	rs based o	on soil reaction	1		
Soil Reaction	Acid Soil		Modera	tely Acid soil	Mildly Acid		
PH	Under 4.4		4.4 – 5.4	ļ	Over 5.4		
Form of Nitroge	n For each	three	Alternat	e between	Use	Ammoniu	IM
Fertilizer	application	ns use	Calcium	Ammonium	Sulphate	(AS)	or
	CAN twice	e, ASN	Nitrate	(CAN) and	Ammonium	Sulpha	te
	or Urea* c	nce	Ammon	ium Sulphate	Nitrate (ASN	1)	
			Nitrates	(ASN) or			
			Urea				
Note: for Urea (46%	% N) multiply r	ate by 0	.55.				
Recommended rat	e of application	on for Ni	itrogen				
Amount of crop esti	mated in the	Kg	"	gm per tree		kg of fei	rtilizer/ha
current season		Nitroge	en/ha				
		per yea	ar	2404 1		2404 11	2.00())
				21% N	26% N	21% N	26% N
Less than 1000 kg	clean coffee	80		330	260	390	310
per nectare (5 kg o	of cherry per						
1000 1500kg also	n coffee nor	100		250	200	176	205
1000 - 1500kg clea	h conee per	100		338	290	470	385
1500 - 2000 kg close	nen y/uee	100 1	150	250 to 520	200 to 424	176 +0	295 to 577
1300 - 2000 kg Clear hortzing = 10 kg clear hortzing (7 - 10 kg) of the second	f cherny/troo	er 100 – 150		550 10 558	29010434	4/0 LO	303 10 377
$\frac{11000 \text{ kg}}{1000 \text{ kg}} = \frac{1000 \text{ kg}}{1000 \text{ kg}} = 1$	coffee por	e Un to 200		716	578	052	769
hectare (nuer 10 L	g of charry	00102	200	/ 10	570	332	703
	S OF CHEITY						
/1166						1	

Note: The above fertilizer rates are based on coffee density of 1330 trees/ha or 2.74 m x 2.74 m spacing. Apply Nitrogen fertilizer only when the soil is wet

Phosphate (P) fertilizers													
Recommended types of application for Phosphate fertilizers Soil reaction Acid soil													
Soil reaction	Acid soil	Moderate acid soil	Mildly acid soil										
PH	under 4.4	4.4 – 5.4	over 5.4										
Types of	Single or Triple	SSP	DAP										
Phosphate fertilizers	Super phosphate	TSP											
Recommended rate of	f application for Pho	osphate fertilizers											
Types	Quantity (g/tree)												
SSP 350 350 -													
TSP 150 150 -													
DAP 150													
Phosphoric acid *	iosphoric acid * 40ml in 20l water 40ml in 20l water (30 40 ml in 20l water												
	(30 trees)	trees)											
(3 – 4 sprays per													
year)													
TEA (Tea Research Fo	oundation)												
Fertilizer: Use compo	und fertilizers (NPK 2	26:5:5 or 20:10:10)											
1 st year: apply 180kg/h	a (6g per plant) 6 w	eeks after transplanting	and thereafter at 8 weeks	intervals up to									
end of the first year													
2 nd year: apply 160kg/ha (15g/bush) every 3 months													
3rd year: Apply 720kg/ha (67g/bush) once													
4 th year: Apply 920kg/	ha (86g/bush) once												
5 th year: Prune and the	en apply 600kg/ha (5	56 g/bush) at tipping											

SUGARCANE (Sugar Research Centre)

Fertilizer: Plant with 2-3.5 bags/ha DAP or 6-9 bags/ha SSP, Top dress with 4-5 bags/ha urea or 8-9 bags/ha CAN depending on zone and crop cycle

Source: MOALF Extension Handbook (2012)^{ix}

4.5 Fertilizer Use By Crop (FUBC)

Study results indicate that in Kenya, fertilizer use by crops varies depending on value of crop, soil types, reliability of rainfall and farmers' agronomic practices (see details in Table 9). For most crops, fertilizer is applied in two common regimes: planting fertilizer applied during crop sowing and top-dressing fertilizer applied later during plants' vegetative growth. While this split application of fertilizer is recommended to enhance crop's nutrients uptakes, farmers do not necessarily apply same volumes of planting and top-dressing fertilizer on one crop. Results of this study show that overall, farmers tend to use more volumes of planting fertilizers compared to top-dressing fertilizers.

Table 9: Factors influencing fertilizer use by crop

Factor	Details

Crop value	Crops with good economic returns and ready market
Soil type	Whether soil is acidic or alkaline
Rainfall reliability	Farming risks associated with rainfall in a rain-fed agriculture system; farmers willing to invest more in fertilizer when rainfall is reliable
Farmers' agronomic practices	Farmers who have adopted fertilizer application tend to use more fertilizer
Availability of fertilizer	Ease of access, e.g. through subsidy, affects utilization

The main crops that utilize fertilizer in Kenya are listed in

Table 10. The crops range from cereals to pulses, root crops, horticultural crops (vegetables, fruits, flowers), nuts and oil crops, and industrial crops (tea, Coffee, Sugar cane) and seeds. Not all the crops grown in Kenya are shown in the table, as it only reflects the crops that use fertilizers within measurable levels. Collectively, it is estimated that the total quantities of fertilizer used by crops increased from 512,363mt in 2011 to 533,276mt in 2012. In 2013 however, the total volumes of fertilizer used by crops is estimated at 528,425mt. The marginal decline in total volumes of used fertilizer is attributed to poor weather conditions that affected several parts of Kenya in 2013. Of the crops listed, maize uses the largest amount of fertilizers followed by tea, sugar cane, wheat, beans and flowers respectively.

TOTAL QUANTITY OF FERTILIZER USED PER CROP CROP 2013 2012 2011 Maize 268,605,229 273,496,424 268,695,741 Wheat 25,621,563 29,066,258 24,473,674 Barley 4,969,802 4,652,283 4,097,447 Beans 20,719,820 21,102,929 20,584,107 Rice 5,891,782 5,491,877 4,163,771 Sorghum 9,094,113 9,200,031 10,529,866 Millet 5,632,033 6,406,106 5,061,649 Cowpeas 2,045,941 2,338,328 2,262,254 Irish potato 13,411,529 12,384,799 11,089,817 Tomato 4,667,677 4,303,070 3,967,851 French beans 733,817 653,700 795,211 387,405 496,515 453,032 Snow peas Sugar Snaps 383,686 611,194 473,246 Garden peas 1,100,388 840,296 743,193 497,690 440,714 spinach 509,831 Cabbage 1,853,420 1,407,935 1,307,121 kales 818,896 936,599 786,695 carrots 223,004 166,608 198,885 **Bulb Onions** 173,549 300,636 162,539 Banana 66,990 63,869 72,684 Mango 36,567 35,452 19,790

Table 10: Total quantity of fertilizer used by Crop in 2011-2013

Purple passion	1,318,095	1,106,068	1,082,292
Oranges	33,280	1,756	1,756
Lemons	3,657	398	395
Grape fruit	4,189	779	373
Lime	55,328	11,396	11,260
Tree tomato	65,202	77,037	79,597
Pineapples	674,062	653,664	674,251
Melons	448,131	397,324	394,319
Flowers	17,123,485	17,058,712	17,715,880
Coffee	7,410,964	7,510,387	1,637,586
Sugarcane	28,103,519	29,193,854	29,175,193
Tobacco	2,311,221	1,706,000	2,053,400
Теа	101,036,570	99,083,200	98,983,935
Seeds	2,829,025	1,706,000	4,460,145
Total fertilizer type	528,425,162	533,276,490	512,363,225

4.5.1: Fertilizer Use By Crop by type of fertilizers for all crops in 2013

	Crop Fertilizer Use (tons) 2013																
Сгор	Area (Ha)	Area applied with fertilizer (Ha)	DAP	Mavuno- P	NPK 17:17:17	NPK 23:23:0	CAN	UREA	Mavuno- TD	МАР	SA	TSP	NPK 20:20:0	DSP	Calcium Nitrate	МОР	Fertilizer Totals
Banana	60153	493	34	0	0	0	17	9	0	0 0	0	8	0	0	0	0	68
Barley	22670	21538	2076	0	0	0	1922	0	0	430	0	0	0	0	0	0	4428
Bean	1083886	318907	20140	1060	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21200
Bulb Onion	7730	5176	139	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	35	0	0	0	0	174
Cabbages	50668	30065	1809	0	0	0	1503	0	0	0 0	0	394	0	0	0	0	3707
Carrots	10104	5739	266	24	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	155	0	0	0	0	446
Cowpeas	197028	22005	822	0	0	0	400	469	0	0 0	0	0	354	0	0	0	2046
French Bean	9056	5847	390	0	0	491	484	. 0	0	0 0	0	75	0	150	0	0	1590
Garden Peas	27564	12101	1020	158	0	0	1023	0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2201
Grape Fruit	175	58	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	5
Irish Potatoes	126243	98134	12995	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12995
Kales	57128	15419	573	0	0	0	645	276	0	0 0	0	143	0	0	0	0	1638
Lemons	1200	49	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Lime	645	23	1	0	54	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Maize	1883289	1311582	121606	7600	0	13661	62810	13216	2033	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	220925
Mango	46980	301	20	5	0	0	12	5	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Melons	7344	6617	300	100	0	0	397	0	0	0 0	0	100	0	0	0	0	896
Millet	88049	42731	2225	0	0	0	947	929	0	247	0	0	0	0	0	0	4349
Oranges	7494	427	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 0	0	6	0	0	0	0	33
Pineapples	12230	3546.5	125	0	161	42	0	0	0	0 0	225	42	0	0	0	753	1348
Purple Passion	4377	2174	100	1114	0	0	87	0	36	0	0	41	0	0	0	0	1376
Rice	34989	32562	1596	0	957	638	457	2439	0	0 0	152	0	0	0	0	0	6241
Snow Peas	2470	2062	139	0	223	0	170	0	0	0 0	0	26	0	53	0	0	611
Sorghum	222023	82189	5225	0	0	0	1336	1953	0	581	. 0	0	0	0	0	0	9094
Spinach	9569	3138	406	0	0	0	377	0	0	0 0	0	79	0	158	0	0	1020
Sugar Snaps	2524	2108	183	27	228	0	174	. 0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	611
Tomato	47732	31377	2388	0	1908	0	2916	0	0	0 0	0	457	0	914	753	0	9335
Tree Tomato	789	216.8	13	3	13	0	13	0	0	0 0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Wheat	131309	126203	12181	0	0	0	12181	0	0	1262	0	0	0	0	0	0	25624
Totals	4155418	2182789	186806	10090	3544	14832	87872	19297	2069	2520	377	1563	354	1274	753	753	332105

4.5.1.1: Fertilizer Use By Crop by type of fertilizers for AFFA crops in 2013

Fibuers Area Angelied Circuit New Magnesium New Magnesium New Magnesium Super-Inspike Amount Rock Northe Nor							A	AFFA Cr	ops Fertili	zer use (ton)	2013							
Crop New Hell with fert- HA Area with fert- HA Area with fert- HA Area With fert- HA NPK: N17.12 NPK: N17.12 NPK: N17.12 NPK: N17.12 Superphosphate above 35%. Amonium Hydroxide Rock Phosphate Other Phosphate Amonium Hydroxide Rock Phosphate Other Phosphate Amonium Hydroxide Moor Phosphate Moor Phosphate Amonium Hydroxide Moor Phosphate Amonium Hydroxide Moor Phosphate Amonium Hydroxide Moor Phosphate <th>Flowers</th> <th></th>	Flowers																	
Bit	Сгор	Area (Ha)	Area applied with fert- HA	Calcium Nitrate	NPK: 14:14:20	NPK: 27:6:6 +s	Potasium Sulphate	Potasium Nitrate	Magnesium Nitrate	Superphosphate above 35%	Amonium Hydroxide	Rock Phosphate	Other NPKs	Amonium Hydroxide	Magnesium Sulphate	МОР	Fertilizer Totals	
CANAM ONS 634 1634 76 270 260 138 131 23 660 136 138 71 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 70 <td>ROSES</td> <td>8,420</td> <td>8420</td> <td>4000</td> <td>1389</td> <td>1368</td> <td>947</td> <td>674</td> <td>118</td> <td>354</td> <td>84</td> <td>926</td> <td>5 1474</td> <td>34</td> <td>1 51</td> <td>1010</td> <td>12,428</td>	ROSES	8,420	8420	4000	1389	1368	947	674	118	354	84	926	5 1474	34	1 51	1010	12,428	
STATCO 430 204 71 70 48 34 6 18 6 77 2 3 52 63 63 64 9 26 67 107 2 37 30 30 33 33 149 52 51 33 25 4 13 3 34 55 1 2 38 26 008005 121 122 127 20 10 10 2 5 1 3 21 0 1 15 17 0714L 2165 5778 2070 1.977 3.89 72 511 122 1,388 2.129 97 1.46 70 73 0704L 2,165 5778 2070 1.877 7018 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121 121	CARNATIONS	1634	1634	776	270	266	5 184	131	23	69	16	180	286	-	7 10	196	2,412	
ALSTROMERIA 011 0511 200 100 00 00 26 6 67 107 2 6 73 000 ALMICUM 313 134 052 35 25 4 13 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 05 1 3 34 35 33 36 37 33 30 20 33 33 39 34 35 37 30 30 30	STATICE	430	430	204	71	. 70) 48	34		5 18	4	47	7 75	2	2 3	52	635	
ARABICUM 313 313 313 149 52 51 35 25 4 13 33 34 55 1 2 38 66 OTHEROS 636 636 302 105 107 10 2 51 6 70 111 3 4 76 925 OTHEROS 636 5776 2007 1,377 1,369 97 51 9 72 1,338 2,129 49 73 1,460 97.99 OTOTAL 12,165 5,776 0.07 1,379 1,379 1,310 1,22 1,338 2,19 49 73 1,460 77.99 Coffee	ALSTROMERIA	611	611	290	101	. 99	69	49	9	26	6	67	107	2	2 4	73	902	
TUBEROS 121 121 57 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	ARABICUM	313	313	149	52	51	35	25		13	3	34	55	1	1 2	38	462	
OTHERS 636 636 636 636 636 932 103 12 13 13 4 76 983 12165 12,165 5,778 2,007 1,2169 12,105 122 1,338 2,129 49 73 1,460 17,93 Coffee	TUBEROSE	121	121	57	20	20) 14	10		2 5	1	13	21) 1	15	179	
TOTAL 12,165 12,178 12,178 12,165 5,778 2,007 1,977 1,869 973 170 511 122 1,338 2,129 49 73 1,460 17,951 Coffee V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V V <th cols<="" td=""><td>OTHERS</td><td>636</td><td>636</td><td>302</td><td>105</td><td>103</td><td>3 72</td><td>51</td><td>9</td><td>27</td><td>6</td><td>70</td><td>111</td><td>3</td><td>3 4</td><td>76</td><td>939</td></th>	<td>OTHERS</td> <td>636</td> <td>636</td> <td>302</td> <td>105</td> <td>103</td> <td>3 72</td> <td>51</td> <td>9</td> <td>27</td> <td>6</td> <td>70</td> <td>111</td> <td>3</td> <td>3 4</td> <td>76</td> <td>939</td>	OTHERS	636	636	302	105	103	3 72	51	9	27	6	70	111	3	3 4	76	939
Coffee Area with Fert. NPK 18:4:12 NPK 20:0:10 NPK 16:16:16 NPK 16:16:16 NPK 17:17:17 Fertilizer Total NPK 18:17:17 Fertilizer Total NPK 18:16:16:16 NPK 18:16:16:16 NPK 16:16:16 NPK 16:16:16 NPK 18:16:16:16 NPK 18:16:16:16 NPK 17:17:17 Fertilizer Total NPK 18:16:16:16 NPK 18:16:16:16 NPK 17:17:17 Second 18:16:16:16 NPK 18:16:16:16 NE NE<	TOTAL	12,165	12,165	5,778	2,007	1,977	1,369	973	170	511	122	1,338	2,129	49	73	1,460	17,956	
Curring Area (Ha) Area (Ha) Area (Ha) Area (Ha) NPK thet. NPK 20:00:0 NPK 15:6:6:10 NPK 17:17:17 Fertilizer Totals Image: Control of the theta of the theta of the theta of theta o	Coffee											1						
Area (Ha) Area (Ha) Area (Ha) NPK with Fert. Ha NPK 18:4:12 NPK 16:16:16 NPK 17:17:17 Totals Image: Constraint of the const	conee	1	A.r.o.o.		r –	1	1	1				-						
Large Scale (Estates) 24330 1654 310 5 97 146 30 887 300 773 300 987 300 97 146 300 887 300 773 300 987 300 97 150 300 881 300 2000 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100		Area (Ha)	applied with Fert- Ha	NPK 18:4:12	NPK 20:10:10	NPK 16:16:16	NPK 17:17:17	Fertilizer Totals										
(Estates) 2430 16544 5 97 146 487 <td>Large Scale</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>735</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Large Scale							735										
Smallholders 38300 4195 1.7 210 151 503 881	(Estates)	24330	16544	5	97	146	6 487	1										
TOTALS 108,220 20,739 22 307 297 990 1,61 $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ $<$ <	Smallholders	83890	4195	17	210	151	503	881										
Sugarcane Area applied with fert. (Ha) DAP MOP $23:23:0$ NPK $23:23:0$ $Special 1$ $Special 2$ $UREA$ CAN AS $Fertilizer Totals$ I <td>TOTALS</td> <td>108,220</td> <td>20,739</td> <td>22</td> <td>307</td> <td>297</td> <td>990</td> <td>1,616</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	TOTALS	108,220	20,739	22	307	297	990	1,616										
Area (Ha) Area applied with fert. (Ha) DAP MOP NPK 23:23:0 Special 1 Special 2 UREA CAN AS Fertilizer Totals Sugarcane 213780 89788 8081 718 180 90 207 826 16162 1751 90 28104 Total 213780 89788 8081 718 180 90 207 826 16162 1751 90 28104 <	Sugarcane	1					1											
Sugarcane 213780 89788 8081 718 180 90 207 826 16162 1751 90 28104 Total 213780 89788 8081 718 180 90 207 826 16162 1751 90 28104 <td></td> <td>Area (Ha)</td> <td>Area applied with fert- (Ha)</td> <td>DAP</td> <td>МОР</td> <td>NPK 23:23:0</td> <td>NPK 17:17:17</td> <td>Special 1</td> <td>Special 2</td> <td>UREA</td> <td>CAN</td> <td>AS</td> <td>Fertilizer Totals</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>		Area (Ha)	Area applied with fert- (Ha)	DAP	МОР	NPK 23:23:0	NPK 17:17:17	Special 1	Special 2	UREA	CAN	AS	Fertilizer Totals					
Total 213780 89788 8081 718 180 90 2807 8661 1716 90 28104 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	Sugarcane	213780	89788	8081	718	180	90	207	826	5 16162	1751	90	28104					
TobaccoArea applied with fert- HaNPK 14:20:20CAN Fertilizer TotalsCAN Fertilizer TotalsSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSSS <td>Total</td> <td>213780</td> <td>89788</td> <td>8081</td> <td>718</td> <td>180</td> <td>90</td> <td>207</td> <td>826</td> <td>5 16162</td> <td>1751</td> <td>90</td> <td>28104</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Total	213780	89788	8081	718	180	90	207	826	5 16162	1751	90	28104					
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Tobacco																	
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $		Area (Ha)	Area applied with fert- Ha	NPK 14:20:20	CAN	Fertilizer Totals												
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Tobacco	15025	5 10518	1798	513	2311												
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Total	15025	5 10518	1798	513	2311												
Area applied with fert. (Ha) NPK 26:5:5 NPK 25:5:5 Fertilizer Totals Total 198,657 177,425 64516 23365 87881 Image: Control of the system	Теа																	
Tea 198,657 177,425 64516 23365 87881 Image: Constraint of the state of the		Area (Ha)	Area applied with fert- (Ha)	NPK 26:5:5	NPK 25:5:5	Fertilizer Totals												
Total 198,657 177,425 64516 23365 87881	Tea	a 198.657	177.425	64516	23365	87881			1		İ	1	1		1			
	Total	198,657	7 177,425	64516	23365	87881												

4.5.2: Fertilizer Use By Crop by type of fertilizers for all crops in 2012

						C	rop Fert	ilizer Us	e (tons) 2	012							
Crop	Area (Ha)	Area applied with fertilizer (Ha)	DAP	MAVUNO- P	NPK 17:17:17	NPK 23:23:0	CAN	UREA	MAVUNO- TD	МАР	SA	TSP	NPK 20:20:0	DSP	Calcium Nitrate	МОР	Fertilizer Totals
Banana	58003	474	32	0	0	0	16	9	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	64
Barley	21827	20736	1990	0	0	0	1851	0	0	414	0	0	0	0	0	0	4255
Bean	1058941	318452	20048	1055	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21103
Bulb Onion	7043	4721	253	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	0	0	0	0	301
Cabbages	38502	22794	1355	0	0	0	1140	0	0	0	0	321	0	0	0	0	2816
Carrots	7380	4218	199	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	0	0	0	0	333
Cowpeas	219095	25025	945	0	0	0	454	532	0	0	0	0	407	0	0	0	2338
French Bean	8454	5392	359	0	453	0	448	0	0	0	0	69	0	139	0	0	1468
Garden Peas	16756	9230	780	120	0	0	781	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1681
Grape Fruit	72	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Irish Potatoes	119703	94405	12385	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12385
Kales	57470	17679	650	0	0	0	758	4197	0	0	0	154	0	0	0	0	5760
Lemons	1021	41	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Lime	524	21	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Maize	2159321	1526507	147116	9195	0	17123	81591	16009	2463	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	273496
Mango	37320	298	19	4	0	0	12	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Melons	6863	5840	267	89	0	0	350	0	0	0	0	89	0	0	0	0	795
Millet	118289	62447	3491	0	0	0	1188	1340	0	388	0	0	0	0	0	0	6406
Oranges	5942	382	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	28
Pineapples	12230	3548	125	0	162	42	0	0	0	0	225	42	0	0	0	754	1349
Purple Passion	3743	1853	84	923	0	0	75	0	31	0	0	34	0	0	0	0	1146
Rice	30206	28447	104791	0	836	557	404	2167	0	0	134	0	0	0	0	0	108889
Snow Peas	2014	1680	114	0	181	0	137	0	0	0	0	21	0	43	0	0	497
Sorghum	232864	87204	5692	0	0	0	1402	2044	0	629	0	0	0	0	0	0	9767
Spinach	9302	6129	396	0	0	0	368	0	0	0	0	77	0	155	0	0	995
Sugar Snaps	4994	4215	365	54	455	0	348	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1222
Tomato	43748	28693	2176	0	1822	0	2667	0	0	0	0	417	0	835	689	0	8606
Tree Tomato	639	176	11	3	11	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Wheat	148703	142897	13771	0	0	0	13869	0	0	1429	0	0	0	0	0	0	29068
Total	4430970	2423525	317439	11460	3924	17722	107869	26302	2494	2860	358	1402	408	1171	689	754	494852

4.5.2.1: Fertilizer Use By Crop by type of fertilizers for AFFA crops in 2012

						AFFA C	rops Fer	tilizer Use	(ton)2012							
Flowers																
Сгор	Area (Ha)	Area applied with fertilizer (Ha)	Calcium Nitrate	NPK: 14:14:20	NPK: 27:6:6 +s	Potasium Sulphate	Potasium Nitrate	Magnesium Nitrate	Superphosphate above 35%	Amonium Hydroxide	Rock Phosphate	Other NPKs	Amonium Hydroxide	Magnesium Sulphate	МОР	Fertilizer Totals
ROSES	8,820	8820	4190	1455	1433	992	706	123	370	88	970	1544	35	53	1058	13,018
CARNATIONS	1934	1934	919	319	314	218	155	27	81	. 19	213	338	8	12	232	2,855
STATICE	428	428	203	71	70	48	34	6	18	4	47	75	2	3	51	632
ALSTROMERIA	726	726	345	120	118	82	58	10	30	7	80	127	3	4	. 87	1,072
ARABICUM	306	306	145	50	50	34	24	4	13	3	34	54	. 1	2	37	452
TUBEROSE	108	108	51	18	18	12	9	2	5	1	12	19	0	1	13	159
OTHERS	790	790	375	130	128	89	63	11	33	8	87	138	3	5	95	1,166
TOTAL	13,112	13112	6228	2163	2131	1475	1049	184	551	131	1442	2295	52	79	1573	19,353
Coffee																
	Area Ha	Area applied with fertilizer (Ha)	NPK 18:4:12	NPK 20:10:10	NPK 16:16:16	NPK 17:17:17	Fertilizer Totals									
Large Scale (Estates)	24,606	15,994	4	88	132	440	16,658									
Smallholders	84,110	4,206	5	63	45	151	4,471									
TOTAL	108,716	20,199	9	151	177	591	21,128									
Sugarcane																
	Area (Ha)	Area applied with fertilizer (Ha)	DAP	МОР	NPK 23:23:0	NPK 17:17:17	Special 1	Special 2	UREA	CAN	AS	Fertilizer Totals				
Sugarcane	213,710	89,758	8078	718	180	90	206	826	16156	1750	90	28094				
Tobacco	-															
	Area (Ha)	Area applied with Fertilizer	NPK 14:20:20	CAN	Fertilizer Totals											
Tobacco	14,380	10,066	1268	513	1782											

4.5.3: Fertilizer Use By Crop by type of fertilizers for all crops in 2011

					Cro	p Fertili	zer Use	e (tor	is) 2011								
Сгор	Area (Ha)	Area applied with fertilizer (Ha)	DAP	Mavuno- p	NPK 17:17:17	NPK 23:23:0	CAN	UREA	Mavuno- TD	МАР	SA	TSP	NPK 20:20:0	DSP	Calcium Nitrate	МОР	Fertilizer Totals
Oranges	10300	638	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	39
Banana	54266	810	56	0	0	0	25	11	0	0	0	11	0	0	0	0	103
Barley	18827	17885	1711	0	0	0	1596	0	0	357	0	0	0	0	0	0	3664
Bean	698020	208118	12985	683	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13668
Bulb Onions	3405	2026	119	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	0	0	0	0	149
Cabbage	33632	19828	1165	0	0	0	991	0	0	0	0	275	0	0	0	0	2432
Carrots	7518	4313	219	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128	0	0	0	0	367
Cowpeas	177321	21651	820	0	0	0	389	465	0	0	0	0	351	0	0	0	2024
French Beans	5932	3852	260	0	324	0	313	0	0	0	0	49	0	99	0	0	1045
Garden peas	17556	7469	628	96	0	0	639	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1364
Grape Fruit	71	20	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Irish Potatoes	112600	85617	11090	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11090
Kales	55362	16053	636	0	0	0	688	322	0	0	0	163	0	0	0	0	1809
Lemons	1015	41	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Lime	517	21	1	0	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Maize	2131888	1511376	144590	9037	0	16797	80049	15793	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	266266
Mango	51653	169	10	2	0	0	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Melon	9414	5794	265	88	0	0	348	0	0	0	0	88	0	0	0	0	789
Millet	111304	48974	2496	0	0	0	1252	1027	0	287	0	0	0	0	0	0	5062
Pineapples	12233	4162	183	0	235	0	0	0	0	0	341	61	0	0	0	1098	1918
Purple Passion	3687	1820	83	938	0	0	73	0	31	0	0	35	0	0	0	0	1161
Rice	23061	21621	1059	0	635	424	307	1637	0	0	102	0	0	0	0	0	4164
Snow Peas	1840	1533	104	0	166	0	125	0	0	0	0	20	0	39	0	0	453
Sorghum	254126	94382	6068	0	0	0	1529	2259	0	674	0	0	0	0	0	0	10530
Spinach	8796	5436	350	0	0	0	326	0	0	0	0	68	0	137	0	0	881
Sugar snaps	3928	3269	286	42	353	0	265	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	946
Tomato	40678	26642	2029	0	1610	0	2489	0	0	0	0	390	0	779	639	0	7936
Tree Tomato	639	206	13	3	12	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Wheat	105649	95549	9162	0	0	0	9555	0	0	955	0	0	0	0	0	0	19672
Totals	3955238	2209275	196422	10910	3378	17220	100978	21516	31	2274	443	1326	351	1054	639	1098	357641

						AF	FA Crop	s Fertilize	r use (ton) 20	11					
Flower	Area (Ha)	Area applied with fertilizer (Ha)	Calcium Nitrate	NPK: 14:14:20	NPK: 27:6:6 +s	Potasium Sulphate	Potasium Nitrate	Magnesium Nitrate	Superphosphate above 35%	Amonium Hydroxide	Rock Phosphate	Other NPKs	Amonium Hydroxide	Magnesium Sulphate	МОР
ROSES	8.820	8820	4.190	1.455	1.433	992	706	123	370	88	970	1.544	35	53	1.058
CARNATIONS	1990	1990	945	328	323	224	159	28	84	20	219	348	8	12	239
STATICE	407	407	193	67	66	46	33	6	17	4	45	71	2	2	49
ALSTROMERIA	715	715	340	118	116	80	57	10	30	7	79	125	3	4	86
ARABICUM	300	300	143	50	49	34	24	4	13	3	33	53	1	2	36
TUBEROSE	98	98	47	16	16	11	8	1	4	1	11	17	0	1	12
OTHERS	550	550	261	91	89	62	44	8	23	6	61	96	2	3	66
Total	12,880	12880	6,118	2,125	2,093	1,449	1,030	180	541	129	1,417	2,254	52	77	1,546
Coffee	•					•									
Coffee	Area (Ha)	Area applied with Fertilizer (Ha)	NPK 18:4:12	NPK 20:10:10	NPK 16:16:16	NPK 17:17:17	Fertilizer Totals								
Large Scale	24,606	14763.6	25	15	5	98	143								
Smallholders	85,189	3407.56	85	3	17	213	319								
Total	109,795	18,171	110	18	22	311	461								
Sugarcane															
	Area (Ha)	Area applied with Fertilizer (Ha)	DAP	МОР	NPK 23:23:0	NPK 17:17:17	Special 1	Special 2	UREA	CAN	AS	Fertilizer Totals			
Sugarcane	213,610	89716	8,074	359	179	90	206	825	16,149	3,499	90	29,472			
						1									-

4.5.3.1: Fertilizer Use By Crop by type of fertilizers for AFFA crops in 2012

		(110)														
OCEC	0 020	(na)	4 100	1 455	1 422	002	706	100	270	00	070	1 6 4 4	25	50	1 059	12 010
	0,020	1000	4,190	1,455	1,455	992	100	125	370	20	970	1,544	35	33	1,056	15,010
	1990	1990	102	520	525	224 AC	159	20	17	20	219	340 71	o 2	12	239	2,937
	407	407	195	07	110	40	55	10	17	4	45	125	2	2	49	1.055
LSTRUIVIERIA	715	715	340	118	116	80	57	10	30	/	79	125	3	4	86	1,055
RABICUM	300	300	143	50	49	34	24	4	13	3	33	53	1	2	36	443
UBEROSE	98	98	4/	16	16	11	8	1	4	1	11	17	0	1	12	145
	550	550	261	91	89	62	44	8	23	6	61	96	2	3	66	812
otal	12,880	12880	6,118	2,125	2,093	1,449	1,030	180	541	129	1,417	2,254	52	77	1,546	19,011
offee		-														
		Area														
		applied	NPK	NPK	NPK	NPK	Fertilizer									
offee	Area (Ha)	with	18:4:12	20:10:10	16:16:16	17:17:17	Totals									
		Fertilizer														
		(Ha)			_											
arge Scale	24,606	14763.6	25	15	5	98	143							-		
mallholders	85,189	3407.56	85	3	17	213	319							-		
Fotal	109,795	18,171	110	18	22	311	461									
														-		
ugarcane		-												-		
		Area														
		applied			NPK	NPK						Fertilizer				
	Area (Ha)	with	DAP	МОР	23:23:0	17:17:17	Special 1	Special 2	UREA	CAN	AS	Totals				
		Fertilizer														
		(Ha)														
ugarcane	213,610	89716	8,074	359	179	90	206	825	16,149	3,499	90	29,472				
Гоbассо																
		Area														
		applied	NPK		Fertilizer											
	Area (Ha)	with	14:20:20	CAN	Totals											
		Fertilizer														
		(Ha)														
Fobacco	14,828	10,380	1,479	573	2,053											
ea				1												
		Area														
		applied	NPK	NPK	Fertilizer											
	Area (Ha)	with	26:5:5	25.5.5	Totals											
		Fertilizer														
		(Ha)														
ea	187,855	174,227	69289	29695	98984											
			1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1			

Fertilizer Totals

4.6 Fertilizer application rates for all crops

2013							
Сгор	Average Fertilizer Use Rate on Total Arable Area (Kg/ha)	Average Fertilizer Use Rate on Fertilized Area (Kg/ha)					
Banana	1	137					
Barley	195	206					
Bean	20	66					
Bulb Onion	22	34					
Cabbages	73	123					
Carrots	44	78					
Cowpeas	10	93					
French Bean	176	272					
Garden Peas	80	182					
Grape Fruit	26	79					
Irish Potatoes	103	132					
Kales	29	106					
Lemons	3	76					
Lime	86	2406					
Maize	117	168					
Mango	1	138					
Melons	122	135					
Millet	49	102					
Oranges	4	78					
Pineapples	110	380					
Purple Passion	314	633					
Rice	178	192					
Snow Peas	247	296					
Sorghum	41	111					
Spinach	107	325					
Sugar Snaps	242	290					
Tomato	196	298					
Tree Tomato	54	195					
Wheat	195	203					
Total	80	152					

2012					
Crop	Average Fertilizer Use Rate on Total Arable Area (Kg/ha)	Average Fertilizer Use Rate on Fertilized Area (Kg/ha)			
Banana	1	136			
Barley	195	205			
Bean	20	66			
Bulb Onion	43	64			
Cabbages	73	124			
Carrots	45	79			
Cowpeas	11	93			
French Bean	174	272			
Garden Peas	100	182			
Grape Fruit	19	70			
Irish Potatoes	103	131			
Kales	100	326			
Lemons	3	76			
Lime	11	285			
Maize	127	179			
Mango	1	134			
Melons	116	136			
Millet	54	103			
Oranges	5	72			
Pineapples	110	380			
Purple Passion	306	618			
Rice	3605	3828			
Snow Peas	247	296			
Sorghum	42	112			
Spinach	107	162			
Sugar Snaps	245	290			
Tomato	197	300			
Tree Tomato	54	196			
Wheat	195	203			
Total	112	204			

2011							
	Average	Average					
	Fertilizer Use	Fertilizer Use					
Crop	Rate on Total	Rate on					
	Arable Area	Fertilized					
	(Kg/ha)	Area (Kg/ha)					
Oranges	4	61					
Banana	2	127					
Barley	195	205					
Bean	20	66					
Bulb Onions	44	73					
Cabbage	72	123					
Carrots	49	85					
Cowpeas	11	93					
French Beans	176	271					
Garden peas	78	183					
Grape Fruit	22	78					
Irish Potatoes	98	130					
Kales	33	113					
Lemons	3	86					
Lime	86	2159					
Maize	125	176					
Mango	0	124					
Melon	84	136					
Millet	45	103					
Pineapples	157	461					
Purple Passion	315	638					
Rice	181	193					
Snow Peas	246	296					
Sorghum	41	112					
Spinach	100	162					
Sugar snaps	241	290					
Tomato	195	298					
Tree Tomato	63	196					
Wheat	186	206					
Total	90	162					

4.7 Fertilizer application rates for AFFA crops

2013							
	Average	Average					
	Fertilizer	Fertilizer					
	Use Rate	Use Rate					
	on Total on						
	Arable Fertiliz						
	Area	Area					
Crop	(Kg/ha)	(Kg/ha)					
Flowers	1476	1476					
Flowers Coffee	1476 15	1476 78					
Flowers Coffee Sugarcane	1476 15 131	1476 78 313					
Flowers Coffee Sugarcane Tobacco	1476 15 131 154	1476 78 313 220					
Flowers Coffee Sugarcane Tobacco Tea	1476 15 131 154 442	1476 78 313 220 495					

2012							
	Average	Average Fertilizer Use					
	Fertilizer Use						
Crop	Rate on Total	Rate on					
	Arable Area	Fertilized Area					
	(Kg/ha)	(Kg/ha)					
Flower	1476	1476					
Coffee	194	1046					
Sugarcane	131	313					
Tobacco	124	177					
Теа	520	568					
Total	313	551					

2011							
	Average	Average					
	Fertilizer	Fertilizer					
	Use Rate	Use Rate					
Crop	on Total	on Fertilized					
	Arable						
	Area	Area					
	(Kg/ha)	(Kg/ha)					
Flowers	(Kg/ha) 1476	(Kg/ha) 1476					
Flowers Coffee	(Kg/ha) 1476 15	(Kg/ha) 1476 90					
Flowers Coffee Sugarcane	(Kg/ha) 1476 15 138	(Kg/ha) 1476 90 328					
Flowers Coffee Sugarcane Tobacco	(Kg/ha) 1476 15 138 138	(Kg/ha) 1476 90 328 198					
Flowers Coffee Sugarcane Tobacco Tea	(Kg/ha) 1476 15 138 138 527	(Kg/ha) 1476 90 328 198 568					

4.8 Fertilizer Use By Nutrients FUBC

The amount of nutrients from mineral fertilizers used by various crops in Kenya depends on the area of crop planted, portions of planted area applied with fertilizer, and the rates of fertilizer application. For each crop and fertilizer type used, the total quantities of nutrients are calculated using the AFO/FAO fertilizer-nutrients calculation procedure, as shown in Table 11 below.

Table 11: Fertilizer use by crop per nutrient

	Year 2011			Year 2012				Year 2013			
	Total Fert	ilizer Cons	umption	Total Fertilizer Consumption Total				Total Fe	Total Fertilizer Consumption		
	('000 metri	ic tonnes n	utrients)	('000 met	('000 metric tonnes nutrients)			('000 me	tric tonnes	nutrients)	
Crop	N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O	Ν	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O		N	P ₂ O ₅	K ₂ O	
		-	1								
Maize	3,242.60	1,964.7 5	0.00	3,454.9 2	1,990.0 3	0.00		2,703.6 9	2,256.4 1	0.00	
Wheat	47.94	37.91	0.00	143.94	107.11	0.00		127.11	94.58	0.00	
Barley	16.61	15.87	0.00	19.25	18.39	0.00		19.99	19.83	0.00	
Beans	43.06	558.63	0.00	45.71	571.32	0.00		45.29	566.15	0.00	
Rice	23.67	2.89	0.00	69.55	8.80	0.00		56.31	4.67	0.00	
Sorghum	57.65	166.05	0.00	53.51	159.88	0.00		48.56	96.71	0.00	
Millet	31.15	55.34	0.00	47.98	99.48	0.00		17.86	32.09	0.00	
Cowpeas	35.94	50.41	0.00	41.04	57.92	0.00		33.24	46.16	0.00	
Green grams	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	
Pigeon peas	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.00	0.00	0.00	
Irish potato	16.88	220.20	0.00	16.94	227.47	0.00		20.26	40.52	0.00	
Tomato	54.61	162.51	0.00	14.50	42.64	0.00		10.34	38.72	0.00	
French beans	2.58	8.11	0.00	2.92	9.13	0.00		1.57	5.75	0.00	
Snowpeas	1.48	4.61	0.00	1.63	5.11	0.00		0.86	3.14	0.00	
Sugar Snaps	1.26	3.80	0.23	1.61	4.90	0.30		0.71	2.28	0.00	
Garden peas	4.20	10.15	0.00	4.64	11.33	0.00		5.97	14.59	0.00	
Spinach	1.31	3.12	0.00	1.29	3.06	0.00		1.33	3.15	0.00	
Cabbage	3.60	7.25	0.00	3.99	8.01	0.00		5.25	10.54	0.00	
Kales	11.06	11.20	0.00	11.65	11.40	0.00		11.59	11.34	0.00	
Carrots	0.30	3.47	0.00	0.24	2.71	0.00		0.33	3.71	0.00	
Bulb Onions	0.15	0.94	0.00	0.14	0.90	0.00		0.15	0.87	0.00	
Banana	15.27	16.58	0.00	16.66	19.72	0.00		16.66	19.72	0.00	
Mango	32.92	24.11	0.08	29.59	23.60	0.12		31.75	25.32	0.79	
purple passion	7.39	20.10	2.01	7.39	20.30	2.06		9.44	25.90	2.59	
Oranges	0.18	0.88	0.00	0.17	0.88	0.00		0.27	1.20	0.00	
Lemons	0.05	0.26	0.00	0.05	0.25	0.00		0.06	0.29	0.00	
Grape fruit	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.13	0.44	0.00	
Lime	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00		0.15	0.17	0.15	

	Year 2011			Year 2012				Year 2013				
	Total Fertilizer Consumption			Total F	Total Fertilizer Consumption			Total Fertilizer Consumptio				
	('000 metri	c tonnes nu	utrients)	('000 m	('000 metric tonnes nutrients)			('000 metric tonnes nutrients)				
Crop	Ν	P_2O_5	K ₂ O	Ν	P_2O_5	K ₂ O		Ν	P_2O_5	K ₂ O		
Tree	1.28	2.98	0.19	0.32	0.75	0.06		0.01	0.50	0.00		
tomato												
Pineapples	6.52	1.93	126.7	0.32	2.26	23.27		1.13	0.64	0.08		
			3									
Melons	1.81	2.62	0.01	1.78	2.67	0.01		0.75	1.13	0.00		
Flowers	86.80	15.48	17.36	86.19	124.37	331.86		126.52	202.45	288.47		
Coffee	53.13	3.88	3.88	52.60	3.84	3.84		52.36	3.82	3.82		
Sugarcane	1,644.80	146.96	0.05	1,645.5	147.02	0.05		1,646.1	147.07	0.05		
				7				1				
Tobacco	5.88	1.92	2.78	6.39	2.65	3.77		6.39	2.65	3.77		
Теа	1,669.07	6.24	6.24	2,198.8	8.33	8.33		2,228.4	8.44	8.44		
				9				6				
TOTAL	7,121	3,531	160	7,981	3,696	374		7,231	3,691	308		

CHAPTER FIVE: CONCLUSIONS

5.1. Dealing with missing data/ data gaps

It is assumed that in general, it is the overall responsibility of the government of Kenya to manage and provide relevant, accurate and timely agricultural data to meet the demands of policy makers as well as other data users. Overall, access to data on fertilizer production, importation, distribution, export and utilization by crops is constrained by several factors. The major ones include:

a) Staff Capacity

- i. Inadequate Staff Capacity: few number of staff in some stations at the field level that should be dealing with agricultural data collection; aging field extension officers at the grassroots thus affecting mobility and application of modern technologies.
- ii. Work overload: most field extension staff carry out several activities related to government extension and collaboration activities with other organizations and projects/programs.
- iii. Limited technical knowledge owing to limited trainings on agriculture statistics and data management. This has led to, among others, generation of inaccurate data with non-probability based sampling methods, lack of the coefficient of variation, sampling errors as well as nonsampling errors.
- iv. Lack of validated sampling frames. Partly, this is caused by lack of census of agriculture.
- v. Lack of basic tools and equipment for data collection and analysis.
- vi. Low application of modern technology including ITC tools and systems.

b) Institutional and Management challenges

- i. There is a general low appreciation of the importance of data and quality statistics at various levels in the public sector.
- ii. Limited networking and collaboration amongst relevant stakeholders and agencies.
- iii. Poor planning leading to among others inadequate budgetary provision for data collection and management activities.
- iv. Inadequate policy and regulatory framework for food and agricultural statistics management.
- v. Lack of understanding, hence poor cooperation by private sector in providing data when required by the government.

c) Lack of master sampling frame

One of the major drawbacks to crops data management in Kenya is lack of validated farm sampling frame. Owing to lack of agriculture census, Kenya has not developed comprehensive agriculture master sampling frame. Lack of list of farmers has significantly effect on sampling of farmers, other studies as well as surveys conducted in the agricultural sector.

5.2 Proposed changes to support data collection and management

In order to improve on fertilizer data management in Kenya, the following suggestions should be considered:

- i. Restructuring of agricultural statistics unit at the Ministry Headquarters; expanding its mandate and improve staffing.
- ii. Review of agricultural statistics legal framework and policy to take care of emerging challenges and concerns.
- iii. Refinement of field officers' job description to incorporate expected roles of data collection, analysis, dissemination and collaboration.

- iv. Field officers' regular and expanded training on agriculture statistics, including data collection, surveys, census etc.
- v. Mainstreaming stakeholders' approach to statistics and information management.
- vi. Provision and use of basic tools, equipment and software for data collection, analysis and networking.
- vii. Regular annual work planning and budget allocation for agricultural statistics management.
- viii. Adoption of new technologies such as ICT-based systems to reduce time and paperwork in data management.
- ix. Sensitization of stakeholders responsible for data provision.

The factors that have been stated in the previous chapters. In order to manage missing data, the following suggestions should be considered:

5.3 Cost-effective ways if collecting real consumption and FUBC data

Results from this study show that there are several variations of the data on the amount of fertilizer manufactured, imported, exported and utilized by each crop. There is therefore need to establish cost-effective way of collecting data based on consumption and fertilizer use by crops. In order to achieve this goal, the following suggestions should be considered:

- a) To have competent staff on fertilizer subsector stationed at Kenya Revenue Authority (KRA) and Kenya Ports Authority (KPA) border points for easy identification and monitoring the importation and exportation of fertilizer and fertilizer supplements;
- b) Deployment of agricultural officers at border points to monitor and collect data on informal fertilizers imports and exports;
- c) Mass training of officers responsible for farm inputs data collection and management in the Ministry as well as other stakeholders in the agricultural sector;
- d) To have location specific recommendations for fertilizer that are socially and economically acceptable to farmers so as ease follow ups and proper management of fertilizer distribution by types and amounts;
- e) Use census and surveys methods to capture more data on fertilizer use at various levels;
- f) Use of modern technologies such as cameras to help monitor inflows and outflows of fertilizers at the border points.
- g) Establish an automated system that will connect the Counties and MALF for easy access of fertilizer availability and utilization at village levels;
- h) Strengthen communication between MALF and KRA and KPA for improved fertilizer data collection, storage and utilization;
- i) Establish site specific fertilizer use for easy traceability of types and amount of fertilizer use at farm levels according to existing Agro-ecological zone and the farming systems.

5.4. Concluding Remarks

Fertilizer consumption in Kenya in the last two decades has risen tremendously due to the liberalization of the fertilizer industry in 1991 leaving most of the activities to be done by the private sector. However fertilizer quality control measures as well as fertilizer standards, policies and distribution systems are not well developed leading to inefficiencies and thus high costs of fertilizer in the country. Moreover, fertilizer taxation regimes are yet to be harmonized in line with EAC integration process.

To improve on fertilizer use in general, there is need for new fertilizer policy, which is currently being done. To take care of regional interest and commitments, the new policy should be harmonized with other policies within the EAC and COMESA regions. There is also need for a functioning of a fertilizer quality control system which should also be harmonized with other systems in the EAC and COMESA region. The regional perspective of fertilizer trade also calls for harmonization of fertilizer standards a n d rules governing trade in fertilizers. Besides, stakeholder networks and associations will also be required to take the centre stage in handling national and regional issues on fertilizers.

ⁱ Ministry of agriculture (2012) CROPS EXTENSION POCKET HANDBOOK Vol. 1 - FIELD CROPS. Ministry Office, Nairobi, Kenya

ⁱⁱ Joshua Ariga, T.S. Jayne, and J. Nyoro (2005): Factors Driving the Growth in Fertilizer Consumption in Kenya, 1990-2005:

Sustaining the Momentum in Kenya and Lessons for Broader Reliability in Sub-Saharan Africa Tegemeo Institute Of Agricultural Policy and Development, Egerton University.

 Mary K. Mathenge (2009): FERTILIZER TYPES AVAILABILITY ANDCONSUMPTION IN KENYA TEGEMEO INSTITUTE, EGERTON UNIVERSITY
 Paper presented at the 6th National Fertilizer Conference in Kenya, on "Towards Increased Use of Fertilizer and Improved Seed for Food Security and Economic Growth, KARI headquarters, Nairobi, Kenya, August 20-21, 2009
 S.M. Kanyanjua and G.O. Ayaga (2006): Technical Note Series
 Kenya Agricultural Research Institute
 KARI Technical Note No. 17, January 2006
 Kenya Plant Health Inspectorate Services (2014): National Crops Varieties and Attributes Technical Series; KEPHIS, NAIROBI

 ^{vi} Bell Okello, Silvia Paruzzolo, Rekha Mehra, Adithi Shetty and Ellen Weiss (2010): Agrodealerships in Western Kenya: How Promising for Agricultural Development and Women Farmers?
 International Center for Research on Women ICRW
 1120 20th Street, NW Suite 500 North Washington, DC 20036

^{vii} Future agricultures (2008):The Global Fertilizer Crisis and Africa Policy Brief No 025 of June 2008 www.future-agricultures.org

viii Mary K. Mathenge (2009): Fertilizer Types, Availability and Consumption In Kenya Tegemeo Institute, Egerton University Paper presented at the 6th National Fertilizer Conference in Kenya, on "Towards Increased Use of Fertilizer and Improved Seed for Food Security and Economic Growth, KARI headquarters, Nairobi, Kenya, August 20-21, 2009

^{ix} Ministry of Agriculture (2012):Crops Extension Pocket HandbookVol. 1 - Field Crops. Kilimo Hse, Nairobi, Kenya