The use of CTP in Kenya:
Reflecting on the 2016/17 drought response

Report from an inter-agency reflection workshop
June 2017

Report by the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP)

Table of Contents

1   Introduction and acknowledgments

In June 2017, 41 participants from national and international NGOs, the UN, donors and research organisations came together to reflect on the use of cash transfer programming (CTP) in the current drought response in Kenya. This report summarises the discussions took place and actions that were agreed.

Thanks go to Carrie Ndoka (HSNP), Jude Lumumba (IFRC) and Emily Mkungo (WVI) who reviewed the draft report which was prepared by CaLP. Thanks also go to IFRC who hosted the event.

The workshop was convened and facilitated by Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP).

2 Highlights

a) Overall, the drought response has benefited from strong Government leadership. It has been more timely, covered a wider geographic area and reached more people than some previous responses. Use of CTP has increased.

b) The need for improved coordination was identified as urgent as it will provide a means by which other issues can be addressed. Improved coordination will offer opportunities to strengthen programming and create efficiencies.

c) Cash transfer values vary between the Government National Safety Nets Programmes and there is no commonly agreed basis for the transfer value used for humanitarian response.

d) Some progress has been made towards harmonising transfer values, with efforts driven by various actors to reduce the risk of community conflict and increase consistency between organisations.

e) In some areas, current transfer values may not be sufficient to achieve planned outcomes. There is need for more discussion about transfer values, with consideration of if/how horizontal (more people) and vertical (higher value) expansion plans can be combined in agreed circumstances.

f) Various complaint and feedback systems are being used in the response, some are CTP specific and others have a broader remit. Many participants were unaware of the existence of different systems and this may be creating confusion and inefficiencies.

g) Risks related to inclusion, exclusion, corruption and diversion exist. Risks of 'skimming' are increased by differences in transfer amounts, payment schedules and weaknesses in communicating with communities.

h) The absence of a national cash working group or similar forum has limited inter-agency sharing of CTP information.

i) Regular market information is available from NDMA/WFP for 23 counties and some agencies have undertaken additional market assessments. As many participants were unaware of the markets information which is available, increasing awareness of existing market information offers a potential 'quick-win' for CTP actors.

j) The number, range and coverage of payment providers has increased in recent years, creating opportunities to make transfers via different mechanisms and at lower cost than before.

k) Poor programme design and risks related to using cash and vouchers inappropriately could result in some programmes not meeting planned outcomes.

l) Agencies involved in the response need to develop a common understanding of objectives and how CTP will contribute to planned outcomes. This will make discussions about transfer values and targeting easier and enable progress towards a common M&E approach.

m) A country specific basic checklist/standard operating procedures could help guide agencies planning CTP in Kenya.

n) Issues related to targeting, selection and registration considered issues related to selection methodologies, inclusion/exclusion concerns and whether the most vulnerable are being reached.

o) Some vulnerable populations are excluded from CTP interventions due to lack of National Identification cards. Many agencies have worked with beneficiaries to help obtain National ID but processes are slow and problematic in emergency contexts.

p) While some agencies use information from the single registry, concerns about inclusion errors, duplication and retention of old data were flagged. Despite these difficulties, it was recognised that there is need to improve the use of the registry and there is potential for CTP actors to contribute more systematically to updating the system.

q) Issues for collective actions were identified related to cash transfer values; complaints and feedback; coordination; learning; markets; payment providers; programme design; targeting; registration and the use of the single registry. The identified actions could be used to inform the drafting of Terms of Reference for a new Cash Working Group.

3   Cash transfer programming in Kenya – some context

- The Kenya National Safety Nets Programme (NSNP) is a Government Social Protection programme that was established in September 2013 to improve social protection delivery in the country. The NSNP provides a common operating framework for the Government's cash transfer programmes which target different groups:[i]
  - Three programmes have national coverage and target Persons with Severe Disabilities, Older Persons and Orphans and Vulnerable Children. These programmes are managed within the Department of Children's Services and the Department of Gender and Social Development, both under the Ministry of East African Community, Labour and Social Protection.
  - The forth programme is the Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP) which delivers unconditional cash transfers targeting poor and vulnerable households in four counties namely Turkana, Marsabit, Mandera and Wajir. The first phase of the HSNP (2008-2012) provided cash transfers to 69,000 households with a biometric smart card via local payment agents. In Phase II (2013-2017), the HSNP was expanded and now reaches almost 100,000 households. The HSNP is designed to scale-up in times of emergency with payments made to additional households when pre-defined criteria are met. The HSNP is managed by the National Drought Management Authority, Department for Special Programmes under the Ministry of Devolution and Planning.
  - In addition, the Urban Food Subsidy Programme operated in Mombasa on a pilot basis in 2012-13.
- Between 2012 and 2015, WFP worked with various implementing partners to deliver a multi-million-dollar Protracted Relief and Recovery Operation. Conditional and unconditional transfers (food or cash) were provided targeting refugees, host communities and schools. Food insecure households in the arid and semi-arid lands were supported to cope with and recover from the effects of recurring drought. WFP programmes continue today.
- Many other agencies have also used cash and vouchers as part of their drought responses in Kenya. According to a review of CTP reports[1], cash actors include ACF; ACTED; Adeso; Concern; COOPI; GOAL; Islamic Relief; Kenya Red Cross Society; Mercy Corps; Oxfam GB; Save the Children; and VSF-Germany. The workshop participant list (see annex) demonstrates that many other national and international agencies are also involved or interested in CTP[2].
- A wide range of modalities and payment providers are used, involving conditional/unconditional and restricted/ unrestricted transfers with payments made via bank accounts; mobile phones; smart cards and vouchers.

4   Reviewing our current performance

The following questions provided the focus for discussion:
-    What is on your mind about delivering CTP in the current response?
-    What is working well in the current response?
-    What needs attention? What are the consequences if issues are not addressed?
-    What are the priorities for collective action?

The key discussion points are summarised and grouped by theme below. With the exception of the first point, the sub-headings are presented in alphabetical order.

---

[1] CaLP/Peachey (2017) [Checking Back. Using cash and vouchers in Somalia: Recommendations from the 2011-12 Somalia Drought Response](#)
[2] Despite efforts made, national actors were under-represented in the workshop. CaLP is committed to increasing the involvement of national actors in such learning events.

4.1   Overall progress

When comparing the 2017 response with other drought responses in Kenya, several very positive points were noted:

- The response has benefitted from strong Government leadership. The Government declared a drought emergency and provided Kshs. 21 billion to support the response, with 4 billion to be disbursed through cash transfers in ASAL counties with the exception of Mandera, Marsabit, Turkana and Wajir which are covered by the existing HSNP programme.
- Compared to 2011, the response has been more timely, has wider geographic coverage and more people are being reached.
- Assessments have informed planning and more response options exist. The use of cash as part of the response has increased.
- The number of cash transfer delivery mechanisms has increased as has their geographic coverage. There are a variety of mobile payment providers; banks; Scope; smart cards and so on. The range of systems has been beneficial in terms of how work is managed and provides opportunities to improve cost effectiveness.
- Multiple stakeholders are engaged in the response including Government (national and county), Red Cross, NNGOs, UN, INGOs, donors and the private sector.
- There is a feeling that risk management has improved.
- There has been some use of existing beneficiary databases and some data sharing, though this has not been uniform and there have been challenges.

4.2   Cash transfer values

Issues related to cash transfer values were the focus of much discussion. While some steps have been taken to harmonise values, the need for more action was agreed.

Cash transfer values vary between the National Safety Nets Programmes. The monthly values are currently Kshs. 2,000 for Orphans and Vulnerable Children, Persons with Severe Disability and Older Persons whereas the Hunger Safety Net Programme pays Kshs. 2,750. Equally, the amounts paid by different humanitarian actors in the drought response vary.

In some counties, there has been progress towards harmonising transfer values. Efforts have been driven by different actors in order to reduce the risk of community conflict and to increase consistency between donors.

There is no commonly agreed basis for defining the transfer value for humanitarian response. In many cases, transfer values have been roughly aligned with those used by HSNP in the arid counties of Wajir, Mandera, Marsabit and Turkana. While this has helped create some degree of harmonisation, many other issues remain including:

- What should the basis of calculating the cash value be? Should it be aligned with the HSNP or should there be a commonly agreed Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB)?
- While alignment with HSNP or other social protection values helps reduce the risk of community conflict and makes communication with communities easier, it is debatable whether the current values are sufficient to achieve the planned humanitarian outcomes.
- In areas where transfer values vary, the risk of conflict within communities and between communities and agencies increases.

- The Government response to the drought seeks to increase the number of people reached rather than increasing the transfer value for a small population (horizontal rather than vertical expansion). In contrast, some humanitarian agencies would like to increase the transfer value to increase impact at household level. There is a tension between these two approaches, both of which have a strong rationale.
- Transfers are currently remitted for households but few (if any) agencies make adjustments to take account of household size.
- Some agencies have generated MEBs to provide a basis for calculating the transfer value but few have applied them given the need to harmonise values with other CTP actors and/or because of resource constraints.
- It was suggested that a mechanism could be established through which cash transfer values could be reviewed during crisis. Such a Government lead approach could allow temporary rises in the transfer value and be sensitive to emerging issues e.g. high commodity prices. It was felt that a CWG could support the government to do this.

It was agreed there was need for a more in-depth discussion about transfer values, with consideration of if/how horizontal (more people) and vertical (higher value) expansion could be combined in agreed circumstances. At a minimum, it was agreed there is need for more clarity about how transfer values are calculated and how they relate to planned humanitarian outcomes.

4.3   Complaints and feedback

Various complaint and feedback systems are being used in the response, some are CTP specific and others have a broader remit. Systems include:
- The HSNP case management system which is decentralized to the sub-location level and reaches communities in Mandera, Marsabit, Turkana and Wajir. The system records cases (updates and complaints) and provides the real-time status of the logged cases. Wider rights issues are handled by rights committees managed by HelpAge International, one of HSNP's implementing partners. See HSNP Case Management and HSNP Dashboard
- Uwajibikaji Pamoja is a complaints referral system run by Transparency International in conjunction with state and non-state actors in Marsabit, Turkana, Wajir and West Pokot.
- Most actors have their own complaints and feedback systems.

Discussions highlighted that many workshop participants (let alone beneficiaries) were unaware of the different systems being used and this may be creating confusion and inefficiencies. While multiple systems may be needed, it seems there is need for wider understanding of the systems and if/how they can better complement one another.

4.4   Coordination of CTP

More than any other issue, improved coordination was identified as urgent since it provides a means by which many other issues can be addressed.

At national level, there is no forum through which CTP issues are routinely addressed, though increasingly ad hoc CTP related discussions are arising in multiple forums. At county level, there has been good engagement with some County Steering Committees with, for example, discussions about targeting to reduce the risk of duplication and efforts to harmonise case values (see above). But the capacity of the County Steering Groups and engagement by different actors varies. In some cases, technical working groups are not functioning and there is need to strengthen understanding of CTP, there may be need for County level cash working groups/work-streams to drive forward improvements in CTP.

Some of the issues which could be addressed by improved coordination include:

- Inconsistent cash transfer values paid to beneficiaries (see cash transfer section).
- No commonly agreed MEB or an agreed basis for calculating humanitarian cash transfer values (see cash transfer section).
- There are multiple feedback mechanisms, providing the risk of duplication and confusion.
- Targeting approaches are not commonly agreed, creating risks of duplication and omission.
- The use of data from the single registry (Social Assistance Unit of Department of Social Protection, Ministry of East Africa Community, Labour and Social Protection) varies. There is scope to improve support to strengthen the national system.
- Different payment systems and approaches are used, creating risks of duplication and inefficiencies.
- Communication about the timing of payments could be improved.
- Opportunities to strengthen programme quality and create efficiencies. For example, there could be joint assessments, better targeting, improved coordination of post distribution monitoring (including making data more comparable), improvements to case management and feedback mechanisms, joint market assessments and better sharing and use of CTP experience and learning.

As social protection and humanitarian CTP responsibilities are spread across different Government departments, there is need for CTP coordination to bring these functions together as well as engaging non-state actors. There was some feeling that non-state actors sometimes create problems through limited sharing of information, a tendency to pull in different directions, limited engagement with existing structures and, for some, an inclination to establish parallel systems. Participants were keen to see enhanced Government leadership at national and county level to improve coordination and provide guidance for operating agencies.

4.5   Diversion and corruption

Although not a major focus, issues related to diversion and corruption emerged in various discussions. Issues included:

- There is need to improve accountability and strengthen complaints and feedback management.
- There are risks that community, political or staff influences may have negative impacts. Risks include manipulation of targeting, selection and registration processes, with beneficiaries included because of who they are (communities prioritised based on factors other than need) or who they know (individuals included based on relationships or payments).
- There are risks of corruption at different levels involving community members, implementing agencies and payment providers.
- Risks related to 'skimming' are increased because of differences in transfer amounts, payment schedules and weaknesses in communicating with communities about transfer values, dates and their rights.

4.6   Evidence and learning

Overall, it was felt that information about the response has been shared better than in some similar responses – with information shared by CaLP, OCHA, NDMA/HSNP and others. In addition, CaLP has shared information about CTP learning and good practice.

All agencies involved in CTP generate data but sharing is often weak. The lack of a national cash working group was felt to have impeded inter-agency sharing of CTP information. Further, the lack of a single repository for CTP reports and information has contributed to poor information sharing, though it was recognised that more information could be easily shared via the CaLP resource library.

Overall, it was felt that more information and learning could be shared to strengthen efforts to scale-up and improve the quality of CTP in Kenya.

4.7   Markets

While markets are functioning, prices of some commodities are rising.

Regular market information is available for 23 counties via NDMA/WFP and some agencies have undertaken market assessments. Some gaps in market data may exist, for example, it was unclear if markets are monitored in counties which are not routinely monitored by NDMA/WFP.

Many people were unaware of the breadth of market information currently available. As such, increasing awareness and understanding of existing markets information offers the potential for some 'quick-wins' in terms of CTP management. Further gains could be made if agencies share market assessment reports (via the CaLP resource library) or share information about planned assessments. Furthermore, where additional market assessments and monitoring is needed, there is scope to improve collaboration and undertake joint assessments.

On a more sceptical note, much as market information is collected it is unclear how much it influences planning and decision making in some contexts. For example, despite data showing that commodity prices have increased - cash transfer values have remained the same.

4.8   Payment providers

Discussions about engagement with payment providers was generally positive with recognition that the number, variety and geographical coverage of providers has increased in recent years – providing opportunities to make transfers through different mechanisms and at lower cost than before. Discussions highlighted opportunities to build on these positives as well as the need to address problems that exist. Key points were:

- It is essential to consider the appropriateness of different mechanisms in different areas, to test the reliability and acceptability of services as well as assessing costs.
- In some areas, specific service providers have a monopoly. There is need for agencies to consider how they engage with this and what it means for the long-term provision of financial services in such areas.
- Electronic transfers are the preferred option in most areas, with advantages in terms of offering convenient (for agencies and communities), efficient and cost effective services.
- The high transfer fees charged by banks were flagged as a concern. However, some people cautioned that there is need to ensure that a true 'like for like' comparison is made when costs are reviewed.
- The HSNP platform offers a 'complete package' with services in relation to targeting, registration, communications, monitoring, external evaluation and case management as well as payments services.
- The context in the ASALs has changed and banking and network coverage has increased in recent years. This may result in cost reductions when contracts with existing payment providers end and new tenders are launched.

- The need for timely transfers to beneficiaries was underscored alongside effective communication about payment amounts, dates, complaints and grievances.
- Opportunities may exist for more collective engagement with payment providers to reduce costs or create common payment platforms to make CTP management easier.
- Changes in the financial sector (e.g. the banking switch and new technologies) may offer scope to negotiate different service agreements and offer beneficiaries more choice with regards to how they receive funds.

4.9   Programme design

Poor programme design and using cash and vouchers inappropriately was recognised as a risk with the inevitable consequence that programmes would not result in planned outcomes. There is need for strong assessments and clear response analysis, plus effective planning to ensure the appropriate use of CTP. Other design issues included:

- There is potential for CTP to improve the links between relief, recovery and development programmes. Development and humanitarian agencies need to come together to explore this further.
- Actors need to develop a common understanding of objectives and expected outcomes of the CTP component of the drought response. This will make it easier to discuss other issues such as transfer values, targeting and work towards a common M&E approach.
- There is need for more understanding of how cash programming can contribute to sectoral objectives e.g. livelihoods, health, nutrition and WASH.
- There are opportunities to increase financial inclusion. Development work can increase financial inclusion which could facilitate the scale-up of CTP during disasters and, conversely, humanitarian response could plan to promote financial inclusion for both short and longer term benefits.
- A simple Kenya specific checklist / basic standard operating procedure could be useful to guide agencies planning to engage in CTP in Kenya.

4.10   Targeting, selection and registration, inclusion and exclusion

Issues related to targeting, selection and registration were the subject of considerable debate. Among other things discussions touched on selection methodologies and exclusion concerns. Discussions included:

- Questions about whether current targeting is good enough, whether the most vulnerable are being reached and if inconsistencies in approaches need to be addressed. Concerns included:
    - Fears about community based targeting approaches which may produce skewed results and exclude some vulnerable groups.
    - The processes used to verify targeted beneficiaries and risks of systems being manipulated.
    - The need to ensure that targeting approaches 'do no harm' while, at the same time, being robust enough to reach the most vulnerable.
- Multiple agencies are undertaking similar targeting and registration exercises. It may be there is scope to improve overall effectiveness through improved collaboration and more harmonization of approaches.
- All targeting approaches have strengths and weaknesses. Overall community driven processes were the preferred option but weaknesses need to be considered including the risk of processes being 'captured' or manipulated.
- There was felt to be a risk of needs assessments and targeting exercises focusing on easy to access areas. Needs assessments need to be strengthened and information shared as this provides the basis for targeting.

- While some agencies use information from the HSNP database and the single registry, some flagged concerns about inclusion errors, duplicate entries, out of date information and so on. HSNP is currently engaged in a harmonised registration exercise across the four Counties, the exercise is set to register 400,000HHs. See HSNP [key messages](#).
- Despite limitations and difficulties, it was recognised that there is potential for better use of the single registry and for CTP actors to contribute more systematically to the updating of the system.
- There is a risk of duplicate registrations (given exercises being undertaken by different agencies and/or the risk of families splitting to register twice) but, overall, there was more concern about exclusion errors.
- It was recognised that there is need to update targeting in order respond to changing needs. On the other hand, given debates about the adequacy of the cash transfer values, an argument could be made for blanket targeting in highly vulnerable areas with some of the costs of this off-set by lower costs of targeting processes.
- Concerns were raised about vulnerable populations being excluded from CTPs due to lack of National Identification cards (ID). The lack of ID results in substantial delays in accessing cash transfers and can prevent registration into a CTP that delivers payments through bank accounts (since a national ID is a requirement of Central Bank of Kenya's 'know your customer' (KYC) rule which applies when opening a bank account). Many agencies have worked with beneficiaries to help obtain National ID but processes are slow and problematic in emergency contexts.

5 Priorities for collective action

Priorities for action were discussed, focusing on those which would be collectively beneficial. Some short-term actions could benefit the current response while medium/longer term actions will improve CTP in future responses. This list could be used to inform the drafting of Terms of Reference for a new Cash Working Group in future.

Cash transfer value
a) Consider adjusting the transfer value to ensure it is meeting needs, potentially building on:
  o A study to assess what transfer value is needed to have an impact and then using results to advocate for changes in existing values.
  o Request NDMA/NSNPs to provide advice on cash transfer values.
  o Develop a commonly agreed MEB to inform the calculation of the cash transfer value.
  o Use the long rains assessment (mid-June to July) to inform discussions about the cash transfer value.
b) Establish standards/guidelines to support the review of cash transfer values during crisis.
c) Hold joint discussions with donors about adjustments to transfer values as needed.
d) Communicate with communities to increase understanding of the objectives of cash transfer programmes.

Complaints and feedback
a) Raise the profile and use of existing systems including:
  o Uwabijikaji Pamoja:
    ▪ Include a link on CaLP website.
    ▪ Short briefing note to be prepared by TI/Oxfam and shared with all participants.
  o NSNP/HSNP:
    ▪ Understand more about what HelpAge International is doing with regard to monitoring.
    ▪ Share NSNP single registry national hotline number.
    ▪ HSNP [case management](#) process – check [HSNP website](#) for information.
b) Introduce accountability systems in areas where none exist. Link with County Steering Groups.
c) Improve the sharing of information with beneficiaries about how much they will be given and when.

d) Enhance training on Core Humanitarian Standards.
e) Train suppliers on accountability requirements and develop service charters for the payment service providers.

Coordination
a) Support GOK as the lead coordinator.
b) Promote and support the formation of a regular CTP forum/cash working group taking into account that:
   o CTP is multisectoral.
   o It cuts across different government departments.
   o There is need to improve coordination at local and national levels.
   o There are various options and linkages including the Kenya Food Security Steering Group, a new Cash Working Group, the Social Protection Working Group, the resilience agenda and links with County Steering Groups at county levels.
   o Multiple agencies are engaged in CTP.
   o There is need to invest time in coordination if it is to be effective.
c) Map service providers.
d) Map actors implementing CTP in Kenya.
e) Utilise, support and strengthen national systems and structures e.g. single registry.
f) Improve coordination of geographic targeting.
g) Increase understanding of Government policies and related funds including:
   o The National Drought Emergency Fund (NDEF) is managed by NDMA. The Government is implementing the second stage of a three-phase response programme approved by the Cabinet in November 2016, for which the National Treasury has approved Kshs 7.4 billion against total needs of Kshs 11.6 billion.
   o NDEF will provide contingency financing to scale-up in response to drought. The parliament is yet to pass the NDEF regulations.
   o The draft National Disaster Risk Management bill (2016). The draft bill seeks to establish a Disaster Risk Management Authority which will liaise with the national and county governments to deal with disasters and advise on disaster risk management. It also seeks to establish a Disaster Risk Management Fund to support disaster preparedness, mitigation, response and recovery measures.
h) Advocate/lobby in support of passing of the National Emergency Drought Fund Bill

Evidence and learning
a) Strengthen CTP learning and sharing.
b) Develop a common platform/portal for data/information related to CTP in Kenya.
c) Engage with learning platforms e.g. CaLP.
d) Increase understanding of / and the evidence base for the use of multi-purpose CTP in Kenya.

Markets
a) Increase use of available market information e.g. WFP produce bulletins on market prices.
b) Explore what market information is available outside counties monitored by NDMA/WFP.
c) If existing information does not meet needs, undertake joint market assessments to fill gaps.
d) Share information at County Steering Group meetings.
e) Explore if more market data should be added to the NDMA survey tools (noting the cost benefit of any such proposal).

Payment providers

a) Explore the potential for the collective negotiation of transfer fees with the private sector.

Programme design

a) Share assessment and monitoring information.
b) Strengthen linkages between humanitarian actors and social safety nets.
c) Develop CTP policies - including risk management - to support quality programming.
d) Undertake joint, county led post distribution and wider CTP monitoring.

Targeting and registration

a) Invite National Social Protection Secretariat to a coordination meeting to explain and discuss targeting.
b) Review targeting criteria:
    o Share existing targeting methodologies.
    o Review and harmonise methodologies.
    o Develop more effective community based validation strategies for dealing with issues of inclusion, exclusion, collusion and cheating errors.
    o Nominate technical working group members from implementing organisations.
    o Discussions should be lead by NDMA and HSNP for ASAL areas.
c) Single registry:
    o Use and support the single registry e.g. systematically provide updated information about beneficiaries.
    o Identify excluded HHs and share data with HSNP – through county coordination structures.
    o Harmonise systems that support CTP e.g. synchronise databases.
d) Share information about the single registry with implementing partners.
e) Lobby the National Bureau of Registration to speed up the provision of IDs.

6   Agreed immediate next steps

a) Share website links related to accountability mechanisms and market data (CaLP)
b) KRCS to work with relevant Government departments and other stakeholders to convene a meeting to take forward discussions on coordination, with the aim of agreeing where the cash working group sits; developing TORs, agreeing leadership and so on (KRCS).
c) Agencies with market assessment reports to upload on CaLP resource library (all).
d) CaLP to share details of new Kenya specific resources in future e-bulletins (CaLP).
e) Increase understanding of existing accountability and registration systems as detailed above (all).

Annex 1: List of Participants

1	Actionaid	Ronnie Murungu	Senior Emergency Manager - Horn of Africa
2	ACTED Kenya	Shalom Magoma	Kenya Program Manager
3	British Red Cross	Paul Davenport	Country Manager
4	CaLP	Charity Lukaya	Senior Capacity Building Officer
5	CaLP	Esther Mbogho	Administration and Communications Officer
6	CaLP	Karen Peachey	Regional Representative
7	CARE	Juliet Khisa	Emergency Response Coordinator
8	Concern	Golicha Dima	Livelihoods Manager
9	ECHO	Maria Bernardez	Food Assistance Expert for Eastern Africa
10	ECHO	Eunice MAINA	Programming
11	ECHO	Irene Bosire	Program Officer- Kenya and Somalia
12	Finnish Red Cross	Tiia Haapaniemi	Country Delegate, Burundi and Kenya
13	Food for the Hungry	Alex Mwaura	Program Director
14	GiveDirectly	Mark Laichena	Country Director
15	HSNP	Carrie Ndoka	Communications Specialist
16	ICRC	Aden Harun Abdi	Field Officer -Economic security
17	Kenya Red Cross	Fredrick Orimba	National Cash Transfer Programme Officer
18	Kenya Red Cross	Leila Chepkemboi	Program Manager
19	NRC	Halkano Jillo Boru	Food Security Specialist
20	Oxfam Kenya Programme	Lucy Gikonyo	Consortium Lead
21	PACIDA	Dub Guyo	Programmes Manager
22	Plan Kenya	Jim Ouko	Economic Strengthening Specialist
23	Plan Kenya	Gabriel Wambua	Emergency Response Manager - North
24	SDC	Abdi Kunow	Programme Officer
25	Tearfund	Mairo Retief	Humanitarian Response Advisor
26	Trocaire	Patricia Kiprono	Talent Development Humanitarian Trainee
27	Trocaire Kenya	Amina Ahmed	Humanitarian Trainee
28	UNHCR	Mirjam Resch	Programme Officer (Cash-based Interventions)
29	UNICEF	Victoria Mwenda	Sector Coordinator
30	WFP	Lara Fossi	Head, Capacity Strengthening Unit Kenya
31	WFP – Kenya	Felix Okech	Program Policy Officer - Cash Based Transfers
32	World Bank	Isabella Hayward	Research and Liaison Officer, ICT Mobile Money
33	World Vision	Emily Mkungo	Program Officer - Food Assistance & Humanitarian Affairs
34	VSF Germany	Lilian Akinyi Ooko	Program Assistant
35	IFRC	Peter Muhangi	Food Security Advisor
36	Oxfam GB	Ogle Dubow	TSU Manager
37	IFRC Somalia	Loise Machira	Innovation Support
38	Oxfam GB	Blandina Bobson	MEAL Officer
39	IFRC	Jude Lumumba	Research & Analytics Support
40	Oxfam GB	Mohamed Abdi	Programme Officer
41	ACF-USA	Douglas Mose	Logistics Manager

Annex 2: Those who registered but couldn't make it

1	CARE	Justus Liku	Livelihoods Technical Advisor
2	DFID	Liz Drake	Team Leader
3	DFID	Mark Agoya	Humanitarian Adviser
4	ECHO	Quentin Le Gallo	Technical Assistant Kenya/Uganda
5	HelpAge International	Luca Saraceno	Technical Team Leader - Africa Region
6	HelpAge International	George Ndung'u Kamau	HSNP Programme Manager
7	HelpAge International	Omondi Ochieng	Research, Evidence and Learning
8	NDMA	Julius Akeno	
9	WASDA	Mohamed Bulle	Programme Manager
10	Welthungerhilfe	Justinah Mwangangi	Programme Officer, Cash and Voucher

---

[i] Information about the NSNP drawn from the social protection and HSNP websites