

---

# **REFLECTING ON THE 2017 DROUGHT RESPONSE AND CASH COORDINATION IN KENYA**

---

**Learning event by the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) planned in  
conjunction with the Kenya Cash Working Group**

**June 19, 2018**

## Table of Contents

1	Introduction .....	2
2	The 2017/18 drought response .....	2
3	What difference did the cash response make? .....	3
4	Cash Coordination.....	5
5	Next steps.....	6
6	Annex : Participants .....	7

## **I Introduction**

A total of 22 participants from Government, various donor agencies, INGOs and the Red Cross movement (annex) attended this half day learning event to reflect on the use of cash in the drought response in Kenya in 2017/18 and consider how cash coordination might be strengthened in future.

This short report brings together the thoughts and reflections from the meeting.

The meeting was organised by CaLP in liaison with the Chair and Co-Chair of the Kenya Cash Working Group. The event was kindly hosted by the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Society (IFRC).

## **2 The 2017/18 drought response**

To get everyone on the same page at the start of the meeting, participants reflected on what – as a collective – the response had set out to achieve; identify what the main interventions and where they took place, plus list what transfer values were used, how they were calculated and by who.

What the response, overall, aim to achieved

- Beneficiary access to food and other basic needs
- Improvement of the local economy/markets
- Protection of livelihoods
- Beneficiary financial inclusion
- Providing dignity, power and choice to the community

The main interventions were;

- Cash for Work (conditional Cash Based Assistance (CBA))
- WASH - vouchers/water ATMs to help in accessing clean and safe water.
- Unconditional cash/multi-purpose grants
- Protection rations (both in kind and cash)

Some of the outcomes from the interventions were;

- Improved access to food and other needs
- Improved access to healthcare, nutrition and education.
- Improved coping with shocks for the beneficiaries.
- Better coordination on the cash responses (national and county levels).
- Capacity building of cash actors (both county government and non-state actors)
- Visibility and pushing the cash agenda.
- Improved efficiency and ‘Value for money’

Interventions took place in the Arid and Semi-Arid Lands counties of Kenya, some coastal counties and Nairobi. The specific counties given were: Baringo, Garissa, Isiolo, Kilifi, Kitui, Kwale, Lamu (parts), Makueni, Mandera, Marsabit, Nairobi, Samburu, Tana River, Taita Taveta, Turkana, Wajir and West Pokot.

Different transfer values were used:

Agency	Value	Notes
CWG recommended harmonized value	KES 4,000	50% of MEB for food
ECHO through KRCS and ACTED	KES 3,000	Based on the GOK Cash transfers for Safety nets
GOK through WFP	KES 2,300 (semi-arid) KES 3,000 (arid)	
Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP)	KES 2,700	Numbers reached increased
KRCS	KES 2000	
KRCS/ICRC	KES 4,800 KES 5,700 in Lamu	
Oxfam	KES 2,000	Conditional NFI
Oxfam	KES 2,700	
WFP	KES 2,500	Cash for Assets
WFP	KES 2,700	Chakula kwa jamii
WFP	KES 4,000	Protection

Transfer values were calculated by different agencies in different ways. Some had calculated based on a percentage of the minimum expenditure basket (MEB); for Lamu, Kenya Red Cross had followed the Somalia MEB calculation guide and IPC classifications. In most cases, the values were endorsed by the government of Kenya and donors.

A discussion of transfer values highlighted that:

- Some of the differences in transfer values reflected different reasons/intended use of the transfers. In addition, some transfer values changed over time as needs and resources changed. To get a clearer picture, these would need to be mapped overtime/geography.
- Work was undertaken by the CWG secretariat to develop a harmonised value but this was not then applied by all and not all agencies were aware of it.
- Discussions later in the day (see below) highlighted examples of where different value transfers were given in the same communities at the same time.

### 3 What difference did the cash response make?

Having reflected on what was done, the focus turned to a self-evaluation of the cash response. Discussion focused on: What was the impact? How do we know/what evidence is there? What needs to be improved? And by who?

#### What was the impact?

On the positive side the use of cash:

- Restored and enhanced purchasing power in some areas.
- Gave freedom of choice on utilization of resources.
- Boosted the economy and revived markets in some areas.
- Increased the use of cash as a modality.
- Improved household food consumption.
- Improved access to healthcare.

- Improved access to education.
- Reached more people with less staff than an in-kind response.
- Helped protect household assets.
- Benefitted financial service provider agents.
- Provided platform for financial inclusion e.g. use of Mpesa
- Implemented quickly, allowing an earlier and faster response.
- Helped protect livelihoods – though it was noted that there were compounding factors.

Some negative impacts were also noted:

- Some cases of family conflicts noted.
- Members of the community who were not targeted felt left out.
- Weak coordination resulted in some double targeting and different transfer values being used by different agencies in the same location. This resulted in cases of community tension, as well as being inefficient.
- Some cases of fraud.

### **What evidence do we have to show there has been impact?**

- Evidence of impact can be seen in multi-sectoral assessments.
- Monitoring reports, including post distribution monitoring.
- Agency specific evaluation reports.
- Study on early response.
- Feedback from beneficiaries through encashment surveys.
- Market assessments and WFP market monitoring.
- Information gathered from meetings and discussions among actors.
- Food consumption score and the Coping Strategies Index.

### **What needs to be improved and by who?**

Below is a summary of ideas that were raised.

<b>What</b>	<b>Who</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is need for more harmonised approaches e.g.               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ methodology of calculating transfer values.</li> <li>○ targeting and monitoring.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	CWG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is need for better understanding and planning to address nutritional needs using cash based assistance. This could be done by improving understanding of nutrition and better linking cash with non-cash interventions sensitization.</li> </ul>	Different agencies, government, and the CWG.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is need to improve cash coordination:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ at all stages - from preparedness through implementation and evaluation</li> <li>○ working across all sectors</li> <li>○ working at both the national and county level</li> <li>○ intervention-specific assessments led by agencies, the government, and the CWG.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	CWG, government and agencies.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need for more integrated cash programming</li> </ul>	CWG and implementing agencies

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase application of learning: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ more sharing of learning among actors.</li> <li>○ greater use of resources and guidance.</li> <li>○ more participation in the forums.</li> <li>○ some felt that information is available and what is needed is a commitment to improving practice.</li> <li>○ evidence-based research needed on use of CBA to fill gaps.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	CWG and willingness by implementing agencies to share learning
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Collective bargaining with Financial Service Providers. This should be done as part of preparedness.</li> </ul>	Coordinated through CWG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broaden participation in the CWG. Seek to involve the private sector and national NGOs.</li> </ul>	CWG
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve beneficiary communication planning and strength accountability.</li> </ul>	CWG

## 4 Cash Coordination

Building on issues which had emerged throughout the morning, discussions turned to cash coordination.

### Positives were acknowledged with a feeling that in the last 6 months:

- There was recognition of the need to improve coordination in order to strengthen CTP.
- There is improved discussion around cash – ‘we are at the table and talking’.
- A CWG formed and, despite challenges, there has been progress in the last six months both at national and county levels.
- MEB discussions have been initiated.
- A joint market assessment was undertaken in Marsabit County.
- The Government of Kenya is starting to take the lead.
- Learning events and CWG meetings have brought together actors involved in CTP.
- There is increasing understanding of the complexity of the viewpoints of multiple stakeholders.
- A refugee CWG was formed as a sub working group but, as far as people know, had only met once.

### Turning to what needs to be improved it was noted that:

- The CWG structure and ways of working:
  - it was not clear to everyone present who was part of the CWG secretariat.
  - there was some confusion about the roles and responsibilities between the secretariat and the wider CWG.
  - some agencies feel excluded.
  - there is need for a decision on whether the refugee subgroup is still needed.
  - membership of the CWG does not include all actors, the private sector and national NGOs are absent.
  - participation in the CWG has been inconsistent. There is need for more commitment from individuals and organisations to actively participate in the group.
  - the location of the CWG meetings is a challenge for many.
- The CWG started by focusing on the MEB which is a hard topic to tackle and which needed more time.
- Everyone is busy during the time of a response and there was not enough time to move CWG issues forward.
- 4w reporting needs to improve.
- Government does not have to chair but endorses the working group.

## Reflections:

- There was debate about whether the private sector should attend CWG meetings routinely. Some felt this was not appropriate, while others championed their inclusion making the case that private sectors actors are a major player in cash programming and that this would help strengthen dialogue.
- The absence of national NGOs was also noted. While the inclusion of NNGOs may be better at County level, it was noted that there was need for international NGOs to encourage partners to attend.
- The importance of sustaining the CWG during periods when there is no response, as well as galvanising action during response periods was noted. Preparedness work could include, for example, the work on MEBs and agreeing potential transfer values; negotiating with financial service providers and so on.
- Much as the CEO of NDMA volunteered that the Government did not need to chair the group, there was a strong feeling that Government should continue with this role.
- The need to strengthen the connection with other parts of Government, including on social protection secretariat, was noted.

## 5 Next steps

Action points were agreed as follows;

- The Cash Working Group should be adjusted as follows:
  - the secretariat should be disbanded and all meetings should be inclusive.
  - there is need for continued administrative support – calling meetings, taking notes and so on. KRCS will continue to provide this as part of the co-chair function.
  - the Government should continue to Chair the CWG. The Chair will endeavour to get more people from NDMA involved and may delegate Chairing of the meeting to others in NDMA or to the co-chair as need arises.
- Time limited working groups will be formed to tackle specific issues.
- The TORs will be updated to reflect changes agreed and discussed/agreed at the next meeting.
- Private sector and NNGO engagement will be encouraged.
- The meeting frequency was agreed to be monthly, on the 3rd Thursday of each at 10 am.
- The CWG will ask IFRC if it can host the next meeting and will consider rotating meetings between IFRC & KRCS, though the value of a consistent location was noted.
- Participating agencies need to suggest/co-develop agenda and priorities.
- The contact list needs to be updated to help better reach out to partners.

## 6 Annex: Participants

Name	Organisation	Designation
Denis Owano	ACTED	Accountability Officer
Esther Mbogho	CaLP	Regional Administration and Communications Officer
Karen Peachey	CaLP	Interim director/ Regional Representative
Lemeria Veillaud	CARE International	HoA Emergency Coordinator
Tim Waites	DFID	Team Leader, Poverty Hunger and Vulnerability
Judith Munyao	ECHO	Food Assistance
Irene Bosire	EU-ECHO	Programme Management
Ruth Aggiss	FEWS NET/Independent Consultant	Senior Cash and Vouchers Consultant
Peter Murgor	Food for the Hungry	Project officer, Cash transfer
Stephen Kalungu	GiveDirectly	Program Manager
Leila Chepkemboi	IFRC	Senior operations Officer
Lisbet Elvekjaer	IFRC	Regional CTP delegate
Rehema Mwanasha Mbete	Independent	Monitoring, Evaluation, Accountability and Learning Coordinator
Jackline Gachiri	International Center for Humanitarian Affairs	CTP researcher
Fredrick Orimba	Kenya Red Cross Society	National Cash Programming Officer
James Oduor	National Drought Management Authority	Chief Executive Officer
Mat Cousins	Oxfam	Humanitarian Director
Joseph K. Chege	USAID	Food security Specialist
Mary Mertens	USAID	Kenya Program Advisor/FFP
Felix Okech	WFP – Kenya	Program Policy Officer - Innovations & CTP Focal Point
Matilda Okech	World Renew	Disaster Response Manager
Robert Ikee	World Vision Kenya	Humanitarian Accountability Specialist

The table below lists people who registered but were unable to attend on the day:

Name	Organisation	Designation
Alice Kimani	British Red Cross	Programme Manager
Allan Mbole	Church World Service	Emergency Response & DRR officer
Ric Goodman	DAI Europe	Team Leader, Hunger Safety Net Programme
Michael Gichumbi	Farming Systems Kenya (local partner of ACT Alliance)	Emergency Response and Disaster Risk Reduction Officer
Apphia Ndungu	FSD Kenya	Technical Adviser
Plounne Oyunge	FSD Kenya	Programme Manager - Government Payments
Caroline Teti	Give Directly	Director, External Relations

Farah Abdulsamed	IGAD	Humanitarian Affairs Coordinator
Kenneth Macharia	JustRich Limited	Executive Director
Moses Talam	Kenya Red Cross Society	M&E Assistant
Jim Ouko	PLAN International	Economic Strengthening Lead
Ann Wanjema	Social Protection Secretariat	Social Development Officer
Moses Edapal Nawoton	Turkana County government	Coordination of disasters and emergency management in county
Rita Maingi	UN OCHA	Community Engagement
LILIAN OTIENO	UNHCR	Livelihoods focal point
George Ombis	USAID	Regional Program Specialist
Ariz Muhammad	World Food Programme	Field Coordinator