

Kakamega County Scoping of Socio-Economic Inclusion Efforts for the Working Group on Ultra Poverty in Kenya

<p>Key Messages</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Kakamega County has the 8th highest numbers of extreme poor. ✓ Largest rural population with agriculture as the backbone of the economy, but smallholders lack diversification and value addition, undermining resilience and nutrition. ✓ The county funded Youth Service & Women’s Empowerment Programme is a graduation initiative though not labelled as such. The Linda Mama programme is another interesting county funded initiative entering into the field of graduation. ✓ Key challenges include coordination between national and county government programmes, a lack of management information systems to enable this, weak monitoring and evaluation and skills in business and mentoring of the poor. ✓ The County Government is very receptive to support from the Working Group.
<p>Background</p>	<p>Kakamega County covers an area of 3,051 Km² and is the second most populous county after Nairobi with the largest rural population of any countyⁱ. The 2009 census put the population at 1,660,651ⁱⁱ (estimated to be 2,079,669 in 2018ⁱⁱⁱ). It is ranked 8th in terms of numbers of extreme poor with an estimated 129,000 though this is only 6.9% of the county population. The county has six sub-counties and 60 wards.</p> <p>Being a rural county, it is dominated by agriculture with the main food crop maize and main cash crop sugar cane. There is a recognised need to diversify agricultural production and nutrition indicators are poor at 28.3% stunting compared to a national average of 26% in 2014.^{iv}</p> <p>A poverty focus to county programming is apparent, but this is not always an emphasis on the extreme poor, reinforced by a sense of political need to spread assistance equally across the county. Poverty across the county has not been mapped but interviewees indicated that the poor and extreme poor are spread throughout the county. An exercise is about to begin with county planning and social services to conduct an abstract statistical survey generating an idea of poverty across the county. This may provide a useful source of information. The registration of populations for county funded NHIF subsidies could also provide useful poverty profiling but it is not clear whether this will cover NSNP beneficiaries and whether there will be any links to national plans to pay NSNP beneficiaries NHIF coverage.</p> <p>Agriculture is the backbone of the Kakamega economy, but small farmers lack diversification which effects their resilience and nutrition, the value addition to basic commodities is weak. Expenditure at national and county level has a 10% target for agriculture however on paper this is nearer 7% and realised expenditure nearer 2%. While FAO recommends a farmer: agriculture extension ratio of 500:1 Kakamega has nearer 3000:1. Key development partners include the World Bank, USAID and DFID especially supporting health projects.</p>

	<p>The NSNP caseload for the county is 43,050; 11,000 OVC, 1000 PWDs, 9000 65+ pension and 22,050 70+. No recertification has taken place since 2012.</p>
<p>County 'Graduation' Pilots</p>	<p>County Youth Service & Women's Empowerment Programme^v, key facts: 3000 men and women targeted – 1800 18-35-year olds and 1200 35-55-year-old women. Began: Jan 2019, Duration: 2 years. Planning next intake for June 2019 of 1500. Purely funded by county government.</p> <p> Five days per week between 8am-1pm – participants engage in public works – cleaning and maintenance etc.</p> <p> Then in the afternoons between 2-5pm they attend polytechnics across the county to participate in a range of courses offered free or some women engage in independent livelihoods activities.</p> <p> For the above participants are paid 8000ksh/ month enabling consumption support. Payment is made through bank accounts helping to build financial literacy. If they miss an hour of work this is deducted.</p> <p> 500ksh per month is automatically paid into a SACCO to begin the process of savings to enable potential investment in businesses/ asset purchase once participants graduate from the programme.</p> <p> 400ksh is deducted each month to cover NHIF for a whole family enabling access to medical care.</p> <p> There is an induction process, but mentoring is recognised as a weaker element of the programme.</p> <p>Entry requirements: no qualifications are required, the intention is to target out of work poor, widows, disabled. Severely disabled are able to nominate a family member if they cannot participate themselves. Every ward in the county could propose 50 candidates for the first round. A similar spread across counties is planned for future rounds.</p> <p>The programme has been passed into law by an Act of Parliament, ringfencing funding in future years.</p> <p> The Imarisha Afya ya Mama na Mtoto (Linda Mama) Programme Target group: Mothers and expectant mothers from poor backgrounds and teenage mothers. Funded by the County Government at 100 million per annum with technical assistance from UNICEF including funding of two staff positions for the programme.</p> <p>Purpose: to address high levels of maternal and infant mortality and poor ANC attendance and levels of hospital births. The programme provides cash incentives (2000ksh per payment) to attend health facilities in the key period of pregnancy and the first 18 months of a baby's life in the following cycles:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Attendance of 4 antenatal clinics – 1st payment released.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Delivery in 1 of 24 health facilities spread across the 12 sub counties by skilled professionals – 2nd payment released. - Attending clinic when baby is 6 weeks – 3rd payment released. - Attendance at clinic at 6 months – 4th payment released. - Attendance at clinic at 9 months – 5th payment released. - Attendance at clinic at 18 months – 6th payment released. <p>In 2014 the scheme enrolled 43,000 – 30,000 of whom were deemed eligible. An impact evaluation took place in 2018 which highlighted an increase in ANC attendance from 62% to 94% and skilled delivery increased from 48% to 78% across the county during the project period.</p> <p>The NSNP’s harmonised targeting methodology (HTM) was used to register and target beneficiaries with verification by community health workers (CHWs) to ensure that the poorest are targeted. The programme has a good MIS in place linked to Safaricom with electronic payment of CTs.</p> <p>Whilst this is not yet a graduation programme containing the full range of graduation components the programme is currently going through a redesign process, one of the intentions of which is to explore how women can be linked to other poverty targeted county funded development initiatives at the 18-month mark to strengthen their livelihoods base towards a sustainable exit from poverty.</p>
<p>Other poverty focused/ social development programming in Kakamega County¹</p>	<p>The County Government is supporting a number of other poverty focused efforts which could form part of a graduation programme. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Shelter programme – shelter provision to the most vulnerable some coordination with a multi-agency approach including DSD and DCS. ✓ 1 cow initiative – beneficiaries are given a cow in calf poverty targeted at ward level over 600 given to date. Beneficiaries are required to join a cooperative to improve their management of the asset. ✓ NHIF – 60 million shillings set aside in the county budget for this. Hoping to register around 8000 (with AMREF support) this may involve comprehensive data gathering across the population to select beneficiaries though priority women of child bearing age who are poor. Not using HTM tool. Would like to increase beyond the 8000 but lack resources. ✓ County bursaries for secondary education and some university scholarships, vocational training and school repairs. ✓ Roads, market infrastructure, lighting and soft loans (5-20,000ksh) to small businesses. ✓ Provision of farm inputs and subsidies of fertiliser and seeds to those with less than 3 acres on a first come first served basis. ✓ Collaborations between MoA and MoH to address nutrition. ✓ Value addition activities between trade and agriculture. ✓ Distribution of physical aids to PWDs & current census of PWDs. <p>Few INGOs are present in Kakamega. CRS was mentioned as working through local NGOs supporting OVC and their families – food assistance, NHIF coverage, IGAs, savings and loans etc. One Acre Fund has a substantial presence working with smallholder farmers providing quality seeds and</p>

¹ Please note this is not a comprehensive overview of initiatives but a snapshot gained through a brief county visit and secondary data review.

	<p>fertilizer on credit, with flexible repayment. Inputs are delivered to farmers and they are provided with training, crop storage and information on market fluctuations to maximize profits. The programme is largely financing.</p>
<p>Gaps/ challenges</p>	<p>In the above graduation programming the county government recognises weaknesses in their capacity in the following areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ Monitoring and evaluation – as yet there is no clear baseline which would enable effective understanding of any changes that the programme brings about. There are a lack of measurable indicators, staffing and systems to monitor the programme implementation. The county government would be interested in independent evaluation of the programme. The DSD and DCS staff also mentioned a lack of capacity to track results and best practice of their caseloads where transfers may have been used for productive purposes or combined with other forms of assistance such as bursaries, shelter and loans. Whilst the CIDP includes an M&E framework with indicators there are challenges in operationalising this. ✓ Management information systems - currently beneficiary data is not captured electronically with no systems able to track beneficiaries across a range of programmes. ✓ The ability to support households and groups in developing business and entrepreneurial skills and financial literacy. ✓ Mentoring elements of the graduation package are also a gap in the current programmes. ✓ Polytechnics differ in the range and quality of training and facilities on offer across the county. ✓ Currently the staffing capacity of the programmes are limited, but the range of activities and the numbers of participants demands good oversight with appropriately qualified staff. <p>There was a similar youth empowerment scheme in the past which did not work well, and the County Government are keen to avoid this happening again, but this requires addressing the above gaps.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ The Linda Mama programme has ambition to develop into a graduation programme to develop sustainable poverty escape pathways for the women it has supported. Whilst there are existing government funded initiatives that could form part of such a programme there will be gaps. Any engagement with this programme should be done with UNICEF who are currently providing TA. <p>Other gaps and weaknesses include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ There is some coordination between national and county government on a sectoral basis such as between the department for social development staff and the County Ministry of Social Services. However, overall coordination between national and county development efforts, and even within county government programmes, could be improved. This is underpinned by the lack of effective MISs and overlap in roles and functions across national and county staff at the county level. ✓ County Planning has responsibility for county level M&E but recognise that it is only able to do limited monitoring and no evaluation. A

	<p>county M&E forum co-chaired by the County Secretary and County Commissioner exists but was said not to be very active.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ There are a range of committees for different programmes, especially for beneficiary selection, this is duplication of effort and undermines the ability to see overlap. There is no common system across programmes to register beneficiaries. Many liked the idea of the HTM, it has been used effectively in the Linda Mama programme but has yet to be rolled out by the NSNP. The NSNP programmes are very overdue a recertification which if done would incorporate the roll out of the HTM. ✓ Interviewees recognised there are challenges in reaching the poorest and it is not clear whether all poverty focused programmes are able to do so. An effective assessment of poverty in the county would provide a good foundation for this. ✓ The political pull to spread resources across the county population is strong and any graduation programmes that aim to target the extreme poor need to be preceded by education of MCAs to ensure their buy in and that supporting laws and budgets can be passed. ✓ The County Government lacks a social protection policy.
<p>Recommendations to the Working Group on Ultra Poverty</p>	<p>The County Youth Service and Women’s Empowerment Programme provides an interesting example of a county led and funded initiative on graduation. The programme is now enshrined in law and budget ringfenced. However, the county has identified some clear gaps and weaknesses that need addressing for it to be a real success. Support in this regard has been requested by the Chief Officer Social Services, Youth, Sports and Culture.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>The Working Group on Ultra Poverty/ DFID should consider engaging with the County Youth Service and Women’s Empowerment Programme as a pilot county led graduation initiative and support independent monitoring and evaluation of the initiative. TA should also be considered to the provision of a MIS, financial literacy and mentoring support to strengthen the programme and increase impact.</u> <p>The HTM has been used in Kakamega for the Linda Mama programme only, where it was found to be a useful, appropriate and neutral tool for identifying the poor. Currently the process of targeting county NHIF assistance is being explored with the MoH and AMREF embarking on an exercise to target and register women across the county. The NSNP programmes are long overdue a recertification exercise. All of these factors provide a strong argument for prioritising Kakamega in efforts to roll out the HTM.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. <u>Consider supporting Kakamega County to undertake the roll out of the HTM to enable effective and coordinated targeting of the poor and extreme poor for both the NSNP and county government led graduation and other poverty focused development efforts. This would also enable a mapping of poverty across the county which is an identified current gap.</u> 3. <u>To support this process raising awareness of the graduation approach, its global and local evidence base and adaptations of the approach to different contexts and target groups would be a useful</u>

	<p><u>foundation for the County Assembly (to enable supportive laws and budgets to be passed) and County Executive.</u></p> <p>The Linda Mama Programme is exploring how to develop into a graduation programme. UNICEF is providing some TA to this process as they have to the programme in its current form.</p> <p>4. <u>The Working Group on Ultra Poverty should explore jointly with the County Government and UNICEF how it may play a role in supporting the evolution of the Linda Mama programme into a graduation initiative. There may be particular elements that DFID/ members of the working group can support to ensure its success and that it is a forum for learning.</u></p> <p>The County Government recognises that coordination systems are currently weak. Effective coordination is central to any efforts to develop graduation programming and in general to ensure the more efficient and targeted use of resources across county government and between county and national government. A one off Kakamega County Stakeholders Forum took place last year which many found useful, but it did not result in an ongoing coordination structure and failed to identify a leadership structure. The decentralisation of the single registry and its potential evolution into a social registry would provide a supportive framework for more effective coordination down the line.</p> <p>5. <u>Support the county, and national government at the county level, to develop a coordination structure and guidelines. Support may also be required to develop a county social development policy as a framework to coalesce around.</u></p>
--	---

Name	Position	Department
National Government Offices		
Dominic Oyayo	Director Social Development	Department for Social Development
Richard Masika	Director of Children's Services	Department for Children's Services
Laura Sambuli	Programme Officer	Department for Social Development
Beatrice Oyiero	Member Kakamega Central	Beneficiary Welfare Committee
Jane Njuguna	Chairperson Navakholo Sub County CSAC	County Social Assistance Committee Representative
County Government		
Kennedy Lumbe	Economist	Planning Department
Edward Achola	Statistician	Planning Department
Augustins Lumumba	Statistician	Planning Department
Luvanga Noel	Economist	Planning Department
Nashon Wawire	Programme Manager, Linda Mama Programme	
Fanuel Wemali Angaya	Chief Officer	Trade, Industry & Tourism
Johnston Imbira	County Director Agriculture	Ministry of Agriculture, County Government
Evelyne Mulanji	Chief Officer	Public Health, Ministry of Health
Phitalis Were Masakhwe	Chief Officer	Ministry of Social Services, Youth, Sports and Culture

Civil Society		
Arnold Change	External Relations	One Acre Fund

ⁱ Kakamega County Statistical Office, Kakamega County Statistical Abstract, 2015

ⁱⁱ <https://www.knbs.or.ke/overview-of-census-2009/>

ⁱⁱⁱ Kakamega County Integrated Development Plan 2018-22 <https://kakamega.go.ke/public-participation-county-development-plans/>

^{iv} Ministry of Health, May 2015, Kakamega County Health at a Glance

^v The Kakamega County Youth Service and Women Empowerment Bill, 2018