

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

<p><b>Key Messages</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ West Pokot County has the 4<sup>th</sup> highest population of extreme poor.</li> <li>✓ Limited development partner presence.</li> <li>✓ County Government has poverty focused programmes in education, agriculture and livestock, health and community service.</li> <li>✓ Some programmes are universally applied, and others are poverty targeted on the absolute rather than extreme poor.</li> <li>✓ The graduation approach is not well known.</li> <li>✓ Key challenges relate to coordination of efforts and management information systems to support this, alongside capacities in monitoring and evaluation, business and mentoring skills.</li> <li>✓ The County Government is very receptive to support from the Working Group.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Background</b></p>	<p>West Pokot County covers an area of approximately 9,169km<sup>2</sup> with a population of 649,000 (2007). The extreme poor are estimated to be 26.3% of the population (170,000 people) this ranks the county 4<sup>th</sup> nationally in terms of numbers of extreme poor.<sup>i</sup> Overall poverty has fallen to 57.3% in 2015/16 from 68% in 2013. West Pokot has 4 sub-counties and 20 electoral wards.</p> <p>Whilst pockets of poverty are found throughout the county there is a recognition that it is concentrated in the lowlands. However, no clear mapping of county poverty exists. Overall there is a lack of recent contextual analysis of the county and grey literature. The CIDP recognises the lack of quality M&amp;E and poor data collection and utilisation<sup>ii</sup> and a county M&amp;E unit has been created to try to address this.</p> <p>The CIDP<sup>iii</sup> highlights key challenges as poverty, insecurity, poor infrastructure and the effects of climate change. To address these issues five key priorities are highlighted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Increase access, retention and completion levels in pre-primary, primary, secondary and post-secondary education by at least 100% by 2022.</li> <li>✓ Support value addition and ensure that manufacturing contributes 15% to GDP by 2022.</li> <li>✓ Focus on initiatives that guarantee food security and nutrition to all.</li> <li>✓ Ensure equity in all socio-economic opportunities and protection of vulnerable groups.</li> <li>✓ Support provision of universal health coverage.</li> </ul> <p>Adult literacy stood at only 30% against a national average of 62% in 2007, addressing this is a huge priority for the population and the county government and education is a key strategy for poverty eradication. This has resulted in significant investments by the county government in education across age groups. Currently many skilled jobs are filled by labour from outside the county, such as health workers and teachers.</p> <p>Overall coordination between national and county government efforts is weak, there are several areas of overlap, this is recognised, and attempts are</p>

	<p>being made to address them. Despite high levels of poverty and the range of development challenges facing the county it does not appear to be sufficiently on the radar in terms of development investment compared to many other ASAL counties, with very few NGOs, limited development partner programmes, no HSNP etc. The EU has several programmes that include West Pokot including those focussing on roads, food security and resilience, nutrition, water and sanitation and strengthening county government capacities.<sup>iv</sup></p> <p>Recognising that 84% of the county’s economy is based on agriculture and livestock the CIDP sees investment in this area as the main driver for economic growth, aiming for it to reduce poverty by 25-30% by 2030. The contribution of culture to poverty is recognised with high levels of early marriage, early pregnancy and FGM. Interviewees highlighted that changes are gradually taking place in terms of shifts in attitudes towards women, a desire to keep girls in school longer, more partial settling of pastoralist populations with more controlled grazing, more likelihood of some crop production amongst previously purely pastoralist communities and more commercial orientation combined with less conflict. The county has very poor access to financial services and poor mobile network coverage.<sup>v</sup></p> <p>The NSNP case load is 6025 OVC households, 876 PWDs, nearly 7000 older persons and 2500 registered and eligible for the 70+.</p>
<p><b>County Poverty focused Programmes<sup>1</sup></b></p> 	<p>Poverty is a clear focus of county development plans, but absolute rather than a specific focus on extreme poverty. However, the County Planning Department noted a move towards more targeted poverty focused response from a universal focus to date. The CIDP is the key guiding document actualised through annual plans and budgets.</p> <p>The County Government is investing heavily in areas that are national functions such as education (primary, secondary and adult). Through construction of schools, bursaries for school fees and adult education. Huge investments have been made in health and attempts to ensure health centres are available and staffed in remote areas.</p> <p>No county social protection policy exists, and the county does not implement cash transfers itself though filling gaps in national provision is something that has been discussed and there are plans to develop a county social protection policy. The targeting of poverty focused programmes is largely done by communities with the involvement of chiefs. There are several committees focused on different sectors such as ward level bursary and agricultural committees which are involved in beneficiary selection.</p> <p>Key county led poverty focused development interventions that could form elements of a social and economic inclusion (SEI) programme include:</p> <p>Education</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Bursaries – 400 million ksh annually (30,700 students in 2017/18<sup>vi</sup>) started in 2013 at 150 million. Universal though amount adjusted to need. Orphans and needy children receive 20,000ksh for boarding</li> </ul>

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

	<p>and 8,000 for day school. Other children receive 10,000 as boarders and 5,000 for day pupils.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ School construction – especially in the poorer border areas that lack facilities.</li> <li>✓ School feeding in ECD centres in poorer areas (998 centres in 2017-18).</li> <li>✓ Adult education - employed and trained 400 teachers to try to tackle the high levels of adult illiteracy. <a href="https://ntv.nation.co.ke/2720202-4682526-9urng3z/index.html">https://ntv.nation.co.ke/2720202-4682526-9urng3z/index.html</a></li> <li>✓ Agriculture - Drought tolerant certified seed distribution approximately 200,000 farmers last season – poverty targeted small amount (2 kilos) largely food security related (maize, green gram, sunflower) and for cash crops (mangoes, onions, watermelon, cabbages). Also accompanying programme that focuses on distribution of free cash crop seedlings. Some training is also provided.</li> <li>✓ Subsidised ploughing in some areas, but not enough machinery to cover needs, not poverty targeted, impacting on increases in production for those who benefit.</li> <li>✓ Livestock - Poverty focused distribution of cattle, small ruminants and chickens. Focus on improved breeds still experimenting with which thrive, artificial insemination for better breeds. Beehive distribution. Animal vaccinations provided on a universal basis. Where gaps in provision exist, the national government may top up supplies.</li> <li>✓ Increased investment in agricultural extension services i.e. vet services employed all graduates from 2017.</li> <li>✓ Value chain development – honey, mango processing plant, milk processing plant and slaughterhouse (first in the county) are all flagship county government projects. Opening of new markets.</li> <li>✓ Polytechnic graduates given tools.</li> </ul> <p>Other</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Drilling boreholes.</li> <li>• County cooperative development fund act (60 million) in process target group is not yet defined.</li> <li>• County community service programme – providing temporary jobs to unemployed youth, PWDs and women replica of the national youth service programme – 75million ksh annually.</li> <li>• Disability aids, sponsorship, training etc.</li> <li>• Affirmative action in government employment – women, PWDs.</li> <li>• Exploring cost sharing on NHIF – not yet operationalised.</li> </ul> <p><b>National</b> projects provide complementary infrastructure investments such as irrigation, pasture improvements, boreholes, sand dams, water pans, climate smart agriculture and poverty focused grants to community groups. These national programmes establish a project office at county level and use local agricultural extension staff for delivery. Some of these projects have been directed to focus on the most marginalised wards through engagement with NDMA – such as the Masol integrated programme which has included the construction of a model health centre, boarding facility, borehole, access road</p>
--	---

	<p>etc. Such examples highlight successful coordination between county and national development efforts.</p> <p><b>NGOs</b> are few in the county as mentioned above. Mercy Corps is implementing a climate governance project which is supporting communities to influence the planning process with a resilience/ climate lens. World Vision has a strong reputation with county government and is working in education (including scholarships) and FGM. Village Enterprise is doing poverty graduation aiming to enrol over 2000 HHs per year.</p>
<p><b>Gaps/ challenges</b></p>	<p>Key challenges relate to coordination, overlap and lack of systems to manage and track different programmes and beneficiaries.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Governor’s manifesto 3 Es – Education, economy and equity. Some criticism that the current blanket targeting approach promotes equality over equity.</li> <li>✓ There are a range of laws that need developing and then passing to set county policy, which is a huge task.</li> <li>✓ No electronic capture of distribution lists and no MIS in place. Most offices lacked computers. Comparison of beneficiary lists across programmes/ departments is a challenge and so overlap is not known nor leveraged. In education they are looking to address this where bursaries are being funded by 4 channels (2 national, 1 county and NGOs). Many were not aware of the single registry but were in favour of the concept of an improved and decentralised MIS to ensure better data management and as a coordination tool.</li> <li>✓ Recognition that poverty focused programmes are not necessarily reaching the poorest who may not have land or livestock. A greater emphasis on skills building to develop small businesses, access to capital especially for women accompanied by timebound consumption support to meet immediate food needs is needed to reach the most marginalised.</li> <li>✓ Access to information and attitude amongst the poorest is a challenge.</li> <li>✓ The potential for bias in current selection processes was noted and the potential exclusion of the extreme poor. Some recognise the need for a more impartial system. The harmonised targeting methodology (HTM) was discussed and there was interest in deploying a smarter tool with less bias, but this would require buy in from political leaders, acceptance of the tool and understanding of how to use it. It is harder to understand and less participatory which may affect its acceptance. It would also require an effective MIS.</li> <li>✓ Coordination is complex at a range of levels. Between national and county government coordination systems still need to be developed. However, signs of improvement were noted with the initiation of an inter-governmental committee at the macro level which will then encourage greater inter-sectoral working. County government is currently mapping different development initiatives and NGO/ development partner programmes but lack an effective MIS to store and manage data. The CSG is active and coordinated by NDMA. The Governor is the chair of this group and delegates this role. It would be helpful if there was consistency in representation to ensure effective coordination and decision making. The County Coordinator</li> </ul>

	<p>or his representative attends the CSG so if well attended it is an important forum cutting across national and county government, NGOs and UN agencies. Poverty is a focus, some targeting of programmes and monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>✓ Some line ministries have established their own forums for partners within their sector such as agriculture (<i>Agriculture Sector Coordination Act</i>). This is practical in nature and directs both private (i.e. seed company trials with small farmers) and NGO actors to different sub-counties based on need and to ensure a spread of actors across the county. National and county led social development actors are attempting to coordinate, they meet regularly and aim to match their activities, compare workplans and incorporate the national Big 4 into their agenda.</li> <li>✓ Some NGOs have a good relationship and are well regarded by government such as World Vision. Others such as Village Enterprise are not on the radar at all and completely unknown to the county government. The county government would prefer more of a collaborative co-implementation arrangement through which they can learn.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Recommendations to the Working Group on Ultra Poverty/ DFID</b></p>	<p>The graduation/ SEI approach was not known by most of those interviewed within both county and national government making it very challenging for them to give any indication of whether this is an approach that they would be interested to take forward. However, there is appetite to explore it further. Therefore, it is recommended that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. <u>An event is organised to provide the county assembly, county executive and select national staff with an introduction to the graduation/ SEI approach in West Pokot. This should draw on Kenyan experiences of implementing the approach, the global evidence base and scaling the approach as a first step in this process.</u></li> </ol> <p>The county assembly is a key structure to engage with as it passes laws and budgets and so would need to be convinced of this change in approach. However, turnover is high with only 2 of 20 members re-elected in the last election. The executive is also key.</p> <p>The government is mapping development initiatives across the county, this process will provide a useful foundation to SEI programming. To support this the following is recommended;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. <u>Support the county government to complete a comprehensive mapping of the development landscape to include national and county government efforts, NGO, CBO and other development partner programmes.</u></li> </ol> <p>The county government is keen to use the above as a foundation for a donor management system. This is something that they are seeking funds for, the role of this would overlap partly with what could be included in a decentralised single registry but would be more of a tool to record, monitor and evaluate initiatives across the county with a view to ensuring greater transparency. The above would also be a good foundation for improving coordination if linked to a live system and done well.</p>

	<p>If there is interest in developing a county led graduation/ SEI pilot the following should be explored;</p> <p>3. <u>Technical assistance, using the above mapping as a basis for exploring what could form part of a SEI programme and what the gaps are. Leading to the design of a county led SEI pilot incorporating current poverty focused efforts and identifying additional programming that may be needed to cover all of the needed graduation elements.</u></p> <p>Current challenges in coordination are underlain by the lack of electronic data capture and management information systems (MISs) that allow programmes to understand their overlap.</p> <p>4. <u>There is an urgent need to develop a county MIS. Ideally this would be in the form of a decentralised and expanded Single Registry but where this will take time thought should be given to whether county level systems can be developed that will build off the same platform and link to the Single Registry once it is decentralised.</u></p> <p>County documents and interviews highlight the weakness of current M&amp;E systems and capacities. The desire to address this appears strong at county level and in particular the ability of county government to monitor and evaluate its poverty reduction efforts is key to achievement of the SDGs and Vision 2030.</p> <p>5. <u>Provide technical assistance for M&amp;E on socio-economic inclusion efforts across existing efforts at county level.</u></p>
--	--

Name	Position	Department
<b>National Government Offices</b>		
Alew William Keem	Programme Officer	Department for Social Development
Margaret Ojago	Director Social Development	Department for Social Development
Patrick Mugun	Director of Children’s Services	Department for Children’s Services
Gabriel Mbogho	County Drought Coordinator	NDMA
Khalifa	Deputy County Commissioner	County Commissioners Office
Mr Sywiat	County Social Assistance Committee Representative	
<b>County Government</b>		
H.E. Prof. John Krop Lonyangapuo	Governor	County Government
Dr Mike Parklea	County Secretary	County Government
Powon Kapelo	Chief of Staff	County Government
Paul Longchinyar	Director of Livestock	Department of Agriculture and Pastoral Development
Dr James Merisya	Director for vet services	Department of Agriculture and Pastoral Development
Evelyne Koskei	Director of Agriculture	Department of Agriculture and Pastoral Development

Bernard Pyegon	Economic Planning & Budgeting Officer	County Treasury
Ms Ruth Kisabit	CEC Tourism, Sports, Culture & Social Development	County Government
Elizabeth Gichuki	Director Resource Mobilization & Donor Relations	County Governors Special Delivery Unit
Civil Society		
Titus Kaprom	County Coordinator	World Vision
Josiah Rotino	Programme Manager	Mercy Corps

---

<sup>i</sup> Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS), Kenya National Bureau of Statistics 2017.

<sup>ii</sup> West Pokot County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP) 2018-22

<sup>iii</sup> <https://www.westpokot.go.ke/images/downloads/generaldownloads/CIDP-Zero-draft-14.pdf>

<sup>iv</sup> <http://eeas.europa.eu/delegations/kenya>

<sup>v</sup> See CIDP

<sup>vi</sup> County Government Annual report 2017-18, Prepared by County M&E Unit.