

## Management Response

**Evaluation Report Title: Kenya Hunger Safety Net Programme Monitoring and Evaluation Component**

### Response to Evaluation Report

#### *What we learned from the programme evaluation*

There is strong evidence of programme impact in relation to:

- HSNP has a strong impact on poverty, particularly for the poorest households.
- Cash provides people with the potential to invest in their livelihoods, as HSNP households are more likely to have savings and access loans than non-beneficiaries.

The HSNP is not having an impact on:

- Households' ability to retain or accumulate non-livestock assets because transfers on their own were perceived as too low. We learnt that social protection on its own, has limitations and wider benefits can be achieved if social protection is implemented alongside other interventions.
- Dependency, which is often identified as a concern in social protection programmes. The HSNP did not create dependency and adults receiving cash were no less likely to be engaged in productive work than those in control households.
- HSNP is not causing tension within or between communities. Investments into rights and grievances mechanisms may help issues be examined and resolved.

Areas where the evidence of impact is inconclusive included:

- Impact on women. Although the majority of nominated HSNP beneficiaries were women, evidence on whether women were being empowered to claim more equality with their husbands was not clear cut.

#### *What we will be doing to take forward any recommendations*

In designing and implementing the second phase of the HSNP programme, recommendations taken forward include:

- To maximise the impact and value for money, the HSNP must target the poorest households. We agree, and have invested in robust targeting methods to ensure the second phase of the programme will continue to identify and reach the poorest. We have worked to influence the GoK and other important stakeholders (e.g. parliamentarians) to maintain a programmatic focus on the poorest.
- Given the fragility and occurrence of conflict in some HSNP areas, conflict should continue to be carefully considered during the second phase. We will work to improve communications and messaging, and have increased our investments into rights and grievances mechanisms.
- The finding that complementary interventions may be required to increase the

## Management Response

impact of the programme, is being taken forward in two respects. Firstly, work has been commissioned to develop a system to scale up the HSNP during times of increased need. This could provide an additional and more effective response to drought and food insecurity. Secondly, we will continue to develop linkages between the HSNP and other programmes (for example, the DFID supported Arid Lands Support Programme), to ensure that we both protect and promote the livelihoods of the poor.

- **Conditionality:** The evaluation recommended that if education or health are key policy objectives, conditionality would need to be investigated further. We do not propose to take this forward at this stage as evidence into the effects of applying conditionality on cash transfer programmes (vs the effect on unconditional programmes) are inconclusive, and conditionality is not commonly a key feature of cash transfer programmes in Kenya. There is also limited availability of services and capacity to administer any conditionality.
- **Recommended areas for future research** included a cost-effectiveness assessment and more robust estimates of programme impact on the local economy. As a result, research questions on these issues have been included in the monitoring and evaluation framework for the second phase. Given the inconclusive evidence on the programme impact on women and girls, the second phase will also have additional evaluation questions on this issue.

Jo Abbot, Deputy Head, DFID Kenya