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Preface

Agriculture and social protection can complement and mutually reinforce each other in reducing hunger and poverty. On the one hand, agricultural interventions can promote growth in smallholder productivity by addressing structural constraints that limit poor households’ access to land and water resources, inputs, financial services, advisory services and markets. On the other hand, social protection can provide liquidity and certainty for poor smallholders, allowing them to invest in agriculture, re-allocate their labour to on-farm activities, invest in human capital development, increase participation in social networks (which constitute an important source of informal risk management) and better manage risks, thereby allowing them to engage in more profitable livelihood and agricultural activities.

Recent policy declarations at global and regional levels emphasize the combined role that agriculture and social protection can play in tackling poverty and hunger. For example, the 39th Session of the Committee on World Food Security (CFS) urged member states to strengthen coordination between agriculture and social protection (CFS, 2012). Several African policy initiatives and declarations explicitly call for stronger coordination between the two spheres, such as the 2003 Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP) and the 2014 Malabo Declaration on Accelerated Agricultural Growth and Transformation for Shared Prosperity and Improved Livelihoods.

Efforts to strengthen links between agriculture and social protection policies are also taking place at national levels. However, little is still known about how to strengthen these linkages, including opportunities for doing so and some of the challenges that need to be overcome. To partly fill this gap, case studies were carried out in seven countries across Africa (Ghana, Kenya, Lesotho and Zambia), Asia (Bangladesh) and Latin America (Mexico and Peru). Findings from the case studies will contribute to country-level policy dialogue and to developing guidance material on how to strengthen coherence between agriculture and social protection.
Executive Summary

This study took place in Kenya (in Nairobi and Turkana) between 4 and 15 May 2015. The study was led by Rachel Slater of the Overseas Development Institute (ODI) along with co-researchers Dr Elvin Nyukuri and Raphael Amodoi and FAO staff Marco Knowles and Maina Kibata.

The project focuses on two core research questions:

- What are the current experiences of achieving coherence between Kenya’s agricultural and social protection policies and programmes?
- What lessons and insights do these experiences hold for achieving more and better coordination between the two sectors?

The Kenya study sets out to address these questions by exploring, in particular, how coherence and coordination play out in devolved settings and where agricultural livelihoods are predominantly pastoralist. The work focused in particular on the Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP) in northern Kenya during interviews with beneficiaries. The research was carried out using purposive sampling of locations, and given the diversity of Kenya cannot be seen as representative of the country as a whole. The focus on pastoralism and on the HSNP programme also means that the findings cast light on only smaller sub-sectors within the full range of agriculture and on only a limited part of Kenya’s safety net system within a wider social protection strategy and suite of programmes and activities. Even at district level, we need to recognize the diversity among those labelled ‘pastoralist’.

The key findings of the study are as follows:

- Despite clear overlaps in policy objectives between agriculture and social protection in government and international agencies, there are few linkages made in practice. Coordination efforts tend to be time-consuming, predominantly involve information sharing and some allocation of roles and responsibilities (but rather less joint planning and programming). Although there are numerous mechanisms, frameworks, secretariats and working groups through which coordination could happen, it is not clear which would be most appropriate for enabling synergies between agriculture and social protection to be achieved. Where coherence and coordination does happen, it tends to be driven by donors, UN agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs). In part this is because they allow human and financial capital constraints to institutional coordination to be overcome.

- Although devolution of many government functions to county level provides a potential entry point for enhanced coherence and coordination, in practice the pathways between national and county-level institutions are taking some time to bed in and become effective. A particular obstacle for coherence between agriculture and social protection is that the mandate and responsibility for social protection is at national level, while for agriculture it is at county level. Agriculture policies and programmes are subject to patronage and rents (often drawn along ethnic/regional lines) and it is unclear whether devolution will reinforce or undermine this.
Regarding programmes, there are clear complementarities between HSNP and the livelihoods of pastoralists in northern Kenya. These complementarities are partly the result of a design that fits well with pastoralist livelihoods (mobility, remoteness, etc.) and partly thanks to features of implementation such as mobile payment agents linking to wireless banking. Some of these features are also achievable in the other three flagship safety net programmes in Kenya (for orphans and vulnerable; for people with severe disabilities; and for older persons) yet these programmes tend to be oriented towards linkages with sectors other than agriculture, such as health or education.

Limited progress and success with decades of programming in Turkana and other arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) provide an important reminder of the difficulties of delivering development, poverty reduction and improved livelihoods in areas where levels of poverty are very high, population densities are low and physical infrastructure is weak; and where beneficiaries groups are remote and insecurity threatens poor people on a regular basis.

In these areas, and in other parts of Kenya where smallholder cultivation is a more common source of livelihood, the vision held by government officials and practitioners about how social protection and agriculture, together, might result in significant progress in reducing poverty and strengthening livelihoods among rural smallholders. Often agriculture was reduced to smallholder agriculture and social protection to cash transfers, with a resulting theory of change that by using cash transfers to purchase agricultural assets (especially goats), vulnerable households would enter a pathway to improved livelihoods and wellbeing. Theories of change rarely recognized the structural constraints to improved livelihoods and the multi-dimensional nature of household vulnerability.

The implications of these findings are as follows:

- Given that it requires significant investments of human and financial resources, achieving coherence between agriculture and social protection may not be the most pressing priority for government officials and international actors. The new institutions created under the devolution process will take some time to settle in and, arguably, county institutions need time to deliver on their core sector roles before attempting the ‘Rolls Royce’ model of coherence and coordination. In some cases, social protection programmes will continue to be oriented towards the health and education sectors rather than agriculture – this is particularly true of the life cycle-based programmes (for orphans and vulnerable children, for older persons, and for people with severe disabilities).

- Given that social assistance programmes in Kenya are fledgling and still struggle to deliver cash transfers in a regular and predictable way, particularly in the remote, rural areas where they are most needed, it is a priority to get safety nets in order first, and only then seek to strengthen linkages with other sectors. In social protection it therefore makes more sense to focus first on the harmonization process within the National Safety Net Programme (NSNP), which will develop a single registry, harmonize targeting systems and benefit levels across the four flagship programmes, and allow clearer policy decisions to be made about whether households can ‘double dip’ (i.e. be beneficiaries of more than one programme at a time).
This is not to say that there are not some immediate potential gains to be made. The most immediate opportunity depends on a much clearer understanding of the opportunities and threats to the livelihoods of vulnerable households and a more reasonable vision or theory of change about how livelihood opportunities can be captured, about how households move from ‘hanging in’, to ‘stepping up’ to ‘stepping out’ in rural areas. This will allow programme design (or redesign or revision) to ensure that interventions fit better with the realities of people’s livelihoods.
1. Introduction

This study forms part of seven country case studies carried out as part of the FAO’s From Protection to Production (PtoP) programme. There are good reasons for including Kenya as one of the case-study countries:

- Despite impressive economic growth, poverty headcount remains high, at 46 percent of the population and more than 90 percent in northern parts of the county such as Turkana County (World Bank, 2013).

- Agriculture is a key source of gross domestic product (GDP) in Kenya (around 30 percent in 2013) but also plays a significant role in food security for a large proportion of the population. This is either through own production for subsistence or sale, or through income from labour in the agriculture sector. Despite agriculture’s falling contribution to GDP and stagnating productivity (DFID, 2015), there are substantial opportunities for increased agricultural production and productivity. However, large numbers of rural poor are unable to meet their basic subsistence needs in arid and semi-arid areas (World Bank online databank) and it is not clear how they will make the transition to commercial agriculture.

- There is a growing commitment to social protection and increasing coverage of programmes, in particular the National Safety Net Programme with its four flagship programmes: HSNP; Cash Transfer for Orphans and Vulnerable Children (CT-OVC) Programme; Older Persons Cash Transfer (OPCT) and Cash Transfer for Persons with Severe Disabilities (PwSD).

- Kenya provides an opportunity to ensure that lessons about coherence between agriculture and social protection are generated beyond crop production and to pay greater attention to pastoralism. Notwithstanding the multiple faces of pastoralism/nomadic livelihoods (see Box 1, and NRC, 2014), mobile populations may present challenges to the implementation of effective social protection programmes.

- Recent devolution in Kenya, with greater power being given to county governments for policy-making, programme design and resource allocation, provides a useful case study of the ways in which coherence might be achieved in devolved contexts and the challenges devolution presents for coherence and coordination.

The analysis in Kenya followed the common approach and framework set out as part of the six country case studies. This involved looking at the context in which policies and programmes are designed, the coordination functions which allow them to be delivered, and the outcomes of those policies and programmes, especially their impacts on the lives and livelihoods of poor and vulnerable people (Figure 1). To answer the overarching research questions, a range of topics were explored through a desk-based review and in-country research following a common investigative framework (see Annex 1 for the main questions).
The two main overarching questions underpinning the study were the following:

1. What are the current experiences in Kenya of achieving coherence between its agricultural and social protection policies and programmes?

2. What lessons and insights do these experiences hold for achieving more and better coordination between the two sectors?

The work was carried out beginning with an initial desk-based review, which involved reviewing key documents covering development strategy, and agricultural and social protection policy. This was followed by a two-week in-country data collection exercise involving a number of key informant interviews (KII s) with ministry staff, development partners/donor agencies and civil society, and focus group discussions with local communities (FGDs).

In terms of the data collection tools for the in-country research, a register of questions developed for the full six country case studies formed the basis of the main lines of enquiry for all KII s and FGDs, with the final questions being adapted for specific roles and depending on the emerging themes and issues. The main areas of investigation spanned policy and programme details, coordination, coherence and performance.

A list of respondents is given in Annex 2. All respondents gave permission for their names to be included in the report, but quotations remain anonymized. At national level, the main focus of the interviews with government stakeholders was with staff in the Ministries of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries (MALF) and Labour and Social Security and Services (MLSSS) plus the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) within the Ministry of Devolution and Planning. Beyond this, interviews were held with a number of development partners – bilateral and multi-lateral agencies and members of civil society.

In order to ensure that the coherence between pastoralism and social protection was captured in the study at county level, Turkana was purposively selected for the case study (Figure 2). Many national functions, including notably agriculture (crop production, livestock and fisheries) have been devolved to county level. In Turkana, there is representation of national

---

1 A full list of key informants is provided in Annex 1.
functions – for example through an NDMA office which, among other things, is responsible for implementing HSNP, and county coordinators delivering national government functions such as delivery of the CT-OVC, OPCT and cash transfers for PwSD. In Turkana there is no equivalent to the national MALF; rather there are separate ministries for Pastoral Economy and Fisheries, and for Water Services, Irrigation and Agriculture. Interviews took place with both county and national government officials at county level, and with other actors – especially NGOs involved in the implementation of programmes. At local level, interviews took place in three locations: Naotin, in a riverine areas approximately 7 km from the county capital, Lodwar; Naoros, about 30 km from Lake Turkana, where fisheries and pastoralist livelihoods begin to be intertwined; and Nakinomet, a now permanent ‘manyata’ (village) in northern Turkana sub-county where many occupants have become ‘pastoralist dropouts’ or are only intermittently in the manyata when not grazing their cattle in the Elemi Triangle to the north. The field team included Raphael Amodoi, Maina Kibata, Marco Knowles, Elvin Nyukuri and Rachel Slater.

At the end of the fieldwork a feedback workshop was held in Nairobi to update key informants interviewed at national level on the progress of the research and some of the main findings. This was followed by a discussion review, challenge and/or corroborate preliminary findings. The transcribed interviews were analysed using MaxQDA Version 11.01.01.

The research was carried out using purposive sampling of locations, and given the diversity of Kenya cannot be seen as representative of the country as a whole. The focus on pastoralism and on the HSNP programme also means that the findings cast light on only smaller sub-sectors within the full range of agriculture and on only a limited part of Kenya’s safety net system within a wider social protection strategy and suite of programmes and activities. Even at district level, we need to recognize the diversity among those labelled ‘pastoralist’ (Box 1).

It is important to note that, at the national level, government officials in the social protection sector were not available for interviews during the short period that the field team were in Nairobi. For this reason the analysis of government actors, at national level at least, is inevitably skewed towards agriculture and cross-sectoral/sub-regional policies and programmes. The research is further limited by the security situation in which the research took place. Due to security requirements for FAO staff the research team that visited Naoros was accompanied by armed guards. Although arms are commonplace in Turkana, and the security team maintained a distance from the interview process, the data from those interviews have not been included in the MaxQDA analysis but have inevitably influenced the views and perspectives of the research team. Together this means that the research provides a partial, albeit useful and informative, view of the coherence between agriculture and social protection in Kenya.
Figure 2  Map of Kenya showing location of Turkana county

Box 1  The many faces of pastoralism

The pastoralist cliché does not exist. On an individual level, the lonely herder wandering the wilderness in search of pasture and water is a romanticized picture of the harsh living conditions that pastoralists face. Neither do they collectively form a homogenous group. Pastoralist communities are tribally affiliated groups with different histories and languages. They have different social and cultural values and ties, engage in distinct power struggles and work with different species of livestock. They have varying degrees of mobility and different migration routes. Some are more diversified and commercialized than others. They have different levels of access to resources and markets, and different views of themselves and their future.

Traditional mobile pastoralism is becoming increasingly rare, but the vision of the lifestyle and the identity it carries remains central despite realities that constrain or even threaten it. The changing face of pastoralism is a challenge in terms of policy-making and programming, because drought, violence and conflict, state interventions and private encroachment on pastoralists’ land have different impacts on different communities and their futures. That said, while acknowledging such diversity, pastoralist lifestyles share three core criteria: some degree of mobility; a livelihood based on livestock; and special attachment to land in terms of access to resources, particularly grazing areas and water, and to markets.

2. Policies and programmes

In this section we review the main policies and the programmes at the heart of agricultural development and social protection in Kenya in relation to coherence. We assess overarching development policies, the role of agriculture and social protection within them, and the extent to which they consider linkages between agriculture and social protection. Next we look at sectoral policies and strategies, and evaluate the extent to which the theories of change for each sector are coherent and consider linkages between the two. Finally, we consider the extent to which there is evidence that, during the policy development process, there has been any coordination between the two sectors.

Overall, we find that:

- although there are some overlapping objectives between agriculture and social protection and some reflection on linkages between agriculture and social protection, in practice the focus on linkages is superficial;

- while there are many opportunities for coordination of policy-making (and a plethora of different policies, frameworks and working groups to provide the mechanisms for them – at national level and county level, and within and between sectors), they do not appear to generate ‘bang for buck’ – i.e. the costs of inputting into coordination processes at policy level are not worth what appear to be rather limited gains; and

- the stage of devolution in Kenya, particularly of agriculture sector programmes and interventions, and the fledging status of social protection, suggest that we should be modest about the level of cross-sector coherence that can be expected.

2.1. National development policies

Vision 2030 is Kenya’s overall, long-term, national development plan for 2008 to 2030. It was conceived prior to devolution and is currently following its second medium-term plan (Government of Republic of Kenya [GRK], 2007a). It comprises three pillars – economic, social and political – and seeks to ‘transform Kenya into a newly industrializing, middle-income country providing a high quality of life to all its citizens by the year 2030’ (GRK, 2007b: 1). The economic pillar aims to improve the prosperity of all Kenyans through an economic development programme, covering all the regions of Kenya and aiming to achieve an average GDP growth rate of 10 percent per annum beginning in 2012. The social pillar seeks to build a just and cohesive society with social equity in a clean and secure environment. The political pillar aims to realize a democratic political system founded on issue-based politics that respects the rule of law, and protects the rights and freedoms of every individual in Kenyan society (Figure 3).
The thematic contents of each pillar provide a first insight into the opportunities for coherence between agriculture and social protection: agriculture is covered under the economic pillar, and social protection under the social pillar. Although there is reference to interlinkages between pillars, there is less detail on this, even in the second medium-term plan (GRK, 2013). Overall, social protection is not viewed as a productive activity in the structure, tone or the substance of Vision 2030.

A core feature of the Vision is the articulation of flagship policies, programmes and activities under each pillar. The second medium-term plan outlines flagship programmes in the agriculture sector as follows:

- Preparation and passage of consolidated agricultural policy reform legislation
- Development and implementation of a three-tiered fertilizer cost reduction programme
- Improvement in the value added in the production and supply chain through branding Kenyan farm products
- Planning and implementation of four to five disease-free zones and livestock processing facilities to enable Kenya meat, hides and skins to meet international marketing standards. There will be more domestic processing of these products for regional and international markets.
- Creation of publicly accessible land registries under an improved governance framework
- Development of an Agriculture Land Use Master Plan
- Implementation of the Tana River Basin Agricultural Development Scheme

For these programmes, there is a strong focus on increasing productivity, on commercialization of agriculture and on markets and processing. The extent to which these flagship activities are targeted at individuals or households that are beneficiaries of social protection is likely to be limited.

It is notable that, under the social pillar of Vision 2030, there is a single flagship related to social protection: to establish a consolidated social protection fund. So, the prominence of social protection in Vision 2030 is far less than that of agriculture, reflecting its relatively fledgling (but growing) status.
### 2.2. Multi-sectoral frameworks

Overall, Kenya’s long-term vision and strategy for development demonstrate limited connections made between the agriculture and social protection sectors. There is slightly more evidence of connections in policy-thinking between agriculture and social protection in other types of policy frameworks. This is particularly the case for sub-regional frameworks such as the Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) framework and the various sessional papers, policies, frameworks and institutional mechanisms created in an effort to enable a coordinated response in the ASAL parts of Kenya, which account for around 80-84 percent of the country’s total land area (Figure 4) (GRK, 2012a; GRK, 2012b). Previously under the Ministry of State for Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands in the office of the president, responsibility now lies with the NDMA, which is housed under the Ministry of Devolution and Planning and leads on policy and programming for both the ASAL regions (Box 2) and the EDE framework. The NDMA also has offices at county level in a number of locations, including Turkana.

From respondents in Nairobi, at least, there are indications that EDE or ASAL frameworks provide a space in which there are greater opportunities for connections to be made between agriculture and social protection programmes. There is a heavy focus in these various frameworks on resilience and, in particular, building pathways out of poverty into more sustainable and remunerative livelihoods for poor and vulnerable households. There is also reference in programme documentation to the roles that agriculture and social protection, together, play in this process. And some of this policy-speak makes it into programming – for example in the HSNP, with its specific focus on the poorest and most arid counties in Kenya and on providing an alternative to food assistance. The lesson here is that, where countries have high levels of geographical inequality, there may be greater scope for coherence between agriculture and social protection policies at sub-national level, rather than national level.

However, if we switch our gaze to the county level, and to Turkana specifically, it is not clear whether the connections made between agriculture and social protection at the policy level for EDE or the ASAL framework play out at the county level. In our interviews in Turkana we were struck that no one mentioned EDE, and that no one knew what EDE was when asked directly. We sought to find other names for EDE in use in Turkana, but could find no equivalent policy or framework or activity approximating EDE. Now, while we know that many county governors are aware of EDE (and indeed have attended meetings about it), it appears that EDE is not (yet) reaching the county level or below. So, although sub-regional frameworks have the advantage that they provide a more manageable opportunity to achieve more coherent programming, it is not clear that they extend beyond Nairobi at present.

### Box 2  Kenya’s arid and semi-arid lands

“Kenya’s dryland areas (or ASALs – arid and semi-arid lands) make up more than 80 percent of the country and are mainly found in the Rift Valley. They are home to approximately 4 million pastoralists who constitute more than 10 percent of Kenya’s population plus other rangeland users (Kirbride and Grahn, 2008:8). Livestock raised by pastoralists is worth US$800 million per year (AU-IBAR in IIED and SOS Sahel, 2010). Pastoralists occupy most of the border areas of Kenya, with pastoral groups straddling borders with Somalia, Ethiopia, Sudan, Uganda and Tanzania. Pastoralists are divided into various ethnic and linguistic groups, ranging from the large and famous groups like the Maasai and the Somali, who number in excess of half a million people each, to small and so-far obscure groups numbering a few thousand (Umar, 1997)”
2.3. Social protection policy and programmes

Kenya’s National Social Protection Policy (NSPP) was formalized in 2011 and defines the scope of social protection as “policies and actions, including legislative measures, that enhance the capacity of and opportunities for the poor and vulnerable to improve and sustain their lives, livelihoods, and welfare, that enable income-earners and their dependants to maintain a reasonable level of income through decent work, and that ensure access to affordable healthcare, social security, and social assistance” (GRK, 2011: v).

It is important to note that the broad definition comprises insurance, labour and assistance. However, given the size of this project, and the current focus of FAO’s work on social protection we will focus specifically on social assistance – and notably cash transfers – for the remainder of the analysis.

At an objective level, the NSPP pursues an overarching goal of ensuring that all Kenyans live in dignity and exploit their human capabilities for their own social and economic development and policy objectives as follows:

i. Protecting individuals and households from the impact of adverse shocks to their consumption that is capable of pushing them into poverty or into deeper poverty.

ii. Supporting individuals and households to manage these shocks in ways that do not trap them in poverty, by reducing their exclusion and strengthening their ability to graduate from social assistance and to become financially self-sufficient.

iii. Cushioning workers and their dependants from the consequences of income-threatening risks such as sickness, poor health and injuries at work as well as from the threat of poverty in their post-employment life.
iv. Promoting key investments in human capital and physical assets by poor and non-poor households and individuals that will ensure their resilience in the medium term and that will break the intergenerational cycle of poverty.

v. Promoting synergies and integration among social protection providers as well as positive interactions among stakeholders for the optimal functioning of this Policy.

The text of the NSPP is clear on the importance of coherence for achieving its objectives. It notes the challenges of fragmented programming in Kenya and “inconsistencies in the operation and implementation of social protection throughout the country” (p. 22). However, the focus is currently on coherence within the sector, perhaps rightfully at this moment in time, rather than between sectors, and the Act of Parliament providing for the newly established Social Protection Secretariat has yet to pass. There is a major focus on harmonizing the existing social assistance programmes (see the four listed programmes in the paragraph below) through the development of a single registry and the establishment of harmonized benefit levels and the like – all delivered through a partnership between government and donor agencies under the ‘National Safety Nets Programme for Results’ project (World Bank, 2013).

At a policy level, the potential for coherence with other sectors is significant, but interviews with stakeholders in MALF suggest there has been relatively little engagement between the two sectors, and the focus of some elements of the NSPP – for example on extending access to affordable healthcare – suggests that, for the social protection sector, there may be competing priorities for making linkages. So linkages with health and education may be a higher priority than agriculture. Policy frameworks such as those for ASALs are mentioned far more than linkages to agriculture. Even for HSNP, it is clear that the current priority nationally is harmonizing within the sector (e.g. with other cash transfers) rather than between sectors.

At programme level, the NSPP translates into the NSNP, which has four flagship cash transfer programmes:

1. Orphans and Vulnerable Children Cash Transfer (CT-OVC)
2. Older Persons Cash Transfer (OPCT)
3. Cash Transfers for People with Severe Disabilities (PwSD)
4. Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP)

In terms of policy objectives, there is a balance between addressing shocks or stresses associated with the lifecycle (such as vulnerability due to old age or childhood) and others related to environmental change, natural disasters, changing economic opportunities and so on. However, in the NSPP three out of four programmes (CT-OVC, OPCT, PwSD) focus on lifecycle-type stresses, especially those associated with labour constraints, while HSNP is geographically and poverty-targeted and focuses more on asset protection and rehabilitation.

This means that, intuitively, the scope of coherence between agriculture and social protection is greater for HSNP than the other three cash transfer programmes. The responses of those interviewed – at national and county levels – suggest that the other three programmes are tending to ‘face towards’ the health and education sectors rather than agriculture.

Respondents also commented that the focus on/language of linkages between agriculture and cash transfers was a less helpful way of describing efforts than using language such as ‘productive inclusion’ or ‘livelihoods’. It wasn’t so much that agriculture wasn’t an important linkage, but that agriculture is only one source of livelihood and productive activity among many. This view is supported by evidence from a performance evaluation discussed in section 4 which suggests that the CT-OVC has a greater impact on non-farm activities than on
agricultural activities (Asfaw et al., 2014). However, overall, while the objectives of the NSPP include graduation, there is no real vision or articulation, either at policy or programme level, as to how social protection will achieve this together with other sectors. The lack of a clearly articulated graduation strategy or theory of change helps to explain the lack of linkages between social protection and productive sectors and interventions.

The tendency to focus on the four main safety net programmes is not universally accepted by all stakeholders. In MALF and among certain UN agencies, there was a view that the NSNP was too focused on poverty and lifecycles and failed to incorporate food security – especially food transfers and school feeding programmes – and agriculture into its schema. It is important to note that in the broader safety net domain, more coordination was found, especially in relation to school feeding, food for assets and other public works programmes. For example, in the case of school feeding programmes, linkages were made to ensure procurement from local producers of grain.
Box 3  Extract: Kenya’s Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP)

[...] an unconditional cash transfer in northern Kenya that aims to reduce poverty, food insecurity and promote asset retention and accumulation in poor households. Phase 1 (2007-13) was a pilot that reached 69,000 households (66% women-headed) or 496,800 people (49% women). It used a private sector payment provider (Equity Bank) and a biometric smart card to make regular, electronic cash transfers of up to Kshs 1,750 (approx. £13, per month) to beneficiaries. It was implemented under Ministry of Northern Kenya with NGO and private sector implementing partners. As a pilot, it was 100% donor-funded by DFID and AusAID. Phase 2 is being implemented under the auspices of National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) and, for the first time, the Government of Kenya will also contribute financing. The programme is scaling up to 100,000 households or 600,000 chronically poor people with regular, electronic cash transfers of up to Kshs 2,700 or approx. £19, per month. Beneficiaries are reached through a fully transactional bank account and bankcard. In order to develop the capacity to act as a scalable safety net in times of crisis up to a further 272,000 households have been given bank accounts and cards as a platform for a more rapid crisis response.

[...] Despite remoteness, thin markets and high levels of mobility among beneficiaries (all of which are often put forward as an argument against using cash transfers) the HSNP has found alternative technologies to overcome the specific economic and geographical implementation challenges. HSNP uses an innovative approach for payments, making cash transfers through the mainstream private sector banking system. It uses standard bank accounts, with international standard two-factor authentication (biometrics and pin) and real-time transactions enabled via handheld Point of Sale devices and low cost satellite modems. Individual households are not restricted to single centres to receive transfers (currently, there are 398 active, paying agents), and the system does not depend on weak and highly dispersed public sector institutions.

[...] in April 2015, the HSNP began emergency weather shock payments for sub-counties badly affected by drought since January. In less than 2 weeks since a trigger, nearly £3 million was transferred electronically into the bank accounts of additional caseload of more than 90,000 temporary beneficiaries. The rapid response payment covered the period of January to March 2015. It was triggered by a decline in the NDMA Early Warning System indicators which are based on the Vegetation Condition Index, based in turn on satellite remote sensed data (personal communication, Drake and Goodman, 8 May 2015 and HSNP website). It is critical to note that it has taken until the second phase of HSNP for its administration, financing and targeting systems to mature to reach the point where they can be scaled up in response to emergencies.

2.4. Agriculture policies and programmes

The performance of the agriculture sector in Kenya has a strong influence on the need for social protection. As FAO noted recently (FAO, 2010) the “agriculture sector in Kenya is the fundamental part of the economy, contributing 25 percent of the total Gross Domestic Product (GDP), and another 27 percent indirectly. The sector employs over 40 percent of the total population and over 70 percent of the rural people. This sector in Kenya is large and complex, with a multitude of public, parastatal, non-governmental and private actors, accounts for 65 percent of the export earnings and provides livelihood (employment, income, and food security needs) for more than 80 percent of the Kenyan population. Agriculture in Kenya is facing many challenges and threats such as increase in fuel prices, climate change and regional surrounding instability. The good performance of this sector ensures good performance of the entire economy. Therefore the policy and institutional frameworks governing the agriculture sector play a vital role for the development of the whole economy” (p.1).

The adoption of Vision 2030 and the subsequent devolution process have resulted in some significant shifts for government functions around agriculture. The Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture (SRA) was upgraded and subsequently resulted in the Agriculture Sector Development Strategy (ASDS) for 2009 – 2020 (GRK, 2009). The major shift for ASDS is the focus on agriculture as business, rather than agriculture for subsistence (FAO, 2010). Thus, the overall goal of the ASDS has been to achieve an average growth rate of 7 percent per year and achieve an “innovative, commercially oriented and modern agriculture”. These goals are anchored in two strategic thrusts: increasing productivity, commercialization and competitiveness of the agricultural commodities and enterprises; and developing and managing key factors of production. At first glance this focus on commercialization suggests that any coherence with social protection is likely to be less in the area of social assistance and safety nets and more in relation to decent work and the national social security fund. Further investigation shows that, while there are at least two overlapping objectives in common with the NSPP – the reduction of people living below absolute poverty lines to less than 25 percent to achieve MDG1 and reduction of food insecurity by 30 percent to surpass the MDGs (GRK, 2009: xvii) – the main focus does appear to be on commercialization rather than ensuring households can meet their own needs. However, there are strong geographical differences in approach, with ASAL counties far more likely to be looking at appropriate support to the livelihoods of poor and vulnerable farmers, but overall the strategy is, at best, ambiguous about what kind of farmers/households it aims to reach and support. The ASDS does not reference social protection or safety nets (but note that it does predate the emergence of a clear social protection policy or framework in Kenya).

Furthermore, agriculture is now a devolved government function in Kenya such that resource allocation and programming are meant to take place at county level. The national government still takes overall responsibility for policy and for some programmes that, they argue, are more appropriately delivered at national level.

The national-level programmes include the National Accelerated Agricultural Inputs Access Programme (NAAIAP) and a number of programmes relating to animal health and the management of livestock diseases. Further national priorities and programmes cover irrigation, mechanization, the revival of cooperatives and farmers unions, access to credit, the establishment of disease-free livestock zones and the rehabilitation of specific crops, for example, coconut (for more detail see GRK 2013: 51-54). Given that devolution is very recent in Kenya, it is useful to focus in on emerging programmes and those at county level since this is where the future opportunities for coherence with social protection are likely to lie. In this
regard, the emerging Kenya Livestock Insurance Programme (KLIP) is an important programme to flag. Based on learning from a pilot conducted by the International Livestock Research Institute in northern Kenya, the government will subsidize premiums for livestock insurance in households with more than five tropical livestock units (TLUs\(^2\)). There is evidence in programme design of consideration of coherence with cash transfer programmes, notably in targeting where it is suggested that by targeting households with no more than five TLUs, the programme will reach those nominally above the targeting level set for programmes such as the HSNP. However, it is not clear that the HSNP’s household registration data have been used to confirm that five TLUs is an appropriate level for entry into the KLIP, nor is there any mechanism for allowing a planned and supported transition from HSNP to KLIP.

3. Coordination and implementation

This section looks at coordination at the level of programme implementation. It identifies a number of types of coordination – from basic information-sharing, to programmes designed explicitly to work alongside particular types of (agriculture-based) livelihoods or in particular agricultural contexts, to bringing the timing together of major policy frameworks, visions and strategies, to adding complementary interventions to existing programmes. However, beyond the cherry-picking, there are major obstacles to coordination including the resources and capacity of actors (and of the fledgling county steering groups), and a lack of incentives for them to coordinate, and a very limited vision of what a coherent system would look like. Overall, it provides a stark reminder of the large number of challenges facing counties like Turkana and suggests that a dose of realism is required about the level of coherence and coordination that is achievable.

3.1. Types of coordination: who, what, where and why?

So who coordinates? And why? The first important thing to note in the case of Kenya is the enormous level of institutional change it has undergone in the last few years as a result of the process of devolution (Box 4). At national level, ministries have been renamed, consolidated, restructured and dissolved. Entirely new institutions have emerged at county and sub-county levels. These changes have had an inevitable impact on policies and programmes, with new relationships being established and the lines of alliance being redrawn. Responsibility for water was brought into the MALF, only to be ‘returned’ to Environmental and Natural Resources. For cross-sectoral strategies and initiatives, the challenge is even more complex since it is necessary to navigate both national and district-level shifts. Drought management and resilience, for example, were previously under the Ministry of State for Development of Northern Kenya and other Arid Lands in the office of the president, but now lie with the NDMA, housed under the Ministry of Devolution and Planning and leading on policy and programming for both the ASAL regions (Box 2) and the EDE framework. The NDMA also has offices at county level in a number of locations, including Turkana, which sit alongside county institutions and national departments at county level.

---

2 The concept of Tropical Livestock Units (TLU) provides a convenient method for quantifying a wide range of different livestock types and sizes in a standardized manner.
Box 4 The Constitution of Kenya 2010 and the path to devolution

[...] Promulgation of the Constitution of Kenya 2010 marked a momentous point in the country’s history. The Constitution provided for, among others, enhanced checks and balances within the government, an enhanced role of Parliament and citizens, an independent judiciary, and a most progressive Bill of Rights. Notably, the Constitution provided for a major devolution—not only of resources and functions, but also creating a whole new layer of county government.

The sweeping changes in Kenya’s policy and institutional framework have brought about a new regime of governance. Multiple new laws have been put in place—including new legislation on county government, urban areas, public financial management, and the transition to devolved government—as well as multiple national bodies and commissions with responsibility for devolution.

Elections in March 2013 marked the official launch of decentralisation, as 47 new county governors and county assemblies were elected and began the challenging work of setting up new institutions, as well as a new national senate representing each county. Functions and funds have been transferred to the new counties, and new county institutions are gradually taking shape.


What about the people in these shifting, merging and reorienting institutions? At national level, there is a common discourse about coordination as something that happens between institutions. People very rarely refer to coordination as something that happens between people. It is as if the agents of coordination are absent. Claims that coordination happened were rarely substantiated with names of people or examples of what they did together. Respondents didn’t instinctively name the people that they coordinated with (in fact they were rarely able to mention individuals from other sectors at all). So there’s a problem here: we can have institutional mechanisms in place – indeed we can have many of them: frameworks, secretariats, working groups, validation processes, information-sharing and so on – but we also need real people to do it. The interviews left the impression that it was rarely in anyone’s interest to do the ‘people bit’, or the ‘interaction bit’ of coordination, that politics and resources drove coordination when it did happen, and that there may not be the capacity to coordinate:

But there is lots of staff movement and lots of leadership changes which challenges things.

What is the incentive for coordination? The incentive is always resources. You need to look at where they’re coming from.

Social protection is contested but Kenyatta has doubled the allocation to social protection in the budget and now there is concern about the capacity of the ministry to absorb.

In the sectors there is a fear that to coordinate will only happen if staff get support from their bosses or their bosses will reap the benefits of coordinating. But that is not always clear.

A broad range of examples of coordination were found – from basic information-sharing, to allocating roles and responsibilities (usually into discrete activities with little overlap but some
complementarity), to joint planning and working. The examples further up the ladder of coordination included parts of national government aligning their planning timing with the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for 2014-2018 (although arguably it might make sense in the future for the UNDAF timing to align itself with government planning and budgetary procedures), and Oxfam in Turkana providing small grants to small local traders to ensure that the increased demand resulting from cash transfers to vulnerable households was matched by a supply response from local traders. However, these examples were relatively few and far between.

In most cases, the coordination described by most respondents was some level of information-sharing. In some cases information-sharing was formalized – for example in thematic county steering groups where donors, governments and NGOs presented content. Commonly, though, presentations at the thematic county steering group meetings were about programmes that were already designed, rather than providing a space for joint planning or adaptation in order to ensure complementarity. But in many cases information-sharing was ad hoc and/or between two individuals or institutions, rather than a broader, more inclusive process. There were examples of a step up the coordination ladder, namely where actors worked together to clarify roles and responsibilities. It appeared to be a useful mechanism for avoiding repetition and overlapping programmes and, despite the risks of silos between actors, was a positive step towards ensuring coherence. A number of respondents noted the limited participation of government agriculture staff in social protection coordination groups, including the secretariat. Others also noted the limited internal coordination on agriculture and social protection among UN and donor agencies – the barriers to coherence were as present in international agencies as in government.

At national level, we were frequently told that the problems encountered in coordination at national level could be addressed by the County Steering Group (CSG). And it was certainly the case that, at county level, people were able to name individuals whom they linked up with, shared information with, and so on. After following this up at county level in Turkana, we do not think the CSG can, at this time, unlock obstacles to coordination. First, there is no single CSG – rather the range of policies and frameworks and strategies and working groups found at national level is similarly bewildering at county level:

The county steering group? There are seven sub-county steering groups. Then there are county steering groups on cash transfers, natural resource management, food for assets, WASH, health, security and peace, UN joint coordination, and livestock. There are more in other silos.

Second, the main CSG is not yet an effective decision-making and task-allocating body. It is not often attended by the governor and, as a result, other key stakeholders and senior staff (i.e. those empowered to make significant decisions or allocate financial and human resources) tend to send an alternate staff member.

And we tend to look at the projects rather than trying coordinate better. The technical people are few.

---

3 Water, sanitation and health.
Respondents suggested that it is only in the event of emergencies that the CSG works effectively to coordinate activities and resource allocation.

3.2. Features of design and implementation that enable / disable coherence

At all levels there is a lack of clarity or agreement about what a coherent system could or should look like, or what the optimal coherent system would be. There are at least two dimensions to the ways in which coherence between agriculture and social protection play out for beneficiaries: ‘fit’ and ‘logic’.

How well does programme design ‘fit’ with the realities of people’s livelihoods? In this regard the evidence from the HSNP in Turkana was very positive. Meeting the needs of mobile pastoralist populations is difficult. Even reaching pastoralism dropouts can be hard – when they are located in very remote manyata such as Nakinomet. From its original pilot phase to the second phase when the HSNP is reaching a regular caseload of nearly 100,000 households (and has also provided emergency transfers to another 92,000 households this year), the programme was designed to work for pastoralists, to fit with the realities of mobile livelihoods and beneficiary groups in unpredictable locations with very limited access to immobile financial services. The key features that allow this are described in Slater et al (2015):

First, despite remoteness, thin markets and high levels of mobility among beneficiaries (all of which are often put forward as an argument against using cash transfers) the HSNP has found alternative technologies to overcome the specific economic and geographical implementation challenges. HSNP uses an innovative approach for payments, making cash transfers through the mainstream private sector banking system. It uses standard bank accounts, with international standard two-factor authentication (biometrics and pin) and real-time transactions enabled via handheld Point of Sale (PoS) devices and low-cost satellite modems. Individual households are not restricted to single centres to receive transfers (currently, there are 398 active, paying agents), and the system does not depend on weak and highly dispersed public sector institutions (Slater et al p. 4).

Furthermore, a distinctive feature of the HSNP is that payments roll over from one period to the next. The accumulation allows pastoralists to keep their livestock in good grazing areas, only returning to collect transfers when it is a suitable time and from whichever of the nearly 400 agents that is most convenient. Beneficiary responses reflect this view:

\[\text{We were behind the mountains when the monthly allocation first came so we’re coming.} \]
\[\text{The access to the other agents was about a three- to four-hour walk. Many people went to Kaikor, which is about 12 km away. But we can wait for two days there to get paid.} \]
\[\text{We’ll get cash from the agent. There is no charge for it.} \]

\[\text{At first we had to go to a lot further for the cash. Now with more agents it is much easier} \]

\[\text{We use it to pay fees for schools, and for food. We buy animals and medicines for the animals. We buy fertiliser for a bit of agriculture and seeds.} \]
\[\text{The money from HSNP helps by at least enabling us to get cash to buy a goat or two. They multiply and then you can exchange them for a cow or a camel. When we go far} \]
with the animals and even stay there for four or five months without collecting the money, it is okay. The money will still come and accumulate.

I come here with a donkey and my wife and buy medicine for the animals, foodstuffs, beans, sugar, tea, maize. It is in a big quantity and when I take it back (my friend is taking care of the animals there) I am selling food for cash, and I barter for the goats and sheep. And over time I stay for some more months. I sometimes stay for six months or four months. And then I am able to buy in bulk. The rolling over is good for pastoralists.

The second dimension is logic: whether the set of established programmes in the agricultural and social protection sectors are meant to follow one another in a sequenced way (i.e. households move from one programme to another but are not benefitting from more than one programme at any point in time) or whether programmes are layered (such that one household could receive a number of different sources of support). In relation to the NSNP (i.e. the flagship cash transfer programme), there was almost complete agreement that households should be beneficiaries of only one cash transfer programme at any given moment.

In theory one household can’t access more than one programme. There is a concern about double dipping, about taking advantage of the systems.

Beneficiaries said that:

We appreciate what we are getting but it is better that somebody else assist the other people. We are very happy and we are able to join the merry-go-round. We all pool money to send to collect fertiliser so we are cooperating with each other. We would want to get more people into the programme but we don’t want for us to get less than we do now. It would make sense to the people who are not getting anything to move into HSNP and eventually for the people in the HSNP move into the agriculture programme.

There appears to be significant potential for sequencing – for example, for poor or vulnerable pastoralist or pastoralist dropout households in Turkana to transition from cash transfers into the KLIP; or for households exiting the CT-OVC because one or all children have now reached the age of 18 to then be picked up by ministries of education, agriculture and so on, in order to provide them with opportunities for further education, or training and support to livelihood activities. The ramifications of not supporting young people on exit from the CT-OVC are significant (Box 5). And some of the prerequisites for sequencing – such as pre-registration of populations or a single registry of beneficiaries, and harmonization of benefit levels and targeting systems – are already in place, underway or pending.

However, it is not apparent that the information-sharing taking place at present is enabling enough recognition of the sorts of sequencing that are possible, or the types of mechanisms that are already in place to support sequencing. Some, but not many, respondents in the agriculture/livestock sectors knew about the HSNP pre-registration list (which pre-identifies households that HSNP will support in case of increased need due to, for example, drought) and the opportunities to use it to target households above the threshold for inclusion in the core HSNP programme.
Box 5 The need for transitions from the CT-OVC to employment

“As Kenya’s ‘youth bulge’ swells the labour market by 800,000 a year, it will only increase economic growth if those of working age have productive jobs. This is currently not happening - with only 50,000 new jobs each year in the formal sector (just 6%), the vast majority are forced into low-income jobs in the informal sector (family farming or microenterprises). This is getting worse, as growth in formal sector jobs cannot keep pace with the growth of the labour force. Kenya therefore needs to increase both the rate of formal sector job creation, and the productivity of the informal sector.”

Source: DFID, 2015, pp. 5-6.

In the case of layering, the response was mixed. High poverty levels and acutely limited resources mean that those working on social protection and agriculture face a ‘Catch-22’ situation. On the one hand, there are barely enough resources to cover those requiring social protection with cash transfers to meet their basic needs. Indeed, many respondents viewed a layering system as unfair – particularly because the differences between beneficiaries in a programme, and those just above the threshold for eligibility for inclusion, may be very small indeed (Ellis, 2012). There was evidence of the social divisiveness of targeting of HSNP in Nakinomet, where one beneficiary was attacked by non-beneficiaries for refusing to slaughter a goat for them to eat. On the other hand, it is simultaneously recognized that a broader response than cash transfers is required: on their own, cash transfers are a blunt instrument that cannot address the multiple vulnerabilities that households face, nor can they, by themselves, make a meaningful, long term and sustainable difference to people’s lives and livelihoods.

Cash transfers should be a package with other things. It should not just be food, there need to be livelihood support links to health and for reading and writing.

Households have multiple and overlapping vulnerabilities. We need to work to challenge this view about double dipping. Improvements in livelihoods and in well-being are not linear. It’s not clear that we can move from social assistance to assets to agriculture. We need a packet of complementary things if we’re going to do anything that is sustainable.

Respondents recognized that, on their own (and notwithstanding some very positive anecdotal evidence about how beneficiaries of HSNP used cash to invest in agricultural and petty-trading livelihoods), cash transfers have limited potential to help households onto pathways to improved well-being and into sustainable livelihoods:

The single registry under the NSNP will end double dipping. But we do have households with multiple deprivations. And the older persons are receiving less than the HSNP households. We need other interventions, for example, food for assets, to get people out of poverty. It is too little money [in cash transfers] to get there on their own. If we target separately, that group in the gap between social protection and agriculture programmes will still be there.

And double dipping? Double dipping is very likely. It is the biggest debate in the NSNP. Common indicators are needed to see what people get and to agree on the baseline. There is only one programme baseline so far for the safety nets. Is integration necessary? We can’t say that one programme is enough. We need all approaches.

The jury is out on which approach (sequencing or layering) is most appropriate for Kenya, and it is not the job of this report to pass judgement on this. Some argued for a sequenced approach by donors and government from sequencing to layering:
The ministry in Malawi looks at community perceptions of sharing and fairness, and the importance of rotating the benefits. But first we need to get coverage and then get linkages.

We need sequencing and then layering.

However, it is important for stakeholders in the social protection, agriculture (and other) sectors to agree which approach they are taking, in order to make programming as cost-effective as possible and achieve the greatest possible outcomes.

4. Performance

Assessing performance from the point of view of coherence is difficult. There are no robust methodologies for empirical evaluations of coherence between policies, programmes and projects, in part because establishing counterfactuals is difficult. We depend here on a number of evaluations of individual programmes, and anecdotal evidence about how far social protection programmes support people’s existing livelihoods, and help them navigate the challenges in the agriculture sector. Overall, programme performance evaluations highlight the following:

- The theories of change (implicit or explicit) that are embedded in social protection programmes do not appear to demonstrate a realistic vision of what is achievable in people’s lives and livelihoods beyond the programme itself. Moving beyond viewing an increase in household assets as an end point for programme effects would be helpful in this regard.

- The limited impacts of cash transfers in Kenya when compared to other countries in sub-Saharan Africa highlight the importance of getting the basics of programmes right – for example setting meaningful transfer levels that can have an impact on productive investment, or delivering on time – rather than trying to do something very complex that requires very high levels of coordination with other sectors.

- The current ambiguity in agriculture programmes – especially whether they seek to support more productive farmers with greater capacity to transition to more commercial activities and engagement with markets and value chains, or whether they support subsistence producers with the objective of ensuring their food security – makes it difficult to identify where coherence between agriculture and social protection might be achieved and what the priority policies and programmes should be for coordination actions.

Altogether, programmes with limited resources struggle to balance this reality of resource constraints with the more ambitious goals of overcoming the structural inequalities and disparities between farmers that underpin their current vulnerable and food-insecure status and influence the extent to which they can get on a pathway out of poverty and into a productive and secure livelihood.

Perhaps because it is a fledgling sector in Kenya, there is a heavy burden of proof on cash transfer programmes compared to programmes in other sectors. So many of the evaluations considered here assess the performance of social protection rather than agriculture programmes.
There are a number of evaluations of NAAIAP that shed light on coherence. These tend to highlight the ongoing ambiguity in agriculture policies and programmes regarding the targeting of poor, vulnerable smallholders or pastoralists versus targeting those with greater productive capacity.\(^4\) Two examples include Ochol and Fengying (nd) who note that returns to fertiliser use among a number of different income categories are “sensitive to residual effects of fertiliser application” (p. 1) – so farmers previously using fertiliser are more likely to get returns from its use under the programme. Sheahan et al. (2014) similarly find that, while resource-poor farmers have been targeted in the programme, “a large portion of the targeted households used commercial fertilizer before the start of the programme and often in high amounts, implying that vouchers were not necessarily distributed to households who lacked the financial capacity to purchase fertiliser on commercial terms” (p. v). The importance of fertiliser (or vouchers) arriving on time is also noted as a key constraint to returns to fertiliser use. While the importance of group savings systems for financing the take-up of subsidized fertiliser is noted, the use of income from cash transfers to purchase subsidized fertiliser does not appear to have been measured in either case (perhaps because cash transfer programmes were mainly small pilots at the time of data collection). So we cannot assess, as has been the case in Malawi (Dorward and Chirwa, 2013), whether receipt of cash transfers can increase the financial capacity of the poorest to use the fertiliser subsidy by overcoming liquidity or cash flow constraints at the time of purchase.

In social protection evaluations of cash transfers in Kenya (see Box 6 for a summary of the main findings of impact evaluation of HSNP), there are numerous examples of evidence of the impacts – often positive – of cash transfer programmes on productive assets (Asfaw et al, 2014; Holland et al, 2014; Hurrell and Sabates-Wheeler, 2013). Notwithstanding this evidence of the accumulation of assets, key points from these evaluations and the design issues and coherence lessons that emerge from them are as follows:

- Hurrell and Sabates-Wheeler (2013), Asfaw et al (2014) and others find that cash transfers in Kenya have positive effects on assets – particularly small livestock. In many ways this is positive, but it raises a particularly important question: to what extent are cash transfers encouraging or leading to investments in assets (particularly goats and sheep) that are likely to result in a significant and sustainable improvement in livelihoods versus helping households to simply ‘tread water’ – i.e. achieve a slightly improved but still very poor standard of living? Hurrell and Sabates-Wheeler (2013) evaluate HSNP and, finding some relatively modest impacts (and in some cases no discernible impacts) in areas such as nutrition, conclude that many of the areas in which HSNP may have an impact are influenced by a broad range of factors exogenous to the programme itself. For the CT-OVC, Asfaw et al (2014) find “very little impact of the programme on direct indicators of crop production”. They also note that most of the beneficiaries (and control) in their sample have limited access to land (around 2.6 acres). Together, these analyses lead to an important lesson for coherence: we should be cautious about being overly ambitious about what social protection and agriculture programmes together can or should achieve – given the binding constraints of access to land, access to markets, and so on. Furthermore, we need to establish a better (i.e. more realistic) theory of change regarding the ways in which social protection might enhance productivity. It is important to go further than showing that social protection programmes build (some) assets in poor households by recognizing

\(^4\) There is some evidence of attempts to overcome this ambiguity, for example in DFID (2015) where they draw on Dorward et al.’s distinction between households that are ‘hanging in’, ‘stepping up’ and ‘stepping out’ (pp. 5-6).
the structural constraints in existing agricultural and other livelihoods systems and ensuring that our theory of change extends beyond increased household assets.

- The CT-OVC has had a broad range of positive impacts on beneficiary households, including poverty reduction, increases in food consumption and dietary diversity, improvement in schooling and health care utilization, and strengthening of the local economy. Impacts on household productive activities – which it should be remembered were not part of the programmes objectives - were lower than those of other programmes, such as the Social Cash Transfer in Malawi. Asfaw et al. (2014) hypothesize that this could be because: i) the CT-OVC transfer value was less than half of that of the Malawi Social Cash Transfer; ii) the value was significantly eroded by inflation in Kenya; and iii) the field sites in Kenya were far more heterogeneous. As with the evaluations of NAAIAP, which flagged the need to get timing right with fertiliser subsidies, this evidence and analysis also point to the importance of getting the programme right and, by extension, prioritizing good programme implementation before getting too carried away with achieving linkages.

**Box 6 Evaluation findings from the HSNP relating to agriculture and livelihoods**

A second evaluation of the HSNP is underway but the evaluation carried out after two years of transfers provides important insights of the HSNP performance. Despite very severe drought, after two years of support:

**Poverty and food security**
- HSNP households are ten percentage points less likely to fall into the bottom national poverty decile than control households. In addition, both the poverty gap and the severity of poverty improve in comparison to control households by seven percentage points each. HSNP households have seen their consumption expenditure increase by KES 247 per adult per month on average.
- The programme is having a significant impact on food security, reflected in a significant positive impact on food consumption. Eighty-seven percent of HSNP households report eating more and/or larger meals. HSNP households spend approximately KES 213 more on food per month per adult than control households (which reduced consumption due to drought).
- No impact is found on dietary diversity for HSNP households overall. However, poorer HSNP household are increasing the diversity of their diets. No significant impact on child nutrition is found. (The evaluation authors note that this is not surprising given the variety of factors external to the HSNP and beyond simple access to food that affect child nutrition, which a cash transfer by itself is unlikely to influence.)

**Productive assets**
- There is some evidence of positive impact on retention of livestock, with HSNP households six percentage points more likely to own some form of livestock after two years of programme operations than control households. The result is more pronounced with goats/sheep, at seven percentage points. (Note: this result is not robust when you control for community- and household-level factors.)
In terms of the retention and accumulation of non-livestock productive assets, the HSNP is not having a significant impact on ownership of a range of key productive assets. However, the qualitative research did reveal some beneficiaries buying consumer goods (‘non-productive assets’), such as housing materials, clothing, or basic household items.

Livelihoods, markets and prices

- HSNP is not causing inflation or stabilizing prices over time (e.g. between seasons). This implies that the scale of the HSNP (coverage rates and value of the transfer) is not sufficient to substantially affect trading patterns, food prices or supplies in local markets.
- HSNP is not creating dependency or disrupting pastoralist livelihoods: The main livelihood activity in the HSNP operational area is livestock rearing. However, droughts, as well as economic, social and political changes, have disrupted pastoralist livelihoods and led to increasing reliance on other sources of income, such as casual labour and selling bush products. It is these broader forces, rather than the HSNP, which have affected people’s livelihoods. The evaluation reveals no impact on labour supply (measured by the proportion of adults engaged in productive work), either in the HSNP or control households, indicating that the programme is not creating dependency among beneficiaries.
- Some livelihoods have been positively affected by the HSNP – a small but significant proportion of beneficiaries have started or expanded a business using the HSNP cash as working capital. Several individuals reported upgrading their livelihoods thanks to the HSNP. The evaluation produces a lot of qualitative testimony as to the positive impact of the HSNP on the local economy.
- HSNP is significantly improving households’ ability to save cash, as well as access loans and credit. HSNP households are seven percentage points more likely than control households to have cash savings, and ten percentage points more likely to access loans.

Source: adapted from Merttens et al, 2013

Across the two sectors, research into the performance of agriculture policy and programmes in Kenya using a political economy lens also explains why the extent to which social protection may contribute to better outcomes in agriculture, or vice-versa, does not appear to provide an incentive for more coherence. Poulton and Kanyinga (2014) note in their analysis of the performance of the Strategy for Revitalizing Agriculture (SRA) from 2004 onwards that patronage politics – along the lines of ethno-regional groups – drive agricultural policies and the allocation of programming resources in Kenya, and perpetuate high levels of poverty and inequality. Historically, the principal winners under agriculture policies have been those areas/ethnic groups aligned with the controlling parties (Poulton and Kanyinga, 2014: S156) and not groups identified on the basis of poverty or vulnerability. Indeed, they note that

“ultimately, the strength of ethnic identity within rural Kenya society means that a poor Luo smallholder in western Kenya feels more affinity to wealthier Luos than to a poor Kikutu or Kalenjin smallholder in another part of the country” (never mind a pastoralist of a different ethnic and religious group in the north!) (p. S169).
Based on this evaluation of SRA, with such strong drivers behind resource allocation in agriculture, it is difficult to see how the case for synergies and linkages with social protection (which is largely targeted on the basis of need and not ethnic identity) will be persuasive.

5. Discussion and conclusions

5.1. Policies and programme design

Four key points emerge from interviews and document analysis about coherence between agriculture and social protection in Kenya in relation to policies and their articulation in programme design.

First, although there is some overlap and therefore scope for coherence in terms of broad policy objectives, especially in relation to food security, it is not clear which policies or frameworks could or should be the focal point for coherence and coordination. The number of different (and sometimes competing) policies, policy frameworks and working groups is bewildering, and it is not immediately clear which to start with. Too often the coordination follows the money:

> It will be years before we can implement rural development and irrigation through one agency or process. It is a struggle to get donors to basket/pool their funding.

> On paper there is some sort of vision or framework but what matters is political clout and what is sexy. But this tends to not be an overarching vision but specific flagships – with personalities behind them – that drive things.

In the eyes of national-level respondents, achieving coherence is more likely to happen through other cross-sectoral frameworks (such as those focusing on resilience) than by aligning two sectoral policies. The latter is seen as unfeasible and yet the former does not yet appear to translate to county level. But government officials invariably connect primarily to and prioritize their own sectoral policies, and there are limited incentives or directives from managers and leaders to go beyond this. Sectoral policies have complementary elements but they also diverge – for example with agriculture increasingly focused on business objectives and growth and significant parts of social protection policy focusing on lifecycle-based vulnerabilities.

Second, a significant amount of time appears to be spent attempting to coordinate policies and policy frameworks, but it is not clear that the outcomes are worth the inputs:

> People get exhausted [with coordination]. Partners come here on a daily basis. Coordination takes time to implement and they ask why they should not have offices here. It requires us to have a greater workforce. And it is expensive. We make tea all the time and it feels like a hotel in the office some days.

> The time that we spend for these meetings: uh-oh!

Third, in a devolution context where the various levels of government are changing, how they work on agriculture (with the national-level ministry focusing more on regulation and policy, and less on programmes and implementation, and county-level governments taking more responsibility for resource allocation, programme design and implementation) and where social protection is a rapidly growing but still young part of government policy and programming, it is important to be modest about the extent to which we might expect and strive for coherence, and to think carefully about what the priorities for coordination around policy should be. At present, it is taking some time for new government agriculture institutions to settle and it may make sense for agriculture to get its own house in better order before reaching out to deal with
more complex and cross-cutting issues. Similarly, many respondents suggested that the inward-facing harmonization of the NSNP should be a priority ahead of outward-facing coordination with other sectors.

Fourth, although it is not clear that intensive efforts to achieve more policy coherence are worth it, there may be some ‘now or never’ opportunities at programme design phase to ensure that opportunities to ensure coherence and coordination in the future are provided for in design. This includes being clear at programme design phase on mechanisms to allow people to exit from a programme in one sector and enter into a programme in another sector. In the case of HSNP this could be ensuring that households that exit the programme (because they move above the current targeting threshold) are then taken up by the KLIP and given the opportunity to access livestock insurance. In the case of CT-OVC, this could be providing a mechanism for OVCs to enter into agriculture or other livelihood programmes when they reach the age of 18. As Harman (2015) notes for Zambia, “Lack of such linkages not only holds back households from making more sustained exits from poverty, but it also means that they are then more likely to continue to require support through the [CT] programme.”

5.2. Coordination, implementation and performance

The evidence about implementation from county and community levels in Turkana at best suggests that a healthy dose of realism is required in relation to coherence between social protection and agriculture, and at worst that we are barking up the wrong tree – i.e. it should not be a priority at all.

The realities of the physical environment in Turkana – that is, challenges of programming in contexts of drought, remoteness, population mobility and sparsity, and conflict/insecurity – point to the need to be more cautious about investing significant efforts into and having too high expectations of what coherence will bring. In many ways, what the HSNP process – including its implementing partners such as Equity Bank and HelpAge International – is contributing to the county is highly significant and represents a significant game-changer in approaches to enhancing livelihoods and supporting pastoralists. HSNP is connecting vulnerable pastoralists and other households with the providers of financial services, and using innovative technologies and leveraging the private sector to reach people who otherwise would be too remote too support.

However, in many of the theories of change – either explicit or implicit, and including those articulated by some for HSNP – that underpin policies and programmes, they appear to be either unclear or unrealistic (or, indeed, sometimes fatalistic!) about development prospects in the county and the country. Despite decades of investments in Turkana (and other parts of Kenya) with relatively little to show for it, very few respondents had a clear idea of why long-standing programmes or instruments were going to yield different results in the future than they had so far, nor did they have clear ideas about what could be done differently. Few were making the distinction between the more ambitious ‘transitional’ and ‘holding pattern’ growth or acknowledging the view that many programmes will not be effective unless we recognize “vulnerability to drought and climate change, and the increasing untenability of smallholder agriculture due to land fragmentation from population growth” (DFID 2015, p. 6). A number of respondents did note significant risks in Turkana – the future of the lake given dam construction in Ethiopia; continued insecurity and cattle-rustling; disputed territories; and the

5 Pastoralism will be pushed to the edge of the county. Pastoralism will die a natural death. I am not anti-development, but any development is not good. It can be good or bad. But we are ready to fight until we’re defeated.
lack of land title despite very rapid investments following the discovery of oil – and noted that it may be futile to seek coherence between agriculture and social protection when there were much bigger forces and risks to address.

This view is strongly echoed in performance evaluations, which leads us to question whether the structural factors that underpin poverty and the binding constraints in the agriculture sector are adequately reflected in theories of change in social protection programmes. Performance evaluations also highlighted the ambiguity of targeting in agriculture and whether social protection and agriculture programme beneficiaries should and could overlap. At the most basic level, it is necessary to be clear whether it is a sequenced or layered approach to programming that is expected to provide the pathway to improving people’s wellbeing and livelihoods.

So, should a preoccupation with coherence between agriculture and social protection be a major priority? It’s a difficult question to answer for Kenya – complicated by the newness of the devolution process, and by the fact that some policies and programmes remain national and others are devolved to countries. But, overall, we find that, while we need to be modest about what coherence can achieve, and target efforts to achieve coherence and coordination very carefully, there is scope for capturing greater synergies between agriculture and social protection so that both provide better outcomes for people who are vulnerable or living in poverty. Our analysis, based as it is on a limited period of time collecting information and analysing policy and programme documentation – and influenced strongly by our experiences in Turkana, which may not be an adequate reflection of the range of county contexts – suggests that:

- Stakeholders should cautious about investing significant efforts in coherence in national-level policy processes by attempting to influence other sectoral policies, and should also be cautious about attempting to invest significant resources in coherence by working within sub-regional/cross-sector frameworks until they become meaningful at county level.

- We can take significant steps towards coherence by ensuring that programme design processes do allow mechanisms by which linkages can be made with other sectors as the programme matures. This will require clarity among stakeholders as to whether a sequencing or layering approach is appropriate.

- After design, as we move into implementation, the focus should be first on getting implementation right in individual sectors/programmes/projects, before then attempting to achieve linkages, synergies and complementarities with others. For social protection, this means prioritizing the harmonization of the safety nets process, and for agriculture working out how support to the agriculture sector will work in a devolved system.
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### Table 1  Research questions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Backgroud and history</th>
<th>Understanding the policies and programmes for agriculture and social protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What are the main challenges in the rural areas of the country? What are levels of poverty, how have they changed over the last 20 years, and what is known about the trends seen? What have been the main public strategies to promote agricultural and rural development and to reduce rural poverty?</td>
<td>How adequate and sufficient have public programmes been compared to the size of the challenge faced? What has been learned about agricultural development and social protection in the country in the last 20 or so years?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the strategy for agricultural development and social protection?</th>
<th>For policies and programmes, what are their aims, intermediate outcomes and activities? [Set out the theory of change, or narrative summary of the logical framework, together with key assumptions that link the levels.]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How much political support does the programme have? Are there groups opposed to the programme? To what extent are goals and the means to achieve them agreed? What is the implementing agency? How broad are its functions? What technical staff does it have? How decentralized is the agency? How much can leaders and staff at regional and district levels vary programme activities to suit local circumstances?</td>
<td>Is the theory of change coherent? Do the means seem adequate to realize the ends envisaged? Are assumptions made reasonable? Do they assume that other programmes are successful? Do they involve high levels of risk or uncertainty? Does the programme have political backing commensurate with its mission? Does the implementing agency have the capacity to deliver the activities planned?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What is the nature of the task set? Simple, straightforward or complex and innovative?</th>
<th>What are the specific features of the programme: • Who: clients, targeting • Where: geographical area • What: delivery of services/ inputs/ payments/ knowledge, etc. • How: Which agency or agencies are involved? What active collaborations form part of the programme?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What key factors in the physical and human environment affect implementation and results? To what extent do programme managers have any influence over these factors? How does the programme deal with changes in the environment?</td>
<td>Does the programme deliver tried and tested interventions, or are there innovative and novel elements? How complex and simple is the programme? Can it be standardized, or does it require tailoring to local circumstances? How much scope do managers and field staff have to adapt the programme to local circumstances and to emerging insights? How is the programme monitored? Any scope for re-planning? [Are mistakes accepted?]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| What is the human and physical environment of the programme? | To what extent does the programme depend on elements in the environment not under control of the agency? How stable are key elements in the environment? What key risks arise from the environment? |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What co-ordination is seen within and between programmes?</td>
<td>What mechanisms are used to coordinate programmes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Where does coordination occur? At central, regional, district or village level?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How much coordination takes place? Through sharing of goals, exchange of information, joint planning, or close collaboration among field staff?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What incentives to coordinate do staff of different agencies have at different levels?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coherence across programmes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In what ways are the programmes coherent?</td>
<td>Do the programmes share a similar theory of change or set of beliefs about to promote development? Do they share goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do the activities carried out complement or conflict with one another? Or are they largely independent of each other?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do the outcomes of one programme affect the other, either positively in creating synergies, or negatively by diminishing the results of the other programme? Or are the outcomes largely independent of one another?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How well do programmes perform?</td>
<td>Does the programme deliver the outputs expected in the field? Are clients receiving the expected services, benefits, etc. from the programme? What problems have arisen in the implementation?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are programme outputs contributing to programme goals?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What does the programme see as successful?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What aspects of performance result from coordination with other programmes?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Position/Role</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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<td>FAO Representative in Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Allport</td>
<td>Assistant FAO Representative (Implementation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Oxfam Turkana, Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Amuyunzu-Nyamongo</td>
<td>Executive Director, African Institute for Health and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damien Aryong</td>
<td>Country Drought Response Officer, Lodwar, Turkana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seraphine Atambo</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Agriculture – Crops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominic Davoux</td>
<td>Head of Rural Development and Agriculture, European Union Delegation to the Republic of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liz Drake</td>
<td>Senior Poverty, Hunger and Vulnerability Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Section Head – Social Protection, Emergencies and Resilience DFID Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christopher Eporon Ekumom</td>
<td>Minister of Pastoral Economy and Fisheries, Turkana County, Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ric Goodman</td>
<td>Hunger Safety Net Programme Coordinator, National Drought Management Authority, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Harrison</td>
<td>Coordination, Programme Innovations, World Food Programme, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Langat</td>
<td>Turkana Department of Children’s Services, Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nahashon Lotaruk</td>
<td>Turkana Social Development Department, responsible for PwSD programme, Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Kamau</td>
<td>Programme Officer, Safety Nets, World Food Programme, Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacqueline M Kiio</td>
<td>Assistant Director of Agriculture, Agribusiness &amp; Value Addition Division, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mbolu Kithama</td>
<td>Food Security Division, Senior Assistant Director Livestock Production, State Department of Livestock, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gladys Mugambi</td>
<td>Head Nutrition and Dietetics Unit, Ministry of Health, State Department of Livestock, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dennis Mudhune</td>
<td>Turkana County Coordinator for Social Development, Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter G. Mwangovya</td>
<td>Assistant Director, Livestock Production, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everlyne Nadio</td>
<td>HSNP Programme Coordinator – Turkana, National Drought Management Authority, Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacinta M. Ngwiri</td>
<td>Food Security and Early Warning, Assistant Director of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job K Nyorsok</td>
<td>Equity Bank Manager, Lodwar Branch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Odour</td>
<td>Chief Executive, National Drought Management Authority, Nairobi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilfred Onchware Onchoke</td>
<td>Director – Irrigation Technology, Infrastructure Development and Mechanization, State Department of Agriculture, Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock and Fisheries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Position/Position/Programme/Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claudia Piacenza</td>
<td>Livelihoods Advisor (DESA), Arid Land Support Programme, DFID Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pius Eiton</td>
<td>Business Partnerships Manager, Equity Bank, Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Musa Tioko</td>
<td>HelpAge International, Turkana, Lodwar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natalia Winder-Rossi</td>
<td>UNICEF, Regional Office for East and Southern Africa, Nairobi, Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus Group Discussion</td>
<td>Naoros, Naotin and Nakinomet Villages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondents in Turkana</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FAO, together with its partners, is generating evidence on the impacts of coordinated agricultural and social protection interventions and is using this to provide related policy, programming and capacity development support to governments and other actors.