Oxford Policy Management

EVALUATION OF THE HUNGER SAFETY NET PROGRAMME (HSNP) PHASE 3

HSNP Operational Monitoring Synthesis Report

Bilal Hakeem

This assessment was carried out by OPM. The project manager was Anita Ntale, The team leader was Patrick Ward. This report was written by monitoring workstream lead, Bilal Hakeem, with inputs from Babatunde Akano, For further information, contact Anita Ntale: anita.ntale@opml.co.uk. The contact point for the client is David Kinyua: David. Kinyua@fcdo.gov.uk. The client reference number for the project is PO8603.

Preface

Oxford Policy Management (OPM) led the monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge (MEK) component of Phase 3 of the Government of Kenya's (GoK's) cash transfer programme for northern Kenya, the Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP), from 2019 to 2024. The research was conducted on behalf of the UK Government and funded by the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office. The MEK component had a number of objectives which were to be achieved through four workstreams: operational monitoring of the continued implementation and expansion of the HSNP into four new counties; capacity assessment and transition monitoring as the implementation of the HSNP was taken over by GoK; and an impact evaluation and a process review of the Economic Inclusion Programme (EIP) pilot implemented by the Directorate for Social Development.

This report was authored by Bilal Hakeem, on behalf of OPM, under the GEFA framework.

Disclaimer

This report has been prepared by OPM for the UK Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), for services specified in the terms of reference and contract of engagement. The information contained in this report shall not be disclosed to any other party or used or disclosed in whole or in part without agreement from OPM. For reports that are formally put into the public domain, any use of the information in this report should include a citation that acknowledges OPM as the author of the report.

This confidentiality clause applies to all pages and information included in this report.

This material has been funded by UK aid from the UK Government; however, the views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK Government's official policies.

Oxford Policy Management Limited

Registered in England: 3122495

Ground Floor

40-41 Park End Street

Oxford, OX1 1JD

United Kingdom

Tel: +44 (0) 1865 207 300

Fax: +44 (0) 1865 207 301

Email: admin@opml.co.uk

Website: www.opml.co.uk

Twitter: @OPMglobal

Facebook: @OPMglobal

YouTube: @OPMglobal

LinkedIn: @OPMglobal

Executive summary

Introduction

The Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP) is a government-led unconditional cash transfer programme that aims to relieve extreme hunger and vulnerability for poor households living in its target counties in arid and semi-arid areas of Kenya. The programme started in 2007 in the four northernmost counties of Kenya, which were the poorest in the country at that time: Marsabit, Mandera, Turkana, and Wajir (referred to as the pioneer counties in this report). In 2019 the programme was expanded to four additional counties: Garissa, Isiolo, Samburu, and Tana River.

At the time of writing, the programme was delivering Kenya shillings (KES) (2,700)[1] each month to 133,800 regular beneficiaries across the eight counties. In addition, the HSNP has been able to rapidly scale up and reach up to a further 679,120 beneficiaries (Group 2 households) to provide emergency payments following climate shocks.

Phase 3 of the HSNP, which started in 2019, transitioned the HSNP to full GoK ownership and financing. The primary aim of the UK Government's support to this phase was to build capacity within Government of Kenya (GoK) to fully take over the management, leadership, and coordination functions required to deliver the HSNP, and to invest in disaster risk financing and approaches to ensure economic inclusion.

Objectives of the HSNP monitoring and evaluation (M&E) activities

OPM was contracted by the UK FCDO to deliver the independent MEK component of the Kenya Social and Economic Inclusion Programme (KSEIP), to provide insights and technical assistance to programme implementation. The MEK component sought to assess the overall progress made by GoK, particularly as it related to the continuation of the HSNP in Phase 3. Within this component was a monitoring workstream, which had two main objectives:

1. Monitoring the quality of service delivery both during the process of transition and once programme implementation was fully transferred to the GoK. This was expected to enable the identification of areas where programme delivery quality might have been falling so that the programme could take remedial action, as well as where it had been maintained or was improving.
2. Examining the effectiveness with which monitoring and reporting were managed in the original four counties, and rolled out to the additional four counties; and documenting how monitoring and reporting were implemented during the transition period, to provide technical support to strengthen the HSNP's operational monitoring.

Overview of HSNP M&E activities

To achieve the monitoring workstream objectives, we implemented the following activities during the lifetime of Kenya Social and Economic Inclusion Programme (KSEIP 1):

1. Desk review and interviews with the HSNP team to map the historical monitoring and reporting practices. These practices included the following: the use of a management information system (MIS) dashboard; spot checks during payment delivery and registration; conducting post-payment monitoring surveys; using evidence from external evaluations; and registration monitoring and spot checks to monitor the coverage of vulnerable and marginalised groups. The desk review indicated that post-payment monitoring was the most developed monitoring activity, with some gaps identified in sampling, data collection tools, and coherent reporting. These gaps then became the focus of capacity-strengthening activities later in the programme.
2. An analysis of HSNP operational monitoring data from 2018 to 2020 to produce an indicative baseline and follow-up periodic data analysis to track the quality of service against this baseline across both pioneer and additional counties.
3. Capacity-strengthening activities following a review of existing monitoring practices. These activities included the following:
    a. Shadow monitoring of post-payment surveys to recommend improvements in the questionnaire and survey implementation.
    b. Development of a coherent monitoring framework to produce systematic evidence that could be used by the programme team to improve the programme.
    c. Recommending ways to improve the sampling strategy for the post-payment monitoring surveys to produce data that are more precise and more representative of the beneficiary population, in order to better understand the experiences of programme beneficiaries.
    d. Making updates to the existing questionnaires and developing new questionnaires in line with the updated monitoring framework.
4. A deep-dive study of the MIS to assess the suitability of the MIS for the production and utilisation of core monitoring data, with a focus on reporting against the recently revised HSNP M&E framework.

[1] KES 2,700 was equivalent to approximately US$ 20.8 as at March 2025.

Main conclusions

Overall programme delivery

- The programme did well to scale up from four counties to eight counties during Phase 3, in terms of targeting beneficiaries, registering them, opening the accounts, and setting up systems, including making and maintaining linkages with pay agents, to deliver payments. The targets were achieved, in terms of beneficiaries reached (133,800 regular beneficiaries and 679,120 emergency cash transfer beneficiaries). However, the frequency of payments was negatively affected due to delays in financial releases from the Treasury. This meant that beneficiaries received infrequent payments, there was uncertainty around when payments would be delivered, and even when they were delivered, the programme had to stagger the payments by sub-county.
- Generally speaking, the transition of the roles from the PMU team to the National Drought Management Authority (NDMA) team was successful, and all roles were transitioned by the end of Phase 3. In addition, there was a successful transition to a new and refreshed MIS, which offers greater control to the MIS team in terms of adding bespoke features and reports.
- A few key challenges that persisted throughout the programme included the high cost of travel for beneficiaries to travel to pay agents to receive their payments; the persistence of the fees charged by some pay agents; and the lack of consistent communication with beneficiaries about payment dates and their rights regarding not having to pay money to pay agents. In addition, pay agents continued to face issues with Point of Sale (POS) equipment functionality that affected their ability to pay beneficiaries on intended payment dates.

Operational monitoring

- Over the programme's lifecycle, incremental improvements were made to the monitoring system. This included the development and validation of a monitoring framework, improvements to the sampling methods, and an update of the data collection tools. There was also greater coordination between the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation (PME) and the MIS team in terms of data sharing and reporting.
- However, key challenges remain in the implementation of operational monitoring. These include the following:
  - The de-prioritisation of monitoring activities following budget cuts by the Treasury. This is reflected in annual and quarterly work plans that do not include provisions for post-payment monitoring surveys. Programme-wide post-payment surveys have not been conducted since March 2024, partly because of inconsistent payment delivery and partly because of a shift of resources away from monitoring.
  - While the monitoring framework has been validated, it is yet to be fully integrated into the HSNP operational manual. Currently, the roles and responsibilities of personnel responsible for data collection, management, analysis, and reporting are missing from the manual.
  - The MIS is not currently used to conduct any M&E reporting, as required in the monitoring framework. While the MIS functions as an effective data collection and storage tool for monitoring data, it is not utilised as analytical tool to generate reports for programme monitoring. Indicators in the monitoring framework that rely on routine programme data (instead of post-payment monitoring surveys) could have been reported while surveys were on pause but were not reported. This is a missed opportunity in terms of making use of available data and converting it into actionable insights.
  - Lack of effective coordination between the PME, MIS, and HSNP programme teams regarding roles and responsibilities for the generation, ownership, and use of monitoring data.
  - Lack of clarity in the operations manual about the data collection, aggregation, analysis, and reporting tasks to address the requirements of the monitoring framework through the MIS.
  - Lack of an offline modality for data collection tools, which could lead to data entry errors.
  - Lack of a review of quantitative data collected through post-payment monitoring surveys at the headquarters (HQ) level and lack of a performance review of Programme Officers (POs) regarding survey completion.

Findings

Overall programme delivery

1. The programme should invest more resources to improve communication about payment dates and beneficiary rights, and should conduct regular monitoring to track the progress and effectiveness of communication strategies.
2. Beneficiaries incur costs to reach pay agents and withdraw payments. In view of this fact, the programme should map the distribution of pay agents and household locations to understand which areas require more pay agents. This should be tracked as part of routine monitoring, as outlined in the monitoring framework.
3. The programme should work with pay agents and partner banks to review issues related to authentication and equipment malfunction.
4. In the next phase, the programme should implement surveys of registration and account monitoring during registration and account opening rounds, and should flag issues to the implementation team as they arise.

Operational monitoring

1. In the next phase, the programme should allocate a budget and resources for monitoring activities at the outset of programme implementation and then ensure that monitoring activities are included in annual and quarterly work plans, and implemented, at both the HQ and county levels.
2. The operational manual should be updated to document tasks related to operational monitoring, including the collection, collation, management, analysis, and reporting of data; and the roles of personnel responsible for carrying out these tasks.
3. Appropriate ways of working across the PME, MIS, and programme teams should be agreed and clearly documented in the operations manual to ensure more effective coordination and joint delivery of the programme.
4. The MIS should be updated to include auto-generated reports of information specified in the monitoring framework to enable the review of trends over time.
5. The survey data should be quality assured and then disseminated by the PME at the country level, programme team level, and senior management level.
6. The programme should work with the MIS supplier to ensure that offline functionality is made available for surveys, to avoid manual entry data errors.
7. The old case management forms should be retired and a single current version of the form should be used across all eight counties.
8. A data confidentiality policy should be written up to serve as a guide on how to handle data collected, stored, and distributed as part of the HSNP.
9. NDMA's senior management should oversee the implementation of these recommendations and should apply good practice by requesting and using MIS reports to ensure that the HSNP is delivering as intended.

Table of contents

List of tables and figures

List of abbreviations

BWC	Beneficiary Welfare Committee
GoK	Government of Kenya
HQ	Headquarters
HSNP	Hunger Safety Net Programme
KES	Kenyan shillings
MEK	Monitoring, evaluation, and knowledge
MIS	Management information system
M&E	Monitoring and evaluation
NDMA	National Drought Management Authority
OPM	Oxford Policy Management
PME	Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation
PMU	Programme Management Unit
POs	Programme Officers
PoS	Point of Sale

1 Introduction

1.1 HSNP Phase 3

The HSNP is a government-led unconditional cash transfer programme that aims to relieve extreme hunger and vulnerability for poor households living in its target counties in arid and semi-arid areas of Kenya. The programme started in 2007 in the four northernmost counties of Kenya, which were the poorest in the country at that time: Marsabit, Mandera, Turkana, and Wajir (referred to as the pioneer counties in this report). In 2019 it was expanded to four additional counties: Garissa, Isiolo, Samburu, and Tana River.

At the time of writing, the programme delivered KES 2,700[2] each month to 133,800 regular beneficiaries across the eight counties. In addition, the HSNP has been able to rapidly scale up and to reach up to a further 679,120 beneficiaries (Group 2 households) to provide emergency payments following climate shocks.

The third phase of the programme, which started in 2019, transitioned the HSNP to full GoK ownership and financing. The primary aim of the UK Government's support to the HSNP Phase 3 was to build capacity within GoK to fully take over the management, leadership, and coordination functions required to deliver the HSNP and to invest in disaster risk financing and approaches to ensure economic inclusion.

OPM was contracted to deliver the independent MEK component of the HSNP Phase 3. This report synthesises the monitoring work conducted under this component during HSNP Phase 3 (2019–2024).

2 Background

2.1 The HSNP

The HSNP was implemented in three phases (see Figure 1). The first phase (2007–2013) piloted cash transfers as an alternative to costly and often poorly targeted food aid provided to households during drought periods.
The second phase (2013–2019) expanded the reach to over 100,000 households, which received regular electronic cash transfers. Phase 2 also included a separate shock-responsive mechanism which enabled the programme to scale up its coverage during periods of drought to an additional 272,000 households. In the third phase of the HSNP, cash transfers were scaled up to double the number of counties and to reach a total of 133,800 routine beneficiary households and 679,120 emergency cash transfer beneficiaries.

[2] KSE 2,700 was equivalent to approximately US$ 20.8 as at March 2025.

Figure 1: Evolution of the HSNP

OPM has been funded by FCDO to work in partnership with GoK over the last 15 years to generate evidence on the impact of the HSNP and its operational performance to inform programme strategy and management.

The impact evaluation of the first phase of the programme showed that it was an effective safety net that helped people in remote areas to lift themselves out of extreme poverty. The beneficiaries from Phase 1 were found to be 10% less likely to fall into the bottom national consumption decile compared to the control group. In addition, both the poverty gap and the severity of poverty improved by 7 percentage points each. The evaluation showed that HSNP was scalable, and helped build the business case for FCDO to continue funding the programme. The evaluation of the second phase demonstrated that the programme led to a moderate reduction in food poverty by 3 percentage points. The second phase of the programme was also found to have a significant spill-over effect that helped stimulate the local economy. For every KES 1 invested through the HSNP, income in the local economy increased, ranging from KES1.38 to KES1.93.[4] In addition to the impact on the beneficiaries, the evaluation found that the HSNP fostered the integration of marginalised and hard-to-reach communities in national and financial systems, which is a prerequisite to increase resilience. The evaluation of Phase 2 of the programme highlighted the need to transition the programme from a stand-alone cash transfer programme to an integrated drought response mechanism within the NDMA. Therefore, a key focus for the HSNP Phase 3 was to build capacity within GoK to fully take over the management, leadership, and coordination functions required to deliver the HSNP and to invest in disaster risk financing and approaches to ensure economic inclusion.

2.2 MEK component of the HSNP Phase 3

OPM was contracted by the UK FCDO to deliver the independent MEK component of the Kenya Social and Economic Inclusion Programme (KSEIP), to provide insights and technical assistance to programme implementation. The MEK component sought to assess the overall progress made by GoK, particularly as it related to the continuation of the HSNP in Phase 3 and the impact of the pilot economic inclusion sub-component of KSEIP: the Economic Inclusion Programme (EIP) pilot.

The MEK component had several objectives which were to be achieved through four workstreams: Workstream 1 – Monitoring; Workstream 2 – Capacity assessment; Workstream 3 – Process evaluation; and Workstream 4 – Impact evaluation. The objectives of the MEK component were:

1. to assess the quality of programme delivery throughout the transition of HSNP and programme implementation to GoK;
2. to assess the capacity needs of GoK in regard to managing the HSNP and to inform capacity-building and transition plans and processes;
3. to assess the progress made in building capacity within GoK to successfully manage and finance the programme;
4. to assess the effectiveness and efficiency of the economic inclusion implementation process, with a focus on operational lessons and recommendations for scale-up; and
5. to assess the impact of economic inclusion interventions on households' poverty and well-being.

The MEK component was designed to provide useful, relevant, and timely outputs to the FCDO, the World Bank, and government stakeholders which can be used to inform programme design and implementation and ultimately improve service delivery for beneficiary households.

[4] Impact Evaluation of the Kenya Hunger Safety Net Programme Phase 2: impact-evaluation-final-report.pdf

2.3 Monitoring support to the HSNP during Phase 3

2.3.1 Objectives

As part of the MEK component of the HSNP Phase 3, the monitoring workstream had two main objectives.

1. To monitor the quality of service delivery both during the process of transition and once programme implementation was fully transferred to the GoK. This was expected to enable the identification of areas where programme delivery quality might have been falling so that the programme could take remedial action, as well as where it had been maintained or was improving.
2. To examine the effectiveness with which monitoring and reporting were managed in the original four counties, and were rolled out to the additional four counties, and to document how monitoring and reporting were implemented during the transition period, to provide technical support to strengthen the HSNP's operational monitoring.

2.3.2 Progress to date

From the start of the HSNP Phase 3 MEK project the monitoring workstream delivered seven reports, excluding this synthesis: one baseline report, five bi-annual monitoring reports, and one deep-dive review of the use of the MIS for monitoring reporting. Table 1 below provides the timing and a description of each of these reports.

Table 1: Outputs delivered under the monitoring workstream

Report	Submission Timeline	Description
Baseline narrative report	September 2020	The report mapped the historical monitoring and reporting practices of the HSNP and analysed the programme's operational monitoring data from phases 1, 2, and 3 (until May 2020). The purpose of this report was to provide an indicative 'baseline' narrative against which to assess the evolution of service delivery during Phase 3.
Bi-annual monitoring report 1	December 2021	The report documented the monitoring support provided by the OPM team to the HSNP ME) team for the following M&E components: • monitoring framework; • recommendations to improve the survey process; • a proposal for a continuous sampling approach.
Bi-annual monitoring report 2	Draft report: September 2022. Final version: December 2022	The report presented the results from post-payment surveys conducted from June 2020 to July 2022 and summarised the progress made on key recommendations from the previous round.
Bi-annual monitoring report 3	March 2023	The report presented the following: • results from post-payment surveys conducted from April 2023 to December 2023; • a draft M&E framework developed in consultation with NDMA's Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation team, Director Technical Services, HSNP's operations team, programme officers from selected new and old counties, and county managers; • a responsibility matrix that outlined who was responsible for data generation, quality assurance, and reporting; and • a revised sampling approach.
Bi-annual monitoring report 4	January 2024	Identifying successes and barriers and exploring underlying reasons for observed trends.
Bi-annual monitoring report 5	December 2024	conducted from January to March 2024 and summarised the progress made on key recommendations from the previous round.
Deep-dive review of the MIS with respect to M&E reporting	March 2025	The report presented the findings of a deep-dive study that looked into the suitability of the current MIS system for M&E reporting.

2.4 Purpose and structure of this report

The purpose of this report is to synthesise the findings from all previous monitoring reports, to present conclusions about the progress of the HSNP, both with respect to the quality of service delivery and the quality of programme monitoring, and to present recommendations for the next phase of the programme.

The rest of this report is structured as follows. Section 3 provides an overview of the HSNP M&E activities. Section 4 presents a summary of findings across the programme. Section 5 provides conclusions. Section 6 outlines recommendations.

3 Overview of HSNP M&E activities

To achieve the monitoring workstream objectives, we implemented the following activities during the lifetime of the HSNP Phase 3 MEK project:

1. Desk review and interviews with the HSNP team to map historical monitoring and reporting practices. These practices included the following: the use of an MIS dashboard; spot checks during payment delivery and registration; post-payment monitoring surveys; the use of evidence from external evaluations; and registration monitoring and spot checks to monitor the coverage of vulnerable and marginalised groups. The review indicated that post-payment monitoring was the most developed monitoring activity, with some gaps identified in sampling, data collection tools, and coherent reporting. These gaps then became the focus of capacity-strengthening activities later in the programme. This review was documented in the baseline narrative report.
2. An analysis of HSNP operational monitoring data from 2018 to 2020 to produce an indicative baseline and follow-up periodic analysis to track the quality of service against this baseline across both pioneer and additional counties. The baseline figures were shared in the baseline narrative report and the periodic analysis was reported in bi-annual monitoring reports 2–5. The analysis was based on the post-payment monitoring raw data shared by the HSNP PMU and NDMA teams.
3. Capacity-strengthening activities following a review of existing monitoring practices. These activities included the following:
    a. Development of a coherent monitoring framework to produce systematic evidence that can be used by the programme team to improve the programme.
    b. Recommending ways to improve the sampling strategy to produce data that are more precise and representative of the beneficiary population, to better understand the experiences of programme beneficiaries.
    c. Shadow monitoring of post-payment surveys to recommend improvements in the questionnaire and survey implementation. This activity was followed up with updates to the questionnaires following the validation of the monitoring framework.
4. A deep-dive study of the MIS review to assess the suitability of the MIS in regard to the production and utilisation of core monitoring data, with a focus on reporting against the M&E framework. The review focused on data capture, processing, analysis, and use for decision-making. The methods used for this study included a review of the MIS and existing reports, a document review of policies and procedures for data collection and reporting, and interviews at the NDMA HQ and two selected counties: Turkana and Tana River. The study was conducted from 4 to 10 December 2024.

4 Findings

In this section, we present the findings from the monitoring work, including the capacity-strengthening activities, trends analysis based on periodic analysis of post-payment monitoring surveys, and the deep dive to assess the suitability of the MIS for M&E reporting.

4.1 Capacity strengthening

As mentioned above, the baseline narrative report indicated the need for a coherent monitoring framework to enable systematic reporting against a set of agreed core indicators at regular intervals. The work on the monitoring framework started in early 2022 and included repeated consultations with the PMU, the NDMA team including the Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation team, the MIS team, the HSNP programme team (both from PMU and NDMA shadow officers), and the Finance team. The framework was agreed in a workshop held in December 2023 and validated by the NDMA management in March 2024. This was followed up with an agreement on the sampling approach and updates to the questionnaires.

4.1.1 Monitoring framework

The main features of the framework are presented below and the detailed framework is provided in Annex 1. Its key features are as follows:

- A revised and refreshed monitoring draft framework that responds to current information needs and can be operationalised within the existing resources. The revised monitoring framework includes a detailed description of each indicator, disaggregation requirements, thresholds, calculation methods, and reporting frequency and format. The main areas covered by the framework include the following:
    - Impact-level indicators related to beneficiaries' self-reported improvement or decline in household consumption, health, income, ownership of assets, and school attendance.
    - Registration process indicators to report on the extent to which the registration process has been implemented as intended.
    - Account opening process indicators to report on the extent to which the account opening process has been implemented as intended.
    - Payment procedure indicators to track beneficiary and pay agents' experience of receiving and disbursing payments, including any challenges faced, and general awareness of the grievances and household information update mechanisms.
    - Grievance and case management system indicators to report on the effectiveness of the mechanism in resolving grievances and case management, and the overall satisfaction level of beneficiaries who use these mechanisms.
    - Communication-related indicators to track the awareness level of beneficiaries regarding HSNP funding, eligibility and exit criteria, payment amount, frequency, and overall satisfaction.
    - Overall M&E indicators to track the completeness of information in the MIS for key indicators, and the number and frequency of M&E activities conducted and reports submitted.
- A clear responsibility matrix that outlines who is responsible for data generation, quality assurance, and reporting (see Annex 2).

4.2 Sampling approach

One feature of the revised sampling approach was an agreed sampling strategy that will improve the scientific rigour of the results from the post-payment monitoring surveys. The main features of the sampling approach are presented below and the detailed approach is presented in bi-annual monitoring report 1 (December 2021) and in the monitoring framework workshop slide deck shared with NDMA in December 2023 (Annex 3).

- At the start of the HSNP Phase 3, the sampling approach used by the HSNP programme had two main gaps:
    - In the first stage of sampling locations, the team did not use a probability sampling approach. Instead, the team purposively selected locations from a list of sites which had not been visited in previous surveys.
    - In the second stage sampling of beneficiaries, while a random sample of main and replacement beneficiaries was drawn, there were no guidelines regarding how to conduct replacements. In practice, the programme officers selected respondents from a pool of primary and replacement samples based on convenience.
- To improve the robustness of the sampling process, we proposed a stratified, two-stage, systematic random sampling approach that integrates the sampling process across monthly or bi-monthly data collection rounds such that the survey is considered one integrated survey, conducted continuously throughout the year. The continuous survey will deliver one final dataset and

results on a yearly basis, whilst also providing temporary datasets that can be used for periodic reporting throughout the year: for example, in each payment cycle. The final cumulative dataset will provide the best statistical power and enable the presentation of the results at the lowest disaggregation level (i.e. the county level).

- In practice, this means drawing an annual sample at the start of the year and randomly allocating samples for each period or month to teams.

It was agreed that the proposed sampling approach would be trialled in the post-payment surveys conducted after March 2024; however, this has not yet been implemented.

4.3 Shadow monitoring of data collection and updating questionnaires

In line with the agreed monitoring framework, we proposed revisions to the existing questionnaires (post-payment monitoring questionnaire and registration monitoring questionnaire) and the development of new questionnaires (account opening monitoring questionnaire and case management monitoring questionnaire). These questionnaires were developed by NDMA and reviewed by the OPM team. The questionnaires have now been added to the MIS data structure and programme officers have been trained on the revised questionnaires. However, these revised questionnaires have not been used in the post-payment monitoring surveys, mainly because no monitoring activity has been carried out since the completion of these questionnaires. The final approved questionnaires are provided in Annex 4.

Following the completion of the monitoring framework, it was agreed that the framework would be integrated into the revised operations manuals. However, this is yet to be completed.

4.4 Deep-dive study to assess the suitability of the MIS for M&E reporting

The HSNP programme depends on its MIS for operations and for reporting against the M&E framework. A deep-dive study was conducted to assess the suitability of the refreshed and updated MIS for M&E reporting.

A summary of key findings from this MIS deep dive—conducted to assess human resource requirements and competencies for MIS development and operations—is provided below, with detailed findings available in the full report.[5]

- **Data reporting for the requirements of the monitoring framework:** Currently, the MIS is not used to conduct any M&E reporting, as required in the monitoring framework. While the MIS functions as an effective data collection and storage tool for monitoring data, it is not utilised as an analytical tool to generate reports for programme monitoring. The MIS has not been programmed to use the beneficiary-level source data and to generate routine reports, as required in the monitoring framework. Indicators in the monitoring framework that rely on routine programme data (instead of post-payment monitoring surveys) could have been reported while surveys were on pause but were not reported. This was a missed opportunity in terms of making use of available data and converting it into actionable insights.
- A monitoring framework populated with available data was shared with the OPM team as part of the MIS assessment that indicated gaps in the availability of data and reporting of indicators outlined in the monitoring framework. Source data (beneficiary-level raw data) were not provided so we could not assess the accuracy of reported figures.

In terms of the overall data system that underpins reliable data reporting for programme monitoring, we identified the following gaps:

- A lack of effective coordination between the PME, MIS, and HSNP programme teams regarding roles and responsibilities for the generation, ownership, and use of monitoring data.
- A lack of clarity in the operations manual about the data collection, aggregation, analysis, and reporting tasks to address the requirements of the monitoring framework through the MIS.
- The lack of an offline modality for data collection tools, which could lead to data entry errors.
- The lack of a review of data quantitative data collected through post-payment monitoring surveys at the HQ level and the lack of performance reviews of POs regarding survey completion.

4.5 Trends analysis of implementation quality indicators

In this section, we present trends in the quality of programme implementation, based on the analysis of selected indicators. This analysis is based on the post-payment survey data collected from beneficiaries and pay agents and provided to OPM by the HSNP/NDMA teams. The sample breakdown for each county is provided in Table 2. To compare trends across the two periods for key estimates, beneficiary weights were calculated at the county level using the proportion of the beneficiary population in each county (numerator) and the proportion of beneficiaries selected in the sample for each county (denominator).

[5] Hakeem, B. and David, C. (2025) 'Evaluation of the Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP) Phase 3: MIS Assessment 3', Oxford Policy Management, Oxford

Table 2: Sample distribution of post-payment surveys – beneficiaries

	Sample (July 2018 – May 2020)	Sample (June 2020 – June 2022)	Sample (July 2022 – March 2023)	Sample (Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Sample (Dec 2023– Mar 2024)	Total Group 1 (regular payment) beneficiaries
Number of survey rounds	6	8	2	4	3	
Mandera	561	920	191	241	311	22,229
Marsabit	675	971	167	250	391	20,453
Turkana	461	863	216	734	470	39,917
Wajir	914	920	187	614	241	19,201
Sub-total pioneer counties	2,611	3,674	761	1,839	1,413	101,800
Tana River				75	416	7,377
Isiolo				61	222	7,027
Garissa				75	244	9,252
Samburu				147	114	8,344
Sub-total additional counties	0	0	0	358	996	32,000
Grand total	2,611	3,674	761	2,197	2,409	133,800

The analysis of the pay agents post-payment monitoring surveys is based on a much smaller sample. Due to limited resources, one programme officer was tasked with interviewing two pay agents per survey round. The pay agent sample is not representative of all pay agents across the programme.

The sample distribution of pay agents included in the post-payment monitoring surveys is provided below.

Following feedback in the dissemination workshop held in February 2025, the findings in this section are presented for the programme as a whole, and then separately for pioneer and additional counties, considering that the programme has been implemented for longer in the pioneer counties.

In interpreting these findings, it should be noted that the proposed continuous random sampling approach was not fully used in the post-payment surveys, which means that the samples may not have properly represented the experiences of all beneficiaries. As highlighted in bi-annual monitoring reports, the sample completion rates remained uneven across counties throughout the programme period, for various reasons, including a lack of resourcing, re-allocation of resources towards the roll-out of the implementation in the additional counties, and lack of monitoring budget towards the end of the MEK programme. These factors may have contributed to variability in the statistics between rounds. However, the findings highlight general trends in the quality of programme implementation. In this section, we present the high-level trends, focussing on a comparison between baseline and the most recent survey where possible, while the detailed tables are presented in Annex 5.

Table 3: Sample distribution of post-payment surveys – pay agents

	Sample (July 2018 – May 2020)	Sample (June 2020 – June 2022)	Sample (July 2022 – March 2023)	Sample (Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Sample (Dec 2023 – Mar 2024)
Number of survey rounds	6	8	2	4	3
Pioneer counties	86	177	46	79	46
Additional counties				10	20
Total	**86**	**177**	**46**	**89**	**66**

4.5.1 Payments

To make the best use of their payments and to minimise the risk of error, fraud, and corruption, HSNP beneficiaries need to be aware of their obligations and entitlements under the programme. Ideally, all beneficiaries should understand who is eligible to receive the HSNP support, what the value of the transfer is, and how often, and on what date, the payments are made.

The HSNP operational team needs to understand the beneficiaries' experience of collecting payments to identify the quality and efficiency of the service beneficiaries are receiving. Understanding and monitoring the direct and indirect costs that beneficiaries incur when collecting their transfer, and identifying any incidents of error, fraud, and corruption during the collection of payments, are key to ensuring that recipients gain optimum benefit from the cash transfer.

Beneficiaries' experience

This section looks at data related to beneficiaries' awareness of the payment cycle and payment process, use of payments, and challenges in collecting payments, including the time and costs involved.

Awareness of the payment cycle

Beneficiaries are expected to be made aware of the dates at least two days in advance so that they can make arrangements to travel and withdraw the payments. **Overall, we found that the majority of the respondents received information about the payment date either on the day of the payment or after the date had passed.**

- Overall, across all the programme counties, most beneficiaries (62.3%) received notice on the day of the payment and 7% received the notice after the payment date – which was an improvement compared to the baseline. At the baseline, 65% of the respondents reported receiving notice on the day of the payment and 16.9% reported receiving notice after the payment date had passed.
- In the pioneer counties, most beneficiaries (64.7%) received notice on the day of the payment and 4.5% received the notice after the payment date – which was an improvement from previous rounds.
- For the additional counties, in the most recent rounds, 52.3% of the respondents reported receiving the notice on the day of the payment while 17.5% of respondents reported receiving notice after the payment date had passed.

Beneficiaries' experience

Beneficiaries were asked about the use of the withdrawn amount in the recent rounds. **Overall, there was no change and little variation in the reported use of the cash across pioneer and additional counties and periods**. The main use of payments was to buy food (94%), followed by paying for education (27.6%), household items (18.6%), health (13.1%), livestock purchases (3.9%), and loans (3.4%).[6]

Impact of cash transfers

Beneficiaries were asked to rate the impact of cash transfers on their household consumption, ownership of assets, children's school attendance, and ability to participate in income-generating activities by selecting one of four categories: much worse, worse, the same, better.

Overall, the data reported across pioneer counties and periods showed that a large majority of the respondents felt that the cash transfers had had a positive impact on all categories, with the highest impact on household consumption.

- In the recent round of data collection, a large proportion of respondents (93.7%) in the pioneer counties reported that their household consumption had improved and 6.2% of the respondents reported that it had remained the same.
- For additional counties, 87.9% reported that consumption has improved while 11.8% reported that it had remained the same.

Challenges collecting payments

In terms of challenges with collecting payments, there was a varied trend across pioneer and additional counties, perhaps owing to the addition of new pay agents in the additional counties.

Across the programme, as a whole:

- there was an increase in travel time to collect payments, from an average of 34.4 minutes at the baseline to 50.6 minutes in the most recent data collection rounds;
- there was an increase in money spent to collect payments, from KES 106.1 to KES 130.9; and
- there was an increase in the time spent queuing to collect payment from the baseline figure of 25.8 minutes to 86.7 minutes.

Amongst the pioneer counties:

- there was a slight increase in travel time to collect payments, from an average of 34.4 minutes at the baseline to 47.8 minutes in the most recent data collection rounds;

[5] The sum is greater than 100% because the question allowed multiple responses to be selected.

- there was a reduction in the money spent to collect payments, from KES 106.1 to KES 42.8; and
- there was an increase in the time spent queuing to collect payment, from the baseline figure of 25.8 minutes to 91 minutes.

Amongst the additional counties, in recent data collection rounds, the travel time reported was 62.4 minutes, the amount of money spent was KES 497.3, and the time spent queuing to collect payments was 68.6 minutes.

The cost associated with payment collection should be further investigated to understand and address any issues that fall under the HSNP's control. As per the HSNP operation manual, all pay points should be located within a 10 km radius of beneficiaries' households, and therefore the beneficiaries should not have to spend money on transport to collect payments. The distance travelled to reach the pay agent has been incorporated as a key indicator in the monitoring framework and going forward should be analysed monthly. Previously, the MIS dashboard visualised the locations of the beneficiary households and points on a map. This feature is yet to be added to the current MIS dashboard. Once incorporated into the dashboard, it will provide a useful visual guide to track areas where more pay points are needed.

Costs of collecting payments

Recent data are consistent with previous survey rounds showing a continued upward trend in the practice of paying agents charging a fee. This points to a gap in communication with the beneficiaries about their rights to get the payment without having to pay money to the agent.

- Across the programme as a whole, the proportion of respondents saying that the agent charged a fee for payment increased from 21.3% in the baseline period to 36.4% in the most recent rounds of data collection.
- Amongst the pioneer counties, the proportion of respondents saying that the agent charged a fee for the payment increased from 21.3% in the baseline period to 37.4% in the most recent rounds of data collection.
- In the additional counties, the figure was reported to be 32.2%.

The persistence of illegal fees being charged by pay agents needs to be further investigated and reported to the payment service providers (banks).

Pay agents' experience

Equity Bank recruits agents to provide services on its behalf. These agents are often storekeepers who run banking services alongside their regular businesses (though occasionally they work solely for Equity Bank). The agent network is a vital part of the banking system since there are very few bank branches in the HSNP counties.

Awareness of the payment date

Most pay agents received communication on payment dates and emergency payments through SMS messages, or directly from Equity Bank officers and Equity Bank representatives. According to the monitoring framework, pay agents should be made aware of the payment date at least two days in advance.

Insufficient notice of the payment date (i.e. on the day of payment or later) affects pay agents' ability to arrange money for payments on time, and, in turn, ultimately affects the beneficiaries' ability to withdraw money after having spent the time and money to reach the sites on the payment date.

The current survey does not track data in terms of how many days in advance the pay agents were made aware of the payment date. Instead, it asks how many weeks in advance there were provided this information. Going forward, in the revised questionnaires, this information will be tracked in terms of number of days for accuracy.

In the most recent data, in the pioneer counties all interviewed pay agents reported having received information one week or less, in advance, which is an improvement from the baseline, during which 62.9% of the pay agents reported receiving information one week in advance. In the additional counties, this figure was at 90% during the most recent survey round.

Liquidity constraints

Liquidity constraints are underscored by the fact that, across the programme as a whole, 54.7% of the pay agents interviewed in the most recent period reported that there was at least one day during the payment cycle when more beneficiaries arrived to withdraw than there was cash available.

In the pioneer counties, 53.3% of the pay agents interviewed in the most recent period reported that there was at least one day during the payment cycle when more beneficiaries arrived to withdraw than there was cash available. This figure remained consistent from June 2020 to July 2022.

However, in the additional counties, none of the pay agents reported that there was any day when more beneficiaries arrived than there was cash available.

Some of the main strategies used by pay agents to manage liquidity problems include sending someone to get cash from the bank, referring the beneficiary to another pay agent, or suspending the payment.

Security

Security was noted as a concern for pay agents in the past, due to the large amounts of cash involved. However, the figures reported in the December 2023 – March 2024 surveys indicate a positive trend, with a reduction in reported robberies and a lower proportion of pay agents reporting

that they felt uncomfortable while collecting or distributing cash. Among the pay agents interviewed during the most recent period, 1.5% reported having been robbed and 34.8% reported having felt unsafe while transporting cash. Some 7.6% of pay agents interviewed in this period reported that they had lost money in the process of payment – presumably due to a robbery or a security incident.

- In the pioneer counties, none of the pay agents reported being robbed while collecting or distributing cash, compared to the baseline figure of 10.2%.
- In the additional counties, 5% of the pay agents reported being robbed.

Overall, security issue remains a consistent concern for pay agents; despite a reduction in robberies and losing money in general, one-third of the agents interviewed across the recent three data collection rounds still indicated that they felt comfortable when collecting or distributing cash.

Equipment maintenance problems

Given the often high opportunity cost in time for beneficiaries in accessing their payments, minimising the number of instances of technical faults is an important way of reducing the burden of the payment system on beneficiaries. Previously, technical problems affecting the pay agent, particularly lack of a network signal and authentication problems, were highlighted as significant problems for beneficiaries.

- Across the programme, in the recent rounds of data collection, about 45.5% of the pay agents interviewed in that period reported that they had faced network problems during a payment cycle, and 50.0% reported that they had experienced problems with authenticating beneficiaries.
- In the pioneer counties, there was an increase in the proportion of pay agents reporting issues with the POS terminal (an increase from 16.5% during baseline to 30.4% in recent data collection rounds); a reduction in the proportion of pay agents reporting issues with network signal (a decrease from 52.7% during the baseline period to 41.3% during the recent data collection period). The authentication issues persisted throughout the programme (48.4% during the baseline compared to 45.7% during the recent data collection period).
- In the additional counties, there was an increase in the proportion of pay agents reporting issues with the POS terminal (an increase from 10% during the previous period to 15% in recent data collection rounds); and a reduction in the proportion of pay agents reporting issues with network signal (a decrease from 90% during the previous period to 60% during the recent data collection period). In addition, there was a reduction in the proportion of beneficiaries reporting authentication issues, from 90% in the previous round to 60% in the recent round.

Considering the persistent issues with the equipment and its impact in terms of increasing the cost of accessing payments, the programme should investigate this issue further, including considering the implementation of roving technical staff at the sites.

Grievances and case management

The grievance system within HSNP is an important mechanism through which individuals can express grievances about any aspect of the programme's operation. From Phase 2 onwards, village chiefs have been the main grievance and complaints channel for beneficiaries.

This analysis presents data collected from the beneficiaries who received payments. It was decided in the December 2023 monitoring workshop that in the follow-up surveys, the grievance and case management survey module would be focused on beneficiaries who have logged cases in the grievance and case management system, to be more representative of the complaints and cases raised in the system. However, while the questionnaires have been prepared, this module has yet to be used. The delay is caused by a lack of funds allocated for monitoring activities.

Awareness of grievance channels

Throughout the programme, the majority of the respondents considered HSNP programme officers and village chiefs as the main grievance channel, across all eight counties. Amongst the pioneer counties, about a quarter of the respondents considered pay agents as people they would go to with complaints or grievances. Even though the pay agents are not able to address the grievances directly, the county teams reported that respondents considered the pay agents as the first point of contact for any payment-related issues.

Awareness of procedures for updating household information

As with awareness about grievance channels, the respondents also considered HSNP officers and village chiefs as the main people responsible for updating the household information, across all eight counties. However, in the case of pioneer counties, about one-fifth of the respondents also considered pay agents as the people responsible for updating household information – which is not the case. This indicates that the programme should improve communication around the mechanisms for grievances and updating household information so that beneficiaries are clear about these channels.

5 Conclusions

In this section, we present the overall conclusion regarding programme delivery and operational monitoring.

5.1 Overall programme delivery

- The programme did well to scale up from four counties to eight counties during Phase 3, in terms of targeting beneficiaries, registering them, opening accounts, and setting up systems, including making and maintaining linkages with pay agents, to deliver payments. The set targets were achieved in terms of beneficiaries reached (133,800 regular beneficiaries and 679,120 emergency cash transfer beneficiaries). However, the frequency of payments was negatively affected due to delays in financial releases from the Treasury. This meant that beneficiaries received infrequent payments, there was uncertainty around when payments would be delivered, and even when they were delivered, the programme had to stagger the payments by sub-county.
- Generally, the transition of the roles from the PMU team to the NDMA team was successful, and all roles had transitioned by the end of Phase 3. In addition, there was a successful transition to a new and refreshed MIS, which offers greater control to the MIS team in terms of adding bespoke features and reports.
- A few key challenges that persisted throughout the programme include the high cost of travel for the beneficiaries to travel to the pay agents to receive their payments, the persistence of fees being charged by some pay agents, and the lack of consistent communication with beneficiaries about payment dates and their rights regarding not having to pay money to pay agents. In addition, the pay agents continued to face issues with POS equipment functionality that affected their ability to pay beneficiaries on the intended payment dates.

5.2 Operational monitoring

- Over the programme lifecycle, incremental improvements were made to the monitoring system. This included the development and validation of a monitoring framework, improving the sampling methods, and updating the data collection tools. There was also greater coordination between the PME and the MIS team in terms of data sharing and reporting.
- However, key challenges remain in the implementation of operational monitoring. These include the following:
  - A de-prioritisation of monitoring activities following budget cuts by the Treasury. This is reflected in annual and quarterly work plans that do not include provisions for post-payment monitoring surveys. Programme-wide post-payment surveys have not been conducted since March 2024, partly because of inconsistent payment delivery and partly because of a shift of resources away from monitoring.
  - While the monitoring framework has been validated, it is yet to be fully integrated into the HSNP operational manual. Currently, the roles and responsibilities of personnel responsible for data collection, management, analysis, and reporting are missing from the manual.
  - The MIS is not currently used to conduct any M&E reporting, as required in the monitoring framework. While the MIS functions as an effective data collection and storage tool for monitoring data, it is not utilised as an analytical tool to generate reports for programme monitoring. The MIS has not been programmed to use the beneficiary-level source data and to generate routine reports, as required in the monitoring framework. Indicators in the monitoring framework that rely on routine programme data (instead of post-payment monitoring surveys) could have been reported while surveys were on pause but were not reported. This is a missed opportunity in terms of making use of available data and converting these data into actionable insights.
  - There is a lack of effective coordination between the PME, MIS, and HSNP programme teams regarding roles and responsibilities for the generation, ownership, and use of monitoring data.
  - There is a lack of clarity in the operations manual about the data collection, aggregation, analysis and reporting tasks needed to address the requirements of the monitoring framework through the MIS.
  - There is a lack of an offline modality for data collection tools, which could lead to data entry errors.
  - There is a lack of review of data quantitative data collected through post-payment monitoring surveys at the HQ level and a lack of performance reviews of POs regarding survey completion.

6 Recommendations

In this section, we present recommendations to improve programme delivery and operational monitoring for the next phase of the HSNP.

6.1 Overall programme delivery

1. The programme should invest more resources in improving communication about payment dates and beneficiary rights, and should conduct regular monitoring to track the progress and effectiveness of communication strategies.
2. Costs are incurred by beneficiaries to reach pay agents and to withdraw payments. In light of this, the programme should map the distribution of pay agents and household locations to understand which areas require more pay agents. This should be tracked as part of routine monitoring, as outlined in the monitoring framework.
3. The programme should work with pay agents and partner banks to review issues related to authentication and equipment malfunction.
4. In the next phase, the programme should implement surveys of registration and account monitoring during registration and account opening rounds, and flag issues to the implementation team as they arise.

6.2 Operational monitoring

5. In the next phase, the programme should allocate a budget and resources for monitoring activities at the outset of programme implementation and then ensure that monitoring activities are included in annual and quarterly work plans, and implemented, at both the HQ and county levels.
6. The operational manual should be updated to document tasks related to operational monitoring, including collection, collation, management, analysis, and reporting of data; and the roles of personnel responsible for carrying out these tasks.
7. Appropriate ways of working across the PME, MIS, and programme teams should be agreed and clearly documented in the operations manual to ensure more effective coordination and joint delivery of the programme.
8. The MIS should be updated to include auto-generated reports of information specified in the monitoring framework to enable the review of trends over time.
9. The survey data should be quality assured and then disseminated by the PME at the country level, programme team level, and senior management level.
10. The programme should work with the MIS supplier to ensure that offline functionality is made available for surveys, to avoid manual entry data errors.
11. The old case management forms should be retired, and a single current version of the form should be used across all eight counties.
12. A data confidentiality policy should be written up to serve as a guide on how to handle data collected, stored, and distributed as part of the HSNP.
13. NDMA's senior management should oversee the implementation of these recommendations and should apply good practice by requesting and using MIS reports to ensure that the HSNP is delivering as intended.

7 References

Hakeem, B. and David, C. (2025) 'Evaluation of the Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP) Phase 3: MIS Assessment 3', Oxford Policy Management, Oxford

van der Westhuizen, W. (2023) 'Evaluation of the Hunger Safety Net Programme (HSNP) Phase 3: MIS Assessment – Deep Dive 6', Oxford.

Annexes

Annexes 1–4 are provided in a separate zipped folder:

Annex 1: Monitoring framework

Annex 2: Responsibility matrix

Annex 3: Sampling approach slides

Annex 4: Questionnaires

Annex 5: Tables

In this annex, we present further details from the analysis of the post-payment monitoring surveys. The tables are broken down by pioneer and additional counties and include the most recent data provided by the NDMA.

Awareness of the payment cycle and process

Table 4: Awareness of the payment date – programme wide

Awareness of the payment date	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
Received information about the payment date on the day of payment	65	75.3	59.3	62.3
Received information about the payment after the payment date had passed	16.9	7.8	14	7

Table 5: Awareness of the payment date – pioneer counties

Awareness of the payment date	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
Received information about the payment date on the day of payment	65	75.3	59.3	62.3
Received information about the payment after the payment date had passed	16.9	7.8	14	7

Table 6: Awareness of the payment date – additional counties

Awareness of the payment date	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
Received information about the payment date on the day of payment	N/A	N/A	24.4	52.3
Received information about the payment after the payment date had passed	N/A	N/A	29.8	17.5

Beneficiaries' usage of payments

Table 7: Beneficiaries' use of payments – programme wide

Usage of cash transfers	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
Purchase food for family	85.9	93.7	93.1	94
Purchase household items	15.4	10	14.5	18.6
Pay off outstanding loans	3.2	4.1	5.8	3.4
Purchase farming implements	1.2	0.2	0.8	1.2
Purchase livestock	9.7	7	3.7	3.9
Household repairs	2.4	1.1	1.1	0.8
Shared with family and neighbours	4	7.5	5.5	1.9
Payment of education costs (uniform, books etc)	38.4	28.9	31.1	27.6
Healthcare services (medicines, doctors' fees)	19.8	15.9	18.2	13.1
Other items	7	3.6	4.5	6.5

Table 8: Beneficiaries use of payments – pioneer counties

Usage of cash transfers	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
Purchase food for family	85.9	93.7	94.1	94.4
Purchase household items	15.4	10	9.8	17.5
Pay off outstanding loans	3.2	4.1	3.9	1.5
Purchase farming implements	1.2	0.2	0.3	0.3
Purchase livestock	9.7	7	2.3	1.8
Household repairs	2.4	1.1	0.6	0.5
Shared with family and neighbours	4	7.5	4.7	1.5
Payment of education costs (uniform, books etc)	38.4	28.9	30.1	27.8
Healthcare services (medicines, doctors' fees)	19.8	15.9	18.5	14.3
Other items	7	3.6	4.4	7

Table 9: Beneficiaries use of payments – additional counties

Usage of cash transfers	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
Purchase food for family	N/A	N/A	89.1	92.5
Purchase household items	N/A	N/A	34.4	23.1
Pay off outstanding loans	N/A	N/A	14.2	11.8
Purchase farming implements	N/A	N/A	3.3	5.2
Purchase livestock	N/A	N/A	9.4	12.4
Household repairs	N/A	N/A	3.6	2
Shared with family and neighbours	N/A	N/A	8.9	3.5
Payment of education costs (uniform, books etc)	N/A	N/A	35.5	26.8
Healthcare services (medicines, doctors' fees)	N/A	N/A	16.8	8.1
Other items	N/A	N/A	5.3	4.2

Impact of cash transfers

Table 10: Self-reported impact of cash transfers – programme wide

Period		...is much worse	...is worse	...is the same	...is better
June 2020 – July 2022	Household consumption	0.1	0.1	7.3	90.5
	Ownership of household assets	0.1	0.4	17.2	80.4
	Children's school attendance	0.1	0	14.9	83.1
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	0.1	0.3	34.5	63.2
July 2022 – March 2023	Household consumption	0	0	3.4	95
	Ownership of household assets	0	0	14.2	84.2
	Children's school attendance	0	0	12.3	86.1
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	0	0	46.1	52.3
Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Household consumption	0	0.1	4.4	93.7
	Ownership of household assets	0.5	1.2	12.5	84
	Children's school attendance	0	0.4	12.1	85.7
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	0.8	1.4	27.3	68.7
Dec 2023 – Mar 2024	Household consumption	0	0.1	7.3	92.6
	Ownership of household assets	0.3	0.5	13.8	85.4
	Children school attendance	0	0.2	11	88.7
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	0.9	1.4	28.7	69

Table 11: Self-reported impact of cash transfers – pioneer counties

Period		...is much worse	...is worse	...is the same	...is better
June 2020 – July 2022	Household consumption	0.1	0.1	7.3	90.5
	Ownership of household assets	0.1	0.4	17.2	80.4
	Children's school attendance	0.1	0	14.9	83.1
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	0.1	0.3	34.5	63.2
July 2022 – March 2023	Household consumption	0	0	3.4	95
	Ownership of household assets	0	0	14.2	84.2
	Children's school attendance	0	0	12.3	86.1
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	0	0	46.1	52.3
Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Household consumption	0	0.1	4	94
	Ownership of household assets	0.6	1.5	10.7	85.3
	Children's school attendance	0	0.5	11	86.6
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	1	1.7	29.2	66.1
Dec 2023 – Mar 2024	Household consumption	0	0.1	6.2	93.7
	Ownership of household assets	0.4	0.6	11.1	87.9
	Children school attendance	0.1	0.2	9.2	90.5
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	1.1	1.7	29.1	68.1

Table 12: Self-reported impact of cash transfers – additional cou

Period		...is much worse	...is worse	...is the same	...is better
Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Household consumption	0	0	6.4	92.2
	Ownership of household assets	0	0	20.1	78.5
	Children's school attendance	0	0	16.8	81.7
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	0	0	19.2	79.4
Dec 2023 – Mar 2024	Household consumption	0.1	0.2	11.8	87.9
	Ownership of household assets	0.1	0.1	25.1	74.8
	Children's school attendance	0	0.1	18.8	81.1
	Household's ability to participate in income-generating activities	0	0.1	27.2	72.8

Challenges collecting payments

Table 13: Challenges in collecting payments – programme wide

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Travel time to collect payment (in minutes)	34.4	42.4	41.4	51	50.6
Money spent to collect payment	106.1	176.6	317.4	203.6	130.9
Time spent queuing to collect payment (in minutes)	25.8	45.9	41.3	40.3	86.7
Days taken to collect payment	1.2	1.3	1.2	0.9	0.9

Table 14: Challenges in collecting payments – pioneer counties

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Travel time to collect payment (in minutes)	34.4	42.4	41.4	44	47.8
Money spent to collect payment	106.1	176.6	317.4	106.5	42.8
Time spent queuing to collect payment (in minutes)	25.8	45.9	41.3	52.5	91
Days taken to collect payment	1.2	1.3	1.2	0.9	0.9

Table 15: Challenges in collecting payments – additional counties

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Travel time to collect payment (in minutes)	N/A	N/A	N/A	80.7	62.4
Money spent to collect payment	N/A	N/A	N/A	606.1	497.3
Time spent queuing to collect payment (in minutes)	N/A	N/A	N/A	110.8	68.8
Days taken to collect payment	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.9	0.8

Costs of collecting payments

Table 16: Cost of collecting payments – programme wide

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Agent charged fee for the payment	21.3	15.5	20.5	24.6	36.4
Paid agent voluntarily for the payment	17.6	9.5	5.2	7.3	8.9
Proportion of transfer paid to the agent	3.6	1.9	1	2.1	1.5
Agent forced beneficiary to buy something	1.9	3.4	5.7	4	2.2

Table 17: Payment of a fee to the agent to collect payments – pioneer counties

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Agent charged fee for the payment	21.3	15.5	20.5	29	37.4
Paid agent voluntarily for the payment	17.6	9.5	5.2	9	9.9
Proportion of transfer paid to the agent	3.6	1.9	1	2.4	1.4
Agent forced beneficiary to buy something	1.9	3.4	5.7	4.1	1.9

Table 18: Payment of a fee to the agent to collect payments – additional counties

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Agent charged fee for the payment	N/A	N/A	N/A	6.1	32.2
Paid agent voluntarily for the payment	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.4	4.6
Proportion of transfer paid to the agent	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.6	1.7
Agent forced beneficiary to buy something	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.3	3.5

Pay agents' experience

Awareness of payment date

Table 19: Awareness of payment date – programme wide

Awareness of the payment date	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
Received information about the payment date one week in advance	62.9	78.3	91	97

Table 20: Awareness of payment date – pioneer counties

Awareness of the payment date	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
Received information about the payment date one week in advance	62.9	78.3	92.4	100

Table 21: Awareness of payment date – additional counties

Awareness of the payment date	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
Received information about the payment date one week in advance	N/A		80	90

Liquidity constraints

Table 22: Liquidity constraints – programme wide

Liquidity constraints	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
One day when there were more beneficiaries than there was cash at hand	56.5	60.5	56.8	54.7

Table 23: Liquidity constraints – pioneer counties

Liquidity constraints	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
One day when there were more beneficiaries than there was cash at hand	56.5	60.5	57	53.3

Table 24: Liquidity constraints – additional counties

Liquidity constraints	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2023 – Mar 2024
One day when there were more beneficiaries than there was cash at hand			20	0

Security

Table 25: Security challenges for pay agents – programme wide

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Robbed while collecting or distributing cash	10.2	2.9	2.3	5.7	1.5
Lost money during the payment process	28.1	19.7	11.6	12.5	7.6
Uncomfortable when collecting or distributing cash	53.4	43.9	48.8	42	34.8
Equipment vandalism in the last two months	4.5	3.5	4.7	3.4	1.5

Table 26: Security challenges for pay agents – pioneer counties

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Robbed while collecting or distributing cash	10.2	2.9	2.3	6.3	0
Lost money during the payment process	28.1	19.7	11.6	7.6	4.3
Uncomfortable when collecting or distributing cash	53.4	43.9	48.8	40.5	34.8
Equipment vandalism in the last two months	4.5	3.5	4.7	2.5	0

Table 27: Security challenges for pay agents – additional counties

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Robbed while collecting or distributing cash	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	5
Lost money during the payment process	N/A	N/A	N/A	55.6	15
Uncomfortable when collecting or distributing cash	N/A	N/A	N/A	55.6	35
Equipment vandalism in the last two months	N/A	N/A	N/A	11.1	5

Equipment maintenance problems

Table 28: Challenges at pay points – programme wide

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
POS not charged	16.5	7.9	8.7	13.5	25.8
No network signal	52.7	33.3	41.3	34.8	45.5
Authentication problem	48.4	40.7	39.1	51.7	50
POS terminal broken	8.8	8.5	13	7.9	10.6

Table 29: Challenges at pay points – pioneer counties

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
POS not charged	16.5	7.9	8.7	13.9	30.4
No network signal	52.7	33.3	41.3	30.4	41.3
Authentication problem	48.4	40.7	39.1	46.8	45.7
POS terminal broken	8.8	8.5	13	6.3	8.7

Table 30: Challenges at pay points – additional counties

	July 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – July 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
POS not charged	N/A	N/A	N/A	10	15
No network signal	N/A	N/A	N/A	70	55
Authentication problem	N/A	N/A	N/A	90	60
POS terminal broken	N/A	N/A	N/A	20	15

Grievances and case management

Grievances

Table 31: Awareness of various grievance channels – programme wide

Proportion of beneficiaries (%)	Jul 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – June 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Equity bank	15.3	17	24.7	12.1	8.1
Pay agent	41.8	49.8	44.5	31.8	24.1
Local administration/chief	62	52.8	71.5	53.3	47.4
Beneficiary Welfare Committee (BWC)	20.5	15.6	7.8	13.7	10.4
HSNP Programme Officer	52.4	38.8	31.6	46.9	49.8
Don't know	2.4	3.9	0	0.7	3.2
There is no one to turn to	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1

Table 32: Awareness of various grievance channels – pioneer counties

Proportion of beneficiaries (%)	Jul 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – June 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Equity bank	15.3	17	24.7	14.3	8.8
Pay agent	41.8	49.8	44.5	35.6	27.8
Local administration/chief	62	52.8	71.5	50	43.9
Beneficiary Welfare Committee (BWC)	20.5	15.6	7.8	15.9	11.9
HSNP Programme Officer	52.4	38.8	31.6	47.3	50.9
Don't know	2.4	3.9	0	0.8	4
There is no one to turn to	0.1	0.1	0.2	0	0.1

Table 33: Awareness of various grievance channels – additional counties

Proportion of beneficiaries (%)	Jul 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – June 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Equity bank	N/A	N/A	N/A	2.8	5.3
Pay agent	N/A	N/A	N/A	15.7	8.1
Local administration/chief	N/A	N/A	N/A	67.2	62.2
Beneficiary Welfare Committee (BWC)	N/A	N/A	N/A	4.2	3.9
HSNP Programme Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	45	45.1
Don't know	N/A	N/A	N/A	0	0.1
There is no one to turn to				0.4	0.5

Updates to household information

Awareness of procedures for updating household information

Table 34: Contact for changing household information – programme wide

Proportion of beneficiaries (%)	Jul 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – June 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Pay agent	31.2	40.4	41.6	25.4	18.7
HSNP Programme Officer	74.4	65.1	63.9	69.8	75
Chief	56.6	53.3	64.9	46.9	39.9
BWC	18.9	13.3	7.3	11.1	7.1
Don't know	2.3	3.3	0.2	0.8	2.6
There is no one to turn to	0.1	0	0	0.2	0.1

Table 35: Contact for changing household information – pioneer counties

Proportion of beneficiaries (%)	Jul 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – June 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Pay agent	31.2	40.4	41.6	29.2	20.8
HSNP Programme Officer	74.4	65.1	63.9	72.7	77.8
Chief	56.6	53.3	64.9	42.9	37.4
BWC	18.9	13.3	7.3	13	8.4
Don't know	2.3	3.3	0.2	0.9	3.2
There is no one to turn to	0.1	0	0	0.1	0.0

Table 36: Contact for changing household information – additional counties

Proportion of beneficiaries (%)	Jul 2018 – May 2020	June 2020 – June 2022	July 2022 – March 2023	Apr 2023 – Nov 2023	Dec 2024 – Mar 2024
Pay agent	N/A	N/A	N/A	9.2	9.5
HSNP Programme Officer	N/A	N/A	N/A	57.3	63.1
Chief	N/A	N/A	N/A	64	50.1
BWC	N/A	N/A	N/A	3.4	1.9
Don't know	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.0	0.2
There is no one to turn to	N/A	N/A	N/A	0.4	0.7

About us

Our purpose is to improve lives through sustainable policy change in low-and middle-income countries.

Oxford Policy Management

Find out more

For further information visit **opml.co.uk**
or email: **admin@opml.co.uk**
OPMglobal