

RESEARCH-POLICY PRACTITIONERS FORUM ON SOCIAL PROTECTION IN KENYA

Organised by

**Partnership for African Social and Governance Research (PASGR) in Collaboration
with Knowledge Platform on Inclusive Development (INCLUDE)**



Aquarist Conference Room, Fairview Hotel, Nairobi, Kenya

MAY 13, 2015

List of Abbreviations

CDF	Constituency Development Fund
CSR	Corporate Social Responsibility
DHS	Demographic and Health Survey
ICT	Information and Communication Technology
ILO	International Labour Organization
INCLUDE	Knowledge Platform for Inclusive Development
KAIS	Kenya AIDS Indicator Survey
KIHS	Kenya Integrated Household Survey
KIPPRA	Kenya Institute of Public Research and Analysis
KNBS	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics
MDGs	Millennium Development Goals
MLSSS	Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Services
MOE	Ministry of Education
NCD	Non-Communicable Diseases
NESC	National Economic and Social Council
NHIF	National Hospital Insurance Fund
NSSF	National Social Security Fund
OVC	Orphans and Vulnerable Children
PASGR	Partnership for African Social Governance and Research
PPPs	Public Private Partnerships
SP	Social Protection
SPF	Social Protection Floor

Table of Contents

List of Abbreviations	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	4
1. INTRODUCTION	6
2. CHALLENGES TO SOCIAL PROTECTION RESEARCH FOR POLICY UPTAKE	8
2.1 <i>Some common challenges based on myths:</i>	8
2.2 <i>Other challenges:</i>	8
3. REACTIONS TO THE CHALLENGES BY POLICY MAKERS AND PRACTITIONERS PRESENT	9
3.1 <i>Realistic recommendations</i>	9
3.2 <i>Research evidence remains important component of policy decision making in Kenya</i> 9	
3.3 <i>The need for national ownership of social protection research agenda</i>	10
3.4 <i>Credibility of research evidence</i>	11
3.5 <i>Dissemination of research findings is as important as generation of the findings</i> ...	11
3.6 <i>Researchers should appreciate the art of policy making in the country</i>	12
3.7 <i>Conduct impact analysis of social protection policies</i>	12
3.8 <i>Strengthening the linkages between research organisations, think tanks and lobbyist</i>	12
4. KNOWLEDGE NEEDS ON SOCIAL PROTECTION TO INFORM POLICY AND PROGRAM DESIGN	13
4.1 <i>Harmonized definitions of social protection and related terminologies</i>	13
4.2 <i>Up-to-date data on poverty and vulnerability for policy decision making at national and county levels</i>	13
4.3 <i>Identifying multiple areas/sectors to anchor social protection programmes</i>	14
4.4 <i>Impact of current social protection programmes</i>	14
4.5 <i>Alternative to cash transfer programmes</i>	14
4.6 <i>Addressing Social Protection Floor</i>	14
5. AREAS IN RESEARCH FOR POLICY UPTAKE THAT ORGANISATIONS MAY SUPPORT	14
5.1 <i>Value for money evidence</i>	15
5.2 <i>Comparative impact evaluations</i>	15
5.3 <i>Assessing the interplay between poverty and other social conditions in communities</i> 15	
5.4 <i>Coalition building</i>	15
5.4 <i>Capacity building</i>	15
5.5 <i>Research dissemination</i>	15
6. PROCESS FOR ENSURING RESEARCH POLICY UPTAKE	16

6.1	<i>Targeting policy makers at the national and county assemblies with research evidence</i>	17
6.2	<i>Improving access to social protection research findings on Kenya through search engines</i>	17
6.3	<i>Collaboration with the Media and other organisations</i>	17
6.4	<i>Using credible data</i>	18
6.5	<i>Packaging of research evidence for different policy audiences:</i>	18
7.	PLANNING FOR ACTION	18
8.	MAPPING THE COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE ON SOCIAL PROTECTION IN KENYA	19
9.	Annexes	23

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

On May 13, 2015; the Partnership for African Social and Governance Research (PASGR) and Knowledge Platform on Inclusive Development (INCLUDE) organised Kenya research-policy practitioners forum on social protection in Nairobi. The forum brought together 33 policy makers, practitioners, the media, and researchers on social protection in Kenya with staff of PASGR and INCLUDE to discuss how researches that aim to influence social protection programmes in the country could be enhanced.

Through experiences shared by researchers and policy actors, and reactions from participants, the forum examined the challenges of social protection research for policy uptake; identified important knowledge needs of policy actors to inform their work on social protection policy and programme design; the processes that researchers need to be aware of and appreciate if their research evidence is to get policy traction in the country; and some important stakeholders that need to be involved in attempts to build social protection policy-research community.

Based on the experiences shared, it became clear that there are a number of myths surrounding low uptake of policy research. While researchers may not have involved key stakeholders in the design and implementation of their studies, there was an appreciation that policy making is not a linear process. It requires continuous efforts to engage policy actors and persuade them to buy in to research evidence. Researchers need to work with fellow researchers who work in the offices of policy makers and practitioners in order to get access to the right information and people who make decisions regarding policy and programme design and implementation. There will be frustrations along the way because there are many interest groups in policy and programme design. So involvement of key stakeholders may not necessarily lead to uptake because politics is a key factor in decision making. Researchers would have to understand when and how study findings could be packaged for dissemination to different audiences.

The forum concluded that research is integral to policy so researchers must be persistent and consistent in providing timely and accurate evidence on social protection to policy actors. The media must be seen as integral actors in setting the agenda and effectively disseminating research evidence to policy actors. Researchers and research organisations should not shy away from the media but must be careful about the type of media to use for specific research evidence and time.

The following are some of the issues that policy actors requested to have knowledge on as far as social protection in Kenya is concerned.

- Clarification and harmonization of terminologies used in social protection research and practice: social assistance; social protection; social insurance; social security, social transformation; social progression; social policy; social protection floor; etc.
- Credible data on the number of poor people deserving social protection based on specific criteria used to define the poor in the country; the current coverage at national and county level; etc. Disaggregated data will be useful

- Information on social protection studies that have been carried out in the country and their key findings;
- The role of devolution in the expansion and sustainability of social protection in Kenya.
- Financing social protection programme at national and country level;
- Strategies for including informal sector employees and their associations in national social security and social protection programmes respectively.
- Impact of cash transfer programmes at the community level;
- Cost effective and sustainable ways of investing in social protection.

It was suggested that research organisations must devote time and resources to building a coalition of researchers, policy makers, policy practitioners and users throughout the research process if the myth surrounding uptake of research evidence for policy is to be broken. PASGR, INCLUDE, Oxfam, the Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Services, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics, the Centre for Parliamentary Studies and Training; and many of the organisations¹ that were present at the forum agreed to collaborate with the national and the county governments to generate quality and relevant research evidence to inform social protection programmes in the country.

Way Forward: Developing research-policy community for social protection in Kenya

Suggesting the way forward, PASGR agreed to facilitate and/or convene a network of researchers, policy makers, and policy practitioners to undertake series of activities with the sole aim of influencing policies and programmes on social protection in the country. PASGR will convene the network community and facilitate the mobilization and sharing of existing and new knowledge on social protection with policy actors in the country. Based on a number of suggestions made during the forum, PASGR proposed to develop programme of activities that will be shared later with members of the community for discussions.

¹ Section 10 of this report provides a matrix of potential partners, their interest, their motivation and the sources of power and influence.

1. INTRODUCTION

On May 13, 2015; the Partnership for African Social and Governance Research (PASGR) and Knowledge Platform on Inclusive Development (INCLUDE) organised Kenya national research-policy practitioners forum on social protection in Nairobi. The forum brought together 33 policy makers, practitioners, researchers on social protection in Kenya to discuss how researches that aim to improve social protection programme in the country could be enhanced throughout the research policy uptake process

Through a series of presentations on experiences by researchers and policy actors, and reactions from participants, the forum examined the challenges of social protection research for policy uptake; identified important knowledge needs of policy actors to inform their work on social protection policy and programme design; the processes that researchers need to be aware of and appreciate if their research evidence is to get policy traction in the country; and some important stakeholders that need to be involved in attempts to build social protection policy-research community. Annexes 1 & 2 provide agenda and participants list respectively.

The rationale for organising the forum was that researchers and policy actors acknowledge the relevance of evidence-based research in promoting effective development policies. However, quite often there are criticisms that research projects do not result in policy changes. In Kenya the need to bridge the evidence- policy gap was evident during the first 'social protection week' organized by the Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Services in January 2015. Prior to this event, PASGR had also organized a conference on Social Protection in November of 2014 during which some of the participants recounted the challenges they go through in trying to influence policy discussions with their research evidence.

PASGR believes that policy relevant research requires dialogue between researchers, policy makers and practitioners.² Since its establishment in 2011, PASGR has supported two major research projects on social protection in Africa that includes Kenya. These projects addressed the politics of cash transfers, governance mechanisms of non-state social protection programmes and political economy analysis of social protection policy uptake. INCLUDE³ on the other hand is a network of researchers, policy makers and practitioners from Africa and the Netherlands with partners in public and private sectors. It was established by the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 2012 to exchanges information and ideas on how to achieve better research policy linkages on economic transformation and inclusive development. Since its establishment in June 2012, INCLUDE has held five meetings on research-policy relevance. It is also supporting studies on social protection and social inclusions in Benin, Ethiopia, Ghana, Mozambique, Rwanda and Uganda.

²PASGR is a pan-African Organization established in Kenya with a vision to promote a vibrant African social science community that addresses governance and public policy issues in Africa. PASGR pursues its vision through three core programmes: Higher Education, Professional Development and Training , and Research

³<http://includeplatform.net/>

Opening the forum, Amb. Prof. Judith Bahemuka, Chancellor of University of Eldoret and a member of PASGR Board of Trustees indicated that designing effective and efficient social protection programme is very important for social policy and it is our role to make sure that the gap between research and policy is narrowed.

We need to be concerned about whether our research impacts the lives of the Kenyan people and whether policy makers care about our findings and are able to translate those findings into meaningful actions. The organisation of the forum is timely in view of the government's intention to expand the current social protection coverage, especially the cash transfer programmes in the country. In addition, some governors are interested in introducing social protection programmes at the county level, in parallel with the national programme. PASGR and INCLUDE should help to broker policy dialogue on social protection in the country.



Opening address by Amb. Prof. Judith Bahemuka, PASGR Board Member and Chancellor of University of Eldoret, Kenya

The co-ordinator of INCLUDE Dr. Marleen Dekker, expressed the organisations' excitement to collaborate with PASGR to organise the forum in Kenya and specifically to helping the government's social protection programmes with evidence based research. INCLUDE also wanted to understand some of the questions that policy makers ask when they think about implementing social protection programmes. She indicated that currently INCLUDE is supporting social protection research for policy uptake in Ghana, Ethiopia, Uganda and Kenya and further facilitating its members to initiate policy knowledge communities that would provide a firmer link between research and policy practice.

INCLUDE will collaborate with PASGR to serve as knowledge brokers by facilitating the mobilization and sharing of existing and new knowledge on social protection with policy actors in the country.

2. CHALLENGES TO SOCIAL PROTECTION RESEARCH FOR POLICY UPTAKE

Moderator: Nicholas Awortwi

Three researchers (i) Mr. Charles Lwanga-Ntale, Regional Director Africa Development Initiatives; (ii) Dr. Akinyi Nzioki, Executive Director - Centre for Land Economy and Rights of Women; and (iii) Prof. Maurice Amutabi – Deputy Vice Chancellor Kisii University (Represented by Dr. Linet Hamasi) shared their experiences regarding the challenges involved in translating research evidence on social protection to policy uptake. Below are summaries of the challenges:

2.1 Some common challenges based on myths:

- Social policy and social protection decisions are driven by research;
- Researchers are best placed to inform policy and that their contributions are valued.
- Uptake of research findings is a logical outcome of the research process itself and that researchers are neutral and apolitical;
- Social protection is recognized as a vital tool of alleviating poverty and reducing risks and vulnerability;
- The decision to embrace social protection is based on technical analysis rather than political interest, and that social protection uptake is a function of knowledge and awareness. Implementation of many social protection programmes including that of Kenya took place only after a national crisis rather than evidence from research.

2.2 Other challenges:

- Getting policy actors to read policy reports/policy brief is difficult because they are overwhelmed by work load and voluminous nature of research reports.
- Understanding what research evidence will be of interest to policy actors and what in the view of the researcher is of interest to the public. The two always don't mean the same. In fact there is no common understanding of basic terminologies in social protection so it is always difficult for policy actors and researchers to understand each other.
- Policy actors and those that ought to be interested in research findings hardly attend meetings/workshops when invited. They also do not follow up on the outcomes of meeting that they could not get time to attend. It appears they are not interested in research findings on programmes and policies that are in their sectors.

3. REACTIONS TO THE CHALLENGES BY POLICY MAKERS AND PRACTITIONERS

Three policy makers and practitioners reacted to the challenges by the researchers. They included Dr. Joanne Bosworth, Chief, Social Policy, UNICEF, Kenya; Ms. Elizabeth Mueni Kimulu, Director, Social Sector, National Economic and Social Council, the Presidency; and Dr. Tavengwa Nhongo, Executive Director, Africa Platform for Social Protection. While making reference to the challenges raised above, the presenters shared their experiences on what needs to be done to improve the outcomes of research activities in the policy space.

3.1 Realistic recommendations

Recommendations arising from social protection research should address the challenges of implementation in the Kenyan political context and within resource constraints. Research that recommends expansion of social protection in the country must be understood in the context of devolution. Recommendations by researchers should take into consideration the policy dynamics in the country and national development priorities at the time of making such recommendations. What contribution can the county government play in social protection success (research, informing policy and implementation)? Is there capacity for effective engagement at all levels? How can counties be included in national level social protection policies? Recommendations that provide answers to these questions have a chance to go up for policy uptake.

3.2 Research evidence remains important component of policy decision making

Though politics and not research evidence may inform the final policy decision on social protection in the country, there is evidence that research contributed to the current programmes on cash transfers and the orphans and vulnerable children (OVCs) support. Policy makers value research evidence especially when it is credible and well communicated using appropriate channels. Some policy makers are research champions. There is evidence that policy makers are looking for convincing evidence to support the sustainability and cost effectiveness of the current social protection programs. Technocrats who draft policies and members of parliament who work on private bills require evidence to support their policy proposals. The funding of social protection is a political decision therefore researchers should work towards cultivating political will among politicians than antagonising them with research evidence.



Ms. Elizabeth Mueni Kimulu, Director, Social Sector, National Economic and Social Council, the Presidency

3.3 The need for national ownership of social protection research agenda

Policy actors want to be involved in the research process so they can relate to the findings. Policy uptake is about ownership so researchers must involve key stakeholders in the country so any uptake will be nationally owned. The success factors of research-policy uptake include wide stakeholder consultation in the research process, credibility of the research, consultations for identification of national policy gaps, and validation of research findings. Policy makers tend to believe or accept research evidence generated from their own countries or communities and not from external studies hence the need for social protection research to be integrated in the national data collection exercise. Research that aims to influence policies on social protection should address topical issues that are of interest to the nation and not the researchers own theoretical interest. It must be strategic and timely. In addition, researchers should conduct policy relevant research that encourages the government to invest in social protection programs. Kenya is now a lower middle income country with a lot of progress in other sectors but little progress with regard to the situation of poverty, particularly as there is no national discourse on poverty reduction. Investing in children at an early age will deliver the transformation that Kenya is looking for in 2030 and beyond so research should help the state charter a path towards social transformation. That is helping children born in poverty to break the vicious cycle.



Dr. Joanne Bosworth, Chief Social Policy, UNICEF, Kenya making a point on research-policy uptake

3.4 Credibility of research evidence

The credibility of research evidence, relevance of the study to the National Constitutions and Kenya's development plans are key factors that are taken into consideration in accepting research evidence. In addition, policy actors also consider affordability of implementing the recommendations arising from the study.

3.5 Dissemination of research findings is as important as generation of the findings

Researchers have failed to communicate to policy makers in simple understandable language. Research findings are characterized by the use of jargons that are not easily understood by policy makers. Dissemination of research evidence should reach those who have the power to decide on the findings, the community members who can build demand for implementing the findings and the people who are affected directly or indirectly by the findings. These people should be able to understand the evidence being disseminated.

Research findings have to be packaged in a concise manner that is easy for policy makers to interpret and defend at parliamentary hearings. In parliament, policies and strategies are interpreted politically. When policy makers lack strong evidence for their policy recommendations, social policy issues such as poverty and social protection programmes are treated as peripheral, while economic and wealth creation programmes are given precedence.

Researchers must incorporate communication activities into project design, taking into account gender, local context, and innovative ways of communicating. Policy briefs are an effective method of communicating research findings to policy audiences if they are concise, precise, appealing and simple. The choice of media to disseminate research findings should

be done carefully to ensure that the mode of communication does not antagonize policy makers. Otherwise research communication becomes counterproductive.

3.6 Researchers should appreciate the art of policy making in the country

Researchers interested in influencing policy and practice should be aware that policy and programme designs are not linear, but involves dynamic interlocking and overlapping processes that are influenced by prevailing political contexts. There is need for researchers to appreciate the art of policy making.

Policy making process is tedious and time consuming as there are multiple players with different interest, power and influence in the policy making space.

Technocrats have to read and get information from various sources to inform policies and strategy discussions. They will need credible data and quality research evidence, and also get convinced about the methodology. This means that not all research evidence will get picked for policy uptake so researchers must be realistic.



Researchers and Policy Actors listening to experience shared by a policy actor in the forum

3.7 Conduct impact analysis of social protection policies

There is need for impact analyses of our policies and programmes to understand their impact on livelihoods, poverty and reduction of vulnerability. Such analyses should be done with a common understanding of the definitions of social protection and related concepts. Communication of these findings should address local vulnerabilities and the impact of social protection programmes on economic growth.

3.8 Strengthening the linkages between research organisations, think tanks and lobbyist

Collaborations/interactions between think tanks, researchers, research organisations, policy makers, bureaucrats, lobbyists, etc. will improve the chances of research-policy uptake.

Researchers should be trained in coalition building and be encouraged to participate in national, regional and global networks. They should constitute a community of policy entrepreneurs and social protection advocates to bridge the gap between research and policy makers.

4. KNOWLEDGE NEEDS ON SOCIAL PROTECTION TO INFORM POLICY AND PROGRAM DESIGN

Moderator: Dr. Darlison Kaija, PASGR

In this session two senior policy practitioners from the national and county governments presented what in their view are important knowledge needs that they want research evidence to inform. The presenters were Mr Richard Rori representing the Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Services and Mrs. Patricia Chepkirui Lasoi, Country Executive Committee, Housing Land and Social Services, Bomet County.

4.1 Harmonized definitions of social protection and related terminologies

The Kenya National Social Protection Policy (2012) defines some of the operational terminologies of social protection. The policy also states that the three interrelated components of social protection include Social Assistance, Health insurance and Social Security. There appears to be confusion in the way researchers and policy actors use and interpret social protection terminologies. There is need for harmonisation of terms such as social protection, social security, cash transfer, social assistance, social safety net; etc.

4.2 Up-to-date data on poverty and vulnerability for policy decision making at national and county levels

Within the national policy decision making process, there are recognized data sources that can be used to inform policy recommendations and decisions. The government uses data sources it considers credible including the demographic and health survey (DHS), household surveys, census data, and the Kenya disability survey. The Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS) is the data source against which most of the social protection decisions in the country are based yet the last time this survey was conducted was in 2005 (10 years ago). This data is not adequately disaggregated by different variables e.g. age, gender, vulnerabilities such as disabilities, and the number of people below the poverty line. With devolution, county governments increasingly demand up to date data to make informed decisions on specific social protection programmes, coverage and eligibility. The Ministry still lacks a master register, robust evidence and baseline data for social protection policies and programs. Researchers should create a database that is cumulative in nature and allows policy makers to access up-to-date data/information when they need it for policy decisions. Consultation with the national statistical bureau will be needed for assessing and supporting data harmonization.

Policy makers would like to know how data is easily generated and accessed, and whether systems like common national registries are the efficient way of working with national data. The ongoing debate at the UN about the data revolution, as conceptualized in the post-2015 agenda, is an opportunity for researchers to contribute to how data can be transformed into messages that inform progressive policies.

4.3 Identifying multiple areas/sectors to anchor social protection programmes

There are huge knowledge gaps in social protection, social assistance and social insurance. The government is looking upon researchers to produce quality research on these areas. Researchers need to help the government understand whether its programs have any best practices, lessons learnt, applicability and scalability. Some of the suggested areas that social protection researchers should explore include cross sectoral processes of anchoring social protection programmes. Researchers can help policy actors identify opportunities in all sectors that can be used to promote social protection e.g. indexed agricultural insurance, bursary programmes in education, school feeding programmes, health subsidies like free primary healthcare, maternity waivers and social health insurance.

4.4 Impact of current social protection programmes

Researchers should provide insights to the government on the impact of current social protection programs in the country. It should also help sponsors to understand the dynamics of the beneficiary communities they are targeting. There is need for evidence on the interaction between fee waivers at health facilities and social health insurance programmes like NHIF. Policy makers and practitioners would need knowledge on the impact of different social protection approaches and their effective mode of delivery. For instance there are many uncoordinated bursary schemes targeting needy children including the children's department bursary fund, the presidential bursary fund, Ministry of Education (MOE) bursary fund, CDF bursary fund, county government bursary fund and bursaries from private sponsors. The results are that some children and older persons get bursaries and cash transfers respectively from more than one source in the same year. Cash transfer to OVCs has been noted to go to widows but not all widows who receive these funds are vulnerable. Cash transfers to senior citizens also face similar challenges. A comparative study of how different social protection programmes or strategies effectively and efficiently improve livelihoods and vulnerability will be needed.

4.5 Alternative to cash transfer programmes

Policy makers need information on alternative strategies or choices that will help the poor and vulnerable people move out of poverty and insecurity beyond cash transfers. Also how long should the poor stay on cash transfer programmes to graduate, and what sort of investment is needed to sustain cash transfer over a period of time.

4.6 Addressing Social Protection Floor

The social protection floor (SPF) is a relatively new concept in social protection necessitated by the ratification of ILO conventions. The SPF will take a centre stage in the post-2015 agenda. What should the government of Kenya take into consideration in its bid to implement the SPF?

5. AREAS IN RESEARCH FOR POLICY UPTAKE THAT ORGANISATIONS MAY SUPPORT

The following organisations indicated areas that they can support:

INCLUDE

5.1 Value for money evidence

Transformative social protection is important for any programme that wants to promote inclusive development. Social protection research still remains very relevant. A recurring theme in the sector is the constraints of resources within governments and we need to convince policy makers there is value for money by investing in social protection programmes.

5.2 Comparative impact evaluations

INCLUDE is currently conducting a number of studies in Kenya and other parts of the region to understand the complementary nature of social protection programmes. One of the research projects is examining the impact of a fee waiver scheme versus a social health insurance scheme in Nandi County in Kenya. This study is being implemented in collaboration with the African Population and Research Consortium and the Health Policy project. The second project looks into the impact of the free maternal health programme (the voucher system) and its contribution to improving access to healthcare, health outcomes and economic resilience among beneficiary women and their families.

5.3 Assessing the interplay between poverty and other social conditions in communities

INCLUDE is supporting research on poverty and ill health, and how cash transfers and social protection policies in Kenya and Ghana can complement each other in improving inclusive development in the two countries. A social protection program in the health sector, for example, will have an impact on other dimensions of development within the household.

PASGR

5.4 Coalition building

PASGR recognizes the issues raised by the policy actors and is interested in convening research-policy community and to collaborate with national and county governments to support research policy uptake. PASGR will be interested in mapping and synthesising existing research that can help decision making at national and country levels.

5.4 Capacity building

PASGR will support capacity augmentation measure that would enable policy actors to discern credible research evidence from mediocre research reports.

5.5 Research dissemination

PASGR will endeavour to connect researchers with media outlets to effectively disseminate research evidence to varied policy actors.

The Media

A lot of information passes through the media and reaches millions of people.

If we are alerted early enough research evidence can be packaged in such a way to influence policy makers to take action.

The media is tasked with the responsibility of setting the right agenda for public-parliament engagement.



Prof. Ken Walibora of the Nation Media Group and some policy actors and researchers

6. PROCESS FOR ENSURING RESEARCH POLICY UPTAKE

Moderator: Prof. Karuti Kanyinga, Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi.

The panel members were made up of Mr. Richard N. Rori, Head of Public Relations and Communication at National Social Security Fund (NSSF); Prof. Nyokabi Kamau, Director, Curriculum Development, Training and Research, The Centre for Parliamentary Studies and Training; and Mr. A. A. Awes, Senior Manager, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. The moderator emphasized that research to influence policy design is relevant today as it was yesterday, and will still be in the future. The government of Kenya has used research evidence to make policy decisions. For example research evidence contributed to the current NSSF Act and the National Social Protection policy. Key issues that came from the discussions include:

6.1 *Targeting policy makers at the national and county assemblies with research evidence*

The existence of a research department in parliament is a proof that parliamentarians need evidence for their parliamentary discussions in the chamber and parliamentary committees. Researchers must pay attention to current issues and discussions in parliament and provide real time evidence to support such discussions. Partnership with parliamentary structures can provide an avenue for updating policy makers on the available research that they can use when defending bills and policy recommendations. They should engage politicians at the committee level where they deal with issues at a more serious and technical level.



Prof. Nyokabi Kamau, Director, Curriculum Development, Training and Research, The Centre for Parliamentary Studies and Training making a point on research policy uptake.

6.2 *Improving access to social protection research findings on Kenya through search engines*

Researchers attached to Parliament and Parliamentarians themselves consult Google and Google scholar in their quest for information on social protection. Therefore researchers should make their studies visible on the internet. A Google search for research evidence on social protection in Kenya should appear on the first page. Research information should be placed in credible repositories and made visible on the web.

6.3 *Collaboration with the Media and other organisations*

Researchers must team up with the media, lobbyists and advocate organisations that have access to policy makers and practitioners so research evidence will be at 'the door-step' of those who need it for policy and programme design.

6.4 *Using credible data*

Researchers must endeavour to use data from Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS). Where data is not available and the researchers are interested in generating primary data, it is better to involve the KNBS to ensure acceptability of your data and findings arising from the analysis. Data that is perceived to be incredible is likely to jeopardise research uptake in the country. In addition, data must be disaggregated especially into gender.

6.5 *Packaging of research evidence for different policy audiences:*

Researchers should consider working with communication specialists to unpack their study findings into simple language that is comprehensible by non-research consumers. They should also translate shorter versions of their studies from English to Swahili and other local languages.

7. PLANNING FOR ACTION

Discussions on the way forward led to the following suggestions:

1. Create a network, list-serve or alert group to share information on social protection. It is also important to think about how to incentivize people, researchers, the media, and all members to be part of this network. There is need for innovative ways of engaging network members like conference calls and occasional meetings;
2. Conducts rapid assessments of what research evidence are out there, what informed the studies, the methodology used, etc. and share the information within the network.
3. Examine social protection from below; that is, undertake a documentary of “African Social Insurance” using the real life stories of people who have come out of poverty. For example, what do the villagers say? The voices from below are missing from discussions on social protection.
4. Regular organisation of research-policy actors’ fora to discuss research evidence that is relevant to policy actors and practitioners.

8. MAPPING THE COMMUNITY OF PRACTICE ON SOCIAL PROTECTION IN KENYA

The table below shows actors that may have to be included in the research-policy forum on social protection. It is not an exhaustive list as new organisations would be included. A snowball approach to rope in others will be needed

Actors in the specific field	Name	Interest in research-policy forum	Motivation to participate in the forum	Power	Capacity
National Government	1. Ministry of Labour, Social Security & Services	<u>Ministry of labour</u> would like to access timely and credible research evidence to enable it design appropriate social protection policies and programmes at the national level and also engage with the counties	Under pressure to deliver government mandates based on performance indicators of the respective ministries	The key institutions responsible to make policies on social protection	Coordination of all social protection programmes in the country. They have knowledgeable staff and secretariat that is responsible for SP programme
	2. Ministry of Health	<u>Ministry of Health</u> is interested in the success of its programme like national hospital insurance fund (NHIF), maternity waiver and their contribution to the wellbeing of the poor	-do-	Responsible for sector policies	
	3. Ministry of Agriculture	<u>Ministry of agriculture</u> is interested in the protection of livelihood of small farmers during drought season.	-do-	-do-	
	4. Ministry of Planning & Devolution	<u>Ministry of planning and devolution</u> would like to see sub-national governments develop programmes to improve local vulnerability and poverty. Also some counties are introducing SP programmes. They're concerned about the (mis)application of central government transfers to counties	-do-	-do-	Oversight ministry of all the counties in the country.
	5. Ministry of Education				

		<u>Ministry of education</u> Effective targeting of bursaries to needy students.			
County government	The 47 counties in Kenya	<p>The counties have departments/agencies that are similar to the national ministries. They are concerned about the welfare of people at the county and how the national social protection programmes can contribute to county specific outcomes. Their interest would be to gather evidence on their county baseline indicators on poverty, analyse what the national government is doing in their counties, and what the counties can do to complement national efforts</p> <p>Are interested in new social protection programmes run by the counties</p> <p>Point of contact with local people</p>	<p>Responsible for designing and implementing programmes at the local level</p> <p>Each county is motivated to introduce a variant of social protection programme. Social protection as social contract between local politicians and voters.</p>	The National Constitution and devolution policy give county governments a lot of power and resources to design and implement innovative programmes to reduce poverty and vulnerability at the local level.	The county has financial allocations that they can use for social protection programs
Private sector and Foundations	<p>Equity Group Foundation/Equity Bank</p> <p>Safaricom</p> <p>Aga Khan Foundation</p>	<p>Potential partners in supporting evidence generation for SP programs to inform their Corporate Social Responsibility</p> <p>These actors invest in corporate social responsibility that aims at improving the welfare of the poor. They contribute to social protection through different sectors and would be interested in getting the evidence that would inform</p>	<p>Contribution to the welfare of the poor and vulnerable people</p> <p>Entry points into policy influence based on the outcome of their programmes</p>	Hold purse strings for social protection programs	These institutions have put in place structures and financial and human resources to reach the poor

		the neediest populations that they should support			
Civil society	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Institute of Economic Affairs 2. Africa Platform for Social Protection 3. KIPPR 4. AERC 5. AIHD 	<p>These institutions are potential collaborators in policy entrepreneurship. They collect evidence from research and use it to influence policy decisions. They also conduct targeted research</p> <p>Research interest for evidence generation</p> <p>Leading national think-tanks on policy dialogues in the country</p>	<p>The need to influence the outcomes of poverty</p> <p>The commitment to inform the public on policy positions and create demand for better services at all levels</p>	Very influential organisations in the country	<p>They organise seminars and have convening capacity.</p> <p>Some individuals in the organisation are also influential</p>
International organizations	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. UNICEF 2. World Bank 3. DFID 4. Rockefeller Foundation 5. Concern Worldwide 6. Care 7. World Vision 8. Oxfam 9. Save the Children 	<p>Currently financing social protection programs in the country</p> <p>Partnership with the government in evidence generation or program implementation</p> <p>Targeting special populations and geographies with social protection programmes</p> <p>Some have conducted own studies</p>	<p>The drive to change the lives of the poor</p> <p>Opportunities for collaboration with governments in policy formulation and implementation</p> <p>Creation of global alignments and contribution to global development frameworks</p>	Hold purse strings for social protection programs and can influence how policy is framed	<p>They are financial enablers of social protection policies and programs in the counties</p> <p>They have linkages with support organizations that can implement SP programs</p>
Individual who can play other	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Millie Odhiambo 2. Joyce Laboso 3. James Nyikal 	<p>Champions of the poor and vulnerable in the country</p> <p>Some have started initiatives that reach</p>	Personal contribution to the welfare of the poor and	Members of Parliament	Opinion leaders in their communities

roles	4. Lina Jelimo	the poor and vulnerable with social protection services and education	vulnerable		and in the country
Media	National Media Citizen Standard Group	Dissemination of information in both English and local languages Telling the story of the poor and the vulnerable in a way that is understood by policy makers Seeking evidence from credible research to set the agenda on social issues	The need to create a large audience for their media content is an incentive for their visibility and business portfolio As part of CSR, media sets the agenda	Positioned as watch dog and fourth estate of the state	Wide reach and influence
Government Committees/Organisations	1. Senate Committee of Social Services	Their interest is to deliver on their constitutional mandate	A responsibility to the people	Power to make key recommendations for policy making on SP	Institutionalized support structures to facilitate the success of their work

9. Annexes

Participant list

	Name	Job Title	Organization	Country/City
1.	Mr. Charles Lwanga-Ntale	Regional Director for Africa	Development Initiatives, Africa Hub	Nairobi, Kenya
2.	Amb. Prof. Judith M. Bahemuka	University of Eldoret	Chancellor	Eldoret, Kenya
3.	Mr. Abdulkadir Amin Awes	Senior Manager	Kenya National Bureau of Statistics	Nairobi, Kenya
4.	Dr. Marleen Dekker	Co-ordinator	Dr. INCLUDE	The Netherlands
5.	Mrs. Elizabeth Mueni Kiiio - Nzioka	Programme Advisor -Policy & Advocacy	Oxfam Kenya	
6.	Mrs Marijn van der List	Research Coordinator	Amsterdam Institute for International Development (AIID)	The Netherlands

	Name	Job Title	Organization	Country/City
7.	Dr. Estelle Sidze	Associate Research Scientist	African Population and Health Research Center (APHRC)	Nairobi, Kenya
8.	Prof. Fredrick Wanyama	Professor, Political Science & Dean, School of Development & Strategic Studies	Maseno University	Maseno, Kenya
9.	Dr. Linnet Hamasi	Lecturer	Kisii University	Kisii, Kenya
10.	Dr. Akinyi Nzioki	Executive Director	The Centre for Land, Economy and Rights of Women (CLEAR)	Nairobi, Kenya
11.	Prof. Karuti Kanyinga	Associate Professor	Institute DS-University of Nairobi	Nairobi, Kenya
12.	Dr. Obadia Miroro	Knowledge Manager	African Economic Research Consortium	Nairobi, Kenya
13.	Mr. Richard Nyakundi	Head of Public Relations and Communication	National Social Security Fund (NSSF)	Nairobi, Kenya

	Name	Job Title	Organization	Country/City
	Rori			
14.	Dr. Tavengwa Nhongo	Executive Director	Africa Platform for Social Protection (APSP)	Nairobi, Kenya
15.	Dr. Joanne Bosworth	Chief, Social Policy	UNICEF, Kenya	Nairobi, Kenya
16.	Ms. Elizabeth Kimulu	Director of Social Services	National Economic and Social Council (NESC)	Nairobi, Kenya
17.	Mrs. Margriet Kuster	Senior Policy Advisor	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Netherlands
18.	Mrs. Patricia C. Lasoi	County Executive Committee	Bomet County, Government	Bomet, Kenya
19.	Prof. Nyokabi Kamau	Director, Curriculum Development, Training and Research	The Centre for Parliamentary Studies and Training	Nairobi, Kenya

	Name	Job Title	Organization	Country/City
20.	Mrs. Isa Baud	Director	University of Amsterdam	Netherlands
21.	Mr. Eric K Gachoki	Research Officer	Parliamentary Service Commission	Nairobi, Kenya
22.	Prof. Ken Walibora	Group Quality Manager	Nation Media Group	Nairobi, Kenya
23.	Dr. Marleen Dekker	Coordinator	INCLUDE	The Netherlands
24.	Mr. Hezekiel Gikambi	Project Manager- SWAHILIHUB	Nation Media Group	Nairobi, Kenya
25.	Ms. Caroline Teti	Senior Programme Manager	Evidence Action	Nairobi, Kenya
26.	Ms. Emily Kimisop	Programme Officer	Ministry of Labour Social Security and Services	Nairobi, Kenya
27.	Dr. Beatrice Muganda	Ag. Director of Higher Education Programme	PASGR	Nairobi, Kenya

	Name	Job Title	Organization	Country/City
28.	Dr. Nicholas Awortwi	Director of Research	PASGR	Nairobi, Kenya
29.	Dr. Darlison Kaija	Programme Coordinator, Research Programme	PASGR	Nairobi, Kenya
30.	Dr. Pauline Ngimwa	Programme Coordinator, HEP, Programme	PASGR	Nairobi, Kenya
31.	Ms. Wangui Kimari	Programme Consultant	PASGR	Nairobi, Kenya
32.	Ms. Pamellah Lidaywa	Programme Assistant, Research Programme	PASGR	Nairobi, Kenya
33.	Ms. Nyambura Irungu	Programme Assistant, PDT Programme	PASGR	Nairobi, Kenya

Forum Agenda

Time	Activity
08:00 - 08:45	Registration
08:45 - 09:10	Opening Remarks by Amb. Prof. Judith M. Bahemuka, Chancellor, University of Eldoret and PASGR Board Member; and Dr. Marleen Dekker, INCLUDE Co-ordinator
09:10 – 10:40	<p>Challenges of Social Protection Research for Policy Uptake</p> <p>Moderator: Dr. Nicholas Awortwi, PASGR</p> <p>Experience sharing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Charles Lwanga-Ntale, Regional Director for Africa, Development Initiatives 2. Dr. Akinyi Nzioki, Executive Director, Centre for Land, Economy and Rights of Women 3. Prof. Maurice Amutabi, Deputy Vice-Chancellor, Kisii University <p>Reaction by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Joanne Bosworth, Chief, Social Policy, UNICEF, Kenya • Ms. Elizabeth Mueni Kimulu, Director, Social Sector, National Economic and Social Council, The Presidency • Dr. Tavengwa Nhongo, Executive Director, Africa Platform for Social Protection <p>Plenary Discussion</p>
10:40 - 11:00	Health Break

11:00 - 13:00	<p>Knowledge needs on social protection to inform policy and programme design</p> <p>Moderator: Dr. Darlison Kaija, PASGR</p> <p>What policy practitioners want research evidence to inform?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Ali N. Ismail, Principal Secretary, Ministry of Labour, Social Security and Services, Kenya 2. Mrs. Patricia Chepkirui Lasoi, Bomet County <p>Reaction by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dr. Marleen Dekker, INCLUDE Coordinator • Mrs Elizabeth Mueni Kio-Nzioka, Programme Advisor- Policy & Advocacy, Oxfam • Dr. Nicholas Awortwi, PASGR <p>Plenary Discussion</p>
13:00 – 14:00	LUNCH BREAK
14:00 – 15:00	<p>Panel Discussion: Processes for ensuring research policy uptake</p> <p>Moderator: Prof. Karuti Kanyinga, Institute for Development Studies, University of Nairobi</p> <p>Panelists:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Richard Nyakundi Rori, National, Head, Head of Public Relations and Communication at NSSF, Social Security Fund (NSSF) 2. Prof. Nyokabi Kamau, Director, Curriculum Development, Training and Research, The Centre for Parliamentary

	<p>Studies and Training, Kenya</p> <p>3. Mr. A.A. Awes, Senior Manager, Kenya National Bureau of Statistics</p>
15:00 – 15:40	<p>Plenary discussion on “Planning for Action”.</p> <p>Expected to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Come up with a summary of key research/knowledge needs on social protection in Kenya • Map the community of practice on social protection in Kenya • Come up with a programme of action for research policy uptake in social protection in the next 18 months
15:40 – 16:00	<i>Health Break</i>
16:00 -16:30	Closing remarks and vote of thanks.