VI. ECONOMIC IMPACT

Key takeaways

- Despite announcing emergency economic measures to cushion businesses and households, significant impact can be observed across several macroeconomic dimensions in both Kenya and Uganda.
- For example, in October, the IMF revised its 2020 projection of real GDP growth rate down from +6.0% to +1.0% in Kenya, and from +6.2% to -0.3% in Uganda.
- Employment is severely affected; in Kenya, the unemployment rate has doubled from ~5.2% to ~10.4% between the first and second quarters of 2020, with those aged 20-29 most affected.
- Greenfield FDI is much lower than in previous years, with a reported ~85% decrease in January - September 2020, compared to the average of previous five years for the same period in Kenya, and no Greenfield FDI reported in Uganda in January - September 2020.
- The Kenyan shilling has seen record lows during the C19 pandemic; the Ugandan shilling has largely maintained its value until the time of writing.
- The informal sector is estimated to contribute ~34% and ~50% to Kenyan and Ugandan GDPs respectively, as well as the majority of jobs; and it has been disproportionally impacted by C19.

Methodology

- Leveraged data from government websites (i.e. press releases, reports), as well as sources from news outlets, nongovernmental organisations, UN agencies, and internationally recognised databases of economic data.
- Supplemented with expert interviews with government officials, technical experts, economists, and relevant private sector leaders including recruitment companies, mobility services providers, agricultural exporters and retailers.
- For the informal sector, we conducted both qualitative and quantitative primary research in Nairobi and Kampala. Qualitative research included 10 focus group interviews and 20 individual interviews with informal business owners (between 14 September and 9 October 2020). The quantitative survey was conducted with 611 informal business owners between 19 October and 4 November 2020. Informal business owners across a range of activities were interviewed including hairdressers, tailors, mechanics and construction, retail and domestic workers.
Macroeconomic impact

C19 has caused a severe economic impact, globally and in Africa. In October, the IMF revised its 2020 projection for global real GDP growth rate down from a positive +3.4% pre-C19 to a negative -4.4%. This prognosis may change further, depending on the disease outlook. Kenya and Uganda have both been impacted, with economic effects being felt at the time of writing.

In October, the IMF revised its 2020 projection for Kenya’s GDP growth rate from positive +6.0% to about +1.0%, and Uganda’s from positive +6.2% to negative -0.3%; as a reference, the sub-Saharan African average is negative -3.0%.

To cushion businesses and households from negative impact, the Kenyan and Ugandan governments announced fiscal and monetary policy measures, some of which remain in place at the time of writing (see Section IV). The announced stimulus packages as of June are equivalent to 0.6% and 1.1% of GDP in Kenya and Uganda respectively. For reference, countries with different fiscal contexts, such as South Africa and Japan, had announced stimulus packages of 8.6% and 21% of GDP respectively by May 2020.

This study assessed to what extent the overall economy has grown or contracted, how different sectors in the economy have been impacted, and how employment has been affected. Additional indicators such as levels of Greenfield FDI, the exchange rate and inflation have also been considered.

The drivers of this impact are two-fold: (i) global shocks that impact aggregate demand for Kenyan and Ugandan exports and disrupt supply chains (i.e. for imports), and (ii) local restrictions for containing C19 that further depress demand and disrupt business operations.

According to a leader in the business community, “The top echelon of businesses may have managed to transition to new ways of working or temporarily reconfigured to manufacture essential goods, but overall, businesses are struggling across the board.”

C19’s impact on GDP varies by sector in both countries. In both Kenya and Uganda, agriculture is the largest contributor to GDP and it tends to be less hard hit by C19. Other sectors such as hospitality and transportation are more heavily impacted by both global shocks and the local NPIs discussed in Section IV (see Exhibit 13).

In terms of employment, the unemployment rate in Kenya nearly doubled from ~5.2% to ~10.4% between the first and second quarters of 2020, particularly in the 20-29 age group. The youth may be more vulnerable to economic shocks as many have limited job experience and vocational skills. For instance, ~50% of 14 to 17-year-olds in Kenya do not finish high school.

Some signs of recovery are being observed since July/August. Greenfield FDI coming into a country is an indicator of new investment flows. In Kenya, Greenfield FDI has fallen by approximately 85% between January and September 2020, compared with the average Greenfield FDI for the period of January through September between 2015 and 2019. In Uganda, the effect has been even worse with no Greenfield FDI being reported thus far in 2020 according to publicly available sources.

---

**Exhibit 13: Comparison of Real GDP Growth Rate by Sector Between 2019 and 2020 in Kenya and Uganda**

**Kenya**

GDP growth rate comparison by industry (Q1-Q2 2019 vs. Q1-Q2 2020)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>-3.2%</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality (accommodation &amp; restaurants)</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Uganda**

GDP growth rate comparison by industry (2018/19 vs. 2019/20)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining &amp; quarrying</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>-7.0%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitality (accommodation &amp; restaurants)</td>
<td>-1.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
<td>-0.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Fiscal year is from 1 July to 30 June
EXHIBIT 14: KENYAN UNEMPLOYMENT RATE BY AGE

Unemployment doubled in 2020 from Q1 to Q2 with the age group of 20-29 being heavily impacted.

- Q2 2019: 65, 186, 65
- Q1 2020: 42, 264, 517
- Q2 2020: 110, 1,158, 4,571

Note: Unemployed people are defined as people without a job who have actively looked for one in the past 4 weeks and are currently available for work.

Source: Kenya National Bureau of Statistics; International Labour Organization

EXHIBIT 15: GREENFIELD FDI FLOWS IN KENYA AND UGANDA

KENYA

Total Greenfield FDI inflow into Kenya from January to September (USD $B)

- 2015: 16
- 2016: 0.6
- 2017: 0.6
- 2018: 1.3
- 2019: 3.5
- 2020: 0.2

Number of projects
- 2015: 55
- 2016: 29
- 2017: 35
- 2018: 36
- 2019: 70
- 2020: 22

Note: FDI Markets data is collected from media sources, industry organisations, investment agencies etc. and is inclusive of “announced” FDIs - although the database is considered to capture majority of investments, some investments may thus not be known, may be tracked and recorded at a later stage, or may have been cancelled. Data from FDI Markets may also differ substantially from official data provided by UNCTAD/UNCTD who receive data from national authorities.


UGANDA

Total Greenfield FDI inflow into Uganda from January to September (USD $M)

- 2016: 2.0
- 2017: 3.5
- 2018: 2.0
- 2019: 1.3
- 2020: 0.2

Number of projects
- 2015: 20
- 2016: 73
- 2017: 12
- 2018: 16
- 2019: 0

Note: FDI Markets data is collected from media sources, industry organisations, investment agencies etc. and is inclusive of “announced” FDIs - although the database is considered to capture majority of investments, some investments may thus not be known, may be tracked and recorded at a later stage, or may have been cancelled. Data from FDI Markets may also differ substantially from official data provided by UNCTAD/UNCTD who receive data from national authorities.


---

Number of projects:
- 2015: 20
- 2016: 73
- 2017: 12
- 2018: 16
- 2019: 0

Election year:
- 2015 - 2019 avg. (USD $1.54B)
- 2015 - 2019 avg. (USD $354 M)

2015 - 2019 avg. (USD $354 M)

Note: FDI Markets data is collected from media sources, industry organisations, investment agencies etc. and is inclusive of “announced” FDIs - although the database is considered to capture majority of investments, some investments may thus not be known, may be tracked and recorded at a later stage, or may have been cancelled. Data from FDI Markets may also differ substantially from official data provided by UNCTAD/UNCTD who receive data from national authorities.

On the exchange rate impact, the Kenyan shilling depreciated by ~7.2% between January and September 2020. The Ugandan shilling depreciated by ~3% between February and May, but has since recovered to pre-C19 levels by August 2020. In May, the Ugandan government received USD $491.5 million in emergency funding from the IMF, of which 70% was used to boost foreign exchange reserves which supported the stability of the currency.

In Kenya, the overall inflation rate has been maintained within target during the course of 2020. However, there have been notable movements in certain categories like transportation, which saw a 13.5% increase in September 2020 compared to the same month in the previous year. The Central Bank of Kenya (CBK) aims to maintain inflation between -2.5% and 7.5%. Stability within this window played a role in allowing the government to reduce the Central Bank Rate from 8.5% in January to 7% in March, and to reduce the Cash Reserve Ratio to 4.25%.

In Uganda, overall inflation has risen towards the ~5% target set by the Bank of Uganda (BoU) between March and September, driven in part by sharp increases in transport costs (~29.6% increase in September 2020 relative to September 2019). The BoU aims to hold annual core inflation at ~5%, which increased in September to ~6.2%. BoU reduced the Central Bank Rate from 9% to 7% with reductions in April and June 2020.

**EXHIBIT 16: FLUCTUATION OF KENYAN AND UGANDAN SHILLINGS**

**KENYA**

The KSh felt the global impact of C19 before Kenya’s first confirmed case

**UGANDA**

The USh has been largely stable, fluctuating by only 3% despite C19’s impacts

---

**Note:** Currency valuation is the period average


---

14 Ibid.
EXHIBIT 17: MONTHLY INFLATION VS. PREVIOUS YEAR FOR KEY CATEGORIES IN KENYA AND UGANDA

KENYA

Monthly Inflation vs. previous year for key categories (2020)

UGANDA

Monthly Inflation vs. previous year for key categories (2020)

ECONOMIC IMPACT

Informal sector

It is important to consider the informal sector when assessing C19’s economic impact. The informal sector contributes significantly to the GDP and employment rates in both countries. In Kenya, the informal sector contributes approximately ~34% of GDP and ~70% of employment. In Uganda it makes up approximately ~50% of GDP and over ~87% of employment.42

The informal sector is often less equipped to respond to shocks, owing in part to limited access to financial resources, technical know-how and information; consequently, many businesses have been disproportionately impacted by C19.

Of the informal business owners surveyed, ~94% in Nairobi and ~86% in Kampala experienced declines in revenue between March and September. Around 70% of business owners in both countries faced additional costs of operations resulting from C19 health requirements.43 Of the businesses that experienced a revenue decline, approximately one-third in Kenya and half in Uganda experienced a decline of more than half their revenue. In Kenya, one retail owner noted, “I would earn KSh 40,000 from each of the 3 shops per month but now, I earn KSh 20,000 from the 3 shops combined.”

Another said, “I am a street vendor, and my clients are mainly those who leave work in the evening, but because of the curfew we are time constrained.”44 In Uganda, where the government lockdown was more stringent than in Kenya, one restaurant owner stated, “I used to earn USh 2-2.5 million at the beginning of the year but when we were on lockdown, I made nothing.”

On the cost side, informal traders were aware of government health and safety requirements and many introduced the use of face masks and made hand sanitisers available.45 One Kenyan mechanic said, “I followed the government directives to the letter. You could not enter the business premises without a mask, and I provided sanitisers and a hand washing station.”

The impact on revenue has not been uniform across sectors, education levels or age of businesses. Non-essential and high-contact services were more impacted as were business owners with lower levels of education. More educated traders were more resilient in the face of C19.

Many employers in the informal sector responded to these revenue losses by reducing their overheads and headcount, or by adjusting salaries. An estimated ~74% of surveyed informal businesses with employees in Nairobi and ~83% in Kampala reduced salaries or retrenched employees.46

Most employers tended to adjust compensation models, rather than immediately retrench employees. As one cybercafé owner in Nairobi noted, “To keep all my employees, I stopped paying them a salary and started compensating them on a commission basis, based on how much we make per day.” A mechanic in Kampala noted, “For my employees, I had to send half of them home on unpaid leave until further notice and the ones I kept, I gave them a 60% pay cut.”

43 Ibid.
44 Percentages add up to more than 100% as multiple responses were accepted.
45 Ibid.
EXHIBIT 18: DECLINE IN REVENUE EXPERIENCED BY INFORMAL TRADERS

Majority impacted in both countries with ~94% in Kenya and ~86% in Uganda experiencing declines in revenue

Deeper impact observed in Uganda with ~34% reporting >80% revenue decrease

Question: By how much have your average monthly sales been impacted since the C19 pandemic hit Kenya?
Source: JICA-BCG Nairobi and Kampala Informal Sector Survey; September - November 2020

Exhibit 19: REDUCED DEMAND AND LACK OF ACCESS TO FINANCIAL SUPPORT ARE THE BIGGEST CHALLENGES FACED BY INFORMAL TRADERS

Biggest challenges faced by informal sector business owners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business challenge</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced customer demand</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to financial support</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot physically operate because of C19 restrictions</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack technical skills to conduct other businesses (to make extra income)</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t afford goods for C19 prevention (sanitiser, masks etc.)</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased theft and vandalism</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited stock due to border closures</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable and stable water supply</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t find employees with right skill sets</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable and stable electricity supply</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know how to use online business tools (e.g. sales/marketing)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of basic business skills (bookkeeping/inventory management etc.)</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secure access to land</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable and stable internet</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: What are the biggest challenges facing your business during this time? Please select top 3.
Source: JICA-BCG Nairobi (n=308) and Kampala (n=303) Informal Sector Survey; 19 October - 4 November 2020; Nairobi, and Kampala informal Focus Group Interviews & in-depth interviews, 14 September - 7 October 2020
ECONOMIC IMPACT

Reduced demand and limited access to financial support are frequently cited as the most pressing challenges of informal sector traders. Both factors constrain liquidity for businesses. 

Approximately ~65% of surveyed traders in Kenya and ~85% in Uganda identified reduced demand as their biggest challenge, followed by access to financial support (~45% in Kenya and ~68% in Uganda). In Kenya, obtaining C19 prevention tools posed a significant challenge (~24%). Increased theft and vandalism were a concern in Uganda (~19%).

Despite the financial strain, only ~23% of surveyed traders in Kenya and ~16% in Uganda turned to credit to support their businesses. Of these, in Kenya, mobile money (~39%) and friends and family (~31%) are the most popular sources, while in Uganda friends and family (~29%) and money lenders (~27%) are most favoured. This is largely because they tend to be more accessible, with simpler repayment terms and without collateral requirements.

Business owners are hesitant to borrow, partially owing to uncertainty about the timeline of full recovery. As one tailor in Kampala noted, “The reason I did not ask for financial support from anywhere is because I did not know how I will pay back the loan.”

Since restrictions were eased around July in both countries, approximately one-third of surveyed traders in Nairobi and Kampala have reported some degree of recovery. However, only ~7% in Nairobi and ~14% in Kampala have recovered ~50% or more compared to their pre-C19 levels.

Many informal traders are tentative about the effect of the coming months on their business as the disease outlook remains uncertain globally and locally. Only ~9% of Kenyan and ~25% of surveyed Ugandan traders believe that a recovery will be evident in the next three months. Moreover, up to ~43% in Nairobi and ~29% in Kampala believe that it will take at least one year for recovery to reach pre-C19 levels. This tentative attitude is driven by global and local economic uncertainty. As one shop owner in Nairobi reported, “Things are getting back to normal but there might be a second wave like in Western countries, so it is still uncertain.” A spare parts retailer in Kampala shared a similar view, “The virus is not bad in Kampala, but I see other countries experiencing a second wave and this will affect our imports again.”

JICA-BCG Informal Sector Survey, October 2020

Percentages add up to more than 100% as multiple responses were accepted

EXHIBIT 20: SOME INFORMAL BUSINESSES SEE EARLY SIGNS OF RECOVERY BUT ~43% IN KENYA AND ~29% IN UGANDA EXPECT MORE THAN 1 YEAR FOR FULL RECOVERY

Recovery experienced

~37% in Kenya and ~36% in Uganda reported recovery in revenue following relaxation of restrictions, but most are still in early recovery phases (~50% recovery for most)

Recovery expectations

Overall, businesses are pessimistic with ~43% of Kenyans and ~29% of Ugandans expecting recovery in 1 year or more

Question: Has your income recovered since the government eased some of the C19 restrictions?

Source: JICA-BCG Nairobi (n=308) and Kampala (n=303) Informal Sector Survey, 19 October - 4 November 2020; Nairobi and Kampala informal Focus Group Interviews and in-depth interviews, 14 September - 7 October 2020
Deep dive on how the informal sector is adapting

Many informal traders tend to operate in dynamic environments and responded to C19 by adapting: the most observed adaptations being increased prices, supply chain changes, new product and service offerings, and location changes. Approximately ~32% of surveyed traders in Kenya and ~11% in Uganda increased prices in response to C19. In both countries, essential businesses were most likely to increase prices (i.e. ~39% and ~10% of grocery stores, ~44% and ~29% of agricultural traders, in Kenya and Uganda respectively).

Some traders increased prices to compensate for increased costs. As one mechanic in Nairobi said, “Suppliers have doubled prices of spare parts as the supply has reduced, resulting in increased charges for the final consumer.” However, it is notable that most traders did not increase prices, with some even reducing prices to retain customers.

Supply chain disruptions, particularly on imports, have proven challenging for informal traders with ~61% of surveyed traders in Kenya and ~39% in Uganda paying more for raw materials. As one vehicle mechanic noted, “Prices for supplies increased due to the shortage of supply, especially for the imported ones.” Despite increase in raw material costs, only ~32% of traders in Kenya and ~18% in Uganda managed to change suppliers to offset the increased cost. In both countries, businesses earning higher revenues were more likely to change suppliers in response to increased supply costs. Of the traders who managed to change suppliers, ~25% in Kenya and ~27% in Uganda started using suppliers more local to their area. As one grocery vendor said, “I started getting my fruits and vegetables from a local supplier at Kangemi instead of going to the market in Muthurwa.”

Another adaptation favoured by informal traders was changing product or service offerings. An estimated ~10% of surveyed traders in Kenya and ~14% in Uganda changed their product offerings in response to C19’s impacts. An example being a grocery vendor in Kenya who noted, “I started selling vegetables to diversify my businesses as most people were now buying them often.” A notable ~27% of surveyed hairdressers in Kenya diversified their offerings. One hairdresser reported, “I had to start selling foodstuffs like samosa, chicken wings and chapatis to supplement my income as my salon had fewer client visits.” In Uganda, ~23% of agriculture traders and grocery store owners added new products. As one poultry farmer said, “I have started farming vegetables to boost income and I plan to venture more into it.”

A further adaptation was changing or consolidating operating locations with ~9% of Kenyans and ~6% of Ugandans doing the former. Of those that changed operating locations, ~57% in Kenya and ~33% in Uganda changed locations to operate within their neighbourhoods. Some started by visiting clients in their own neighbourhoods, while others served clients out of their homes. One shop owner in Nairobi explained, “We started doing home deliveries, so if you cannot come to us, we send someone to you.” In addition, ~29% of traders in Kenya and ~28% in Uganda closed their low performing locations or consolidated their operations.

A pharmacy owner in Kampala noted, “I have closed one of my pharmacy outlets as there are few customers now and focused on the most profitable one.”

C19’s economic impact has been undeniable and continues to present a challenge as the global and local disease outlook remains uncertain. Despite significant challenges coupled with limited resources and support, some informal businesses have demonstrated the adaptability and resilience needed to survive and thrive under the evolving conditions of C19.
VII. TRADE AND LOGISTICS

Key takeaways
- C19 has negatively impacted exports of services in Kenya and Uganda, notably in tourism and transportation.
- However, the total volume and value of goods exported has not been as significantly impacted as predicted by some initial models. For instance, tea exports in Kenya and gold exports in Uganda have been performing strongly in 2020, compared to 2019.
- Imports faced a sharp decline in April and May due to global supply chain disruptions, but have recovered to 2019 levels by August.
- Kenyan and Ugandan trade is partially dependent on the coordination of cross-border logistics in the East African region, notably along the Northern Corridor which witnessed significant disruption due to C19.

Methodology
- Leveraged data from government websites (i.e. press releases, reports), as well as sources from news outlets, nongovernmental organisations, UN agencies and internationally recognised databases of economic data.
- Supplemented with expert interviews with government officials, technical experts, economists, and relevant private sector leaders including recruitment companies, mobility services providers, agricultural exporters and retailers.

Exports

C19 has negatively impacted exports of services in Kenya and Uganda, however the overall value and volume of the export of goods has not been as significantly impacted as some models predicted.

Exports materially drive GDP in the East African region. In 2018, exports from East African Community member states were approximately valued at USD $26.6B, of which transport, tourism, and agriculture comprise over ~50% of the total value of exports.¹⁰

Note: South Sudan is excluded from the calculation of EAC members' exports due to the lack of reliable data.

In 2018, refined petroleum and machinery accounted for nearly one-quarter of the region's USD $46 billion import value. Between 2016 and 2019, trade deficits were growing at a compounded annual growth rate of +12%.\textsuperscript{93}

Zooming in on Kenya, the key exports are tourism, transportation and agriculture. In 2018, tourism and transportation accounted for an estimated 27% of the total USD value of exports. Owing to local and global C19 restrictions, these services exports have been severely impacted. Some recovery has been observed after restrictions were eased in July, spurred by shorter curfew hours, more inter-county movement and the resumption of domestic and later, international flights.\textsuperscript{94}

The impact on goods exports is less severe than initially predicted, though this does differ according to the specific good in question. For example, between January and August 2020, total exported goods from Kenya were ~5% higher in USD value compared to the same period in 2019. This is partially owing to the strong performance of tea and the recovery of cut flower exports in June, as well as the depreciation of the Kenyan shilling.\textsuperscript{95,96}

When we zoom in on Uganda, its key exports have historically been tourism and agriculture, notably coffee. However, gold became the nation's largest export in 2018, accounting for over ~30% of total export value. Like in Kenya, exports of services such as tourism have been severely impacted by C19. By easing restrictions in July like shortening curfew hours and allowing more inter-provincial travel, some recovery has been observed in the tourism industry. But global restrictions on movement continue to impact overall tourism demand.\textsuperscript{97}

Encouragingly, the overall impact on exported goods has been less severe, decreasing by ~4% in USD value in 2020 compared to the same time period in 2019. This has been partially driven by the strong performance of gold.\textsuperscript{98}


\textsuperscript{98} When adjusted for the depreciation of the currency, total goods value has increased by USD $70 (1.6%) due to a strong first quarter.

\textsuperscript{99} Ibid.


EXHIBIT 22: VALUE OF EXPORTED GOODS IN 2019 AND 2020

KENYA

Kenyan exports in 2019 and 2020 (Jan – Sep)

Export value (KSh billion)

2019 2020

KSh 450B KSh 480B +7%

Total exports (Jan – Sep)

Note: Kenya Bureau of Statistics reports trade statistics in local currency (KSh) while Bank of Uganda reports all trade data in USD.

Source: Bank of Uganda; Kenya National Bureau of Statistics

UGANDA

Ugandan exports in 2019 and 2020 (Jan – Sep)

Export value (USD $ million)

2019 2020

USD $3.11B USD $3.13B +1%

Total exports (Jan – Sep)

Since 2018, gold has been Uganda’s largest export and its export value in 2020 has surpassed 2019 levels, driven primarily by an increased global demand. The economic uncertainty due to C19 has caused significant demand increase globally, raising gold prices by ~26% between January and August 2020. In Uganda, monthly export volumes since May have consistently outperformed average monthly levels of 2019, reaching a peak in July 2020.¹⁰

Imports are experiencing a sharp recovery despite the initial significant decline in April and May

Kenya’s total import value in 2020 at the time of writing is KSh 1.1 trillion compared to KSh 1.2 trillion during the same period in 2019 (a net ~11% decrease in value), while Uganda’s total value in 2020 to date is USD $4.2 billion compared to USD $4.7 billion during the same period in 2019 (a net ~10% decrease in value). Oil is the biggest contributor to both countries’ imports, and oil volumes passing through the Port of Mombasa between May and September are down ~14%, compared to the same period in 2019.

Import volumes decreased at the outset of the C19 crisis with the Port of Mombasa experiencing an ~18% reduction in throughput volumes between April and May. In April 2020, there was a ~30% decrease in import volume in Kenya and a ~49% decline in Uganda compared to April 2019. This decrease was chiefly driven by supply chain disruptions in India and China which reduced the availability of certain imports. Import volumes were further impacted when local restrictions reduced the demand for petroleum products. As restrictions have eased, both supply and demand are recovering, and overall import volumes have recovered to near 2019 levels in Kenya. In Uganda, import volumes have surpassed 2019 levels since July 2020.

---

EXHIBIT 24: KENYAN AND UGANDAN IMPORTS DIPPED TEMPORARILY IN APRIL AND MAY MOSTLY DUE TO GLOBAL SUPPLY CHAIN DISRUPTIONS, BUT HAVE RECOVERED

Note: Kenya Bureau of Statistics reports trade statistics in local currency (KSh) while Bank of Uganda reports all trade data in USD
Source: Bank of Uganda; Kenya National Bureau of Statistics

EXHIBIT 25: MAJOR NORTHERN CORRIDOR ROUTE FROM MOMBASA TO KIGALI THROUGH KAMPALA

Source: Expert interviews; press reports
EXHIBIT 26: TRANSIT TIMES AND COST INCREASES ACROSS THE NORTHERN CORRIDOR

Kenyan and Ugandan trade is dependent on the coordination of cross-border logistics in the East African region, notably along the Northern Corridor which witnessed significant disruption due to C19.

The Northern Corridor is the key transport link and a crucial trade route in the East African region. It connects the Port of Mombasa in Kenya through Uganda and into Rwanda as well as South Sudan. C19 disruptions affected both the Port of Mombasa and the land borders, with the latter facing major logistical challenges to date.

Busia and Malaba are the two busiest border posts between Kenya and Uganda. Busia is primarily an entry point for fuel with more than 300 trucks entering daily while Malaba sees a high volume of cargo trucks. These border posts together have been the largest source of inefficiency for regional trade during C19, increasing both costs and transit times across the Northern Corridor.

The initial disruption was triggered by duplicated C19 testing requirements of the two countries. This led to a ~50,000-person queue at times. This was alleviated after an agreement between the two governments was reached on 29 May 2020 to recognise each other’s test certificates.

The congestion reduced significantly post-agreement. But in September, challenges in C19 testing in Kenya impelled many truck drivers to get tested at the Ugandan border instead. These challenges included the shortage of C19 testing supplies and long processing times. In response, the Ugandan government introduced a USD $65 fee to recoup the testing costs, which contributed to further disruptions and delays at the borders.

Overall, these challenges have significantly reduced the efficiency of the Northern Corridor, slowing down trade across the East African region.

---

Source: Expert interviews conducted September 2020
Ibid.
Ibid.
VIII. CONSUMER SENTIMENT AND BEHAVIOUR

Key takeaways

- Household financial strain: Most surveyed urban consumers reported experiencing a decline in household income (~70% in Kenya and ~84% in Uganda), with ~67% in Kenya and ~67% in Uganda experiencing a decline of more than 50% of their income. This was primarily driven by job losses and reduced salary for those employed.

- Health and wellness: ~28% of Kenyans and ~27% of Ugandans are unwilling to be tested for C19. Unwillingness has largely been driven by credibility concerns in Kenya (~38%) and affordability constraints in Uganda (~30%). In both countries, adherence to preventive measures has begun to waver driven by reduced fear of the virus.

- Mobility: In urban areas in both countries, significant reduction in overall movement of people was observed for the first few months under C19. For example, in April, the movement from home to transit station declined by 45% and 82% in Kenya and Uganda respectively, compared to pre-C19 baselines. Only ~33% of Kenyans and ~22% of Ugandans reported adopting new modes of transport, primarily due to affordability concerns.

- Digital adoption: Internet adoption across activities has increased in both countries with education (~66% in Kenya and ~52% in Uganda), and remote work (~62% in Kenya and ~55% in Uganda) driving increased use. However, lower income urban consumers are less likely to increase usage due to financial strain under C19.

Methodology

- Local data research partners led ~2 to 3-hour long discussions with ~5-6 people each, focusing on specific demographics across sectors to develop a foundational understanding of issues, trends and sentiments and develop an initial hypothesis for validation by a quantitative survey.

- Further 1-hour detailed interviews were conducted with carefully selected individuals chosen from the group discussions to provide additional details on their end-to-end experience.

- Conducted 25 focus group discussion (~2-3-hour) with ~5-6 people each, covering key demographic segments and sectors to develop a foundational understanding of issues, trends and sentiments between 14 September and 9 October.

- Conducted fifty ~1-hour detailed 1:1 interviews with selected individuals to provide additional details on their end-to-end experience between 14 September and 9 October.

- Conducted a quantitative survey (n=2500) of consumers in Nairobi, Mombasa and Kampala between 9 October and 4 November.

---

Google Mobility
C19 has impacted the lives of urban consumers across Kenya and Uganda in various dimensions including household income, health & wellness, mobility and digital adoption; many have had to adapt to changing circumstances, catalysing shifts in consumer sentiment and behaviours, some of which are likely to outlast the immediate crisis.

### General sentiment

Only ~27% of consumers in Kenya and ~29% in Uganda reported feeling financially secure with ~37% Kenyans and ~62% of Ugandans expressing concern about food security. Almost half the surveyed consumers in Kenya (~48%) and Uganda (~50%) still believe that the virus poses a serious danger in their countries, with ~51% in Kenya and ~44% in Uganda concerned about contracting the virus. Job loss was the primary driver of reduced income in both countries, with ~45% of respondents reporting layoffs in Kenya and ~48% in Uganda, with reduced hours prevalent in ~36% and ~50% of respondents in Kenya and Uganda respectively. One Ugandan consumer reported that, “Previously, I worked 2-3 shifts at the supermarket but currently, I only work 1 shift to none on some days, hence I am paid less.”

Most consumers in Kenya (~65%) and Uganda (~68%) reported the belief that measures taken by their governments were largely effective. In Kenya, mandatory wearing of masks (~73%) and closure of public spaces (~70%) were viewed as the two most successful measures and curfew (~49%) was viewed as the least effective measure. Consumers in Uganda felt that the closure of public spaces (~80%), quarantine (~79%), and closures of borders (~79%) were the most effective measures to curb the spread of C19, with curfew (~52%) deemed the least effective measure, like in Kenya.\(^{108}\)

### Household financial strain

Consumers’ finances have been severely affected by C19; faced with reduced income or unemployment, some adapted by starting side businesses, changing spending habits, or utilising credit.

A reduction in income is consistent across all income brackets with ~70% of surveyed consumers in Kenya and ~84% in Uganda reporting a decline in household income. Of those who faced a reduction, ~47% in Kenya and ~67% in Uganda saw reductions of more than half their income. In both countries, non-essential products and services like hairdressing were more unduly affected, when compared to essential goods and services such as groceries and pharmacies.

Job loss was the primary driver of reduced income in both countries, with ~45% of respondents reporting layoffs in Kenya and ~48% in Uganda, with reduced hours prevalent in ~36% and ~50% of respondents in Kenya and Uganda respectively. One Ugandan consumer reported that, “Previously, I worked 2-3 shifts at the supermarket but currently, I only work 1 shift to none on some days, hence I am paid less.”

The effect of C19 on the timing of recovery appears to be more severe in Uganda than in Kenya, with ~39% of consumers in Uganda unsure when they will recover to pre-C19 levels compared to ~19% in Kenya. But a similar level of income recovery has been reported in both countries with ~41% of Kenyans and ~43% of Ugandans reporting some level of recovery.

---

\(^{108}\) Percentages add up to more than 100% as multiple responses were accepted

\(^{109}\) Percentages add up to more than 100% as multiple responses were accepted

---

### EXHIBIT 27: FINANCIAL IMPACT ON CONSUMERS AND MAGNITUDE OF THE IMPACT

**Impact on income**

70% of Kenyan consumers experienced reduced income, this rose to 84% in Uganda.

**Magnitude of income reduction**

Of those who had income reduced, 47% in Kenya and 67% in Uganda saw reductions over 50%.

---

Question: Has your personal income changed due to the C19 pandemic?; How much has your personal income reduced compared to before C19?

JICA-BCG Kampala, Uganda Consumer Survey, 18 October - 7 November 2020
Consumers have reported adapting to reduced income by starting side businesses, changing their spending habits and utilising credit. Of the surveyed consumers, ~37% in Kenya and ~29% in Uganda reported starting side businesses with ~43% of consumers aged between 18 to 25 in Kenya likely to start a business.

Consumers have also adjusted their spending behaviour to focus on meeting their basic needs and de-prioritising non-essential items as noted by one consumer in Kampala, “We stopped eating meals like meat, milk and started eating more cereals which were affordable so I can afford other bills such as rent.”

Consumers have also reduced their shopping frequency by ~21% in Kenya and ~22% in Uganda, beginning to favour cheaper outlets such as kiosks and wholesalers which also sell smaller quantities. In Kenya, consumers expressed the sentiment that in the coming six months, they will visit kiosks on an average of ~10% more. While in Uganda, consumers indicated increased visits to both kiosks (~42%) and wholesalers (~7%).

Surprisingly, credit and savings were only used by a minority of consumers to offset the financial effects of C19. In Kenya, ~12% of surveyed consumers reported taking out loans compared to only ~5% in Uganda. In Kenya, ~1% of consumers reported relying on their savings while in Uganda, ~3% did. It is likely that consumers avoided taking out loans owing to concerns about their ability to repay. Others have been blacklisted and cannot access credit. As a consumer reported, “I would like to borrow, but I was blacklisted at the beginning of the pandemic, hence I cannot borrow.”

However, of those who did report taking out loans, mobile money was the most popular source (~48%), followed by friends and family (~36%) in Kenya. In Uganda, friends and family is the most favoured (~48%), followed by commercial banks (~36%). The popularity of friends and family along with mobile money as sources of credit can be explained by their accessibility and no requirement of collateral.

Health and wellness

Around ~28% of Kenyans and ~27% of Ugandans are unwilling to be tested for C19. In Kenya, mistrust towards test results is the main driver reported with ~38% of consumers reporting this as their primary concern. Interestingly, quarantine centre placement is the second most reported concern with ~28% largely driven by the lack of space to quarantine on testing positive. Only ~58% of consumers reported having the space to isolate. Contrastingly, in Uganda, affordability (~30%) is the primary reason for not being tested. Low income consumers earning less than USh 450K per month (~USD $121) were the most likely at (~54%) to cite affordability as the key factor behind unwillingness to test. In both Kenya and Uganda, ~64% of consumers would prefer to be tested at public hospitals, their decision driven by affordability and credibility concerns in both countries, with mid and high-income earners being more concerned with credibility than with affordability.

Consumers reported being well-informed about the virus, and initially observed preventive measures driven by fear of contracting the virus.

Note: Sample is respondents who experienced income reduction due to C19

Question: Has your income started recovering from the worst time during C19? When do you expect to return to your income level before C19?

Source: JICA-BCG Kampala, Uganda Consumer Survey, 18 October - 7 November 2020

As of 23 November 2020
### EXHIBIT 29: WATER AVAILABILITY AND SUPPLY DISRUPTIONS IN KENYA AND UGANDA

#### Water accessibility

- 47% of Kenyans and 39% of Ugandans have indoor taps

#### Water supply

- 15% in both countries experienced significant disruptions while costs rose for -18% in Kenya and -10% in Uganda

#### Cost

- Water costs rose more severely in Uganda with ~33% reporting rises over 50% vs. -19% in Kenya

### CONSUMER SENTIMENT AND BEHAVIOUR

As the pandemic progressed and government restrictions were eased, adherence to preventative measures has become more lax in both countries with one Ugandan observing, “Honestly, I stopped wearing my mask, I just social distance and sanitise… when I leave the house the mask is in my pocket.”

Consumers in Kenya and Uganda reported that they continue with hygiene measures such as washing hands (~54% in Kenya and ~79% in Uganda), and wearing a mask (~82% in Kenya and ~71% in Uganda), but adherence to social distancing measures has dropped significantly. Only ~8% of consumers in Kenya and ~14% in Uganda are avoiding public transport compared to ~21% and ~36% at the outset of the pandemic. In Kenya, only ~16% of consumers are still staying home compared to ~40% at the outset whereas in Uganda, only ~26% of consumers are still staying home compared to ~67% at the outset of the pandemic. This shift in adherence can be attributed to disease fatigue and economic needs outweighing safety concerns.

Consumers in both countries have experienced significant disruptions to their water supply since March. Only ~47% of consumers in Kenya and ~39% in Uganda have indoor taps, with ~21% of surveyed Kenyans and ~34% of Ugandans relying on purchased water to meet their needs. Since the onset of the pandemic in March, ~15% of consumers in both countries have faced significant disruptions to their water supply, with costs rising for ~18% in Kenya and ~10% in Uganda.

#### Mobility

Matatu (minibus) is the primary public transport in urban Kenya while boda-bodas (motorcycle taxis) are equally popular in urban Uganda.

Among daily adult commuters in Kenya, ~48% ride a matatu (minibus), ~42% walk, ~5% commute by private car and ~5% use other modes of transport. Matatu service approximately 1 million adult commuters each day and ~79% of surveyed consumers reported matatus as their primary mode of transport. In Uganda, matatus and boda-bodas (motorcycle taxis) are the primary modes of public transport and account for ~40% of all transport in the Greater Kampala Metropolitan Area. Over 100,000 bodas-bodas operating in Kampala provide more than 800,000 daily trips.

Transport demand has significantly dropped across the board in Kenya and Uganda.

In April 2020, movement from home to transit station declined by ~45% and ~82% in Kenya and Uganda respectively, compared to pre-C19 baselines.

Despite the significant decrease in use, the median weekly transport spend for consumers has increased marginally by ~3% in Kenya, and only decreased ~5% in Uganda.

---

1. Answers add up to over 100% because multiple responses were accepted
2. Question: How does your household get the water that you use in your home?
3. Question: How has your access to water been impacted since March this year?
4. Question: How much has the cost of water increased?

---


---


Increased public transport fares for some modes of transport such as matatus (which doubled in many cases) may account for the low decrease in Ugandan spends, and the marginal increase witnessed in Kenya.

Despite the potential risk of C19 infection, ~67% of consumers in Kenya and ~78% in Uganda have not started using new modes of transport which are viewed as being safer. This is primarily due to economic reasons. In both countries, ‘cost’ is the most important driver for choosing transport modes during C19 (~63% of Kenyan and ~57% of Ugandan urban consumers chose cost as an important factor in their choice of transport).

Public transport operators have adapted to maintain business continuity during the pandemic. When public transport was banned in Kampala, matatu operators leased their vehicles out to essential service providers and many ride sharing companies pivoted to offer delivery services. In Kenya, Uber launched Uber Connect and saw increased usage of its Uber Eats business. Similarly, Bolt launched Bolt Business Delivery. In both countries, capacity limits on public transport remain in place, though non-adherence to these limits has been frequently observed. Many matatu operators have doubled costs to try to recoup revenue losses from earlier in the year and from the capacity limits in place.

Trends in consumer mobility are gradually returning to pre-C19 levels as government imposed NPIs are relaxed, but overall mobility is still below baseline levels. Nairobi witnessed a ~48% drop in retail and recreation visits in April, compared to a baseline time period between 3 January and 6 February. The number of visits to other locations has also decreased significantly. The recovery witnessed since April differs by category, with grocery shops and pharmacies recovering to baselines, while workplace, retail and recreation levels remain below baselines. In Kampala in April, transit stations saw an ~82% decrease in visits compared to a baseline time period between 3 January and 6 February.

A return to baseline levels is being observed since the ban on public transport was lifted on 2 June, but all categories in Kampala remain below baselines at the time of writing. Some of the shifts observed in mobility trends may persist longer-term. Consumers expect to travel less overall in the next six months in both Kenya and Uganda. This may be attributed to lower demand caused by job losses and continued work from home.

---

\[115\] Expert interviews conducted with Kenya Bureau of Statistics, JICA, Uber, UNCDF and UNFPA.

\[116\] Google Mobility reports define retail and recreation as places including restaurants, cafes, shopping centres, theme parks, museums, libraries and cinemas; Google Mobility. 2020. ‘Covid-19 Community Mobility Reports’. Retrieved from https://www.google.com/covid19/mobility/ [Accessed October 2020].

\[117\] Ibid.

EXHIBIT 31: MOBILITY DECISION DRIVERS: COST IS THE PRIMARY DRIVER BEHIND TRANSPORT DECISIONS IN BOTH KENYA AND UGANDA AT ~60%

**KENYA**

**Mobility decision drivers**

Physical distancing (~47%) and cleanliness (~35%) complete the top 3, implying that Kenyans are still wary of C19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical distance to other passengers</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of vehicle</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel duration</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of accident</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to switch modes</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of use</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence from schedules</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to read/work etc.</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UGANDA**

**Mobility decision drivers**

Physical distancing ranks 2nd at ~35% after cost (~57%) and duration (~40%), implying that Ugandan consumers are less concerned about C19

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel duration</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical distance to other passengers</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of accident</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comfort</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleanliness of vehicle</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of use</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility to switch modes</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independence from schedules</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability to read/work etc.</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental sustainability</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question: Which of the following are the 3 most important factors for you when considering which mode of transport to use today?


EXHIBIT 32: INTERNET USAGE INCREASES WITH INCOME DRIVEN BY ACCESSIBILITY AND ABILITY TO WORK FROM HOME, HOWEVER THE CORRELATION IS STRONGER IN UGANDA

**KENYA**

Internet usage frequency across income brackets

Usage is correlated with income but KSh 70-150k segment is more likely to increase usage than those earning KSh 150k+

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Segment</th>
<th>% of Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than KSh 15k</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSh 15k - 30k</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSh 30k - 70k</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSh 70k - 150k</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over KSh 150k</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**UGANDA**

Internet usage frequency across income brackets

Strong correlation with USh 450k segment being ~7% more likely to reduce usage and the USh 4.5M+ segment being ~47% more likely to increase usage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Segment</th>
<th>% of Segment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than USh 450k</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USh 450k - 900k</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USh 900k - 2,000k</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USh 2,000k - 4,500k</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over USh 4,500k</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Income is monthly household income

Question: How would you describe your internet usage compared with pre-C19 times?

Digital adoption

While significant increase in internet usage is reported in higher income groups, lower income groups are more likely to reduce usage due to economic constraints

Internet usage is strongly correlated with income level. While higher income urban consumers in Kenya and Uganda are likely to increase internet usage during the pandemic, we see a divergence in the lower income segments. For example, in the lowest income bracket for both countries (i.e. monthly household income below KSh 15,000 or USh 450,000), the percentage of consumers who reduced internet usage exceeds the percentage of those who increased their usage (~33% vs. ~31% in Kenya, ~35% versus ~27% in Uganda).

Digital adoption across activities has been witnessed in Kenya and Uganda. Initially driven by government imposed NPIs, this trend may persist with growing smartphone penetration. Unsurprisingly, internet use for school and work displayed the highest increases, with work increasing ~55% and ~62%, and school by ~52% and ~66% in Uganda and Kenya respectively. Daily internet usage is high in both countries, with ~87% of consumers in Kenya and ~72% in Uganda reporting the use of internet at least once a day, with ~45% in Kenya and ~41% in Uganda spending more than 4 hours online daily.

In both countries, the primary mode of internet access is via smartphone. Around ~89% of surveyed consumers in Kenya and ~76% in Uganda reported using a smartphone to access the internet. The high use of smartphones is likely driven by accessibility, convenience and relative affordability. It is perhaps the case that some respondents are using the smartphones of family and friends and do not own personal devices yet.

Urban consumers in Kenya and Uganda have been significantly impacted by C19, and have adapted their behaviours in various ways. Some of these changes in urban consumer behaviour may persist into the future as new norms of urban life.

---

NPI stands for Non-Pharmaceutical Intervention
JICA initiated this research study with the intention of establishing a robust fact base that can support decision-making by policymakers involved in the C19 response in Kenya and Uganda. As the outlook for disease progression remains uncertain globally and locally, further adjustments to government policies may take place and the impact on healthcare capacity, economy, trade, logistics and consumer behaviour may evolve further.

In the light of this, there are several imperatives for key stakeholders across public, private and social sectors to consider for Kenya and Uganda. These imperatives can strengthen pandemic resilience of their urban areas, and beyond.

1. **Accelerate health system strengthening:** Apply a holistic approach to strengthen health systems, building on them as the foundation for pandemic resilience. This includes capacity development for healthcare workers, progress towards universal health coverage, optimisation of supply chains, improved information management, and other areas that are important for both the ongoing management of high-burden diseases, and immediate outbreak response.

2. **Build resilience for vulnerable populations:** Make concerted efforts across various stakeholders to empower the most vulnerable populations by linking them with innovative solutions (e.g. onboarding to online marketplaces, improving financial access through data-driven risk assessment, improving access to safe water and sanitation, etc.)

3. **Scale up high-potential homegrown solutions:** Create a platform to accelerate the development and adoption of innovative homegrown solutions in Africa. Emerging in response to C19, some of these solutions have the potential to generate sustainable at-scale impact if sufficiently supported (e.g. provide technical and financial support, match to strategic partners, etc.)

4. **Take East African Community (EAC) regional harmonization to the next level:** Strengthen emergency response coordination mechanisms based on key learnings from C19 response, especially around cross-border movement of people and goods (e.g. early detection of potential disruption, data-driven collective decision-making, joint resource mobilisation, etc.)
### List of Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BoU</td>
<td>Bank of Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>Novel Coronavirus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAGR</td>
<td>Compound Annual Growth Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBK</td>
<td>Central Bank of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAC</td>
<td>East African Community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FDI</td>
<td>Foreign Direct Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoK</td>
<td>Government of Kenya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GoU</td>
<td>Government of Uganda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCW</td>
<td>Healthcare Workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>Intensive Care Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMF</td>
<td>International Monetary Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JICA</td>
<td>Japan International Cooperation Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEPSA</td>
<td>Kenya Private Sector Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSh</td>
<td>Kenyan Shilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSME</td>
<td>Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHIF</td>
<td>National Hospital Insurance Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPI</td>
<td>Non-Pharmaceutical Intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organisation For Economic Co-Operation And Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAYE</td>
<td>Pay As You Earn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPE</td>
<td>Personal Protective Equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDG</td>
<td>Sustainable Development Goals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNAIDS</td>
<td>Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCDF</td>
<td>United Nations Capital Development Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNCTAD</td>
<td>United Nations Conference on Trade And Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFPA</td>
<td>United Nations Population Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USD</td>
<td>United States Dollar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USh</td>
<td>Ugandan Shilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UVRI</td>
<td>Uganda Virus Research Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VAT</td>
<td>Value Added Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report could not have been written without the invaluable contribution and support from the key stakeholders we spoke to. This diverse group includes government officials, industry experts, participants of the primary research (qualitative and quantitative), informal sector business owners, and all the other people we interacted with during the course of this study. We would like to express our deepest appreciation to all these stakeholders.

About the authors

Asuka Tsuboike
Asuka Tsuboike is a Senior Director of Urban and Regional Development Group and leads JICA’s work on urban and regional development planning. You may contact her at Tsuboike.Asuka@jica.go.jp

Koichiro Yamamoto
Koichiro Yamamoto is a Represent of JICA Uganda Office and in charge of Infrastructure and Urban Development. You may contact him at Yamamoto.Koichiro@jica.go.jp

Kobe Nobuyuki
Kobe Nobuyuki is a Deputy Director of Urban and Regional Development Group and in charge of JICA’s work on urban and regional development planning. You may contact him at Kobe.Nobuyuki@jica.go.jp

Ayumi Kiko
Ayumi Kiko is a Deputy Director of Urban and Regional Development Group and in charge of JICA’s work on urban and regional development planning. You may contact her at Kiko.Ayumi@jica.go.jp

Tatsuya Nikai
Tatsuya Nikai is a Represent of JICA Kenya Office and in charge of Infrastructure and Urban Development. You may contact him at Nikai.Tatsuya@jica.go.jp

Yuka Sawayama
Yuka Sawayama is a Program Officer of Urban and Regional Development Group and in charge of JICA’s work on urban and regional planning. You may contact her at Sawayama.Yuka@jica.go.jp

Mathieu Lamiaux
Mathieu Lamiaux is a Managing Director and Senior Partner in the Paris and Nairobi offices of Boston Consulting Group and leads BCG’s healthcare work in Western Europe, South America and Africa. You may contact him at lamiaux.mathieu@bcg.com

Mills Schenck
Mills Schenck is a Managing Director and Partner in the Nairobi office of Boston Consulting Group and leads BCG’s operations in East Africa, including on C19 response. You may contact him at schenck.mills@bcg.com

Takeshi Oikawa
Takeshi Oikawa is a Managing Director and Partner in the Nairobi office of Boston Consulting Group, with expertise on economic development and trade topics in Africa. You may contact him at oikawa.takeshi@bcg.com

Sisi Pan
Sisi Pan is a Principal in the Nairobi office of Boston Consulting Group, with expertise on global health and global development topics. You may contact her at pan.sisi@bcg.com

Alice Haddon
Alice Haddon is an Associate in the Johannesburg office of Boston Consulting Group, supporting C19 research in East Africa. You may contact her at haddon.alice@bcg.com

Disclaimer
The situation surrounding COVID-19 is dynamic and rapidly evolving on a daily basis. Although we have taken great care prior to producing this report, it represents JICA and BCG’s understanding at a particular point in time. This report is not intended to: (i) constitute medical or safety advice or be a substitute for the same; nor (ii) be seen as a formal endorsement or recommendation of a particular response. As such you are advised to make your own assessment as to the appropriate course of action to take, using this presentation as guidance. Please carefully consider local laws and guidance in your area, particularly the most recent advice issued by your local (and national) health authorities, before making any decision.