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IPA Consumer Protection Research Initiative

Four-year program to support policymakers, financial service providers, and civil society to develop and test consumer protection solutions in four emerging markets: Bangladesh, Kenya, Nigeria, and Uganda.

This report presents results from a survey of digital finance users in Kenya.
Understanding the challenges Kenyan consumers face with digital finance

IPA has collaborated with the Competition Authority of Kenya to conduct a survey on key themes in consumer protection, including:

• Fraud and loss of money
• Complaints handling and redress
• Pricing transparency and consumer choice
• Borrowing behavior

Survey responses identify which issues may be of greater or less concern, to inform future policy actions.

Reports from similar surveys conducted in Nigeria and Uganda allow for comparison across countries.
Contents

05: Methodology
06–12: Respondent Profile
13–19: Access and Usage
20–33: Challenges
34–38: Financial Stress
39–48: Competition and Choice
49–52: Transparency and Knowledge
53–57: Redress Process
58: Policy Takeaways
Methodology

Random-digit dial (RDD) phone survey of digital financial service users

Sampling frame:

• All possible mobile numbers following the Kenyan mobile phone number allocation system that were active within Kenya when the RDD samples was generated on September 10, 2020.

• Survey limited to adult mobile money, mobile banking and/or mobile loan consumers through filters at the start of the survey. No further filtering occurred during the survey. Respondents were made aware of the survey's purpose during the consent process.

Sample size: 793

Conducted: September 14 – October 18, 2020
Respondent profile

- Respondent sample more male, younger, wealthier, and better educated than Kenya's overall adult population.

- Some of this is due to filtering for digital financial service users, and some is due to the constraints of random digit dialing.

- Individuals who do not have phones or reside within coverage areas are more likely to be older and more poor, but they are also less likely to use digital financial services.
Because surveys were conducted by phone, respondents’ urban/rural status was estimated based on the population density of the constituency in which respondents reported residing. A cutoff of 600 individuals/km² was selected so that the urban population approximately matched the World Bank urban population estimate for 2009, the latest year where constituency-level population statistics are available. Because of changes in constituencies between 2009 and today, we were able to generate an urban indicator for 71% of respondents. Approximately 36% of respondents were categorized as residing in urban areas using this method (compared with 23% of the population according to the World Bank 2009 estimate).
Gender, age, and education

Gender (n=793)
- Male: 59%
- Female: 41%

Age (n=793)
- 18-24:
- 25-44:
- 45-64:
- 65+:

Education (n=792)
- Primary:
- Secondary:
- Tertiary:

Afrobarometer is a non-partisan, pan-African research institution conducting public attitude surveys on democracy, governance, the economy, and society in 30+ countries repeated on a regular cycle.

Sources:
- Census: [https://www.knbs.or.ke/?p=5621](https://www.knbs.or.ke/?p=5621)
Economic background

Respondent profile

Household member with formal employment (n=791)

- Yes: 28%
- No: 72%

Monthly income (KES) (n=758)

- Less than 2,000: 0%
- 2,001–4,000: 5%
- 4,001–8,000: 10%
- 8,001–14,000: 15%
- 14,001–20,000: 20%
- 20,001–30,000: 25%
- 30,001–40,000: 30%
- 40,001–50,000: 35%
- 50,001–60,000: 40%
- 60,001–80,000: 45%
- More than 80,000: 50%
- No response: 55%
The Poverty Probability Index (PPI) is a poverty measurement tool provided by Innovations for Poverty Action. The PPI uses machine learning techniques to estimate households’ poverty likelihood based on 10 questions. Households are assigned a poverty likelihood between 0-100%. Kenya’s PPI is built from the 2015/2016 Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey.

https://www.povertyindex.org/about-ppi
PPI scores are used to split the sample into three equally sized groups representing relatively low, middle, and high poverty probabilities. Later sections disaggregate results using these groups.

Poverty Probability Index (PPI) (n=764)

- **Lower poverty:** 0–7% poverty likelihood
- **Middle poverty:** 7–18% poverty likelihood
- **Higher poverty:** 18–100% poverty likelihood
Household composition

Respondent Profile

**Relationship to head of household (n=789)**

- **Head of household**
  - Female: 40%
  - Male: 0%

- **Spouse of head of household**
  - Female: 0%
  - Male: 10%

- **Other**
  - Female: 30%
  - Male: 20%

**Marital status (n=789)**

- **Married or cohabitating**
  - Female: 50%
  - Male: 40%

- **Divorced, separated or widowed**
  - Female: 10%
  - Male: 0%

- **Never married**
  - Female: 10%
  - Male: 60%
Access and usage of digital financial services

- Kenya is a global leader in DFS usage with 79% of adults using mobile money in 2019, and a sharp increase in digital credit usage in recent years. (Source: Kenya FinAccess Survey, 2019)

- Survey respondents’ reported usage patterns demonstrate that access has been concentrated almost exclusively on the M-Pesa platform in mobile money, and that this impacts their choice of digital credit providers.

- Most use of digital loans is concentrated in hands of a small set of lenders, despite an estimated 100+ digital lenders active in Kenya prior to the COVID-19 pandemic.
Phone ownership

Access and Usage

Phone sharing (n=793)
- Own phone, do not share: 88%
- Share with spouse: 12%

Phone type (n=792)
- Basic/feature phone: 19%
- Smartphone: 81%

Note: Data exclude respondents who have not used DFS
Digital financial service usage, by service type

Access and Usage

- **Mobile money**: 99% of respondents have ever used mobile money.
- **DFS agent**: 92% of respondents have ever used a DFS agent.
- **Mobile loan**: 27% of respondents have ever used mobile loans.
- **Mobile banking**: 19% of respondents have ever used mobile banking.

Notes: n=793; Data exclude respondents who have not used DFS in the last 90 days.
Nearly all survey respondents using mobile money do so via M-Pesa. While users have accessed competitors very few have done so recently. M-Pesa faces little competition in practice.
**Access and Usage**

**Mobile loan providers**

**Providers ever used**
- M-Shwari
- Fuliza
- KCB M-Pesa
- Tala
- Branch
- All others

**Percent of respondents who have ever used digital credit**

**Provider used most often in the last 90 days**
- Fuliza
- M-Shwari
- KCB M-Pesa
- All others

**Percent of active digital credit users**

*Top 3 loan products all linked with M-Pesa*
Access and Usage

Mobile loan uses

57% use mobile loans for household or personal expenses

23% use mobile loans for business or agriculture expenses

17% use mobile loans for emergencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Household expenses</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business expenses</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergencies</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal expense</td>
<td>N=216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>N=216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay other loans</td>
<td>N=216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School fees</td>
<td>N=216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saving money</td>
<td>N=216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>N=216</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Access and Usage

Mobile banking providers

Percent of all respondents

- Equity Bank
- KCB Bank
- Coop Bank
- All others

- Ever used (n=280)
- Used most often in last 90 days (n=140)
Challenges experienced using DFS

The survey asked consumers about a set of common DFS challenges, to understand how many consumers may experience these issues across two periods:

• Any challenges experienced since January 2020
• The most significant challenge ever experienced—to not miss any issues which may have caused substantial difficulty or harm in the past.

Men, wealthier, and more educated consumers report higher rates of incidences—is this due to deeper usage, more awareness of challenges, greater willingness to report issues, or other reasons?
Key takeaways

Digital loans raise several concerns:
- Majority of borrowers report reducing consumption to service debt
- 77% have not paid a loan back on time at some point
- Limited evidence of comparing costs of different loan providers

Phishing scams were the most common challenge faced—but most consumers do not report having fallen victim to these attempts.

Poor customer care and unexpected charges are areas where providers could improve consumer experience through simple adjustments to transparency and redress.

Many consumers send money to the wrong person—despite innovations by providers to help reduce this error like Safaricom’s “Hakikisha” solution.
Which challenges are most common for consumers

Percent of respondents, reporting consumer protection challenges:

- Phishing by phone or SMS: 56%
- Incorrectly sent money: 35%
- Denied access to a new loan*: 23%
- Poor quality of customer care: 17%
- Could not reach customer care: 17%
- Difficulty using shortcode menu or app: 15%
- Unexpected or unclear charges: 11%
- Money was missing or taken without your permission: 5%
- Agent charged you extra to complete a transaction: 3%
- Someone took out a loan in your name*: 3%
- Agent did not keep your information safe or private: 2%

* For these challenges, percent of mobile loan users reported.

Notes: n=769–793 except for “Denied access to a new loan (n=430) and “Someone took out a loan in your name” (n=426); January – October 2020
Respondents are most likely to experience challenges with mobile money, apart from difficulty using shortcode menus or apps, which is the most common issue for mobile banking and mobile loan users.

### Challenges by service type

**Percent of mobile money, mobile loan, and mobile banking users reporting each challenge**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Challenges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile money</strong></td>
<td>Incorrectly sent money, Poor quality of customer care, Could not reach care</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=789)</td>
<td>Difficulty using shortcode menu or app, Money was missing or taken without</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Agent charged you extra to complete a transaction, Agent did not keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your information safe or private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile loans</strong></td>
<td>Difficulty using shortcode menu or app, Unexpected or unclear charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=430)</td>
<td>Could not reach customer care, Poor quality of customer care, Agent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>charged you extra to complete a transaction, Incorrectly sent money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Money was missing or taken without your permission, Agent did not keep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>your information safe or private</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mobile banking</strong></td>
<td>Difficulty using shortcode menu or app, Incorrectly sent money, Could not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n=280)</td>
<td>reach customer care, Unexpected or unclear charges, Poor quality of customer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>care, Money was missing or taken without your permission, Agent charged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>you extra to complete a transaction, Agent did not keep your information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>safe or private</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges by consumer segment

Male, better educated, better off, and more urban respondents report more challenges at a statistically significant level.

While these segments may be more likely to experience challenges, differences could also be partially driven by higher DFS usage*, higher awareness of these issues occurring, or greater willingness to report these issues to surveyors. Unpacking the causes for these differences could be an area for further future research.

*Survey restricted to DFS users, but there may be differences in DFS usage intensity (e.g., transactions per month) by consumer segment.
Scammers are more likely to ask for money or information than offer a product or service

Percent of respondents who have ever reported calls or SMSs from unknown parties and what the scammer asked them to do...

Challenges experienced using DFS

N=764
What do scammers seek when they contact DFS users?

Challenges experienced using DFS

Send money: 80%
Password/PIN: 20%
Personal information: 20%
Account details: 10%
Payment reversal: 5%
Help relative/friend in need: 2%
Other: 1%

n=591
Scam attempts: How consumers identify scams

Calls from regular numbers and warnings from peers are key to consumers avoiding scams.

These indicators of a scam could be shared with the broader population—remember, our respondents are the ones who realized this was a scam, others may not know what to look for.
Challenges experienced using DFS

Scam attempts: How consumers respond

Consumers' action after scam (n=649)
- Ignored
- Responded
- Reported to MNO
- Reported to other
- Warned friends and family
- Other

How can we increase consumer reporting of scams so that these numbers are blocked?

Consumers' action if they responded to the scam (n=131)
- Exposed scammer
- Did not follow instructions
- Followed instructions
- Called scammer back
- Asked scammer for details
- Checked scammer's claims
- Reached out to provider
- Unclear
- Hung up

These responses expose consumers to fraud risk
Scams are quite common during the pandemic

Challenges experienced using DFS

Percentage of respondents who experienced attempted scams or fraud since COVID-19 began (n=792)

- Yes: 57%
- No: 43%

Mode of scams received (n=449)

- SMS: 70%
- Phone: 50%
- Social media: 0%
Challenges experienced using DFS

Mobile loan users exhibit concerning signs of stress

Percentage of mobile loan users who reported making sacrifices to repay mobile loan (n=430)

- Reduce non-food expenditure: 50%
- Reduce food expenditure: 40%
- Nonpayment of another debt: 30%
- Second loan to pay for first loan: 20%
- Nonpayment of school fees: 10%
- Sold personal/household assets: 5%
- Other: 0%

Mobile loan users who reported ever experiencing the inability to repay a mobile loan on time (n=430)

- Never experienced: 23%
- Yes, experienced: 77%
Financial loss: Where and how it occurs

Challenges experienced using DFS

Where money was lost
(n=297)

93% Mobile money
6% Mobile banking
2% Mobile loans

How money was lost
(n=297)

91% Sent to the wrong number

Very few respondents gave another cause for how money was lost

38% of respondents reported losing money on a DFS service in the past 90 days

By far the most common cause of lost money while using DFS is sending money to the wrong person while using mobile money. Addressing sender errors requires different interventions than when money is lost due to fees or fraud.
Financial losses are significant, more than a typical daily wage, though a majority (64%) of consumers who lost money reached a resolution they were satisfied with. Consumers do seem to be learning lessons, but a sizable minority continue to struggle.
Consumers often blame themselves for the largest challenges they experienced in DFS

When probed about any challenges ever faced, only 54% cited any incidence, and most cited similar issues to 2020.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Largest challenge ever experienced (n=425)</th>
<th>Person or entity consumer blamed for challenges experienced (n=407)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40% Incorrectly sent money</td>
<td>49% Myself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22% Denied access to a new loan</td>
<td>19% Mobile money provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11% Missing money</td>
<td>11% Mobile money agent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61 percent of respondents took some action to try to resolve their largest challenge.

*Note: Largest challenge question did not include phishing as an option.
Financial stress

• This survey took place several months into the COVID-19 pandemic.

• To understand the context of COVID-19 we asked a series of questions on financial well-being and financial stress.

• There is clear evidence of household financial stress and risks like loan default
Financial Stress

Financial stress during COVID-19

Few Kenyans have access to formal safety nets—and so rely on social networks and work

Respondents rate difficulty of coming up with emergency money (n=756)

- Not difficult: 16%
- Somewhat difficult: 41%
- Very difficult: 39%
- Impossible: 4%

KES 10,000 (~1/20th GNI) in 30 days

Source of emergency funding (n=743)

- Family, relatives, or friends: 30%
- Money from working: 20%
- Selling assets: 10%
- Borrowing from a bank or employer: 10%
- Savings: 5%
- Some other source: 5%
Many Kenyans don’t feel prepared for an emergency

Financial Stress

Sufficient emergency funds (n=793)

- Strongly agree: 5%
- Somewhat agree: 15%
- Somewhat disagree: 19%
- Strongly disagree: 61%

Enough money for living expenses (n=791)

- Strongly agree: 15%
- Somewhat agree: 27%
- Somewhat disagree: 21%
- Strongly disagree: 37%
Pandemic had a profound impact on income

Change in income since start of pandemic (n=788)

- Less income: 64%
- Same income: 26%
- More income: 10%

Actions taken to pay for food, healthcare, or other expenses during the pandemic (n=791)

- Deplete savings: 60%
- Borrow regardless of ability to repay: 50%
- Sell assets including livestock: 40%
- Skip required loan payment: 30%
- Other: 10%

7 percent relocated due to the pandemic
Financial Stress

Loan repayment has suffered during the pandemic

Loan repayment since start of pandemic (n=792)
- No difficulty repaying loans: 35%
- Plan to pay later: 12%
- Plan to pay part only: 36%
- Do not plan to repay: 1%

Anticipate not being able to make debt payments on time due to pandemic? (n=514)
- Yes: 75%
- No: 25%
Consumer choice and decision-making

DFS market is heavily concentrated with small set of providers in Kenya

- Over 95% of mobile money consumers have used M-Pesa in the past 90 days, less than 5% have ever used any other provider

- NCBA’s Fuliza and M-Shwari are the most utilized mobile loan products, and top 5 loan products account for large majority of all consumer borrowing activity
Consumer choice and decision-making

Price appears to be of limited importance for choosing providers of DFS:

• Network quality and provider reputation matter most for mobile money

• Link to existing bank account matters most for mobile banking provider choice; reputation is also important

• Speed of disbursement and ease of repayment matter most in mobile loans

Does integration of multiple products on platforms impact consumer switching and competition?

Are there policy solutions which could drive more robust competition in DFS in Kenya?
Consumer choice and decision-making

Mobile money

Reason for choosing mobile money provider (n=786)

- Better network quality/coverage: 45%
- Provider is reputable: 40%
- Others use this provider: 35%
- Family/friend recommendation: 25%
- Least expensive provider: 20%
- Only nearby provider: 15%
- First provider tried: 10%
- Use provider for phone services: 5%
- Some transactions now free: 0%
- Accessibility: 0%
- Only known provider: 0%
- Ease of use: 0%
- Banking services offered: 0%

Price a limited factor in choice
Consumer choice and decision-making

Mobile money

Uses for mobile money account (n=789)

- Receive money: 100%
- Send money to friends or family: 100%
- Buy airtime: 100%
- Pay bills/purchase items: 100%
- Save or keep money: 97%
- Make payments for business: 82%
- Receive payments for business: 69%
- Gambling: 44%
- Receive salary: 25%
Consumer choice and decision-making

Mobile money

Change in mobile money vs cash since pandemic started (n=782)

51% More mobile money use now
23% No change
25% More cash use now

Date of last mobile money transaction (n=780)
# Mobile banking

## Reasons for using mobile banking provider (n=146)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linked to my bank account/salary payment</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This provider is reputable/trustworthy</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface is easy to use</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least expensive provider my agent offers</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tried this provider first</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person am sending to or receiving from, uses provider</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessibility</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some transactions are now free</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Only provider my closest agent offers</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the only provider I know</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends or family use this provider</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Mobile banking security (n=146)

- **86%** Very secure
- **39%** Somewhat secure
- **15%** Not very secure
Consumer choice and decision-making

Mobile loans

Reasons for using mobile loan provider instead of traditional loan (n=217)

- Speed of loan disbursement
- East of repayment terms
- Only provider I am allowed to borrow from
- Price
- Provider is reputable/trustworthy
- Quality of services/customer services
- I tried this provider first
- Only provider I have account with
- Already using provider for other services
- Accessibility
- High loan limit
- This is the only provider I know
- Friend/family member uses services
- Network coverages
- Banking services
- Only provider my closest agent offers

Price a limited factor in choice.

Only 27% of mobile loan users report knowing fees charged by other mobile loan providers.
Consumer choice and decision-making

Mobile loans

Reasons for using mobile loans instead of traditional loan (n=217)

- Ease of access: 70%
- Speed of loan decision: 50%
- Less paperwork or identification requirements: 20%
- Confidentiality: 10%
- No collateral needed: 5%
- Lower interest rate/fees: 5%
- No bank account needed: 5%
Consumer choice and decision-making

Agents

**How agents are chosen (n=764)**

- Agent is respected or trustworthy: 82%
- I chose the one close by: 64%
- Agent has float: 24%
- She/he is a friend: 11%
- Only one close agent: 11%
- Friend or family recommended agent: 7%
- Only agent with my provider: 0%

**How agents are used (n=773)**

- Cash out: 82%
- Deposit: 64%
- Send money: 24%
- Pay bill: 11%
- Receive money: 11%
- Buy airtime: 7%
Agents

Consumers show a healthy amount of caution regarding their information compared to other perception questions on agents.

**Respondents’ perception of agents**

- **Act in your best interests** (n=767)
  - Completely: 35%
  - Mostly: 21%
  - Somewhat: 31%
  - Not at all: 13%

- **Not cheat or deceive you** (n=769)
  - Completely: 4%
  - Mostly: 8%
  - Somewhat: 23%
  - Not at all: 65%

- **Keep your information safe** (n=772)
  - Completely: 27%
  - Mostly: 16%
  - Somewhat: 33%
  - Not at all: 25%

2 percent of DFS users have shared a PIN number or other account details with an agent (n=773)

Respondents who experienced agents withdrawing cash for them without respondent being physically present (n=773)

- Yes: 9%
- No haven't experienced: 91%
Price awareness and transparency

- Unexpected or unclear charges ranked low amongst DFS challenges experienced
- Consumer knowledge of costs of two of the most popular services: M-Pesa and M-Shwari, showed signs of price awareness
- Most consumers identify costs through post-transaction receipt—not pre-transaction disclosure. This may be an area for improvements in pricing transparency.
Self-reported versus posted fees
Consumers perform well in price recall
Mobile Money (M-Pesa)

Marker size represents number of observations. Points lying on the orange lines represent correct responses. Only M-Pesa transfers and withdrawals and M-Shwari loans included. Other transaction types and providers either had few observations or variable pricing. Transfers assumed to be in-network, withdrawals assumed to be from agents (not ATMs), and loans assumed to be paid back on time, but not early (no early repayment discounts or rollover fees).

Mobile Loans (M-Shwari)

Note: Excludes 14% of respondents who reported not knowing transfer fee
Note: Excludes 7% of respondents who reported not knowing withdrawal fee
Note: Excludes 9% of respondents who reported not knowing M-Shwari fee
Young, better educated respondents know mobile money fees best

Percent reporting correct mobile money transaction fee by transaction type and respondent characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender (n=321)</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (n=321)</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education (n=321)</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poverty Probability (n=310)</th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>40%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>60%</th>
<th>70%</th>
<th>80%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geography (n=230)</th>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40% Percent of respondents reporting correct mobile loan fees (+/-5%) (n=174)

Note: Actual rate likely higher, as this analysis ignores the possibility of early repayment discounts or rollover fees. Small samples prevent segmentation analysis.
How do consumers learn about fees they are charged?

Transparency and Knowledge

The portion of mobile loan users who know of other loan providers’ fees beyond those of the provider from which they borrow (n=216) is 27%.

For mobile money fees (n=589):
- Receipt after transaction: 72%
- Notice on phone before transaction: 25%
- Sign at branch or agent: 3%

For mobile loan fees (n=162):
- Receipt after transaction: 69%
- Notice on phone before transaction: 31%
Complaints handling and redress

- Those who had experienced key DFS challenges were asked about any actions taken to address these challenges.
- Majority of consumers attempted to resolve their issue — although 39% took no action.
- Providers’ customer care hotlines are by far the most common channel used for redress by consumers.
- 48% of consumers who tried to resolve their issue were successful.
- Most consumers who did not resolve the issue did not change usage as a result.
How consumers use/don’t use formal redress channels

Number of consumers experiencing each challenge

- Incorrectly sent money: [Bar Chart]
- Denied loan: [Bar Chart]
- Missing money: [Bar Chart]
- Poor customer care: [Bar Chart]
- Couldn’t reach customer care: [Bar Chart]
- Loan ID theft: [Bar Chart]

Type of action in response to challenge, by number of consumers

- Contacted provider
- Contacted agent
- Contacted recipient
- Other response
- Took no action

- Incorrectly sent money
- Denied loan
- Missing money
- Poor customer care
- Couldn’t reach customer care
- Loan ID theft
When consumers took action, most issues were resolved

However, this varied significantly by channel used to present the challenge
1/3 of consumers whose problems were not resolved changed their usage of that service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumers’ behavior change as a result of problem resolution</th>
<th>Resolved problem (n=124)</th>
<th>Failed to resolve problem (n=83)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did not affect usage</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stopped using service</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced usage</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed providers</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When financial loss occurs, consumers are likely to use redress channels

Of respondents who experienced a problem involving a financial loss (n=297)

- 88% reported taking some action to try to resolve the issue
- 86% reported resolution took a day or less
- 81% Contacted provider via phone or SMS
- 77% of those who tried to resolve their issue were successful
- 25% reported having to spend additional money as part of the resolution process
Redress and complaints handling

• More educated and better off segments are more likely to report experiencing challenges. Further research is needed on why this discrepancy exists and if targeted outreach is needed to particular DFS user populations.

Scams and fraud

• Attempted scams are common—although consumers are aware and cautious. The strategies consumers use for avoiding scams could form the basis of consumer education campaigns for other consumers who may not be as aware or vigilant to protect themselves.

Transparency and consumer choice

• Consumers are generally price aware of the mobile money and digital credit products they use. However, pre-transaction disclosures could be made more salient.

• Price is not a leading factor in choice of providers, and borrowers generally do not know the prices of lenders they do not use. Interventions may be needed to improve consumer awareness of the range of choices in DFS to encourage comparison shopping and switching.
Policy takeaways from consumer survey

Digital credit

• Consumers may be borrowing from one lender to repay another, or taking on additional debt when already in a situation of debt stress.

• New monitoring tools could be developed to monitor the market for warning signs of overindebtedness in the digital credit market through indicators such as multiple borrowing, late and non-payment, and outcomes from borrowing. This could include a combination of consumer survey data like the questions asked here and administrative data from digital credit providers.

• Reducing information asymmetries through greater information sharing across digital credit providers could help improve consumer switching and reduce multiple borrowing and related non-payment of debts.
Thank you