

# ASAL Humanitarian Network MPCT New Beneficiaries Baseline Assessment

## Turkana County



January 2022

### Overview

The ASAL Humanitarian Network's (AHN) humanitarian assistance programme provides three rounds of multipurpose cash transfers (MPCTs) to vulnerable populations in drought-affected counties in Kenya. This assessment looks at a supplementary set of beneficiaries households in Turkana county added to the main lot of beneficiary households under the AHN's main programme. This response in Turkana county is primarily funded by Oxfam1 and consists of one implementing local partner non-governmental organisation (NGO): SAPCONE. The AHN will be distributing three rounds of MPCTs between December 2021 and March 2022, to selected beneficiary households across Turkana county in Kenya.

To monitor the ongoing impact of the MPCTs on the beneficiary population, IMPACT Initiatives provides impartial third-party monitoring and evaluation. IMPACT conducted a baseline assessment prior to the first round of transfers, which will be followed by a midline assessment after the first round, and an endline assessment after the second & last round of transfers. This factsheet presents **key findings from the baseline assessment in Turkana county**.

### Methodology

A total of 205 households received the first round of MPCT in December 2021 and January 2022. A census approach was taken for the baseline assessment, aiming to cover all beneficiary households in the week prior to the first receipt of the assistance. The midline and endline assessments will be conducted with a regionally representative sample of MPCT beneficiary households two weeks after the first and last disbursement. The population included beneficiaries in the Turkana county where the MPCT programme was implemented.

This baseline factsheet provides findings from **202 beneficiary households** who were surveyed through a structured household survey between the 24th of December 2021 and the 7th of January 2022.

### Challenges & Limitations:

- Baseline data collection was conducted simultaneously with the registration of beneficiaries, which increased the duration of the assessment.
- Daily data checking and coverage tracking was affected by poor internet connection in some areas, which made it difficult to follow-up with the enumerators engaged in the field.
- One of the partners had to redo the collection since there were discrepancies in the names collected against those registered in the list.
- Data on household expenditure was based on a 30-day recall period; a considerably long duration over which to expect households to remember expenditures accurately. This might have negatively impacted the accuracy of reporting on the expenditure indicators.

## Beneficiary Caseload Profile


### Livelihood Zone

% of households in each livelihood zone:



### Demographics

% of households by age and gender of the head of household:



Average household size: 8.0

Average age of the head of household: 35.6

### Locations Covered



**IMPACT** Shaping practices  
Influencing policies  
Impacting lives

# ASAL Humanitarian Network MPCT New Beneficiaries Baseline Assessment

Turkana County



January 2022

## Income & Expenditure



### Income Source

Most commonly reported primary sources of household income at the time of data collection:

- 1 34.2% Casual labour
- 2 23.0% Begging
- 3 9.4% Livestock
- 4 9.1% Firewood



### Expenditure Share

Most commonly reported expenditure categories and average amount spent (in KES) per category per household in the month prior to data collection:

Food (653)	84.5%
Debt repayment (81)	10.5%
Savings (20)	2.6%
Other expenses (10)	1.3%
WASH items (5)	0.6%
Medical expenses (3)	0.4%

Average reported total household expenditure over a month

774 KES

Average reported total household income over a month

924 KES



### Spending Decisions

% of households by reported primary spending decisions maker:

Joint decision-making	65.4%
Male	27.2%
Female	7.4%



### Spending Conflict

% of households reporting conflict or problems within the household as a result of disagreement on how to spend money during the 6 months prior to data collection:

Yes	0.0%
No	100.0%




## Key Impact Indicators

The key indicators include: Livelihood Coping Strategies Index (LCSI), Food Consumption Score (FCS), Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) and reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI).



### FCS<sup>5</sup>

% of households by FCS category:




Average number of meals consumed by household members per day:

0.9



### HDDS<sup>6</sup>

% of households by HDDS category:



Average HDDS per household: 1.1



### rCSI<sup>7</sup>

Most commonly reported strategies employed to cope with a lack of food or lack of money to buy food in the week prior to data collection, by average number of days these strategies had been employed:

Reduced the number of meals eaten per day	1.7
Relied on less preferred, less expensive food	1.3
Reduced portion size of meals	1.6
Borrowed food or relied on help from friends or relatives	1.5
Restricted adults' consumption so children can eat	1.5

Average rCSI score per household:

12.3


## Drought Effects



### Drought Impact

% of households reporting their community having been impacted by the drought in the 6 months prior to data collection:


Yes	98.5%
No	1.5%



### Crop Losses

Of households reporting having been impacted by the drought, % of households reporting facing any crop losses due to the drought:


Yes	96.0%
No	4.0%



### Conflict

Of households reporting having been impacted by the drought, % of households reporting conflicts in and between communities due to the drought:


Yes	86.9%
No	13.1%



### Rangeland Losses

Of households reporting having been impacted by the drought, % of households reporting facing any rangeland losses due to the drought:


Yes	96.5%
No	3.5%



## Protection Performance Indicators

% of households reporting themselves or someone in the community had been consulted by the NGO about their needs:

Yes **86.6%**  
No **13.4%**



% of households reporting believing that some households were unfairly selected:

Yes **0.0%**  
No **100.0%**



% of households reporting being aware of someone in the community being pressured or coerced to exchange non-monetary favours to get on the beneficiary list:

Yes **0.0%**  
No **100.0%**



% of households reporting having paid, or knowing someone who paid, to get on the beneficiary list:

Yes **0.5%**  
No **99.5%**



% of households reporting feeling that they have been treated with respect by NGO staff upto the time of data collection:

Yes **100.0%**  
No **0.0%**



% of households reporting being aware of the existence of options to contact the agency if you had a question or problem with the assistance:

NGO staff **88.6%**  
Hotline **65.8%**  
NGO desk **47.5%**  
SMS **5.9%**

% of households reporting feeling safe going through the programme's selection & registration processes:

Yes **100.0%**  
No **0.0%**



% of households by their preferred method of receiving assistance:

Mobile money **100.0%**



### Analysis, feedback, and potential issues to follow up on:

Findings suggest the vast majority of households might be experiencing food insecurity; nearly all households were found to have a poor FCS (95.0%) and a low HDDS (99.5%). In addition, food was found to constitute the primary expense, with 84.5% of the average household expenditure was spent on food.

Findings suggest households commonly rely on unsustainable livelihoods sources, with casual labour (34.2%), begging (23.0%) being the two most common sources of income.

Among those households who reported their community had been affected by the drought (98.5%), a majority (86.9%) also reported conflict in and between communities due to effects of the drought. These households also cited that the drought had led to crop losses (96.0%) and rangeland losses (96.5%)

Findings suggest most households were aware of existing options to contact the agency if they were to have any problems or challenges, with 88.6% of the households reporting being aware they could raise issues directly with NGO staff.

Most other key indicators also show positive results; virtually all households (99.5%) reported not having been asked to pay to get on the beneficiary list, and 100% of households reported having felt safe going through the selection process. Moreover, the majority of the households (86.6%) reported having been consulted by the NGO about their needs.

# ASAL Humanitarian Network MPCT New Beneficiaries Baseline Assessment

## Turkana County



January 2022

### End Notes

1. Oxfam's donors involved in the project are Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (SIDA), German Federal Foreign Office (GFFO), Irish Aid, and Danida. Oxfam's affiliates involved in the project are Oxfam Great Britain (OGB), Oxfam Hong Kong (OHK), Oxfam America (OUS), Oxfam IBIS (Denmark), and Oxfam Ireland.
2. The local partner NGO is Sustainable Approaches for Community Empowerment (SAPCONE).
3. For the baseline assessment, IMPACT aimed to conduct a census of all beneficiary households. The total amount of beneficiary households was 205. Eventually, 202 surveys were kept after data cleaning.
4. USD = 113.039 KES as on 19th January 2022.
5. The Food Consumption Score (FCS) is a measure of the food intake frequency, dietary diversity, and nutritional intake. It is calculated using the frequency of a household's consumption of different food groups during the 7 days prior to data collection weighted according to nutritional importance.
6. The Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS) is a measure of the number of unique food groups consumed by household members in the 24 hours prior to data collection.
7. The Reduced Coping Strategies Index (rCSI) is a measure of reliance on food consumption based negative coping strategies to cope with lack of food in the seven days prior to data collection.

### Annex 1: Comparative findings of key indicators\*

		Mandera	Turkana	Average
Food Consumption Score (FCS)	Poor	62.6%	95.0%	69.7%
	Borderline	20.4%	4.0%	16.8%
	Acceptable	17.0%	1.0%	13.5%
Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)	Low	87.2%	99.5%	89.9%
	Medium	12.7%	0.5%	10.0%
	High	0.1%	0.0%	0.1%
Average Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI)		21.5	12.3	19.5
Average household income in KES in the month prior to data collection		4095	924	3398
Average household total expenditure in KES in the month prior to data collection		5716	774	4630
Average proportion of total expenditure spent on food in the month prior to data collection		38.2%	84.4%	61.3%

\* Annex 1 represents comparative findings of key indicators from Mandera and Turkana counties. Findings vary considerably by county, which likely relates to the different livelihoods profiles and are thus presented on two different factsheet.

