

Research Terms of Reference

[Post distribution monitoring of the Kenya Cash Consortium Locally led Multi-Purpose Cash Response to crisis-affected communities in Kenya]

[KEN2302]

[KENYA]

[June 2023]

[Version 1]

IMPACT Shaping practices
Influencing policies
Impacting lives

1. Executive Summary

| | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|------------|---|
| Country of intervention | Kenya | | | | |
| Type of Emergency | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Natural disaster | <input type="checkbox"/> | Conflict | <input type="checkbox"/> Other (<i>specify</i>) |
| Type of Crisis | <input type="checkbox"/> | Sudden onset | <input type="checkbox"/> | Slow onset | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protracted |
| Mandating Body/ Agency | Government of Kenya, Kenya Cash Consortium (KCC) | | | | |
| IMPACT Project Code | 24FLH_QBT | | | | |
| Overall Research Timeframe (<i>from research design to final outputs / M&E</i>) | June to October 2023 | | | | |
| Research Timeframe <i>Add planned deadlines</i> Baseline | 1. Pilot/ training: 19/_06/_2023 | | 6. Preliminary presentation: Upon request | | |
| | 2. Start collect data: 20/_06/_2023 | | 7. Outputs sent for validation: _17/_07/2023 | | |
| | 3. Data collected: 23/_06/_2023 | | 8. Outputs published: _28/_07/2023 | | |
| | 4. Data analysed: 30/_06/_2023 | | 9. Final presentation: Upon request | | |
| | 5. Data sent for validation: 3/_07/_2023 | | | | |
| Endline | 1. Pilot/ training: 16/_10/_2023 | | 6. Preliminary presentation: Upon request | | |
| | 2. Start collect data: 17/_10/_2023 | | 7. Outputs sent for validation: _10/_11/2023 | | |
| | 3. Data collected: 20/_10/_2023 | | 8. Outputs published: _24/_11/2023 | | |
| | 4. Data analysed: 27/_10/_2023 | | 9. Final presentation: Upon request | | |
| | 5. Data sent for validation: 3/_07/_2023 | | | | |
| Number of assessments | <input type="checkbox"/> | Single assessment (one cycle) | | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Multi assessment (more than one cycle) <i>Two assessments, a baseline assessment prior to the first cash transfer and endline assessment after the last cash transfer</i> | | | |
| Humanitarian milestones <i>Specify what will the assessment inform and when</i> <i>e.g. The shelter cluster will use this data to draft its Revised Flash Appeal;</i> | Milestone | | Deadline | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Donor plan/strategy | 31/10/2023 | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Inter-cluster plan/strategy | _/_/_/____ | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Cluster plan/strategy | _/_/_/____ | | |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | NGO platform plan/strategy | 31/10/2023 | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Other (Specify): | _/_/_/____ | | |
| Audience type | | Dissemination | | | |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| Audience Type & Dissemination <i>Specify who will the assessment inform and how you will disseminate to inform the audience</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strategic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Programmatic <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Operational <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Product Mailing - Mailing list of the Kenya cash consortium members. <input type="checkbox"/> Cluster Mailing (Education, Shelter and WASH) and presentation of findings at next cluster meeting <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Presentation of findings at the Kenya cash consortium meetings) <input type="checkbox"/> Website Dissemination (Relief Web & REACH Resource Centre) <input type="checkbox"/> [Other, Specify] |
| Detailed dissemination plan required | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No |
| General Objective | To monitor the impact of the Kenya Cash Consortium Unconditional Cash Transfer (UCT) 2023 programme on the expenditure patterns and food security status of beneficiary households in Samburu, Marsabit, Turkana, Mandera and Wajir to inform the multipurpose cash-based humanitarian response in ASAL counties of Kenya. | |
| Specific Objective(s) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understand household expenditure patterns at the beginning of the UCT programme and how it changes over time or differs between targeted counties. 2. Understand household food and livelihood security status at the beginning of the UCT programme and how it changes overtime or differs between targeted counties. 3. Understand the impact of receiving cash on the household's well-being and interactions with society. 4. Understand household experience and satisfaction with participating in UCT programme at all stages of the project cycle 5. Understand awareness of complaint response mechanisms 6. Understand the degree to which ECHO protection-related key performance indicators (KPI) are met at all stages of the project cycle 7. Understand how all the above varies between the geographical areas assessed. | |
| Research Questions | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. How has different shocks affected households and their communities in the last six months? 2. What are the household's baseline expenditure patterns prior to receiving a UCT from the KCC, and how does this change after receiving multiple rounds of the UCT? <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What is the HH monthly income and what other resources are available to the HH? b. What are the household's main expenditures? c. What proportion of their total income do households spend on food related expenses? d. What proportion of their total income do households spend to meet other basic needs? 3. What is the household's baseline level of food and livelihood security and how does this change over time after receiving UCT from the KCC? 4. How was the cash transfer used by the HH and what was its impact (positive and negative) on social interactions within the household and in the community? 5. What are the household's experiences with protection issues and NGO accountability to beneficiary populations? Specifically in terms of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Awareness about the program details in the beneficiary population before it begins b. Satisfaction with the payment process, amount, and timeframe c. Frequency of payment delays d. Ability to receive and access UCT e. Knowledge of complaint mechanism and ability to engage with a said mechanism to directly provide feedback, comments or complaints f. Presence of community consultations by the partner NGO about the needs of the community? g. Safety perceptions of households during the selection and registration process. h. A fair selection process. i. Respectful treatment by the NGO staff. | |
| Geographic Coverage | Samburu, Marsabit, Turkana, Mandera and Wajir | |
| Secondary data sources | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Baseline, PDM and endline factsheets from Kenya Cash Consortium from 2019 to 2022. | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| | 2. ECHO Protection Key Performance Indicators list. ¹ | | | |
| Population(s) <i>Select all that apply</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | IDPs in camp | <input type="checkbox"/> | IDPs in informal sites |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | IDPs in host communities | <input type="checkbox"/> | IDPs [Other, Specify] |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees in camp | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees in informal sites |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees in host communities | <input type="checkbox"/> | Refugees [Other, Specify] |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Host communities | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other, Specify] |
| Stratification <i>Select type(s) and enter number of strata</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Geographical #:5 Population size per strata is known? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> | Group #: ___ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| | | | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other Specify] #: ___ Population size per strata is known? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No |
| Data collection tool(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Structured (Quantitative) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Semi-structured (Qualitative) |
| | Sampling method | | Data collection method | |
| Structured data collection tool # 1 <i>Select sampling and data collection method and specify target # interviews</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Purposive | <input type="checkbox"/> | Key informant interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Probability / Simple random | <input type="checkbox"/> | Group discussion (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Probability / Stratified simple random | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Household interview (Target #):1,697 ² |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Probability / Cluster sampling | <input type="checkbox"/> | Individual interview (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Probability / Stratified cluster sampling | <input type="checkbox"/> | Direct observations (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other, Specify] | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other, Specify] (Target #):_ _ _ _ _ |
| Target level of precision if probability sampling | 95 % level of confidence | | 5+/- % margin of error | |
| Data management platform(s) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | IMPACT | <input type="checkbox"/> | UNHCR |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other, Specify] | | |
| Expected output type(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> | Situation overview #: _ _ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Report #: _ _ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Profile #: _ _ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Profile #: _ _ |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Presentation (Preliminary findings) #: _ _ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Presentation (Final) #: _ _ |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Factsheet #:2 (Baseline and endline) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Factsheet #:2 (Baseline and endline) |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Interactive dashboard #: _ | <input type="checkbox"/> | Webmap #: _ _ |
| | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Map #: 2 in the factsheets | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Map #: 2 in the factsheets |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | [Other, Specify] #: _ _ | | |
| Access | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Public (available on IMPACT website and other humanitarian platforms) | | |
| | <input type="checkbox"/> | Restricted (bilateral dissemination only upon agreed dissemination list, no publication on IMPACT or other platforms) | | |
| Visibility <i>Specify which logos should be on outputs</i> | IMPACT | | | |
| | Donor: ECHO | | | |
| | Coordination Framework: ASAL Humanitarian Network | | | |
| | Partners: ACTED, CONCERN WORLDWIDE, OXFAM, Wajir South Development Association (WASDA), Arid Lands Development Focus (ALDEF), Pastoralist Community Initiative and Development Assistance (PACIDA), Strategies for Northern Development (SND), Nomadic Assistance for Peace and Development (NAPAD), Rural Agency for Community Development and Assistance (RACIDA) and Lotus Kenya Action for Development Organisation (LOKADO) | | | |

¹ [ECHO key protection indicator guidance](#)

² Detailed breakdown on table1 in page 5

2. Rationale

2.1 Background

Arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) cover 80% of Kenya's landmass. Following the march to May 2023 rainy season, the ASAL counties have begun recovering from the prolonged dry conditions and the consequences of the drought that resulted from the five consecutive failed rainy seasons. In May 2023, Mandera, Marsabit, Turkana and Samburu were classified to be in the recovery drought phase while Wajir was in Alert drought phase.³ All the targeted five counties experienced above the 5-year long term average rainfall. This is supporting the recharge of water sources, regeneration of pasture, crop growth and providing labor opportunities in weeding. However, the livestock body conditions, and productivity remain low.⁴ Therefore, the food security situation for HHs has likely not improved regardless of the rainfall received. In general, about 5.4 million people were projected to be facing high levels of food consumption gaps between March and June 2023 during the February 2023 Integrated phase classification Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC AFI phase 3 or above). Additionally, four of the targeted counties (Mandera, Marsabit, Turkana and Wajir were projected to slip to IPC AFI phase 4.)

2.2 Intended impact

Based on the rationale above, the KCC will implement an emergency multi-sector response through mobile money unconditional cash transfers (UCTs). All targeted households will receive a total of three cash transfers. The planned cash assistance will reach 9,231 households, and 55,133 individuals (the number of individual beneficiaries being calculated based on the average size of households per county as per GoK census data 2019). The proposed action will address economic root causes identified as a barrier to food security, nutrition, health and protection outcomes. The immediate outcome of the program is expected to be increased food consumption and dietary diversity, decreased usage of livelihood coping strategies, and improved income/ expenditure patterns for the beneficiary households.

In order to monitor the ongoing impact of the UCTs at the household level, IMPACT Initiatives will conduct a baseline survey before they receive any UCT. IMPACT Initiatives will conduct an endline survey one month after the last cash transfer. The baseline and endline surveys will be conducted remotely through phone interviews. The overall aim of this research is to understand the outcome of UCT to drought-affected households in Samburu, Mandera, Marsabit, Turkana and Wajir counties.

3. Methodology

3.1 Methodology overview

The baseline and endline surveys will be conducted through household surveys targeting beneficiaries of the Kenya Cash Consortium UCT programme. Through this survey, households will be asked about their overall food security situation, as well as their perceptions of whether humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable and participatory manner. The data will be collected through phone interviews. A stratified simple random sampling approach will be used to have data that is representative of the beneficiary population (households), with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error per county. A 10% buffer will be included in the sample to account for non-response or data quality issues. A total of 1,697 surveys will be conducted. The baseline assessment will be conducted in June 2023, and the endline in October 2023.

3.2 Population of interest

The geographical area assessed consists of Samburu, Mandera, Marsabit, Turkana and Wajir counties. The unit of measurement for the assessment is the household. While the primary disaggregation of the data will be on the county level, the following information will be collected on household demographics to allow a disaggregated analysis according to the demographic characteristics of the population assessed. This includes location i.e. county, sub-county, village/settlement), size of the households, and age & gender of the respondent, and head of household (if different). This disaggregated analysis will be indicative rather than representative as the sample has only been stratified at county level.

³ [NDMA drought bulletin, May 2023](#)

⁴ [FEWSNET, Kenya Food Security Outlook Update, April 2023: 2023 Long rains expected to drive gradual improvements in food security, 2023.](#)

3.3 Secondary data review

1. Baseline, PDM and endline factsheets from Kenya Cash Consortium from 2019 to 2022-will be used to inform the assessment methodology and questionnaire design. Information will be integrated from the 2019, 2020, and 2021 assessment cycles of the Somali Cash Consortium third-party monitoring done by IMPACT.
2. ECHO Protection Key Performance Indicators list.⁵- Will be used for tool development.

3.4 Primary Data Collection

The baseline assessment will be conducted in June 2023, and the endline in October 2023. A stratified simple random sampling approach will be used to have data that is representative of beneficiary population (households) in Samburu, Mandera, Marsabit, Turkana and Wajir counties, with a 95% confidence level and a 5% margin of error. A 10% buffer will be included in the sample to account for non-response or data quality issues. In addition, an additional buffer list of respondents will be generated, so in cases of non-response, the next respondent in the list will be sampled. In case the target sample size has not been met, the team will re-run the sample using only those that were not already contacted, to fulfil the sample. There will be different groups of respondents for each survey, as response rates are expected to be too low to make a longitudinal study possible. To ensure random selection of respondents, IMPACT will generate random numbers on the list of beneficiaries that will be provided by the partners and then sort the random numbers from smallest to largest to select the required number of respondents. The interview will be conducted with the person registered as a beneficiary in each household. All non-responses will be monitored in a tracker. The baseline and endline surveys will be conducted through household surveys targeting beneficiaries of the Kenya Cash Consortium UCT programme. Through this survey, households will be asked about their overall food security situation, as well as their perceptions of whether humanitarian assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable and participatory manner. The data will be collected through phone interviews. A breakdown of the sample size per county is shown in table 1 below.

Table 1.

| County | Number of beneficiaries | Sample size (baseline and endline) | Sample size +10% buffer |
|----------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|
| Samburu | 650 | 242 | 266 |
| Mandera | 1,852 | 318 | 350 |
| Marsabit | 2,486 | 333 | 366 |
| Turkana | 2,003 | 322 | 354 |
| Wajir | 2,240 | 328 | 361 |
| Total | 9,231 | 1,543 | 1,697 |

3.5 Data Processing & Analysis

The assessment will comprise a household survey designed in partnership with the Kenya Cash Consortium partners. The tool will be designed and coded using kobo and all data will be collected via smart phone using Open Data Kit (ODK collect). Collected data will be subjected to daily checks to identify any issues with data quality and divergence from the sample frame, in line with IMPACT's [Data Cleaning Minimum Standards Checklist](#).⁶ In addition to the daily data checks, the final datasets will undergo a thorough cleaning, with any outstanding issues reported to the field staff for feedback. Following data cleaning, the data will be analyzed using R. For the open-ended questions, a thematic analysis approach will be for analysis. For food consumption score and coping strategy index, the guidelines provided by World Food Programme (WFP) from pages 63 to 80⁷ will be used. We will compile factsheets from the analyzed data and there after publishing the reports on IMPACT resource centre and share the outputs with the Kenya Cash Consortium.

3. Roles and responsibilities

Table 2: Description of roles and responsibilities

⁵ [ECHO key protection indicator guidance](#)

⁶ [IMPACT data cleaning minimum standard checklist](#)

⁷ [WFP Food security guidance](#)

| Task Description | Responsible | Accountable | Consulted | Informed |
|--------------------------------------|--|---------------------------|---|---|
| Research design | Senior Assessment Officer | Research Manager | IMPACT HQ Research Design and Data Unit (RDDU), consortium members, Research Manager | HQ, Consortium Members, county coordinator |
| Supervising data collection | Senior field officer | Database Officer | IMPACT HQ RDDU, Consortium members, Research Manager, Assessment officer | HQ, Consortium Members, county coordinator |
| Data processing (checking, cleaning) | Database Officer | Database Officer | IMPACT HQ RDDU, consortium members, Research Manager, Senior Assessment officer | HQ, Consortium Members, county coordinator |
| Data analysis | Database Officer | Database Officer | IMPACT HQ RDDU, Senior Assessment officer consortium members, Research Manager, | HQ, Consortium Members, county coordinator |
| Output production | Senior Assessment Officer, GIS officer | Senior Assessment Officer | IMPACT HQ Research Reporting Unit (RRU), consortium members, Research Manager | HQ, Consortium Members, county coordinator |
| Dissemination | Senior Assessment Officer | Senior Assessment Officer | Consortium members, Research Manager, | HQ, Consortium Members, county coordinator, |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|--|
| | | | IMPACT HQ Communications Officer | HQ Communications Officer |
| Monitoring & Evaluation | Senior Assessment Officer | Senior Assessment Officer | IMPACT HQ Research Department, consortium members, Research Manager | HQ, Consortium Members, county coordinator |
| Lessons learned | Senior Assessment Officer | Senior Assessment Officer | IMPACT HQ Research Department, consortium members, Research Manager | HQ, Consortium Members, county coordinator |

Responsible: the person(s) who executes the task

Accountable: the person who validates the completion of the task and is accountable of the final output or milestone

Consulted: the person(s) who must be consulted when the task is implemented

Informed: the person(s) who need to be informed when the task is completed

NB: Only one person can be Accountable; the only scenario when the same person is listed twice for a task is when the same person is both Responsible and Accountable.

4. Key ethical considerations and related risks

The proposed research design meets / does not meet the following criteria:

| The proposed research design... | Yes/ No | Details if no (including mitigation) |
|---|---------|--------------------------------------|
| ... Has been coordinated with relevant stakeholders to avoid unnecessary duplication of data collection efforts? | Yes | |
| ... Respects respondents, their rights and dignity (specifically by: seeking informed consent, designing length of survey/ discussion while being considerate of participants' time, ensuring accurate reporting of information provided)? | Yes | |
| ... Does not expose data collectors to any risks as a direct result of participation in data collection? | Yes | |
| ... Does not expose respondents / their communities to any risks as a direct result of participation in data collection? | Yes | |
| ... Does not involve collecting information on specific topics which may be stressful and/ or re-traumatising for research participants (both respondents and data collectors)? | Yes | |

| | | |
|--|-----|---|
| ... Does not involve data collection with minors i.e. anyone less than 18 years old? | Yes | |
| ... Does not involve data collection with other vulnerable groups e.g. persons with disabilities, victims/ survivors of protection incidents, etc.? | | Given that we do not know the profile of participants beforehand; we will not be able to ascertain whether they belong to vulnerable groups. Enumerators will receive training on ensuring questions are asked in a non-intrusive, sensitive manner to mitigate any unintended harm. Additionally, respondents always have the option to not answer any question (prefer not to answer) or withdraw consent for the interview at any stage. |
| ... Follows IMPACT SOPs for management of personally identifiable information ? | Yes | |

5. Data Analysis Plan

ATTACHED SEPARATELY

6. Data management Plan

Available upon request

7. Monitoring & Evaluation Plan

•

| IMPACT Objective | External M&E Indicator | Internal M&E Indicator | Focal point | Tool | Will indicator be tracked? |
|--|---|--|-----------------------|---------------|--|
| Humanitarian stakeholders are accessing IMPACT products | Number of humanitarian organisations accessing IMPACT services/products Number of individuals accessing IMPACT services/products | # of downloads of x product from Resource Center | Country request to HQ | User_log | x Yes |
| | | # of downloads of x product from Relief Web | Country request to HQ | | x Yes |
| | | # of downloads of x product from Country level platforms | Country team | | x Yes |
| | | # of page clicks on x product from REACH global newsletter | Country request to HQ | | x Yes |
| | | # of page clicks on x product from country newsletter, sendingBlue, bit.ly | Country team | | X Yes |
| | | # of visits to x webmap/x dashboard | Country request to HQ | | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes |
| IMPACT activities contribute to better program implementation and coordination of the humanitarian response | Number of humanitarian organisations utilizing IMPACT services/products | # references in HPC documents (HNO, SRP, Flash appeals, Cluster/sector strategies) | Country team | Reference_log | Partners asked whether this assessment was used in their programming through survey monkey, if one is conducted in the future. |
| | | # references in single agency documents | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--|--|---|--------------|---|--|
| Humanitarian stakeholders are using IMPACT products | Humanitarian actors use IMPACT evidence/products as a basis for decision making, aid planning and delivery Number of humanitarian documents (HNO, HRP, cluster/agency strategic plans, etc.) directly informed by IMPACT products | Perceived relevance of IMPACT country-programs | Country team | Usage_Feed back and Usage_Survey template | Decisions made and implemented based on of the assessment – to bare e checked with operational and donor partners to ask what actions they took based on the findings and recommendations. This assessment may also be included in a usage survey of partners if one is conducted in the future. Partners asked whether this assessment was used in their programming through survey monkey, if one is conducted in the future. Decisions made and implemented based on of the assessment – to bare e checked with operational and donor partners to ask what actions they took based on the findings and recommendations. This assessment may also be included in a usage survey of partners if one is conducted in the future. |
| | | Perceived usefulness and influence of IMPACT outputs | | | |
| | | Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs | | | |
| | | Perceived capacity of IMPACT staff | | | |
| | | Perceived quality of outputs/programs | | | |
| | | Recommendations to strengthen IMPACT programs | | | |
| Humanitarian stakeholders are engaged in IMPACT programs | Number and/or percentage of humanitarian organizations directly contributing to IMPACT programs (<i>providing</i> | # of organisations providing resources (i.e.staff, vehicles, meeting space, budget, etc.) for activity implementation | Country team | Engagement_log | x Yes |
| | # of organisations/clusters inputting in research design and joint analysis | x Yes | | | |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|-------|
| throughout the research cycle | <i>resources, participating to presentations, etc.)</i> | # of organisations/clusters attending briefings on findings; | | | x Yes |
|--------------------------------------|---|--|--|--|-------|

ANNEX 1: METHODOLOGY NOTES (IF RELEVANT)

ANNEX 2: [OTHER SPECIFY]