

Understanding the Socioeconomic Conditions of Refugees in Kenya

Volume A: Kalobeyei Settlement

Results from the 2018 Kalobeyei Socioeconomic Survey

2019



Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Au

Public Disclosure Authorized

Public Disclosure Authorized

Understanding the Socioeconomic Conditions of Refugees in Kenya

Volume A: Kalobeyei Settlement

Results from the 2018 Kalobeyei
Socioeconomic Survey

Cover photos by Laura Abril Ríos Rivera, World Bank.



Table of Contents

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	vi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	vii
FOREWORDS	viii
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	x
BACKGROUND	1
1. Data Needs for Displaced Populations	1
2. Refugees in Kenya	2
RESULTS	6
1. Demographic Profile	6
1.1 Age structure	6
1.2 Country of origin, gender, and disability	8
2. Access to Basic Services	9
2.1 Housing	10
2.2 Sanitation and water	10
2.3 Lighting	12
2.4 Education	12
3. Employment and Livelihoods	16
3.1 Livelihood assets	20
3.2 Food security and coping strategies	21
4. Social Cohesion and Security Perception	23
5. Consumption and Poverty	24
5.1 Monetary poverty	24
5.2 Multidimensional poverty	29
5.3 Understanding refugee women’s socioeconomic limitations	31
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	33
REFERENCES	36
APPENDICES	39
1. Map of Turkana West in Kenya	39
2. Map of Kakuma Refugee Camp and Kalobeyei Refugee Settlement	40
3. Identification Documents	41
4. Determinants of Welfare	42
5. Detailed Overview of the Methodology	43

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Determinants of welfare, preliminary regression analysis results	42
Table 2: Kalobeyei questionnaires for basic and extended surveys	44
Table 3: The VRX and SES interview types.	45
Table 4: Robustness check of consumption item removal: poverty headcount rates comparison. . .	47
Table 5: Consumption shares of items in the optional module groups.	48
Table 6: Weights used for multidimensional poverty index	48

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Demographic profile of Kalobeyei refugees versus Kenyan nationals	7
Figure 2: Dependency ratio for Kalobeyei compared to Kenya and country of origin averages	7
Figure 3: Population distribution in Kalobeyei by country of origin and residence	8
Figure 4: Distribution of women-headed households by residence and country of origin	9
Figure 5: Distribution of households by floor, roof, walls materials, and type of housing	11
Figure 6: Distribution of households by number of habitable rooms and density	11
Figure 7: Distribution of households by improved sanitation and drinking water source	12
Figure 8: Distribution of households by source of lighting	13
Figure 9: Distribution of population ever attending school, age four and above	13
Figure 10: Net and gross attendance rates, primary school	14
Figure 11: Net and gross attendance rates, secondary school	14
Figure 12: Population aged 15 and above, not attending school by educational level.	15
Figure 13: Population aged 15 and above who currently attend school by educational level and sex	15
Figure 14: Population distribution, by ability to read and write in any language	16
Figure 15: Population distribution in Kalobeyei, by ability to read and write in official languages.	16
Figure 16: Labor force participation methodology (UN/ILO)	17
Figure 17: Working-age population.	18
Figure 18: Labor force status	18
Figure 19: Reason for not looking for work among potential labor force, by sex.	19
Figure 20: Main reasons for having been absent from work.	19
Figure 21: Type of work in last seven days, among employed	20
Figure 22: Main employer for the primary activity (excluding volunteer)	21
Figure 23: Family networks and access to financial services, by sex of household head	22
Figure 24: Livelihood coping strategies for food security.	23
Figure 25: Perception of trust, safety, and participation	24
Figure 26: Relations with the host community, by frequency of interaction.	24
Figure 27: Poverty headcount, international poverty line	25
Figure 28: Poverty gap and severity, international poverty line.	26
Figure 29: Poverty by household size, international poverty line	26

Figure 30: Poverty by whether children reside in the household, international poverty line. 27

Figure 31: Poverty by sex of the household head, international poverty line 27

Figure 32: Poverty by education of the head, international poverty line 28

Figure 33: Poverty by origin of the head, international poverty line. 28

Figure 34: Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) 29

Figure 35: Monetary poverty 29

Figure 36: Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), by gender and origin of head 30

Figure 37: Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), by education of head and household size 30

Figure 38: Factors limiting refugee women socioeconomic potential 32

Figure 39: Illustration of VRX and long and short SES coverage in the settlement. 44

Figure 40: Allocation of consumption item questions using the RCM 46

Figure 41: Imputation of total consumption using the RCM 47



List of Abbreviations

DRA	Department of Refugee Affairs
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
GCR	Global Compact on Refugees
KCHS	Kenya Continuous Household Survey
KIHBS	Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey
KISED	Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan in Turkana West
MPI	Multidimensional Poverty Index
OLF	Outside the Labor Force
proGres	Profile Global Registration System (UNHCR)
RCM	Rapid Consumption Methodology
RSD	Refugee Status Determination
SES	Socioeconomic Survey
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
VRX	proGres Registration Verification Exercise
WEE	Women Economic Empowerment



Acknowledgments

This report was prepared by a team led by Jed Fix (UNHCR) and Utz Pape (World Bank). The team consisted of Felix Appler (World Bank), Theresa Beltramo (UNHCR), Florence Nimoh (UNHCR), Laura Abril Ríos Rivera (World Bank), and Felix Schmieding (UNHCR), with additional contributions received from Nduati Kariuki (World Bank). The team is grateful to refugees without whose participation, insights, and contributions this work would not be possible.

The team would like to thank the outstanding efforts of the enumerators and supervisors who collected the data, including Sabina Achola Joseph, Said Aden Said, Top Ruot Paul, Glama Gutu Jirmo, Feysal Abdi Abdirahman, Abraham Ntomba, Moawenimana Celestin, Ahadi Matabaro Emmanuel, Natalena Totoi Charles, Innocent Ndahiriwe, Hussein Abdalla Suliman, Abdalazeem Abdallah Ibrahim, Manyok Madit Ajoh, Treize Miderho David, Moses Lujang, Samson Mawa Ebere, Abdikani Waadi Ali, Keyse Abdi Dahir, Mohamed Abdirizak Farah, Isaac Puoth Samuel Gai, Abdullahi Mohamed Hussein, Anthony Gai Ogida, Daniel Ongejuk Tome, Orach David Obwoya, William Opio Ogwaro, Odong Paul Clement, Joshua Tom Lado, Nyanuer Gony Peter, Evaline Lamwaka Dominic Ochira, Pasquina Abalo Dominic Ochira, Abubarkar Rugumba Kaura, Mukesh Karn, Isaac Puoth Samuel Gai, Daud Ibrahim Warsame, Ali Mohamed Abdi, Akec Jacob Dhol, Chol Deng Arok, Osman Mani Ali, Mohamed Mohamed Bille, Ntumba Tshilombo Innocent, Elie Mlgisha Bafuliru Elie, Fikiri Kikombe Bienfait, Ochele Luka Karasin, Israel Jacob Talaja, Bolis Gassim, Dak Simon Riek, Ebengo Honore Alfani, Ochan Riek Jack, Jamila Mohamud Hashi, Muna Muhammad Bilal, Roselyn Aminah Khandaka, Sulekha Awoi Farah, Namuya Lawrence Lorot, Emmanuel Losiru, Stephen Esibitar Etorite, and Hilary Kiprop Kimaiyo.

The team would like to thank the peer reviewers Tara Vishwanath (World Bank) and Anna Lisa Schmidt (World Bank) for their helpful comments, as well as Patrice Ahouansou (UNHCR), Mukesh Karn (UNHCR), Seda Kuzucu (UNHCR), Eva Lescrauwaet (World Bank), Loise Nkonge (UNHCR), and Ivana Unluova (UNHCR) for support on the ground and feedback on the report.


The team would like to thank the UNHCR Kakuma Sub-Office management team Mohamed Shoman, Ignazio Matteini, Seda Kuzuku, Jennifer Chuwa, Elodie Lamal, and Tayyar Sukru Cansizoglu for their vision and commitment to this work, as well as Pierella Paci and Allen Dennis from the World Bank. The team would also like to express its gratitude to UNHCR Kenya Representatives Raouf Mazou and Fathiaa Abdalla, UNHCR's Director of Division of Resilience and Solutions Ewen Macleod, UNHCR's Division of Resilience Chief of Section for Partnerships Analytics Research and Knowledge Section Betsy Lippman, the World Bank Country Director C. Felipe Jaramillo, and World Bank Manager for the Fragility, Conflict and Violence Group, Xavier Devictor, as well as the Government of Kenya, its Refugee Affairs Secretariat, and the Turkana County Government.

This initiative received financial support from UNHCR and the World Bank Fragility, Conflict and Violence Unit, as well as the Dutch Partnership Fund.

This work is part of the program “Building the Evidence on Protracted Forced Displacement: A Multi-Stakeholder Partnership.” The program is funded by UK aid from the United Kingdom's Department for International Development (DFID). It is managed by the World Bank Group (WBG) and was established in partnership with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The scope of the program is to expand the global knowledge on forced displacement by funding quality research and disseminating results for the use of practitioners and policy makers. This work does not necessarily reflect the views of DFID, the WBG, or UNHCR.

This work is part of the Prospects partnership program funded through the Multi Donor Trust Fund for Forced Displacement (FDTF) administered by the World Bank.

This work was supported by the State and Peacebuilding Fund. The State and Peacebuilding Fund (SPF) is a global fund administered by the World Bank to finance critical development operations and analysis in situations of fragility, conflict, and violence. The SPF is kindly supported by: Australia, Denmark, France, Germany, The Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, The United Kingdom, as well as IBRD.



Forewords

Today, more people than ever are forcibly displaced due to conflict, violence, and environmental hazards. Fragility, conflict, and violence (FCV) has become a development barrier that predominantly affects the most vulnerable people, threatening their livelihoods and economic growth opportunities. In fact, by 2030, at least half of the world's poor will be living in fragile and conflict-affected settings and most of them in Africa. With violent conflicts rising at an unprecedented rate, the impact of violence and conflict has worsened, creating the largest forced displacement crisis since World War II. We need adequate data on displaced and host communities to better understand their characteristics and dynamics, which is fundamental to inform the design and implementation of targeted interventions. However, notably in Sub-Saharan Africa, multidimensional data gaps prevent an assessment of socioeconomic conditions among the displaced and host populations.

Kenya is exemplary of the challenges and opportunities at the heart of these dynamics. The current refugee and asylum seeker population in Kenya exceeds 490,000 people, engendering multilayered impacts on host communities. In Turkana, the poorest county in the country, the refugee population makes up a significant share of the local economy and the population (an estimated 40 percent). The Kalobeyei settlement in Turkana West was established in 2015 as an alternative to a camp setting, based on principles of refugee self-reliance, integrated delivery of services, and greater support for livelihood opportunities through evidence-based interventions.

Aligned with the Global Compact on Refugees, the Kalobeyei Integrated Socioeconomic Development Plan (KISED) recognizes the need for collecting and using socioeconomic

data on refugees and hosts for targeted programming. The UNHCR-World Bank 2018 Kalobeyei Socioeconomic Survey (SES) addresses this need by introducing an innovative approach which allows generating welfare data that are representative of the Kalobeyei settlement's population and comparable to the Turkana County and national residents.

This report provides a comprehensive snapshot of demographic characteristics, standards of living, social cohesion, and specific vulnerabilities. Moreover, the analysis provides several recommendations. First, building and maintaining human capital in the refugee population—especially among girls and women—needs to be prioritized. Second, promoting self-reliant agricultural interventions can help improve food security. Third, increasing work opportunities for the refugee population can help lift aid dependence and improve livelihoods. Fourth, joint programs for refugees and host populations can further improve social cohesion.

This report is part of a global collaboration between the World Bank and the UNHCR, as well as the World Bank-UNHCR Joint Data Center, and constitutes a milestone for future work on displacement in East Africa and beyond. Data collection exercises, such as the one presented in this report, are invaluable in providing evidence to design development policies to address socioeconomic vulnerabilities, potentially unlocking economic self-reliance and boosting synergies with the development of host communities.

Xavier Devictor
Manager
Fragility, Conflict, and Violence
World Bank

The scale, complexity, and speed of forced displacement today means that we can no longer afford to respond through humanitarian action alone. In recognition of this, the Global Compact on Refugees (GCR), endorsed by the United Nations General Assembly in December 2018, establishes a framework for more predictable and equitable planning and management of refugee situations, in line with the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

Evidence and data are central to the GCR's bid to achieve lasting social and economic progress for the displaced persons of the world and the communities that host them, and key to linking the approaches of humanitarian and development actors, with their complementary know-how and resources. Socioeconomic data, in particular, is used to design effective assistance programs, while comparative statistics help to understand displacement within the context of the host community, and vice-versa.

Kenya is exemplary of the opportunities at the heart of this dynamic. Since 1992, it has been a generous host of refugees and asylum seekers, with over 490,000, mainly from South Sudan and Somalia, living in the country today. The majority resides in the Dadaab camp, located in Garissa County, and the Kakuma camp and Kalobeyei settlement, located in Turkana County. Despite the limited economic

infrastructure, the camps stand out for their vibrant economies and the entrepreneurial spirit of their dwellers.

The Kakuma refugee camp and Kalobeyei settlement, in particular, have expanded significantly, with an estimated 67 percent of the current refugee population having arrived there in the past five years. Evidence shows that refugee populations bring with them substantial skills and expertise that benefit economies in host countries. The World Bank and UNHCR report *"Yes" in My Backyard* (2016) provides analysis of the impact of refugees, demonstrating the positive overall effect on economic growth that their presence has had in the area.

The Kalobeyei Socioeconomic Survey builds on these insights by providing estimates for poverty and other socioeconomic indicators for refugees. In doing so, it fills an important data gap. It also contributes to the realization of the Kalobeyei Integrated Social and Economic Development Plan (KISEDPP), which focuses on the economic development of the settlement, enabling refugees and host communities to pursue more opportunities together.

Ms. Fathiaa Abdalla
UNHCR Representative in Kenya
United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees



Executive Summary

The Global Compact on Refugees represents a new approach to managing forced displacement situations, one in which evidence and data are central to its success and key to link humanitarian and development actions.

Kenya is exemplary of the challenges and opportunities of this new approach. Since 1992, it has been a generous host of refugees and asylum seekers, a population which today exceeds 490,000 people, engendering both positive and negative impacts on local Kenyans. The Kalobeyi Settlement, located in Turkana County along the northwestern border of Kenya, was established in 2015 as an alternative to a camp setting, based on principles of refugee self-reliance, integrated delivery of services to refugees and host community members, and greater support for livelihood opportunities through evidence-based interventions.

In Kenya, refugees are not systematically included in national surveys and, as a result, there is a lack of data on refugee poverty measures that is comparable to the national population. While the humanitarian-development approach used in Kalobeyi emphasizes the interconnectivity of refugees and host communities, the existing data sources do not lend themselves to easy comparison. The Kalobeyi Socioeconomic Survey (SES) helps close data gaps by using micro-level data to understand the living conditions of refugees and ultimately inform policy and targeted programming. The SES employed a novel approach to addressing this need by generating data that are statistically representative of the settlement's population in 2018 and comparable to the Kenyan national survey measuring poverty from 2015/16.

This survey provides one of the first comparable poverty profiles for refugees and host community members, enhancing the evidence base for informing targeted policies and programs. Taking place within a UNHCR registration verification exercise, the SES included a range of standard socioeconomic indicators, including consumption-based poverty, aligning with the national 2015/16 Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS) and Kenya

Continuous Household Survey (KCHS). Initiated jointly by UNHCR and the World Bank, the SES was designed to support the settlement's development framework, as well as the wider global vision laid out by the Global Compact on Refugees and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In doing so, it provides lessons for how this important information may be collected in other settings, in line with the vision of the World Bank-UNHCR Joint Data Center (JDC).

When compared to national averages, the results of the SES show that residents of Turkana County—both hosts and refugees—are among the worse off in Kenya in terms of poverty and associated socioeconomic indicators. More than 6 in 10 refugees (65 percent) are poor—as measured by the international poverty line for extreme poverty of US\$1.90 (2011 PPP) per capita per day. This is higher than the national rate (37 percent) and comparable to what is found in the 15 poorest counties in the country (59 percent on average) but lower than Turkana County (72 percent overall, including 85 percent in rural areas and 51 percent in urban areas). Using a modified version of the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), used by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) in its *Human Development Report*, shows that one-third of refugees (33 percent) are found to be 'deprived' or 'severely deprived' in respect to education, health, and living standards. Of the remaining, 41 percent are 'vulnerable to deprivation', while 26 percent are 'non-deprived'. Comparable data for nationals are not available.

Demographic profile. In terms of their demographic profile, refugees in Kalobeyi are younger than the Kenyan population, with virtually no elders (65 years of age and older)—resulting in a high dependency ratio and subsequent increased need for basic services for children and youth. To contribute positively to future economic prospects, children and youth require investment in human capital, in terms of health and education. Additionally, in Kalobeyi, refugee children face special risks which require targeted support—particularly the over 300 unaccompanied minors and more than 1,600 separated children. The large share of young

people to working-age adults—many of whom are single mothers—means that households may not be able to finance investments in health and education themselves, raising the need for continued public investment to preserve human capital and ensure a productive future.

Access to basic services. Access to basic services varies across population groups. The connection between the delivery of basic services and development outcomes, including living standards, health status, and economic output, is well documented. Refugees in Kalobeyei report higher levels of access to improved sanitation than in Turkana County. However, sharing facilities is a common practice. Likewise, refugees in Kalobeyei report higher access to improved drinking water than nationals—although most still describe regular shortages. Conversely, almost no refugee households have access to electricity from the main grid or a generator. In comparison, 12 percent of households in Turkana County have access to electricity/generator, while nationally 42 percent are connected to the main grid/generator.

Education. Primary school attendance was found to be 77 percent for children ages 6–13 years. In comparison, enrollment is over 80 percent nationally, but only 48 percent in Turkana County. However, low levels of secondary school attendance are observed, consistent with the lack of available schooling options for refugee youth. Among refugees, secondary school attendance for youth aged 14–17 years is 5 percent, versus 38 percent nationally and 9 percent in Turkana County. When considering overall education levels, most refugees report having attended school at some point in their lives (80 percent)—yet gender gaps are large: compared to 90 percent of men, only 71 percent of women have attended school.

Literacy rates. Literacy rates for refugees fall between the national and Turkana County averages—and vary significantly by gender. While over 60 percent of all refugees above age 15 report being able to read or write in at least one language, only 44 percent of women in this group are able to do so versus over 80 percent of men. More than half of refugees (55 percent) speak one of Kenya’s two official languages—English (49 percent) or Swahili (29 percent). Nationally, 84 percent of Kenyans age 15 and older are literate in at least one language versus 40 percent of those in Turkana County (the distinction is not made to the level of English/Swahili).

Economic activity. Rates of economic activity are low, in part due to the young age of the population. In Kalobeyei, the large proportion of children and young people means that only 39 percent of the population is of working age (15–64 years). Comparatively, 55 percent of the total population of Kenya falls in this age range, as well as 46 percent of Turkana County. Even among those of working age, labor force participation rates are low. In Kalobeyei, 39 percent of the working-age population are classified as employed, while the majority (59 percent) are outside the labor force (OLF), a classification which includes caring for household members and students. The remaining 2 percent—those who are available and looking for work—are considered as unemployed. In comparison, 71 percent of Kenyans on the whole have an occupation, 26 percent are OLF, and 2 percent are unemployed.

Food security. Refugee households experience varying degrees of food insecurity. The World Food Program Livelihoods Coping Strategy Index is used to understand longer-term coping capacities of households, the presence of food shortages, and strategies commonly undertaken to address them. Only 43 percent of households are food secure, meaning that in the last 30 days no strategy was employed for dealing with a lack of food or money to buy food. The remaining households employed strategies in order of severity: 27 percent are “under stress,” 15 percent are in “crisis,” and 17 percent are in “emergency.”¹

Trust and social cohesion. Levels of trust, security, and participation in decision making are high among refugees. Overall, 8 in 10 refugees feel that neighbors are generally trustworthy. More than 9 in 10 feel safe walking alone in their neighborhood during the day—though only 3 in 10 feel so at night. Meanwhile, 3 in 4 believe that they are able to express their opinions within the existing community leadership structure, and 2 in 3 perceive that their opinions are being taken into consideration for decisions that regard their well-being. In terms of social cohesion between refugees and hosts, half of refugee households reported interacting with a member of the host community in the past week and more than 60 percent of refugees feel safe visiting a neighboring

¹ The total sums to greater than 100 percent due to rounding of individual results. Maxwell and Caldwell (2008) provide more information on how to interpret the Coping Strategy Index.

town alone. Around half agree that host community members are generally trustworthy. Similarly, around half would feel comfortable with their child socializing with members of the host community.

Gender-based vulnerabilities. Overall, most refugee households in Kalobeyi are headed by women, face poor living standards, and have low literacy and labor force participation rates. The SES findings demonstrate that living conditions for refugees in Kalobeyi vary according to sex and gender norms. Such variation translates into a series of disadvantaged living conditions for women that exacerbate their already complex situation, creating a matrix of intersecting vulnerabilities. Despite being most of the refugee population in Kalobeyi, women face higher poverty levels; lower access to basic services such as water, sanitation, and education; and tend to have a lower labor force participation rate. Therefore, gender-responsive policies and programs need to take into consideration sociocultural norms and practices that prevent women from having economic empowerment and limit women opportunities for socioeconomic growth.

Data collection, analysis, and dissemination are crucial to inform targeted policies. Systematically surveying and including refugees into national surveys can contribute to filling socioeconomic data gaps which is needed to inform evidence-based policies and programs. The analysis of the SES data from Kalobeyi provides several recommendations. First, building and maintaining human capital and improving housing conditions among refugees and hosts, needs to be prioritized. Second, efforts to strengthen access to improved sanitation must be continued among the refugee and host populations. Third, promoting self-reliant agricultural interventions can support food security. Fourth, joint programs for refugees and host populations can strengthen social cohesion. Fifth, gender-responsive policies and programs need to be implemented to address gender-based stereotypical barriers that prevent women from finding sustainable livelihoods and fully participate in the labor force. Sixth, increasing work opportunities for the refugee population can help lift aid dependence, improve livelihoods, and support self-reliance.

1. Data Needs for Displaced Populations

1. The world is witnessing the highest levels of forced displacement on record. With over 79 million forcibly displaced people worldwide,² forced displacement has become a crisis with substantial impacts among both the displaced and host communities. Forcibly displaced persons face specific vulnerabilities that need urgent attention, namely, limited rights, lack of opportunities, protection risks, lack of a planning horizon, loss of assets, and low living standards among others. Comparatively, host communities—which tend to be overwhelmingly in developing countries—are often among the poorest populations experiencing low standards of living, and they often face developmental challenges related to insecurity and lack of access to education and employment opportunities. Thus, host communities face increased challenges in pursuing their own development efforts in an environment that has been transformed by large inflows of displaced persons.

2. A new global paradigm has emerged to better manage forced displacement situations. The Global Compact on Refugees (GCR), reaffirmed by the United Nations General Assembly in December 2018, establishes a framework for more predictable and equitable responsibility sharing across member states in managing refugee situations.³ It calls for measures at the global, regional, and national levels that governments, international organizations, and other stakeholders can implement to better support host communities and to ensure that refugees have opportunities to thrive alongside their hosts.

3. The Global Compact on Refugees recognizes the need for greater complementarity between humanitarian and development actors. The cost of humanitarian aid has sharply increased in the last 15 years, from US\$7.2 billion in

2000, the cost of humanitarian assistance tripled, reaching US\$21.8 billion in 2015.⁴ To sustainably respond to emerging and protracted crises and to ease skyrocketing humanitarian costs, the international community has increasingly advocated for a development response to displacement situations beyond and in coordination with humanitarian aid. There is increasing recognition that—while critical at the onset—humanitarian assistance is unable to address the socioeconomic dimensions of displacement, including access to livelihoods and employment. As emphasized in the GCR, humanitarian and development responses need to be coherently facilitated and include the early and sustained engagement of development actors to ensure that “the impact of a large refugee situation on a host country is taken into account in the planning and implementation of development programs and policies with direct benefits for both host communities and refugees.”⁵ Thus, displacement situations require development instruments to tackle challenges with a medium- to long-term horizon. Improving self-reliance, as opposed to aid dependency, is the basis of the development approach and is critical to reducing poverty and vulnerability for refugees.

4. Data are central to the success of these global efforts and constitute an essential input to link humanitarian and development activities. Reliable, comparable, and timely data are key to policy making and targeted programming, and to effectively use humanitarian and development resources. Especially socioeconomic data on refugees and hosts, constitute a crucial input that can inform effective interventions, linking humanitarian and development work by using relevant indicators to monitor progress and ensure success. However, multidimensional data gaps prevent an assessment of socioeconomic conditions among displaced populations, hindering efforts to design targeted interventions. Notably in Sub-Saharan Africa, key challenges include the limited comparable analyses on poverty and living standards of displaced

² United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2020.

³ United Nations 2018. See: <https://www.unhcr.org/5c658aed4>.

⁴ World Bank Group 2017a.

⁵ United Nations 2018, 24.

populations and hosts. Evidence-based development policies to address socioeconomic vulnerabilities have the potential to unlock economic independence of refugees by strengthening their agency, self-reliance, and synergies with host communities. Thus, addressing data gaps and limitations is crucial to inform targeted policy interventions to find sustainable solutions for displaced and host communities.

5. Kenya is exemplary of the challenges and opportunities at the heart of this dynamic. Since 1992, Kenya has been a generous host of refugees and asylum seekers, a population which today exceeds 490,000. Refugees in Kenya reside in three locations: urban areas mainly in Nairobi (16 percent), Dadaab in Garissa County (44 percent), and the Kakuma camps and Kalobeyei Settlement in Turkana County (40 percent). The majority of refugees and asylum seekers in Kenya originate from Somalia (54.5 percent). Other major nationalities are South Sudanese (24.4 percent), Congolese (8.8 percent), and Ethiopians (5.9 percent).⁶ The Kakuma Refugee Camps in Turkana West subcounty have long been among the largest hosting sites, becoming even larger in recent years with an estimated 67 percent of the current refugee population that has arrived in the past five years. In Turkana West, the refugee population makes up a significant share of the local economy and the population (an estimated 40 percent).⁷ Thus, refugees and hosts regularly have socioeconomic interactions that shape their living conditions and represent an opportunity for development.

6. Refugees in Kenya are not systematically included in national surveys and, as a result, there is a lack of data on refugee welfare and poverty that is comparable to the national population. Such information is critical for area-based development and targeting of assistance for both refugees and host community members. Kenya has shown progress in data availability at the national and county levels and made efforts to measure the impacts of forced

displacement.⁸ However, refugees are not systematically included in the national household surveys that serve as the primary tools for measuring and monitoring poverty, labor markets, and other welfare indicators. Comparable data on the welfare and poverty of refugees and host communities are necessary for implementing and monitoring area-based development frameworks, such as the Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISED) and the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP). Data are essential for engaging with development actors whose strategies are based on poverty alleviation and who require this information for long-term planning and investment. Further, it is required for the design of humanitarian programming, such as cash assistance, which seeks to target the most vulnerable. As a result of socioeconomic data gaps, comparisons of poverty and vulnerability between refugees, host communities, and nationals remain difficult.

2. Refugees in Kenya

7. The Refugees Act of Kenya came into force in 2006, confirming Kenya's commitment to international refugee conventions, while setting out the rights and treatment of refugees and asylum seekers in Kenya.⁹ The Act established the Department of Refugee Affairs (DRA) replaced by the Refugee Affairs Secretariat (RAS)¹⁰ in 2016. Among other responsibilities, the RAS is partly in charge of registration, documentation, and refugee status determination (RSD) functions. While it was expected that in 2017 the RAS would fully assume responsibility for reception, registration, documentation, RSD, and refugee management—with UNHCR's active support¹¹—such responsibilities have not been fully undertaken by RAS. Therefore, the UNHCR in collaboration with the RAS accords refugee status through

⁶ According to UNHCR, Kenya hosts 476,695 registered refugees, asylum seekers, and other persons of concern, as of May 2019 (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2019a). See: <https://www.unhcr.org/ke/figures-at-a-glance>.

⁷ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2018, 11. See: https://www.unhcr.org/ke/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/12/KISED_Kalobeyei-Integrated-Socio-Econ-Dev-Programme.pdf.

⁸ Much has been written about Turkana County and the Kakuma camps in recent years. See: Sanghi, Onder, and Vemuru 2016; World Bank 2018a; Betts et al. 2018.

⁹ Kenya became a party to the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees in 1966, and the 1967 Protocol in 1981. It has also ratified the 1969 Convention Governing the Specific Aspects of the Refugee Problem in Africa (O'Callaghan and Sturge 2018).

¹⁰ Refugee Affairs Secretariat 2019. See <http://refugee.go.ke/about-us/>.

¹¹ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Refugee Status Determination 2019e.

individual interviews and through prima facie group determination.¹² The RSD process in Kenya takes approximately two years rather than an intended maximum of six months, and it lacks an appeal system.^{13, 14} The Refugees Act stipulates that refugees should be provided with a ‘refugee identity card’. ID cards take the form of either a UNHCR Mandated Refugee Certificate (MRC) that is valid for two years, or the DRA-issued Alien Refugee Certificate (ARC),¹⁵ valid for five years (see Appendix 4 Identification documents). Furthermore, refugees in Kenya face restrictions on the freedom of movement and right to work (see section 3 “Employment and Livelihoods”).

8. Forty percent of refugees in Kenya reside in Turkana West, an ethnically diverse region which remains among the poorest counties in the country. The Turkana people, who are plain Nilotes, constitute the main community in the county and in Turkana West where the refugees reside. The most important economic activity in the county is pastoralism, characterized by livestock rearing, with the major livestock reared being cattle, donkeys, camels, and goats.¹⁶ While poverty in Kenya has declined over the past decade, Turkana continues to be one of the poorest counties. The proportion of Kenya’s population living beneath the international poverty line of US\$1.90 a day (2011 PPP) fell from 44 percent in 2005/06 to 37 percent in 2015/16. At this level, poverty in Kenya is below the Sub-Saharan Africa average and among the lowest in the East African Community. Poverty reduction has been driven by improvements among the poorest of the poor, and particularly among the progress observed in rural areas.¹⁷ In rural Kenya, poverty declined considerably from around 51 percent in 2005/06 to 39 percent 10 years

later. Despite these overall reductions in poverty, in Turkana 72 percent of the population lives in poverty.

9. Refugees in Turkana are located in two areas: Kakuma Refugee Camp and Kalobeyi Integrated Settlement, with a cumulative population of over 190,000. The refugee population in Turkana has fluctuated over the years due to the outbreak of different conflicts. The South Sudan crisis of 2013 led to a massive outflow of refugees into the neighboring countries, and more than 86,000 individuals fled and sought asylum in Kenya. Despite the long existence of Kakuma refugee camps (since 1992), 67 percent of its population arrived only during the last five years.¹⁸ At the same time, the host community in Kakuma town has also grown in population size and economic activities. The socioeconomic study “Yes in My Backyard? The Economics of Refugees and their Social Dynamics in Kakuma, Kenya”¹⁹ finds refugees as an integral part of the Kakuma social, cultural, and economic fabric with a vibrant economy. The study shows that refugee-owned businesses serve both communities and have boosted overall economic activity that has led to better nutritional outcomes and greater physical well-being of the host community.²⁰ Nevertheless, as in other parts of Kenya, refugees in Turkana face restrictions on their freedom of movement and right to work.

10. The Kalobeyi Settlement, located in Turkana County, was established in 2015 to accommodate the growing population from the Kakuma Refugee Camps. Kalobeyi Settlement, located 30 kilometers north of Kakuma, was established by UNHCR, the regional government, as well as development and humanitarian partners. Its aim was to take pressure off the Kakuma camps and to transition refugee assistance from an aid-based model to a self-reliance model.^{21, 22} Kalobeyi Settlement was planned to offer opportunities for economic inclusion, integrated delivery of services, and improved livelihood opportunities for both refugees and the host community.²³ Originally it was planned

¹² Refugee Status Determination, or RSD, is the legal or administrative process by which governments or UNHCR determine whether a person seeking international protection is considered a refugee under international, regional, or national law. RSD is often a vital process in helping refugees realize their rights under international law. States have the primary responsibility to conduct RSD; however, UNHCR may conduct RSD under its mandate when a state is not a party to the 1951 Refugee Convention and/or does not have a fair and efficient national asylum procedure in place (United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Refugee Status Determination 2019d).

¹³ UNHCR-DRC 2012.

¹⁴ Under the Refugees Act, asylum seekers and refugees are entitled to appeal any unfavorable decision of the DRA to the Board. However, Kenya has yet to constitute this body (Garlick et al. 2015).

¹⁵ In some official government documents, the RAS is sometimes referred to as DRA.

¹⁶ Kenya National Bureau of Statistics 2015.

¹⁷ World Bank 2018b.

¹⁸ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2018.

¹⁹ World Bank Group-UNHCR 2016.

²⁰ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2018.

²¹ Betts et al. 2018.

²² The UNHCR defines self-reliance as ‘the social and economic ability of an individual, a household, or a community to meet essential needs (including protection, food, water, shelter, personal safety, health, and education) in a sustainable manner and with dignity’ (UNHCR 2005).

²³ Host community is understood as the overall population of Turkana County. Data limitations do not allow a more detailed breakdown that differentiates across Turkana County inhabitants.

that Kalobeyei would target established refugees (who had arrived more than five years before) from Kakuma. However, a new emergency from South Sudan and other factors forced the original plan to be adapted.²⁴ Nevertheless, Kalobeyei's planners have retained a significant commitment to self-reliance. For example, Kalobeyei has differed from Kakuma in having designated market areas, more extensive use of a cash-assistance program called *Bamba Chakula* ('get your food'), and a greater promotion of subsistence agriculture.²⁵

11. Integrated self-reliance for refugees and the host community through evidence-based interventions are at the core of the Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISED). This 15-year comprehensive multi-sectoral and multi-stakeholder plan, led by the Government of Kenya and UNHCR, uses an area-based approach which envisions that both refugees and host communities will benefit from strengthened national service delivery systems and increased socioeconomic opportunities, along with sustained investments in people's skills and capabilities, so that they can become drivers of economic growth in Turkana West.²⁶ With its 8 components of health; education; water, sanitation, and hygiene; protection; spatial planning and infrastructure; agriculture, livestock, and natural resource management; sustainable energy solutions; private sector and entrepreneurship, the KISED aims to transition refugee assistance from an aid-based to a self-reliance model, while also increasing opportunities for interaction between refugees and hosts. Aligned with the Global Compact on Refugees and an integral part of the County Integrated Development Plan (CIDP), the KISED recognizes the need for collecting and using data for programming and reporting.²⁷ Specifically, socioeconomic data are acknowledged as an essential input to understand specific needs and vulnerabilities, and inform area-based programming and investments to achieve the expected outcome of socioeconomic growth among hosts and refugees.

12. The Kalobeyei Socioeconomic Survey (SES) employed a novel approach to generating data that are statistically representative of the settlement's population and comparable to the national population. Taking place within a UNHCR registration verification exercise, the SES included a range of standard socioeconomic indicators, both at the household and individual level, aligned with the national 2015/16 Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS) and Kenya Continuous Household Survey (KCHS).²⁸ To improve efficiency and save time—a comprehensive poverty survey requires repeated visits over days—the Rapid Consumption Methodology (RCM)²⁹ was used to estimate consumption and thus the level of poverty of refugee populations in Kalobeyei. The SES survey and ensuing analysis provide a comprehensive snapshot of the demographic characteristics, standards of living, social cohesion, and specific vulnerabilities facing refugees regarding food security and disabilities.

13. This survey provides one of the first comparable poverty profiles for refugees and host community members, enhancing the evidence base for programming and efficient design of interventions. Initiated jointly by UNHCR and the World Bank, this survey was designed to support the KISED development framework, as well as the wider global vision laid out by the Global Refugee Compact and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). In doing so, it provides lessons for how this important information may be collected in other settings to facilitate potential replication by the World Bank-UNHCR Joint Data Center (JDC). The socioeconomic profile presented here includes refugees living in the Kalobeyei refugee settlement surveyed in 2018 compared to the Turkana County host community,³⁰ as well as the national population surveyed in 2015/16.³¹

²⁴ As a result, most villages in Kalobeyei are primarily populated by South Sudanese. Village 2 has a higher portion of Ethiopians who are ethnically Somalis displaced from Ethiopia's Ogaden region and Burundi refugees who were originally located in Dadaab.

²⁵ Betts et al. 2018.

²⁶ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2019c. KISED Progress Report. January 2018–June 2019.

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS), Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey 2015–2016: See: <http://statistics.knbs.or.ke/nada/index.php/catalog/88>.

²⁹ Pape and Mistiaen. 2018. Household Expenditure and Poverty Measures in 60 Minutes: A New Approach with Results from Mogadishu.

³⁰ Host community includes not only Turkana West subcounty residents but the whole population of Turkana County.

³¹ Host community and national estimates were derived from the Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS).

The Kalobeyei SES was conducted in parallel to an update of the UNHCR registration database, proGres. Together with the Government of Kenya, UNHCR maintains a database of all registered refugees and asylum seekers in the country. While registration takes place on a continuous basis, verification exercises are conducted periodically, typically every two to three years, to ensure that records, including biometric identifiers, are up to date. The SES was designed to take place during the 2018/19 Kalobeyei registration verification exercise (VRX), during which UNHCR registration teams conducted house-to-house visits across the settlement. Most households were administered a shorter basic questionnaire, while a systematic random sample of these households were selected for an extended SES questionnaire. The extended survey is used to generate poverty estimates for the population as a whole, while the additional household-level variables in the basic version may be used to identify vulnerable households for targeted programming.

The SES questionnaire was designed to produce data comparable to the national household survey and other standard instruments. Modules on education, employment, household characteristics, assets and consumption, and expenditure were aligned with the most recent national poverty survey, the Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS) 2015/16 and are therefore comparable to results reported locally and nationally. Questions were also aligned with the Kenya Continuous Household Survey (KCHS) which, since end-2019, has collected comparable statistics on an annual basis for all counties in Kenya. Additional modules on access to services, vulnerabilities, social cohesion, and the World Food Program Livelihoods Coping Index were administered to capture specific challenges facing refugees. The questionnaires were administered in English. The questionnaire was not translated into different languages but either (in most cases) enumerators (who were refugees themselves) were able to translate, or interpreters were used to translate the questions during the interview. The questionnaire was interpreted from English to Lotoku, Dedinka, Arabic, Nuer, Dinka, Somalian, Aromo, and Ayuwak. See Appendix 5, “Detailed Overview of Methodology.”

14. Understanding the socioeconomic characteristics of the population, and the poor in particular, is helpful to identify factors limiting economic growth.³² Moreover, comparing poor and nonpoor households along different dimensions, such as demographics, human capital, economic activities, and asset ownership, can inform specific policy actions that may help raise their living standards, address limitations associated with poverty, and promote self-reliance.

15. Kalobeyei hosts a diverse community made up of recent arrivals to Kenya, as well as transfers from Dadaab and Kakuma camps. The basic SES covers 6,004 households (35,043 individuals) across the three villages of Kalobeyei.³³ An estimated 85 percent of those surveyed arrived in Kenya in 2016 or 2017, while 12 percent have been in Kenya for more than five years. The majority of residents are South Sudanese, though the population also includes ethnic Somalis displaced from Ethiopia's Ogaden region, Burundians who were originally located in Dadaab, and others.

1. Demographic Profile

1.1 Age structure

16. Refugees in Kalobeyei are younger than the Kenyan population, with virtually no elders. In Kalobeyei, 68 percent of the population is below 18 years old, versus 57 percent

in Turkana County and 48 percent nationally ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 1). At the same time, only 1.7 percent of the refugee population is over 50 years of age, including only 0.4 percent of people aged 65 and above. In comparison, 3.9 percent of Kenyans are age 65 and above ($p < 0.001$). The broad base of the Kalobeyei population pyramid demonstrates the large presence of young refugees, while the thinner shares at the top demonstrate the 'missing' elders.


17. At the same time, refugee households are larger in size than local and national populations. The average household size in Kalobeyei is 5.8, compared to 4.4 in Turkana County ($p < 0.001$), and 4.0 in greater Kenya ($p < 0.001$). Only 14 percent of refugee households are made up of only one or two members, versus nearly 32 percent nationally ($p < 0.001$). Nearly 40 percent of refugee households reportedly contain seven or more household members.

18. The result is a high dependency ratio, with the large young population significantly outweighing the number of working-age adults. Dependency ratio is a measure of the number of dependents (children aged 0 to 14 and adults 65 years of age and older) compared with the total working-age population (ages 15 to 64). A higher dependency ratio suggests a larger economic burden placed on working age adults. In Kenya as a whole, the ratio is 0.9—meaning that working-age adults outnumber dependents—rising to 1.4 in Turkana County. Among refugees in Kalobeyei, the overall ratio is 1.9, ranging by country of origin from 0.8 (Sudanese) to 2.2 (South Sudanese). In all cases, the dependency ratio of refugees living in Kalobeyei is greater than that found in their country of origin. The high variance of dependency ratio by country of origin could also be correlated with date of arrival. While the South Sudanese arrived within the last five years, the majority of the Sudanese arrived over a decade ago. This discrepancy in dependency ratio between recently arrived refugee populations and those more established underlines the importance of increasing panel data sets for the forcibly displaced persons and their hosts so as to measure the change over time across different ethnic and national groups. Finally,

³² Unless otherwise noted, graphs and charts for refugee estimates were created based on the Kalobeyei SES Survey 2018 data, referred to as Kalobeyei (2018). The graphs and charts depicting national and Turkana County information were created based on the Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS) 2015/16 (Kenya National Bureau of Statistics 2018a). Significance levels are reported as p-values for comparative figures, with the 1% ($p < 0.001$), 5% ($p < 0.005$) and 10% ($p < 0.01$) levels considered significant. Error bars in graphs display standard error estimates.


³³ As discussed above, the UNHCR proGres group classification may differ from what is used for national household surveys. On average, 1.15 UNHCR "proGres households" were found for "national household." This indicates the presence of function households outside of the UNHCR ration and case management system, as would be expected, especially given the presence of unaccompanied minors and other single refugees.

► **FIGURE 1:** Demographic profile of Kalobeyei refugees versus Kenyan nationals



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).³⁴

► **FIGURE 2:** Dependency ratio for Kalobeyei compared to Kenya and country of origin averages



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16); World Bank Databank (dependency ratio, country of origin).³⁵

Note: Dark blue bars represent the dependency ratio of refugees in Kenya. Light blue bars represent the dependency ratio in refugees' countries of origin.

additional evidence shows South Sudanese who remain in South Sudan have a dependency ratio of 0.82, while South Sudanese refugees in Kaloyebai have a dependency ratio more than 2.5 times higher (Figure 2). It is possible that the much lower dependency ratio for those who remain in South Sudan could be due to the fact that many household members have migrated looking for work.

19. Unaccompanied minors and separated children face special risks which require additional and specific support. Kalobeyei contains an estimated 317 unaccompanied minors and 1,644 separated children according to UNHCR's protection monitoring framework. These populations face significant additional protection risks and require specialized

³⁴ Kenya National Bureau of Statistics 2018a.

³⁵ Country of origin dependency ratio data from the World Bank Databank. See: <https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/sp.pop.dpnd>.

programming, including case management, counseling, and placement within existing household networks.

1.2 Country of origin, gender, and disability

20. Most refugees in Kalobeyei are South Sudanese, with sizeable populations also from Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DR Congo), and Ethiopia. Refugees in Kalobeyei come from thirteen different countries of origin, with the largest numbers from South Sudan (74 percent), Ethiopia (13 percent), Burundi (7 percent), and the Democratic Republic of Congo (4 percent) (Figure 3). While it was initially anticipated that residents of Kakuma would move voluntarily to Kalobeyei, the influx of South Sudanese at the time of construction required a change to this plan. As a result, while all villages are primarily populated by South Sudanese, Village 2 has a higher portion of Ethiopians, including many ethnic Somalis displaced from Ethiopia’s Ogaden region and Burundian refugees who were originally located in Dadaab.


21. The population as a whole is gender balanced, though differences exist across age segments. The refugee population is nearly in equal parts men (50 percent) and women (50 percent), similar to Kenya as a whole (49 percent men, 51 percent women). Within the individual population segments, however, differences are notable: boys and young

men are shown to outnumber girls and young women, while working-age women are greater in number than working-age men. Practically, this translates into a refugee population with around 2,000 more men than women under age 25 (43 percent of the total population, versus 37 percent). Among adults age 25 and greater, nearly the opposite is true, with women outnumbering men by 1,700 persons (12 percent of the total population, versus 7 percent).

22. Most households are headed by women. Overall, 66 percent of households are headed by women, differing substantially from the 32 percent of households nationally in Kenya (Figure 4). In Turkana County, the shares are more balanced (48 percent men-led households, 52 percent women-led households, $p < 0.61$). Women-headed households have on average 1.32 children under age 5 versus 0.95 for men-headed households ($p < 0.001$). This evidence shows that not only are most households headed by women, but they tend to have a greater number of young children and be overwhelmingly managed by single women.


23. This is particularly true among South Sudanese households, of which 77 percent are headed by women. Refugee households with other nationalities (excluding Ethiopian) tend to be headed by men. Similar patterns were observed in the 2017 South Sudan Poverty Assessment and 2017 Ethiopia Skills Survey, where 90 percent

► **FIGURE 3:** Population distribution in Kalobeyei by country of origin and residence



Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

► **FIGURE 4:** Distribution of women-headed households by residence and country of origin



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

of South Sudanese households were headed by women.³⁶ South Sudanese households are often headed by women whose male partners or husbands are either dead, missing, living in South Sudan,³⁷ or might have migrated elsewhere. Thus, most women-headed households have missing male members and/or spouses, which further drives up dependency ratios among them. The lack of male family members could have negative implications due to gendered roles and social interpretations of ‘women alone’, which could result in an increased risk of gender-based violence against women and girls in women-headed households. Moreover, high dependency ratios in single women-headed households can increase the burden of domestic and caring labor on women and girls, which in turn can affect their ability to attend school, participate in the labor force, and develop professional skills.

24. Physical and mental disabilities are persistent, both among heads of households and the broader community.³⁸

Based on the Washington Group definition, nearly 7 percent of the population reportedly suffer from some type of disability, with the most frequent being ‘difficulty with self-care’ (3 percent) and ‘difficulty seeing’ (nearly 2 percent). No significant differences exist across genders or countries of origin. Difficulty in walking, or climbing, is the most prominent disability among hosts. Without the proper services and assistance, the limitations that come with these disabili-

ties could place a disproportionate burden of responsibility on younger household members if the head of household is unable to provide for their family.

2. Access to Basic Services

25. While service delivery in Kalobeyei is managed by the Government of Kenya (GoK), the UNHCR, and development organizations, substantial investment is needed to improve its capacity and quality. “Improving the capacity of existing systems to provide public goods and ensuring that the government has the ability to manage their delivery in a sustainable manner are critical to ensure the sustainable delivery of services.”³⁹ As of November 2019, health and education service delivery in Kalobeyei was strengthened through the joint efforts of the county government, and humanitarian and development partners. Nevertheless, substantial investment is needed to enhance inclusive delivery of services for hosts and refugees, as well as to improve the quality of the delivered services.⁴⁰ Investment in basic services has a direct impact on human capital accumulation, economic growth rates, and poverty reduction.

26. Kalobeyei is a planned settlement with clear demarcation and assignment of residential lots, health facilities, schools, market areas, and agricultural zones. Construction of permanent housing units and sanitation facilities are financed by cash grants and built by refugees themselves. Access to health in Kalobeyei is provided through two health

³⁶ World Bank Group 2017a and Pape and Sharma 2019. Informing Durable Solutions for Internal Displacement In Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Sudan.

³⁷ Betts et al. 2018.

³⁸ A person is disabled, according to the Washington Group on Disability Statistics, if he/she answers ‘a lot of difficulty’ or ‘cannot do it at all’ to at least one of the following: seeing, hearing, walking/climbing, remembering/concentrating, washing/dressing, and communicating.

³⁹ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2019. KISEDPP Progress Report. January 2018–June 2019c, 8.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

facilities run by international organizations and accessible for both hosts and refugees. These facilities are under review to be accredited as part of the efforts to promote Universal Health Care, which for Turkana translates into the enrollment of refugees in the National Hospital Insurance Fund (NHIF). Health services are complemented by government run health centers. Furthermore, there are five primary and two secondary schools run by international organizations. Efforts to strengthen inclusion of refugees and asylum seekers in the national education system are being carried out through the development of the Refugee Education Policy.⁴¹ Market and agricultural designated areas (kitchen gardens) were established as part of the Kalobeyei settlement plan, while self-reliance programs have largely replaced in-kind food rations with monthly cash vouchers under the World Food Program's *Bamba Chakula* program.⁴²

2.1 Housing

27. In Kalobeyei, only 5 percent of refugee households have access to improved housing. Construction of permanent housing units and sanitation facilities, which were initially built by partner organizations, are now financed by cash grants and built by household members themselves. Village 1 was the first to be built and partly benefited from construction of permanent housing by partners; in contrast, no household in villages 2 and 3 has access to improved housing (Figure 5).⁴³ Comparably, 12 percent of housing in Turkana County is improved, which is one of the lowest rates in the country, while 44 percent of households at the national level have access to improved housing. Wall, roof, and floor materials also vary by population. Refugees mostly use plastic or tents as a wall material while Turkana hosts tend to use thatching, and Kenyans at the national level often use cement. While makuti is more frequently

used by Turkana residents as a roof material, refugees and Kenyans at the national level tend to use corrugated iron sheets—which are provided to refugees by the UNHCR and partners. Finally, among Turkana residents and refugees, the most common material for flooring is earth or sand, while Kenyans at the national level tend to use cement. These variations reflect the differential access to improved materials for housing that refugees and Turkana residents use, when compared to Kenyans at the national level. Thus, this reflects that housing conditions of refugee and host community households are largely unimproved.

28. The number of rooms and density of use is also similar to what is observed in Turkana County, but varies from national norms. Crowded conditions—measured by both space within a housing unit and distance between them—lead to increased morbidity and stress,⁴⁴ and constitute a major factor in the transmission of diseases.⁴⁵ On average, households in Kalobeyei occupy 1.3 habitable rooms, versus 2.1 nationally ($p < 0.001$) and 1.1 in Turkana County ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 6). Due to the higher average number of household members—likely driven by the large population of children and young people—this translates into 4.5 persons per habitable room, against 2.3 in Kenya as a whole ($p < 0.001$) and 4.2 in the rest of Turkana County ($p < 0.38$).

2.2 Sanitation and water

29. The Constitution of Kenya 2010 recognizes that access to safe and sufficient water is a basic human right. It also assigns responsibility for water supply and sanitation provision to the 47 county governments. In Turkana there has been a general decline in both the quantity and quality of water for productive and domestic use. During drought, reduced water tables are common; this leads to low yielding boreholes and longer waiting times at the few water points available. Other challenges include the drying of surface water sources, high siltation, and long distances to water points. Better water governance is therefore key to unlocking some of the long-established barriers to economic development of the county.⁴⁶

⁴¹ Ibid.

⁴² *Bamba Chakula* is a cash-based intervention designed by the World Food Program as an alternative to in-kind food aid. By providing refugees with currency rather than food aid, it allows recipients to purchase goods according to their priorities from a network of registered traders. Whereas in Kakuma refugees receive a mix of in-kind and food aid, in Kalobeyei, assistance is provided almost completely through *Bamba Chakula*, with refugees receiving approximately 1,400 KES (US\$14) per person per month, plus a small supplement of fortified porridge.


⁴³ The types of wall, roof, and floor materials used for the construction of residential dwellings, determine the classification of housing as improved or unimproved. See *DHS Analytical Studies. Using Household Survey Data to Explore the Effects of Improved Housing Conditions on Malaria Infection in Children in Sub-Saharan Africa* (IFC 2016).

⁴⁴ UNHCR Camp Planning Standards. See: <https://emergency.unhcr.org/entry/45581/camp-planning-standards-planned-settlements>.

⁴⁵ World Health Organization 2019.


⁴⁶ Department of Water Agriculture and Irrigation 2017.

► **FIGURE 5:** Distribution of households by floor, roof, wall materials, and types of housing



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

► **FIGURE 6:** Distribution of households by number of habitable rooms and density




Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

30. Refugees in Kalobeyei reported higher access to improved drinking water than nationals—although most still describe regular shortages.⁴⁷ Kalobeyei residents

⁴⁷ “Improved drinking water” is defined as water that is piped, public tap, or from a borehole. “Unimproved drinking water” includes an unprotected well or spring.

report 100 percent access to a water point, though two-thirds reported insufficient quantities of drinking water in the past month (Figure 7). This is consistent with results from a 2018 Oxford Refugee Studies Center report, which found that lack of access to sufficient quantities of water was a commonly expressed challenge among residents, especially for those

► **FIGURE 7:** Distribution of households by improved sanitation and drinking water source



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

engaged in agriculture. Nationally, Kenya has made strides toward improving access to drinking water, with 73 percent of households reporting improved access in 2015 (against 59 percent 10 years before that), including 63 percent in Turkana County.

31. Refugees in Kalobeyei report higher levels of access to improved sanitation than the Turkana County population; however, shared facilities are common.⁴⁸ Comparably, access to improved sanitation is lower for refugees (52 percent) and Turkana hosts (32 percent) than for nationals (65 percent). Poor sanitation conditions and waste disposal practices are well-known contributors to the spread of infectious disease and are linked to negative development outcomes in education and increased risk of gender-based violence.^{49, 50} Sharing facilities is common in Kalobeyei, where 66 percent of sanitation facilities are shared, as is the case in much of Kenya (54 percent) and Turkana County (64 percent).

32. Overall, women-headed households are 11 percent less likely than those headed by men to have access to improved sanitation facilities. Women-headed households report lower access to improved facilities (48 percent) versus 60 percent for men-headed ones ($p < 0.001$). Taking into account that more than two-thirds of households are women-headed and have on average a larger number of

dependents than men-headed households, the result is a disproportionate increase in the population exposed to a larger burden of disease.

2.3 Lighting

33. Almost no refugee household has access to electricity from the grid or a generator. No household is connected to the larger electricity grid, less than 1 percent of households report access to a generator, and some 20 percent report no access to lighting at all (Figure 8). The top three sources of lighting in Kalobeyei include: solar lantern/biogas (31 percent), battery-powered lamp (33 percent), and light from the fire at night (12 percent).⁵¹ In comparison, 12 percent of households in Turkana County have access to electricity or a generator,⁵² while nationally 42 percent are connected to the main grid or generator. Lack of access to lighting can have negative implications on education outcomes, perceptions of insecurity, and community violence.

2.4 Education

34. Most refugees report having attended school at least once in their life—however, gender differences are substantial. Overall, 80 percent of refugees age four and above report ever having attended school, including 90 percent of

⁴⁸ “Improved sanitation” is defined as access to a flush toilet, piped sewage system, septic tank, pit latrines, ventilated improved pit (VIP), or composting tanks. “Unimproved sanitation” includes pit latrines without slab, hanging toilet, or bucket.


⁴⁹ Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME) 2017.

⁵⁰ WaterAid 2013.

⁵¹ A previous initiative provided solar lanterns to a number of households.


⁵² In Turkana, the main challenges faced by the energy sector include poor transmission and distribution infrastructure, the high cost of power, low per capita power consumption, and low countrywide electricity access (Turkana County Government 2019).

► **FIGURE 8:** Distribution of households by source of lighting



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

► **FIGURE 9:** Distribution of population ever attending school, age four and above



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

men and 71 percent of women (Figure 9). Among household heads, this share falls to 52 percent overall—but only 37 percent for women heads. Nationally, 89 percent of all Kenyans over age three have attended school. In Turkana County, just over half of the population has done so (52 percent).


35. Despite a limited number of schools at the time of the survey, most primary school-age children reportedly attend school. At the time of the survey, UNHCR and partners operated three schools in Kalobeyei, which were acknowledged to be insufficient to accommodate all school-age students.⁵³ Nevertheless, primary school attendance was found to be 77 percent for children ages 6–13 years and

129 percent when students of all ages are taken into account.⁵⁴ In comparison, attendance is over 80 percent nationally at the primary level for ages 6–13 and over 100 percent when all age groups are taken into consideration. Turkana County falls far below national averages with only 48 percent of primary school-age students in attendance, and 70 percent with taking younger and older populations into account (Figure 10). The high level of primary school attendance is consistent with the outcomes reported by the Oxford study, wherein 87 percent of children reportedly attend school, and with UNHCR’s own monitoring, which estimated primary enrollment rates of 70 percent (net, ages 6–13) and 103 percent (gross, all ages)

⁵³ Betts et al. 2018.


⁵⁴ Net attendance considers students within the defined age category (6–13 years for primary school and 14–17 years for secondary school). Gross attendance is the total number of persons attending school regardless of age.

► **FIGURE 10:** Net and gross attendance rates, primary school



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

► **FIGURE 11:** Net and gross attendance rates, secondary school



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).


as of December 2018. One possible explanation suggested in Betts et al. (2018) is the growth in informal schooling, which is not measured in the survey. Another possible explanation, though not corroborated, is overreporting of enrollment in primary school to avoid a negative connotation that refugees may perceive from the international community regarding not having school-age children enrolled and attending school.

36. Low levels of secondary school enrollment are consistent with the lack of available schooling options for refugee youth. In Kalobeyei, there are only two secondary schools. Among refugees, secondary school attendance for youth aged 14–17 years (net attendance rate) is 5 percent, rising to 29 percent when all age groups are considered (gross attendance rate) (Figure 11). In comparison, secondary enrollment is 38 percent nationally for youth aged 14–17, rising to

over 66 percent for all age groups. In Turkana County, these shares fall to 9 percent and 33 percent, respectively.


37. Educational attainment is low, although lower among refugees and Turkana hosts than for Kenyans at the national level. More than 5 in 10 refugees and nearly 7 in 10 host community members who are 15 years and above and are currently not attending school, have no education, or less than primary school (Figure 12). In contrast, only 13 percent of Kenyans at the national level have no education. Women refugees, as well as national and Turkana host women are more likely than men to have no education ($p < 0.001$). Furthermore, for both refugees and nationals, men are more likely to have studied above primary school than women, but the difference is more pronounced for refugees. Educational attainment (completed or somewhat attended) is generally

► **FIGURE 12:** Population aged 15 and above, not attending school by educational level



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2016/16).

► **FIGURE 13:** Population aged 15 and above who currently attend school by educational level and sex




Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

low, although Kenyans at the national and Turkana County level are more likely to have higher education (have some form of higher education) than refugees ($p < 0.001$). Interestingly, men in Turkana County are more likely to have completed or partially attended a college/university-level education (higher education) than refugees ($p < 0.037$).

38. More than 7 in 10 refugees aged 15 and above who currently attend school do so at the primary school level—most of them are men. Two in 10 refugees attend secondary

school, while only 3 percent attend technical or vocational school and 1 percent attend higher education—reflecting the limited opportunities for tertiary education among refugees (Figure 13). The proportion of men attending school is twice as much as that of women across education levels. The higher the level of education, the least likely it is for women to attend. Only 1 in 10 refugees who attend higher education are women. Similarly, nearly 3 in 10 refugee women study technical or vocational school, while comparable proportions are noticeable for primary and secondary education.

► **FIGURE 14:** Population distribution, by ability to read and write in any language



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

Note: For English and Swahili literacy, data are unavailable for the Kenyans.


39. Literacy rates for refugees fall between the national and Turkana County averages—and vary significantly by gender. While over 60 percent of all refugees above age 15 report being able to read or write in at least one language, only 44 percent of women in this group are able to do so, versus over 80 percent of men ($p < 0.001$). Nationally, 84 percent of Kenyans age 15 and older are literate in at least one language, versus 40 percent of those in Turkana County (the distinction is not made to the level of English/Swahili) (Figure 14). More than half of refugees (55 percent) speak one of Kenya’s two official languages—English or Swahili—with 49 percent doing so in the former and 29 percent in the later (Figure 15).

3. Employment and Livelihoods

40. Refugees in Kenya face restrictions on the freedom of movement and right to work. Although the constitution of Kenya 2010 stipulates that every person has the right to freedom of movement,⁵⁵ Kenya’s policy of encampment constrains refugees’ ability to move outside the camps without a movement pass. Only camp residents in possession of a movement pass can travel to other parts of Kenya. Passes are issued for a limited set of reasons, such as medical or higher educational requirements or due to protection concerns in camps. Refugees’ lack of freedom of movement fundamentally curtails

⁵⁵ National Council for Law Reporting 2010, 23.

► **FIGURE 15:** Population distribution in Kalobeyei, by ability to read and write in official languages



their ability to access employment and higher education.⁵⁶ Moreover, the 2006 Refugee Act provides refugees the same rights to employment as other nonnationals. Employment of nonnationals is governed by the Kenya Citizenship and Immigration Act 2011, under which work permits, called ‘Class M’ permits, are granted. Applications for permits also need a recommendation from a prospective employer and must be accompanied by a letter from the DRA confirming refugee status.⁵⁷ While refugees may theoretically work, in practice this is reportedly much more difficult given that work permits for asylum seekers or refugees are issued only in a few isolated cases.⁵⁸ For those who manage to obtain them, work permits last for a limited period of time of five years. Due to the obstacles to formal employment, refugees undertake low paying jobs (incentive workers)⁵⁹ and often seek employment in the informal sector. For refugees, the right to work, as well as the freedom to move where the economic opportunities are, and access labor markets are vital for becoming self-reliant and allows them to contribute to the local economy.⁶⁰

41. Refugees in possession of a valid refugee identification document can acquire a business permit independent of a Class M permit. Issuance of single business permits is carried out by county business licensing offices. In Kakuma and Kalobeyei, refugees can apply for single business permits

⁵⁶ Refugee Consortium of Kenya 2012.


⁵⁷ Zetter and Ruadel 2017.

⁵⁸ Refugee Consortium of Kenya 2012.

⁵⁹ Betts et al. 2018.

⁶⁰ Zetter and Ruadel 2016; Schuettler 2017.

► **FIGURE 16:** Labor force participation methodology (UN/ILO)



at the office of the county administration (Trade, Tourism and Industrialization). While single business permits are issued to enterprises with permanent facilities, street vendors or traders with temporary stalls are charged daily fees.⁶¹ One of the key challenges with regards to fee collection is the lack of a streamlined approach with clear charging regulations. Fee collection is carried out without issuing receipts, collectors often lack official IDs, and there is no consistent and clear information about requirements for different business-related documents. Furthermore, some refugees end up paying higher costs since they often opt to use “intermediaries” to help navigate this information asymmetry.⁶²

42. The standard UN/ILO labor force framework is used to understand employment dynamics in Kalobeyei.

According to this approach, the working-age population is defined as all individuals ages 15–64 years. An employed person is classified as someone who reported having worked (with or without pay or profit) for at least one hour in the last seven days, or was temporarily absent from a job to which they would definitely return to.⁶³ Unemployed persons are those who did not work during the seven-day reference period, but were available and actively seeking work in the four weeks leading up to the survey. Together, these two groups make up the economically active population. The remaining share of the working-age population is outside of the labor force: those who did not work in the last seven days, who are not returning to a job, did not search for one,

and are not available for work.⁶⁴ Figure 16 provides a visual of the labor force framework just described.

43. Only 4 in 10 refugees are of working age, lower than what is seen nationally, or in Turkana County. In Kalobeyei, due to the large proportion of children, only 39 percent of the population are of working age (15–64 years). Comparatively, 55 percent of the total population of Kenya falls in this age range, including 46 percent of Turkana County (Figure 17).

44. Even among those of working age, labor force participation rates are low. In Kalobeyei, 59 percent of the working-age population is outside the labor force compared to 35 percent of the non-refugee Turkana residents and 26 percent at the national level (Figure 18). Thirty-nine percent of the working age refugee population is employed⁶⁵ and 2 percent is unemployed (available and looking for work).⁶⁶ This is especially true for women who make up a larger share of the total working age population (53 percent, versus 47 percent for working age men) but are less likely to be working (36 percent versus 43 percent). Possible explanations for this, including family responsibilities, exasperated

⁶¹ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2017. Kakuma Integrated Livelihoods Strategy 2017–2019, 27.

⁶² United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2018, 90.


⁶³ Kenya currently follows the methodology set out at the 1982 International Conference of Labor Statisticians.

⁶⁴ This category includes full-time students, homemakers, those unable to work due to a disability, etc.—but also the group of discouraged jobless persons who were available to work but not actively seeking (or actively seeking but not available, although this subgroup is often negligible). The latter part of the inactive population can be referred to as the “potential labor force” (Figure 16).

⁶⁵ These figures are consistent with other studies. The Oxford study found that while a substantial portion of refugees in Kalobeyei would like to work, many are unable to find a job or develop an economic activity. This is similar to what was observed in the Durable Solutions report (Pape and Sharma 2019), where rates of economic inactivity ranged among country of origin groups from 44 to 69 percent, with an average of 58 percent, and unemployment from 2–9 percent.


⁶⁶ Employment and unemployment rates are considered as a share of the active population.

► **FIGURE 17:** Working-age population



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

► **FIGURE 18:** Labor force status



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

by the disproportionate number of households that are single-headed female households are explored below.

45. Among those OLF, 6 percent can be described as “potential labor force,” or those who were available to work but not actively seeking mainly due to lack of jobs, discouragement, and skills mismatch.⁶⁷ Seven in 10 refugees who did not search for work cited lack of jobs, discouragement, and skills mismatches (Figure 19). Family responsibilities (17 percent), and studies (3 percent) were other common reasons (Figure 19). This is similar to what is observed for other refugee populations in Ethiopia,⁶⁸ family reasons (22 percent), and nonexistent/poor employment opportunities (17 percent) were some of the most commonly referenced


reasons for not working. Considering that most of the refugee population is young, and will soon be of working age, it is extremely important to generate employment opportunities and skills building programs that match the market needs, promoting inclusive participation in the labor market.

46. Reasons for not having looked for a job vary according to sex and gender-based ‘responsibilities’. Twenty-four percent of women did not look for a job because of ‘family responsibilities’, while that was the case for only 6 percent of men ($p < 0.001$). Such a trend partly reflects that women mainly undertake nonpaid domestic and caring work (family responsibilities), which limits their availability to look for a paid job. Another reason for not having searched is full-time studies, which is more common among refugee men (5 percent) than among women (2 percent). Interestingly, most refugees aged 15 and above who are currently in education are men (67 percent overall). Among them, most men are in technical or vocational education (76 percent vs 24 percent of women) and in

⁶⁷ This includes those actively seeking but not available, but this is negligible in the refugee population.


⁶⁸ Pape and Sharma. 2019. Informing Durable Solutions for Internal Displacement In Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Sudan.

► **FIGURE 19:** Reason for not looking for work among potential labor force, by sex



Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

► **FIGURE 20:** Main reasons for having been absent from work




higher education (87 percent vs 13 percent of women). The gender gap for working-age household members who report currently building human capital through studying is important, not only because women are a much higher proportion of household heads than men, but also because they bear a disproportionate responsibility in providing for children. Thus, while the gains in human capital as a population are valuable and show great potential for improving overall welfare in the future, assuming jobs are to be found, women's reported lower building of human capital provides them and their families with a much lower probability for improving welfare through gainful employment in the future.

47. Out of those employed, 12 percent were absent from work during the last seven days due to education or training, as well as 29 percent due to family and community-based responsibilities. The main reasons for having been

absent from work also vary according to gender. Compared to 7 percent of women, 19 percent of men were absent from work due to education or training. In contrast, compared to 8 percent of men, 44 percent of women were absent from work due to family or community responsibilities. Absences to work and reasons for not having looked for a job, are marked by a gender divide which illustrates that stereotypical gender roles linked to gender-based responsibilities are negatively impacting the opportunities for economic development for women, their families, and their communities at large. This observed gender divide is likely only enhanced by an already complex and income-scarce context (Figure 20).⁶⁹

⁶⁹ If employment and earnings gender gaps were closed in each of the top 30 refugee-hosting countries (which include Kenya), refugee women could generate up to \$1.4 trillion to annual global GDP (Kabir and Klugman 2019).

► **FIGURE 21:** Type of work in last seven days, among employed



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

Note: Percentages do not sum up to 100 percent since persons may have engaged in more than one activity.

48. “Volunteering” was the most predominant form of work reported by refugees. As found in precedent studies that show that due to restrictions on the freedom of movement and difficulties in obtaining a Class M work permit, most refugees in Kalobeyei are limited to ‘incentive work’ and volunteering.⁷⁰ Nearly half of the refugees who are employed reported working as a volunteer during the past seven days—possibly in combination with another activity (Figure 21). In fact, 25 percent of those employed worked exclusively as volunteers, interns, or apprentices.⁷¹ The presence of “incentive workers,” those hired with pay restrictions by the United Nations and NGOs in community service functions, is closely regulated, and since these positions are paid, these positions were classified as remunerated work (under labor force status “wage employment”).⁷² Conversely, almost no one (less than 1 percent) in the Kenyan national population reports being engaged in volunteer activity. For Turkana County, the proportion is 3 percent. At the national level, the most common activity is wage employment, while in Turkana, the majority reported to be self-employed (49 percent

versus 23 percent for the Kenyan national average). The disproportionate number of nationals in Turkana County who report being self-employed is another contributing factor to the county being one of the poorest in Kenya.

49. Self-employed work in the informal sector is the most common source of self-generated income. Excluding volunteers, who earn very little or no money, 28 percent of refugees are self-employed in the informal sector, while an additional 10 percent are employed by others in the informal sector and 8 percent work in the formal private sector. Reportedly, 14 percent were self-employed in the agricultural sector, and 5 percent in activities related to pastoralism. Nearly 25 percent are employed by nongovernmental organizations or the United Nations. Among other factors, but mainly due to restrictions on the freedom of movement and difficulties to obtain a Class M work permit, which allows a full salary,⁷³ refugees have no option but to accept ‘incentive work’ positions and participate in the informal sector (Figure 22).⁷⁴

3.1 Livelihood assets

50. Nearly 1 in 10 refugee households received remittances in the last 12 months, while 13 percent have relatives in high-income countries. Moreover, 10 percent of households have at least one family connection outside of

⁷⁰ Betts et al. 2018.

⁷¹ Due to how the questionnaire was formulated, it is not possible to see the primary employer for volunteer positions. However, an ongoing socioeconomic assessment of the Kakuma refugee population (to be published on the last quarter of year 2020), will include this differentiation.

⁷² Betts et al. (2018) estimate that 80 percent of those with a regular income source work as “incentive workers” acting as teachers, community mobilizers, and security guards. When asked to verify this finding, enumerators confirmed that incentive workers were correctly classified as employed, and indicated that they encountered numerous refugees who reported separate volunteering activities, often as a gateway to employment.

⁷³ There are legal restrictions on the allowable monthly salary for incentive work (Betts et al. 2018).


⁷⁴ Betts et al. 2018; O’Callaghan and Sturge 2018.

► **FIGURE 22:** Main employer for the primary activity (excluding volunteer)



Source: Kalobyei (2018).

► **FIGURE 23:** Family networks and access to financial services, by sex of household head



Source: Kalobyei (2018).

the settlement in Kenya (Figure 23). Programs helping to channel remittances to productive investments, such as business-related skills, have been shown to be effective for promoting development. In Mexico—one of the highest recipients of remittances worldwide—programs focused on using remittances to foster business growth have been shown to boost entrepreneurship in lower income areas.⁷⁵ Entrepreneurship promotes self-reliance and can lead to the creation

of employment opportunities for refugees and hosts.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, although remittances can be useful to finance refugee entrepreneurial activities and family networks can support refugees in starting-up businesses, the current restrictions on the right to work and freedom of movement sharply limit refugee’s opportunities to start up businesses, hindering efforts to unlock refugees economic potential.

⁷⁵ World Bank 2019.

⁷⁶ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2019b. How business incubators can facilitate refugee entrepreneurship and integration.

51. Access to financial services and credit markets is limited. Twenty-eight percent of refugee households own a bank account—men-headed households are more likely to own one. As part of the humanitarian sector’s broader shift toward cash programming in place of traditional distributions, UNHCR adopted cash grants for shelter in 2018, for which all households were required to establish a mobile money account.⁷⁷ Therefore, it is likely that mobile banking is more common than conventional bank accounts among Kalobeyei refugees. However, mobile banking requires a mobile phone which restricts access to households that do not own one. Furthermore, access to mobile banking services are limited for refugees as buying a SIM card in Kenya requires registration and proof of identity (identity or service card, passport, or alien card), which many refugees do not have. As for access to credit and loans, refugees who received a loan in the last 12 months more often used informal sources such as friends and relatives and only 2 percent used formal sources. Kalobeyei refugees have limited access to financial services which can negatively impact their possibilities for starting up, growing, and maintaining successful businesses (Figure 23). Formal financial institutions have sizable opportunities to expand to Kalobeyei and Kakuma areas.

3.2 Food security and coping strategies

52. In the recent years, and especially starting from 2008, Kenya has been facing severe food insecurity problems. These are depicted by a high proportion of the population having no access to food in the right amounts and quality. Official estimates indicate that over 10 million people are food insecure, with the majority of them living on food relief. The current food insecurity problems are attributed to several factors, including the frequent droughts in several regions of the country, high costs of domestic food production due to high costs of inputs, especially fertilizer, displacement of a large number of farmers in the high potential agricultural areas following the post-election violence which occurred in early 2008, high global food prices, and low purchasing power for a large proportion of the population due to

⁷⁷ The SES questionnaire inquired only about accounts in banks and other formal financial institutions, given the assistance previously provided for enrollment in mobile money.

the high level of poverty.⁷⁸ In Turkana regular droughts since early 2016 have left more than 300,000 people in critical need of food assistance to survive.⁷⁹

53. In Kalobeyei, refugees’ food needs are mostly covered by UN agencies and partners. Under UNHCR’s overall protection and solutions strategy for persons of concern, the World Food Programme (WFP) and the UNHCR provide assistance to ensure that food and other basic needs are met. Recognizing the complementarity between this assistance and the increased use of cash as a modality, the UNHCR and the WFP have committed to collaborate on targeting in-kind and/or cash assistance to those most in need.⁸⁰ In Kalobeyei and Kakuma, the WFP *Bamba Chakula* (‘get your food’ in Swahili) program is the main intervention aimed at improving food security. In this program refugees receive credit on their phones every month to use at shops of registered traders to purchase food items of their choice. The aim of the program is to offer greater flexibility than in-kind food aid. While feedback from refugees recognizes the positive impact of the program, in terms of access to a more varied diet, they also report receiving insufficient food (through food rations and *Bamba Chakula*).

54. Half of the refugee households in Kalobeyei reported to have taken some measures to adapt to a recent food shortage. The World Food Program Livelihoods Coping Strategy Index is used to better understand longer-term coping capacity of households, the presence of food shortages, and strategies commonly undertaken to address them, such as selling assets, reducing nonfood consumption, and begging. The results are then weighted progressively by severity. Results show that only 42 percent of households are food secure, meaning that in the last 30 days no strategy was employed for dealing with a lack of food or money to buy food.⁸¹ The remaining households employed strategies in order of severity: 27 percent are “under stress,” 15 percent are in “crisis,” and 17 percent are in “emergency.” This finding is


⁷⁸ Kenya Agricultural Research Institute 2012.

⁷⁹ United States African Development Foundation 2017.

⁸⁰ UNHCR-WFP 2018.

⁸¹ When this report was written, no data on livelihoods coping strategies were available for Kakuma. However, these findings will be compared to the socioeconomic assessment survey results (to be published in end-2020).

► **FIGURE 24:** Livelihood coping strategies for food security



Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

coincident with precedent studies that show that food security is poor in both Kakuma and Kalobeyei (Figure 24).⁸²

4. Social Cohesion and Security Perception

55. Social cohesion and interaction between refugees and hosts are at the core of the Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan (KISED). The KISED was initially devised to support a new approach aimed at establishing a settlement in Turkana West, where both refugees and host populations would live together, rather than separated such as in an enclosed refugee camp.⁸³ The term host community officially covers all Kenyans living close to the camp/settlement or otherwise affected by the presence of the camp. In this report, host community includes all Kenyan residents of Turkana West. For many refugees, the term indicates the local Turkana people, an ethnic group that makes up most of the population in the county where Kakuma is located.⁸⁴ In this section, levels of trust and frequency of interaction between refugees and hosts are analyzed as an exploratory approach to examine social cohesion in Kalobeyei. This analysis is limited to quantitative data collected through

survey questionnaires and does not include qualitative data, which could be beneficial, especially when looking at refugees' opinions and perceptions. For that reason, qualitative approaches are recommended to be included into future socioeconomic surveys.

56. Levels of trust, security, and participation in decision making are high among refugees. Eight in 10 refugees report feeling that neighbors are generally trustworthy. More than 9 in 10 feel safe walking alone in their neighborhood during the day—but only 1 in 3 feel so at night. Meanwhile, 3 in 4 believe that they are able to express their opinions within the existing community leadership structure, and 2 in 3 perceive that their opinions are being taken into consideration for decisions that regard their well-being (Figure 25).


57. Half of refugee households reported interacting with a member of the host community in the past week—but this did not have a uniform impact on the levels of trust and feelings of safety. More than 60 percent of refugees feel safe visiting a neighboring town alone. Around half agree that host community members are generally trustworthy. This is also true for those that have not recently interacted with the host community. Similarly, around half—unsurprisingly, more so for those who reported interactions with the host community—would feel comfortable with their child socializing with members of the host community (Figure 26).

⁸² Betts et al. 2018.

⁸³ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2018.


⁸⁴ Betts et al. 2018.

► **FIGURE 25:** Perception of trust, safety, and participation



Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

► **FIGURE 26:** Relations with the host community, by frequency of interaction



Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

5. Consumption and Poverty


5.1 Monetary poverty

58. Poverty is defined as a level of consumption at which a person's minimum basic needs cannot be met. Three measures of poverty were used in this analysis: poverty headcount, poverty gap, and poverty severity. The poverty

headcount is the most widely used poverty metric; it determines the proportion of the population that is poor—who live on less than US\$1.90 a day (2011 PPP). The poverty gap estimates the average extent by which poor individuals fall below the poverty line of US\$1.90 a day;⁸⁵ expressed as a

⁸⁵ The international poverty line determines the threshold of being able to purchase a fixed basket of goods that meets basic needs in a way that is consistent across countries.

► **FIGURE 27:** Poverty headcount, international poverty line



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

percentage of the poverty line. Simply put, the poverty gap indicates how far away the poor are from escaping poverty and can also be considered a very crude measure of the cost of eliminating monetary poverty. The squared poverty gap measures the severity of poverty by considering inequality among the poor. It is simply a weighted sum of poverty gaps, where the weights are the proportionate poverty gaps themselves.⁸⁶

59. More than half of refugees in Kalobeyei are poor—this is higher than the national rate, similar to the Turkana County rate, and comparable to what is found in the average of the 15 poorest counties in Kenya. More than 60 percent of refugees fall below the international poverty line, versus 37 percent at the national level ($p < 0.001$) and 72 percent at the Turkana County level ($p < 0.105$). However, when disaggregating by location in Turkana, 85 percent of rural residents are poor, versus 51 percent of urban residents. Comparatively, the poverty rate among the 15 poorest counties in Kenya is 59 percent (Figure 27). Of note, given Kalobeyei was created less than five years ago and is populated by relatively new arrivals from South Sudan, the majority of the refugee population still benefit from a large food assistance subsidy through cash vouchers (*Bamba Chakula*). Even with this support, the poverty rate of the refugee community is


higher than that of the 15 poorest counties in Kenya. Given resource constraints and competition from new emergencies, it is likely that going forward this assistance will be reduced, bringing into frame the extreme fragility for the refugee population, particularly women-headed households, in the medium term.

60. The incidence and depth of poverty is greater among refugees than among Kenyan nationals—yet Turkana County residents are the poorest overall. The poverty gap is higher for refugees than nationals, 24 percent versus 12 percent, but lower than the poverty gap of Turkana residents (39 percent, $p < 0.01$). Added to that, the poverty severity among refugees is 12 percent, while for Turkana residents it is 25 percent. The poverty gap can be used for a rough estimation of the cost of closing the poverty gap and thus to eliminate poverty. In this case, eradicating poverty among refugees in Kalobeyei would require a transfer of US\$168 per person per year (2011 PPP) (equivalent to around US\$14 a month), versus US\$270 per person per year for the rest of Turkana County (Figure 28). Based on these estimates, it would cost around US\$6 million per year to eradicate poverty for refugees and about US\$290 million per year for the host community.

61. A larger household size is associated with higher poverty rates. More than two-thirds of refugee and host community households with seven or more members live below


⁸⁶ Foster et al. 1984; Haughton and Khandker 2009.

► **FIGURE 28:** Poverty gap and severity, international poverty line



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

► **FIGURE 29:** Poverty by household size, international poverty line



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).


the poverty line. For refugee households with one to three members, this estimate drops to 15 percent. The same patterns are found for Kenya overall, increasing from 10 percent for households with one to three members to 58 percent for households with seven or more members. For Turkana County poverty incidence increases from 41 percent for households with one to three members, to 80 percent for households with seven or more members (Figure 29).

62. Poverty is substantially higher among households in which children reside. Fifty-nine percent of refugee households with children live below the poverty line as compared

to 10 percent of those without children ($p < 0.001$) (Figure 30). The same pattern is observed for Kenyan households at the national (36 percent vs 8 percent) and Turkana level (75 percent vs 25 percent).


63. Women-headed households are poorer than their men-headed counterparts. As outlined above, refugee households have a higher frequency of women headship than the national average. However, poverty is more widespread among women-headed households than among those headed by men. Fifty-nine percent of women-headed households in Kalobeyei are poor, compared to 38 percent

► **FIGURE 30:** Poverty by whether children reside in the household, international poverty line



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

► **FIGURE 31:** Poverty by sex of the household head, international poverty line



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

of men-headed households ($p < 0.001$). While a similar pattern of higher poverty among women-headed households can be found in Kenya overall and Turkana County, the differential is more pronounced in the settlement than it is among non-refugees (Figure 31). As discussed in previous sections, refugee women in Kalobeyei tend to have a lower level of education compared to men. Women’s employment rate is also lower than that of their male counterparts. Overall, women have less access to paid labor and education opportunities than men, which translates into higher levels of poverty.

64. Poverty declines with higher levels of education.


Estimates also show that poverty is negatively associated with increases in the level of education of household heads.

Poverty rates are the highest when household heads have never attended school, and the lowest when they have tertiary education. For households who have heads that have never attended school, the poverty rate is 65 percent in Kalobeyei, 51 percent in Kenya overall, and 74 percent in Turkana (Figure 32). As seen in the education section, most refugees with low levels of education are women. Therefore, the poverty trap in Kalobeyei can be partly explained by gender-based factors related to disadvantageous gender roles that restrict women’s access to education and participation in the labor market.

65. Poverty is high among households headed by the South Sudanese, mainly in villages 1 and 3.


Among the four major nationalities in the settlement, households headed by the

► **FIGURE 32:** Poverty by education of the head, international poverty line



Source: Kalobeyei (2018); KIHBS (2015/16).

► **FIGURE 33:** Poverty by origin of the head, international poverty line



Source: Kalobeyei (2018).


South Sudanese, which are also mostly headed by women, are the poorest (60 percent). For the other three nationalities, poverty estimates stand at 38 percent for Ethiopians, 29 percent for Congolese, and 28 percent for Burundians (Figure 33).⁸⁷ Consequently, poverty is higher in villages 1 and 3, which have higher numbers of South Sudanese. About 57 percent of households in Village 3 live below the international poverty line, compared to 52 percent in Village 1 ($p < 0.217$) and 46 percent in Village 2 ($p < 0.001$).

66. Poverty is mainly driven by age, employment status of the household head, household size, and assets. A welfare model based on a regression analysis was carried out to model factors associated with increasing levels of poverty (Table 1 in Appendix 4).⁸⁸ Households with older heads (55+ years) are worse off than those with younger heads (15–34 years), while those with paid jobs or owning a business are better off than those without paid jobs or businesses. Among household characteristics, welfare decreases

⁸⁷ This paragraph considers only households with heads from South Sudan, Ethiopia, DRC, and Burundi. For other households, sample sizes were too low to generate reliable poverty estimates.

⁸⁸ The welfare model is given by $Y_i = \alpha + \beta X_i + \epsilon_i$; where Y_i is the consumption expenditure, X_i are household and head characteristics, and ϵ_i is a normally and independently distributed error term.

► **FIGURE 34:** Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI)



Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

with increases in household size, number of people occupying a room, while having at least a child in the house does not affect welfare. Households with improved floor and roof materials are better off than those with unimproved floor and roof materials. As for source of lighting, households that use battery lamps are better off than those with no source of lighting. Furthermore, the asset index shows that the higher the index, the greater the welfare. Surprisingly, after controlling for other factors, gender, education, and country of origin of head do not significantly affect welfare. However, while most of unemployed and inactive refugees are women, larger households are normally headed by women, thus women in Kalobeyei are the poorest overall.


5.2 Multidimensional poverty

67. The Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI) is designed to complement monetary poverty measures by weighing key human development outcomes—referred to here as ‘deprivations’—related to health, education, and standard of living. The standard MPI, comprised of 10 indicators, can be used to create a comprehensive picture of people living in poverty, and permits comparisons both within countries and across countries and regions around the world, by ethnic group, and urban or rural location, as well as other key household and community characteristics.^{89, 90} For the

⁸⁹ The standard MPI, developed by Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), comprises 10 weighted indicators across three dimensions: education (years of schooling, educational attendance), health (child mortality, nutrition), and living standards (electricity, sanitation, drinking water, household, cooking fuel, and assets). See Appendix 5 for detailed description of methodology.

⁹⁰ United Nations Development Programme 2019.

► **FIGURE 35:** Monetary poverty



Kalobeyei refugee population, a partial multidimensional poverty index is calculated using available data.⁹¹ Below refugees’ multidimensional poverty rate is compared to the consumption-based monetary poverty rate presented above.


68. One-third of households in Kalobeyei are multidimensionally deprived—lower than what is found using monetary poverty measures. Using the modified MPI, households fall into the following classifications: ‘severely deprived’ (6 percent), ‘deprived’ (27 percent), ‘vulnerable to deprivation’ (41 percent), and ‘non-deprived’ (26 percent) (Figure 34). The numbers are similar when using individual headcount, versus status of household head. In comparison, the headcount for monetary poverty using consumption is 65 percent (Figure 35).

69. The main drivers of multidimensional deprivation are found in the “living standards” dimension of the MPI. Higher proportions of deprivation were identified in the indicators of quality of flooring (90 percent of households deprived or severely deprived), asset ownership (76 percent), and access to electricity (68 percent). In the education dimension of the MPI, deprivation is low for the current school enrollment indicator (2 percent) but somewhat higher for the adult education achievement indicator (33 percent). Child mortality as captured in the health dimension of the MPI was reported by 8 percent of households.

70. The highest rates of multidimensional poverty occur in women-headed households, as well as those from South Sudan and Uganda. Women-headed households have a


⁹¹ The multidimensional poverty rate was not calculated for nationals.

► **FIGURE 36:** Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), by gender and origin of head



Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

► **FIGURE 37:** Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), by education of head and household size



Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

depravity rate (deprived or severely deprived) of 40 percent, versus 19 percent for those headed by men. Of countries of origin, South Sudanese (38 percent) household heads have the most elevated rate, while the lowest were found among those from Ethiopia (15 percent) and DR Congo (20 percent). With the exception of Burundians, in all cases the multidimensional deprivation rate is lower than that of monetary poverty (Figure 36). Nevertheless, this confirms that poverty in Kalobeyei has a female face.

71. Education was also correlated with the multidimensional poverty rate, but household size was not. Multidimensional poverty rate is negatively correlated with education level: 51 percent of households with an uneducated household head are deprived, falling to 22 percent for those with a primary education and under 10 percent for a secondary education and above. Small families (1–3 members) and large families (7+) had a slightly lower chance of being poor than those with 4–6 members (Figure 37).

5.3. Understanding refugee women’s socioeconomic limitations

BOX
2

Refugee women’s socioeconomic limitations


Overall, most refugee households in Kalobeyei are women headed, face poor living standards, and have low literacy and labor force participation rates. The SES findings demonstrate that living conditions for refugees in Kalobeyei vary according to sex and gender-based norms. Such variation translates into a series of disadvantaged living conditions for women that exacerbate their already complex situation, creating a matrix of intersecting vulnerabilities. Despite being most of the refugee population in Kalobeyei, women face higher poverty levels; lower access to basic services such as water, sanitation, and education; and tend to have a lower labor force participation rate. South Sudanese households which are mostly headed by women (77 percent) are the worse off among refugees in Kalobeyei. In fact, 60 percent of the poor households in Kalobeyei are headed by South Sudanese. A closer examination of the employment and education findings provides possible explanations for this trend:

1. *Education.* Refugee women and girls have lower literacy rates and lower gross and net attendance rates than men and boys. Likewise, less women than men are literate in English and Swahili. Literacy is associated with higher levels of education and socioeconomic standing, while skill with an official language of Kenya may help facilitate business and employment opportunities. Following this, the lower literacy rates among women correlate with low levels of access to education and can potentially imply a barrier to seeking local employment opportunities. Lower literacy rates and access to education for women and girls may be explained by gender-based norms that prioritize male education and restrict women from developing non-domestic-related skills. With some differences across cultures, women are usually not expected to work on a paid basis and thus ‘do not need to study to get a job’ since they are to be economically dependent on a male partner or spouse, take care of family members, and carry out unpaid household and care work.⁹²
2. *Employment.* Refugee women in Kalobeyei have lower labor force participation rates and are more likely to be outside the labor force due to ‘family responsibilities’—which include domestic and care work—than men. Furthermore, more women than men reported to not have looked for a job because they were not able to find an activity in which their abilities were required. These findings reflect that on the one hand, women are overburdened with ‘family responsibilities’ that prevent them from looking for paid jobs. On the other hand, the survey findings show that some refugee women have not developed the required skills to be able to participate in the labor market (due to restrictions to education) (Figure 38). Thus, women are prevented from looking for a paid job because they

⁹² From cooking and cleaning, to fetching water and firewood or taking care of children and the elderly, women carry out at least two-and-a-half times more unpaid household and care work than men. As a result, they have less time to engage in paid labor, or work longer hours, combining paid and unpaid labor (UN Women 2016).

are devoting their time to nonpaid, caring labor activities while men are busy in full-time education where they can develop useful skills that can translate into paid jobs in the future. Considering that many refugee women—especially from South Sudan—migrate without a male partner or spouse, refugee women are facing new responsibilities that involve shifting gender roles. Refugee women need to engage in paid labor activities—possibly for the first time—and undertake jobs for which they may not necessarily have the needed skills. Migration (forced and voluntary) largely permeates trajectories of women economic empowerment (WEE). While in some cases migration may bring opportunities for WEE due to exposure to new social norms, it can also limit WEE due to an increased risk of violence or disadvantageous gender-based norms. The case of South Sudanese women in Kalobeyei is an example of forced migrant women that face new living experiences in which they need to work for pay and undertake jobs for which they may not necessarily have the needed skills. In consequence they remain inactive and thus, reliant on aid.

► **FIGURE 38:** Factors limiting refugee women socioeconomic potential



Therefore, gender-responsive policies and programs need to take into consideration socio-cultural norms and practices that prevent WEE and limit women's opportunities for socio-economic growth. Furthermore, gender-responsive programs need to be developed in a participatory manner, assessing the needs of the target population by including them into the program design process.



Conclusions and Recommendations

72. Data collection, analysis, and dissemination are crucial to inform targeted policies and to meet the objectives of the Global Compact on Refugees. With the rise in forced displacement worldwide, efforts have been made to understand and tackle its causes and consequences. These contributions have produced useful analytical outputs. However, several data limitations prevent an accurate assessment of socioeconomic conditions among refugees and hosts, which hinders efforts to design targeted policy interventions. Micro-data collection through household surveys which is comparable between refugees and nationals, as carried out for refugees in the Kalobeyei settlement and later in Kakuma refugee camp, can contribute to filling socioeconomic data gaps while supporting the objectives of the Global Compact on Refugees. Therefore, it is recommended to develop and strengthen international and national policy frameworks that promote the implementation of refugee household surveys comparable to national measures to understand the living conditions and needs of both populations and correctly inform targeted policies and programs. Such efforts can be instrumental in strengthening the humanitarian-development nexus to find durable solutions and designing both development and humanitarian programs.

73. Systematically including refugees into national surveys can contribute to filling socioeconomic data gaps on internationally displaced populations. Kenya has shown progress in data availability at the national and county levels and made efforts to measure the impacts of forced displacement. However, socioeconomic data to compare poverty and vulnerability levels between refugees, host communities, and nationals remain scarce. Refugees in Kenya are not systematically included in national surveys that serve as the primary tools for measuring and monitoring poverty, labor markets, and other welfare indicators at the country level. Including them can contribute to filling socioeconomic data gaps on international displacement, while providing crucial inputs

to inform targeted responses, policies, and programs for refugees and host communities. Particularly, increasing panel data across refugee and host communities would provide a rich learning to assess how welfare and social cohesion trends change over time. Investigating this hypothesis and others underlines our earlier point, the need for panel data to monitor changes of the same household over times of war and forced displacement.

74. Socioeconomic data with a focus on the displacement trajectory can further enhance the design of solutions for displacement. Socioeconomic surveys are essential to understand the current living conditions of households to inform policies, for example, on labor markets and safety nets as well as health and education. However, they usually do not consider the specific displacement trajectory of refugees who are affected by traumatic episodes causing them to cross international borders. It is critical to understand refugees' vulnerabilities and needs in order to find solutions. It is recommended that a forcibly displaced module be developed by development organizations in collaboration with national statistics offices, to serve as an input for existing surveys, such as national surveys that measure poverty, Living Standards Measurement Surveys, and beyond. A standardized forced displacement module that measures the vulnerabilities faced by refugees and other forcibly displaced persons is essential to complete the picture needed for informing optimal national policies and programming. A newly developed framework by the World Bank has been administered to displaced populations in Ethiopia, Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Sudan—and should be considered for future data collection of refugees in Kenya and other countries in the region.⁹³

⁹³ Pape and Sharma. 2019. Informing Durable Solutions for Internal Displacement in Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Sudan.

75. Access to improved sanitation must be further enhanced among the refugee and host populations.

While 68 percent of Turkana residents do not have access to improved sanitation, almost half of the refugees in Kalobeyei face the same situation. Lack of access to improved sanitation involves overcrowding in toilet use, which reduces living standards, contributes to the spread of communicable diseases, and increases the threat of being a victim of gender-based violence (GBV)—especially for women and girls. Investment and financial support to policy and program efforts such as those under the CIDP (Turkana County Integrated Development Plan) and KISEDIP must be increased and continued to promote access to improved sanitation facilities for hosts and refugees. Interventions to improve access to sanitation facilities could build on ongoing work to provide training on building latrines, accompanied with the provision of building materials, as well as the use of innovative technological solutions. Added to that, awareness raising campaigns on the risks of poor sanitation for hosts and refugees could help overcome risks associated with lack of access to improved sanitation. Overall, substantial investment is needed to enhance inclusive delivery of services for hosts and refugees, as well as to improve the quality of the delivered services. Investment in basic services has a direct impact on human capital accumulation, economic growth rates, and poverty reduction.

76. Building and maintaining human capital and improving housing conditions among refugees and hosts, needs to be prioritized.

The young refugee and Turkana host populations have lower access to education than other Kenyans. The large number of young refugees and hosts has implications for the need for basic services today, as well as economic opportunities in the future. Improving the availability and quality of service delivery for refugees and the host community is a recognized goal of the KISEDIP, as well as the social pillar of the Kenya national development strategy, *Vision 2030*. Despite improvements, access to basic services remains a challenge in Turkana County, the consequences for which are magnified by the large share of a young population. Policy, programmatic, and financial interventions must prioritize and maintain human capital by expanding access to education for young refugees and hosts, improving housing conditions, and ensuring access to electricity. Thus,

substantial investment is needed to enhance inclusive delivery of services for hosts and refugees. Policy efforts must incorporate a gender-responsive approach that addresses the needs and vulnerabilities of women and girls and ensures access to education and livelihoods opportunities for them.

77. Promoting self-reliant agricultural interventions can support food security.

While 42 percent of households are food secure,⁹⁴ 27 percent are “under stress,” 15 percent are in “crisis,” and 17 percent are in “emergency.” Investment and financial support is needed for policies and programs such as those under the KISEDIP to promote self-reliance interventions to overcome food insecurity; firstly, by ensuring that no refugee (nor host) lives under stress, crisis, or emergency due to lack of food, and secondly, by assessing the needs, skills, and resources in refugee and host populations to promote sustainable practices to achieve food security. Food security interventions could include access to land for agricultural activities, subsidies on farm inputs, access to credit and cash transfers for farming, and development of rural agricultural markets and agribusiness skills. The implementation of food security interventions needs to promote partnerships between (national and international) organizations in the field and the Government National Cereals and Produce Board (NCPB) and other relevant government institutions. While food security has been improved through the *Bamba Chakula* program and partners interventions, further investment and targeted interventions are needed to overcome high levels of food insecurity. In addition to this, future surveys can benefit from comparing Kalobeyei and Kakuma levels of food security to identify which model (camp vs settlement) brings more durable impacts and leads to sustainable solutions.

78. Joint programs for refugees and host populations can further improve social cohesion.

Overall, 8 in 10 refugees report feeling that neighbors are generally trustworthy. Meanwhile, 3 in 4 believe that they are able to express their opinions within the existing community leadership structure, and 2 in 3 perceive that their opinions are being taken into consideration for decisions that regard their well-being.

⁹⁴ Meaning that in the last thirty days, no strategy was employed to deal with a lack of food or money to buy food.

In terms of social cohesion between refugees and hosts, 50 percent of refugee households reported interacting with a member of the host community in the past week, and more than 60 percent of refugees feel safe visiting a neighboring town alone. Around 50 percent agree that host community members are generally trustworthy. Similarly, around 50 percent would feel comfortable with their child socializing with members of the host community. To continue to promote greater social cohesion and generate opportunities for socio-economic integration outside of camps, policy and financial interventions should facilitate the implementation of social cohesion programs that promote interaction between refugees and hosts to (a) deconstruct myths about hosts or refugees, (b) promote intercultural exchange, and (c) stimulate the creation of partnerships and collective businesses co-led by refugees and hosts. In addition, programs that improve livelihoods and access to services should be designed to include host communities.

79. Gender-responsive policies and programs need to be implemented to address gender-based stereotypical barriers that prevent women from finding sustainable livelihoods and fully participate in the labor force. It is urgent to support refugee women and ensure they have enabling conditions to participate in the labor force. This involves having time to devote to paid activities—and not only caring and domestic nonpaid work in the household. Interventions could include business skills development programs, cash transfer interventions, literacy programs for women, and gender stereotypes awareness programs that promote shared responsibility of caring labor (between men and women), subsidized day care programs for working moms, and sensitize communities regarding the positive impacts of supporting girls' education and women's participation in the labor market. It is important to shift gender-stereotypical perspectives and address vulnerabilities derived from overburdening

women and girls with 'family responsibilities' that should be shared by both men and women. Furthermore, focusing on enhancing access to financial services for women can help close gender gaps and contribute to women economic empowerment efforts by enabling them to gain control over spending decisions within the household. A systematic use of existing good practices to closing gender gaps and enhancing the agency of women and girls would increase the scope and impact of operations in contexts of forced displacement.⁹⁵

80. Increasing work opportunities and business conducive environments for the refugee and host populations can help reduce aid dependence, improve livelihoods, and support self-reliance. In Kalobeyei, only 39 percent of the population are of working age (15–64 years), versus 55 percent in Kenya as a whole and 46 percent in Turkana County. Among those of working age, labor force participation rates are low (39 percent). In order to tackle this, policy and programmatic efforts must promote and ensure easing of legislative barriers to enable refugees to work and freely move in Kenya. Entrepreneurial activities can be supported by engaging formal financial institutions to expand access to loans and credits. Similarly, the county government and development organizations can partner with the private sector to promote investing in refugee-led businesses and create employment opportunities in the area.⁹⁶ Coupled with that, market system analyses to identify the sectors in Turkana West that can maximize jobs and income generation, along with vocational and business training to assure market-driven skills development, and job-matching can enhance livelihood opportunities. Access to land to promote the utilization and development of agricultural skills can also support livelihoods among refugees. Importantly, substantial investment is needed to maintain gains made and accelerate the KISED P's areas of intervention.

⁹⁵ The Gender Group 2019.

⁹⁶ An example of this is the IFC investment climate program, as well as the Huduma-Biashara One-Shop-Stop programs, which have been approved and will be rolled out in 2020.




References

- Beegle, Kathleen, Joachim de Weerd, Jed Friedman, and John Gibson. 2012. "Methods of Household Consumption Measurement through Surveys: Experimental Results from Tanzania." *Journal of Development Economics* 3-18.
- Betts, Alex, Remco Geervliet, and Claire MacPherson. 2018. *Self-Reliance in Kalobeyei? Socio-Economic Outcomes for Refugees in North-West Kenya*. Oxford: Refugee Studies Center.
- Deaton, Angus, and S. Zaidi. 2002. *Guidelines for Constructing Consumption Aggregates for Welfare Analysis*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- Department of Water Agriculture and Irrigation, Turkana County Government. 2017. *Turkana County Water, Sanitation Services Sector Strategic Plan 2017-2021*. Turkana County Government.
- Foster, J., Greer, J., and Thorbecke, E. 1984. "A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures." *Econometrica* 781.
- Garlick, M., Guild, E., Proctor, C., and Salomons, M. 2015. *Building on the foundation: formative evaluation of the refugee status determination (RSD)*. UNHCR.
- Houghton, J., and Khandker, S. 2009. *Handbook on Poverty and Inequality*. Washington DC: World Bank.
- IFC, International Finance Corporation. 2016. *DHS Analytical Studies. Using Household Survey Data to Explore the Effects of Improved Housing Conditions on Malaria Infection in Children in Sub-Saharan Africa.* DHS Analytical Studies No. 61. USA: IFC. <https://dhsprogram.com/pubs/pdf/AS61/AS61.pdf>.
- Institute for Health Metrics and Evaluation (IHME). 2017. *Global Burden of Disease Study*. Seattle: IHME.
- Kabir, Raiyan, and Jeni Klugman. 2019. *Unlocking Refugee Women's Potential. Closing Economic Gaps to Benefit All*. International Rescue Committee.
- Kaplan, Lennart, Utz Johann Pape, and James Walsh. April 2018. "Eliciting Accurate Responses to Consumption Questions among IDPs in South Sudan Using 'Honesty Primes'." *World Bank Group, Working Paper, 8539*.
- Kenya Agricultural Research Institute. 2012. "Food Security Report." *Food Security Portal*. Accessed 2019. <http://www.foodsecurityportal.org/kenya/food-security-report-prepared-kenya-agricultural-research-institute>.
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. 2015. *County Statistical Abstract. Turkana County*. Kenya National Bureau of Statistics.
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. 2018a. *Basic Report: 2015/16 Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey*. Nairobi: KNBS.
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. 2018b. *Basic Report on Well-Being in Kenya*. Nairobi: KNBS.
- Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. 2018c. *Labour Force Basic Report*. Nairobi: KNBS.
- Kilic, Talip, and Thomas Sohnesen. 2019. "Same Question but Different Answer: Experimental Evidence on Questionnaire Design's Impact on Poverty Measured by Proxies." *Review of Income and Wealth* 144-65.
- Maxwell, Daniel, and Richard Caldwell. 2008. *The Coping Strategies Index. A tool for rapid measurement of household food security and the impact of food aid programs in humanitarian emergencies*. CARE.


- Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government. 2017. *Identification Documents*. <https://perma.cc/4UDM-BJGB>.
- National Council for Law Reporting. 2010. *Constitution of Kenya*. Nairobi: National Council for Law Reporting with the Authority of the Attorney-General. <http://kenyalaw.org:8181/exist/kenyalex/actview.xql?actid=Const2010>.
- O’Callaghan, and Sturge. 2018. *Against the odds: refugee integration in Kenya*. Humanitarian Policy Group.
- Pape, Utz, and Ambika Sharma. 2019. *Informing Durable Solutions for Internal Displacement In Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Sudan*. Washington DC: World Bank Group.
- Pape, Utz, and Johan Mistiaen. 2018. “Household Expenditure and Poverty Measures in 60 Minutes: A New Approach with Results from Mogadishu.” *Working Paper*.
- Refugee Affairs Secretariat. 2019. *Background/A brief history*. Nairobi: State Department of Immigration and Citizen Services.
- Refugee Consortium of Kenya. 2012. “Asylum under threat: assessing the protection of Somali refugees in Dadaab refugee camps and along the migration corridor.” Accessed 2019. https://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/Asylum_Under_Threat.pdf.
- Sanghi, Apurva, Harun Onder, and Varalakshmi Vemuru. 2016. *Yes in my backyard? The economics of refugees and their social dynamics in Kakuma, Kenya*. Washington DC: World Bank Group.
- Schuetzler, Kirsten. 2017. *Refugees’ right to work: Necessary but insufficient for formal employment of refugees*. World Bank.
- The Gender Group, The World Bank Group. 2019. “Addressing the Needs of Women and Girls in Contexts of Forced Displacement: Experiences from Operations.” <http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/138521556825963608/Addressing-the-Needs-of-Women-and-Girls-in-Contexts-of-Forced-Displacement-Experiences-from-Operations>.
- Turkana County Government. 2019. *County Integrated Development Plan*. Turkana County Government. https://www.turkana.go.ke/wp-content/uploads/2019/10/Turkana_CIDP_Book_POPULAR_V3.pdf.
- UN Women. 2016. “Redistribute unpaid work.” <https://www.unwomen.org/en/news/in-focus/csw61/redistribute-unpaid-work>.
- UNHCR, The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. 2005. *Handbook for Self-reliance*. Geneva: United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR).
- . 2003. *Implementing Registration within an Identity Management Framework*. Geneva: UNHCR.
- . 2017. *Kakuma Integrated Livelihoods Strategy 2017-2019*.
- . 2018. *Kalobeyei Integrated Socio-Economic Development Plan for Turkana West (KISED P)*. Nairobi: UNHCR.
- . 2019. *Kenya Figures at a Glance*. May. <https://www.unhcr.org/ke/figures-at-a-glance>.
- . 2019a. *Figures at a Glance*. UNHCR.
- . 2019b. *How business incubators can facilitate refugee entrepreneurship and integration*. <https://www.unhcr.org/innovation/how-we-can-use-business-incubators-for-refugee-integration/>.
- . 2019c. *KISED P Progress Report. January 2018-June 2019*. UNHCR.
- . 2019d. *Refugee Status Determination*. <https://www.unhcr.org/ke/refugee-status-determination>.
- . 2019e. *Refugee Status Determination*. <https://www.unhcr.org/refugee-status-determination.html>.
- . 2020. *Global Trends. Forced displacement in 2019*. UNHCR.
- UNHCR-DRC. 2012. *Living on the Edge. A Livelihood Status Report on Urban Refugees Living in Nairobi, Kenya*. United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, Danish Refugee Council.

- UNHCR-WFP. 2018. *Joint principles for targeting assistance to meet food and other basic needs to persons of concern*. World Food Programme.
- United Nations. 2018. *Global Compact on Refugees*. New York: United Nations.
- United Nations Development Programme. 2019. *Frequently Asked Questions—Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI)*. <http://hdr.undp.org/en/faq-page/multidimensional-poverty-index-mpi#t295n2957>.
- United States African Development Foundation. 2017. *In Kenya, supporting Turkana to move from food aid to self-sufficiency*. Accessed 2019. <https://reliefweb.int/report/kenya/kenya-supporting-turkana-move-food-aid-self-sufficiency>.
- WaterAid. 2013. *We can't wait: A report on sanitation and hygiene for women and girls*. London: WaterAid.
- World Bank. 2018a. *Kakuma as a marketplace: a consumer and market study of a refugee camp and town in northwest Kenya*. Washington DC: World Bank Group.
- . 2018b. *Kenya Poverty and Gender Assessment 2015–2016: Reflecting on a Decade of Progress and the Road Ahead*. Washington DC: World Bank Group.
- . 2019. *Migration and Remittances: Recent Developments and Outlook*. Washington DC: World Bank Group.
- . 2017a. *The Impact of Conflict and Shocks on Poverty: South Sudan Poverty Assessment 2017*. Washington DC: World Bank Group.
- World Bank Group-UNHCR. 2016. *Yes in My Backyard? The Economics of Refugees and Their Social Dynamics in Kakuma, Kenya*. UNHCR, World Bank Group.
- World Health Organization. 2019. *Water sanitation hygiene. What are the health risks related to overcrowding?* World Health Organization.
- Zetter and Ruadel. 2017. “Kenya profile, KNOMAD refugees’ right to work and access to labor markets: an assessment, Kenya country case study.”
- Zetter, Roger, and Héloïse Ruadel. 2016. *KNOMAD Study. Refugees’ Right to Work and Access to Labor Markets—An Assessment*. KNOMAD. Global Knowledge Partnership on Migration and Development.



Appendices

1. Map of Turkana West in Kenya



2. Map of Kakuma Refugee Camp and Kalobeyei Refugee Settlement



-  UNHCR Sub-Office
-  Refugee Settlement
-  Refugee Camp



Map Sources: UNCS, UNHCR
The boundaries and names shown and the designations used on this map do not imply official endorsement or acceptance by the United Nations. Printing date: 13 Jan 2020

3. Identification Documents

Type of document	Purpose of document	Information included	Document holder	Validity	Place of issue and authority
DRA asylum pass	To confirm that person/s is accepted as an asylum seeker	Names of all members on a case, photos of each person, age, family relationship	The principal applicant	6 months	DRA Shauri Moyo, Kakuma, Dadaab, Mombasa, Nakuru, Eldoret
Notification of recognition	This document is issued to all refugees recognized after July 1, 2014. The document confirms recognition of refugee status. It is intended to document the refugee status of the individual while the refugee awaits the issuance of the Refugee ID card. It can be used to access all services	File number, photo, name, nationality, and DOB. Indicates that holder and dependents are persons of concern to UNHCR	The principal applicant and all dependents over 16 years	1 year	DRA Lavington. Issued jointly by DRA-UNHCR
Mandate Refugee Certificate (MRC)	This document is issued to all refugees recognized before July 1, 2014. Document confirms recognition of refugee status. Can be used to access all services	File number, photo, name, nationality, and DOB and validity of document	The principal applicant and all dependents over 16 years	2 years. Renewable by UNHCR until further notice	First issuance of by UNHCR, RSD Unit. Renewal is undertaken by UNHCR, Protection Delivery Unit
Refugee ID card		Photo, fingerprints, and name		5 years	DRA
UN Convention Travel Document (UNCTD)	Traveling outside Kenya	—	Applicant	—	DRA in collaboration with UNHCR

Source: Ministry of Interior and Coordination of National Government 2017.

4. Determinants of Welfare

► **TABLE 1:** Determinants of welfare, preliminary regression analysis results

	Variable	Coefficient (standard error)
Head characteristics		
Age (base: 15–34 years)	35–54 years	–0.022 (0.038)
	55+ years	–0.206* (0.100)
Gender	Women	–0.024 (0.039)
Education (base: none)	Primary	0.046 (0.037)
	Secondary	0.078 (0.057)
	Technical or vocational	0.194* (0.079)
	Higher	0.098 (0.120)
Country of origin (base: South Sudan)	Ethiopia	–0.003 (0.061)
	Burundi	–0.107 (0.057)
	DR Congo	0.038 (0.081)
	Other	0.026 (0.111)
Activity	Employee	0.114* (0.050)
	Business owner	0.120* (0.049)
Disability	Disabled	0.241*** (0.058)
Household characteristics		
Size (base: 1–2)	3–4	–0.590*** (0.092)
	5–6	–0.831*** (0.095)
	7	–1.110*** (0.100)
Asset index		0.046*** (0.011)
Floor material (base: Unimproved)	Improved	0.391* (0.176)
Roof material (base: Unimproved)	Improved	0.102* (0.050)
Source of lighting (base: none)	Solar/biogas	0.059 (0.047)
	Battery lamp	0.169*** (0.048)
	Fire	–0.022 (0.062)
	Electricity/Generator	0.120 (0.190)
Relative abroad		0.079 (0.066)
Household crowding index (base: 3 or more)	2–3	–0.037 (0.095)
	0–2	–0.238* (0.107)
Percentage of children less than 15 years (base: none)	0–50%	0.030 (0.083)
	50%–75%	0.039 (0.087)
	75% +	–0.003 (0.099)
Village of residence (base: Village 1)	Village 2	0.068 (0.045)
	Village 3	0.056 (0.042)
N		1090
Adjusted R ²		47

Source: Kalobeyei (2018).

Note: Significance level: 1% (***), 5% (**) and 10% (*). Standard errors are in parenthesis.

5. Detailed Overview of the Methodology

Design

81. The household definition is aligned with what is used by the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics (KNBS) and was adapted to the refugee context. According to the KNBS 2015/16 Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS), households are groups of people who are living together, have a common household head, and share “a common source of food and/or income as a single unit in the sense that they have common housekeeping arrangements [. . .]” Based on the KNBS definition of a household, as well as with the feedback from the field testing carried out before the data collection, the household definition adopted for this survey is “a set of related or unrelated people (either sharing the same dwelling or not) who pool ration cards and regularly cook and eat together.”⁹⁷ The UNHCR definition of family was not used as a definition of a household. The definition of a UNHCR family was not used for this assessment since it serves for registration processes as well as for allocation of assistance and resettlement. Additionally, in practice, refugees may or may not live with their registration unit—or they may share resources across units. To ensure that the results are comparable to national surveys, the SES was designed to allow merging and splitting of UNHCR registration units to align with the Kenya National Bureau of Statistics household definition.⁹⁸

82. Linking VRX and SES reduced survey application time and the nonresponse rate, improved quality through enhanced oversight, and saved refugees’ time—though new challenges are introduced. Both the basic and the extended SES have a household nonresponse rate of about

2 percent, mainly due to the absence of an adult household member present at the time of the survey. This relatively low nonresponse rate is attributed to the large communication campaign undertaken by UNHCR and the government to ensure the presence of all household members on the day of the survey, given the connection between verification, legal status, and continued eligibility for assistance. The use of monitoring tools, including daily consistency checks adapted from the KIHBS and national surveys, had positive impacts on data quality for both surveys, while running them together allowed for an efficient allocation of financial resources and time. Linking the two also introduces a challenge: as verification is known among refugees to inform eligibility for assistance, there is a risk that responses to the socioeconomic survey are influenced by this perception.⁹⁹ The Kalobeyei SES controlled for this through careful communications, both in a campaign in advance of the data collection and in messaging from the enumerators, and by monitoring response rates compared to averages from national surveys.¹⁰⁰ Future work is recommended to further assess this dynamic, for example, through the use of behavioral nudges.¹⁰¹

Survey instruments

83. The exercise encompasses three different survey instruments: the VRX questionnaire, a basic SES, and an extended SES interview. ProGres records were updated for all households in the settlement. A systematic random sample was then selected for an extended SES interview.¹⁰² Those who were not selected for the extended interview were administered a shorter version of the questionnaire (Figure 39, Table 2). The sample of the extended survey alone is representative and therefore sufficient for generating poverty estimate headline indicators for the population as a whole.

⁹⁷ Kenya National Bureau of Statistics 2018a.

⁹⁸ United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees 2003. See: <https://www.refworld.org/pdfid/3f967dc14.pdf>. UNHCR group definitions include household, family, and case. A *household* is defined as “a group of persons (one or more) living together who make common provisions for food or other essentials of living.” A *family* is “those members of a household who are related to a specific degree through blood, adoption, or marriage. The degree of relationship used in determining the limits of the family is dependent on the uses to which the data is put, and cannot be defined on a worldwide basis.” Finally, case is an additional designation used for specific actions, such as status determination or resettlement.


⁹⁹ For example, those who are not present and accounted for at the time of verification may not be eligible for further food or cash distribution.

¹⁰⁰ Similar to national governments in some settings, UNHCR often acts as the primary service provider on which refugees rely for their well-being. Registration data carry legal standing, including use in resettlement, and are increasingly verified by biometric identification, which increases quality. At the same time, data use for distribution of assistance may create certain incentives when it comes to reporting on need or indicators related to targeting of these services.

¹⁰¹ An extension of this work in Kakuma is expected to include behavioral nudges to understand the potential impact of this effect Kaplan et al. 2018.

¹⁰² The sample was implicitly stratified for the three villages in the camp.

► **FIGURE 39:** Illustration of VRX and long and short SES coverage in the settlement



Source: Authors' illustration.

► **TABLE 2:** Kalobeyei questionnaires for basic and extended surveys

Module	Questionnaire	Respondent	Based on KIHBS 2015/16
Education	Basic & extended	Individual	✓
Employment	Basic & extended	Individual	✓
Household characteristics	Basic & extended	Head	✓
Assets	Basic & extended	Head	✓
Access to services	Extended	Head	
Vulnerabilities, social cohesion, coping	Extended	Head	
Consumption and expenditure	Extended	Head	✓

Source: Authors' illustration.

Combined with this, the additional household-level information allows household-level poverty modeling for programmatic purposes.

84. The SES data can be linked to the proGres database for additional analysis and programming. The SES survey records the proGres ID for the data to be linked to the proGres database and enables cross-checks and comparisons between the datasets.¹⁰³ This allows verifying the accuracy and plausibility of the data in the analysis. In addition, the correlation between variables in the proGres database

and the more detailed SES indicators can be explored and used for programming. This helps to better understand the implications of the proGres variables, which are available for a large number of refugee populations worldwide (Table 3).

Sampling

85. The sample size for SES is based on power calculations allowing detection of statistical differences across balanced groups for key indicators. The survey is designed to identify up to a 15 percent difference in the poverty rate between two groups in the sample. For the Kalobeyei SES to obtain these results at a confidence level of 95 percent and a power of 80 percent, while allowing for about 5 percent invalid interviews, a targeted sample size of 1,500 households,

¹⁰³ For technical and confidentiality reasons, the SES and VRX surveys may have to be conducted with different devices and on different platforms.

► **TABLE 3:** The VRX and SES interview types

Questionnaire	Coverage	Interviews	Administering time	Unit of observation	Purpose	Consumption module
VRX	Full population (100%)	7,465	-15 min	proGres families	proGres update	
Extended SES	Representative sample (20%)	1,114	-100 min	Households	Poverty headcount	✓
Basic SES	Non-sampled households (80%)	4,949	-25 min	Households	Poverty ranking, programming	

Source: Authors' illustration.

or 18.5 percent of the total population, was required for the extended SES questionnaire.¹⁰⁴

86. The basic SES produces a list of all refugee households in the settlement to serve as the sample frame for the extended SES, making a separate listing exercise unnecessary. Drawing the sample requires a list of all households in the settlement to serve as the sample frame. If it does not exist beforehand, a separate listing exercise usually has to be conducted before data collection where all households are visited and recorded. Since all refugee dwellings in the settlement are visited for the VRX and basic SES to interview all families and households, however, such an advance listing becomes unnecessary. A complete list of refugee households can be produced during data collection, and the sampling can be done on-the-fly during the visit, using the survey software on the mobile devices. The parallel design thus improves the efficiency of sampling as compared to stand-alone household surveys. However, it also requires thorough monitoring of whether records that appear in the VRX data also come up in the SES data and vice versa. In addition, it is essential that a record be made of refused or otherwise unsuccessful interviews so that the sample frame and nonresponse rate are accurate.

87. Households were sampled on the spot and with a fixed probability. Without certainty on the number of households in the settlement, the probability of selection that was needed to implement the random draw in the survey software was determined from an estimate. A straightforward approach to do it was to use the families registered in the UNHCR proGres dataset¹⁰⁵ before the exercise and divide the 1,500-sample size by this total to obtain the selection probability. Families were randomly selected for the extended SES before the start of the interview using the tablet software. Once proGres families were selected, households (comprised of individuals who cook, eat, and pool ration cards) were identified within the family. Therefore, one proGres family could be comprised by more than one household.

88. Implicit stratification balances the sample in case systematic differences in household characteristics are expected between different parts of the settlement. There may be important systematic differences between the populations of different parts of the settlement, say in the date of arrival, which makes it desirable to ensure that each neighborhood be represented proportionally in the sample. A straightforward way to ensure such a balanced representation in the sample is to implicitly stratify for neighborhoods. Households then need to be linked to the families and their

¹⁰⁴ Detecting the difference is most difficult when the proportion of one of the groups is $p = 0.5$. The formula for the sample size n of one of the two balanced groups is $n_A = \frac{(Z_{1-\beta} + Z_{1-\alpha/2})^2 (p_A(1-p_A) + p_B(1-p_B))}{(p_A - p_B)^2}$.

Given the z-scores of $Z_{1-\beta} = 0.84$ and $Z_{1-\alpha/2} = 1.96$ for a power of 80 percent and a 95 percent confidence interval, and the proportions $p_A = 0.5$ and $p_B = 0.575$ or $p_B = 0.425$, this yields a minimum total sample size of $N_{final} \approx 1,380$. Allowing for around 5 percent nonresponse, this leads to a planned sample of $N = 1,453 \approx 1,500$.

¹⁰⁵ ProGres families are registered by the UNHCR upon arrival. ProGres families are comprised of a group of asylum seekers who arrived in the settlement together and thus are registered as a group. ProGres families do not need to be comprised by members who come from the same country, have a common nationality, and are members of a biological family. While that is the case for some proGres families, it is not a requirement to be registered as part of the same family.

existing proGres records before the sampling, and are stratified based on the addresses in the data base.¹⁰⁶

89. The single-stage sample design implies uniform sample weights, both for the basic and extended SES. Sample weights are essentially the inverse of the probability of an observation of being included in the data. For the basic SES, all households in the settlement are selected and the selection probability is 1. For the extended SES, denote the selection probability by p_0 . In a next step, the weights need to be adjusted for unit nonresponse. The final weights for analyzing the basic SES data are then $w_b = 1 * \frac{1}{\pi}$, where π is the estimated propensity of response, so the overall response rate for all SES interviews. For the extended SES, the implementation of the sampling also has to be accounted for. If after data collection the final ratio p_1 of extended interviews to the overall number of households differs slightly from p_0 , the sample weights need to be scaled to sum up to the overall population.¹⁰⁷ The extended SES sample weight for a given household is therefore calculated as

$$w_e = \frac{1}{p_0} * \frac{1}{\pi} * \frac{p_0}{p_1}$$

where the factor $\frac{p_0}{p_1}$ corrects for variations in the surveyed proportion of households.


Rapid consumption module

90. Collecting household consumption data is methodologically challenging. Living standards are most widely measured using consumption aggregates constructed from data collected in household surveys.¹⁰⁸ Variation in survey methodology and processing steps has been shown to affect the resulting aggregates, for example, through phrasing of questions or deflation of prices.¹⁰⁹ The SES Survey is therefore modeled after the most recent national poverty surveys,

the 2015/16 Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS) and 2018/19 Kenya Continuous Household Survey (KCHS).¹¹⁰ Given the limitations of operating in the refugee setting, this approach does not include a consumption diary but only an extensive list of items for which households are asked to recall their recent consumption over periods ranging from seven days for food to one year for some durable goods.

91. The Rapid Consumption Methodology (RCM) improves the efficiency of collecting consumption data while delivering robust results. Measuring consumption levels increases questionnaire administering times considerably. The RCM reduces the number of questions in the consumption module, while still providing reliable poverty estimates.¹¹¹ The method consists of five steps: First, core consumption items are selected based on their importance for welfare and consumption. Second, the remaining consumption items are partitioned into optional consumption modules (three, in this case). Third, these optional modules are randomly assigned to groups of households, which are then only administered the core module and their respective optional module (Figure 40). Fourth, after data collection, a model imputes the consumption of items contained in the optional modules for all households based on the households' characteristics and their found association with

► **FIGURE 40:** Allocation of consumption item questions using the RCM



Source: Authors' illustration.

¹⁰⁶ In practice, implicit stratification entails making a list of families ordered by their neighborhoods and randomizing the order within neighborhoods. If then, e.g., one-fifth of the households needs to be sampled, one can just select every fifth household in the list.

¹⁰⁷ In the Kalobeyei SES, the probability of selection was $p_0 = 0.190$, while the actual proportion of extended SES interviews to the sample frame was $p_1 = 0.184$. Note that it is important that this difference does not result from significantly lower response rates to the long interviews, which would have to be accounted for separately.


¹⁰⁸ Deaton and Zaidi 2002.

¹⁰⁹ Beegle et al. 2012; Kilic and Sohnesen 2019.

¹¹⁰ Kenya National Bureau of Statistics. 2018a. 2015/16 Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (KIHBS). See: <https://www.knbs.or.ke/launch-201516-kenya-integrated-household-budget-survey-kihbs-reports-2/>.

¹¹¹ Pape and Mistiaen. 2018. Household Expenditure and Poverty Measures in 60 Minutes: A New Approach with Results from Mogadishu.

► **FIGURE 41:** Imputation of total consumption using the RCM



Source: Authors' illustration.

consumption levels (Figure 41). And fifth, the resulting consumption aggregate is used to estimate poverty.

92. To further minimize administration times and reduce enumerator and respondent fatigue, the list of consumption items used in the survey is optimized based on national consumption patterns. The list of consumption items used in national surveys in Kenya is substantial when compared to other countries. To reduce administration time, those items which occurred infrequently in the national survey were removed. A robustness test estimates the expected impact of this optimization by recalculating the consumption aggregates from the 2015/16 KIHBS consumption data based on the reduced list of items. As a result, there is an increase of the national poverty headcount rate by only 0.05 percentage points, and a change in rural and urban poverty of 0.1 and -0.3 percentage points, respectively (Table 4). These impacts

► **TABLE 4:** Robustness check of consumption item removal: poverty headcount rates comparison

	KIHBS 2015/16 (n = 489)	Low-share items removed (n = 368)
National	36.1%	36.2%
Rural	40.1%	40.3%
Urban	29.4%	29.1%
Peri-urban	27.5%	28.3%

Source: Authors' calculations.

are deemed acceptable for the SES given that measurement and sampling errors are generally considerably higher than that. The items in the optional modules are distributed such that similar items within categories are included in different modules to ensure orthogonality between groups. At the same time, items that are more commonly consumed are spread across optional modules, for each module to represent similarly meaningful consumption shares.

93. Allocation of items into the RCM modules is also informed by national consumption shares. The consumption items of the SES questionnaire are allocated into one core module and three optional modules, which allows sufficient reduction of items for individual households while still producing reliable poverty estimates. The allocation is informed by consumption shares retrieved from the KIHBS 2015/16.¹¹² The accuracy of the allocation based on KIHBS 2015/16 shares was tested using the full consumption module, and an accompanying pilot using the RCM. Both yield statistically indistinguishable estimates for poverty. Therefore, the SES consumption module is comparable to the KIHBS 2015/16 consumption module. The items in the optional modules are distributed such that similar items within categories are included in different modules to ensure orthogonality between groups. At the same time, items that are more commonly consumed are spread across optional modules, for each module to represent similarly meaningful consumption shares (Table 5).

Multidimensional poverty

94. The standard MPI, developed by the Oxford Poverty and Human Development Initiative and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), comprises 10 weighted indicators across three dimensions: education (years of schooling, educational attendance), health (child mortality, nutrition), and living standards (electricity, sanitation, drinking water, household, cooking fuel, and assets). An individual is considered "MPI poor" if they are deprived in more than a third of weighted indicators. The standard MPI may be modified based on available data and custom weights. In this case, no data were collected on the

¹¹² The food and nonfood items list is comparable to the Kenya Integrated Household Budget Survey (2015/16) and the ongoing Kenya Continuous Household Survey.

► **TABLE 5:** Consumption shares of items in the optional module groups

Module groups	Core	Module 1	Module 2	Module 3	Total	KIHBS 2015/16
Food						
National democratic share	90.8%	2.8%	2.8%	2.6%	99.0%	100%
Number of items	78	26	27	29	160	218
Nonfood						
National democratic share	86.9%	3.5%	3.5%	3.5%	97.4%	100%
Number of items	87	40	40	41	208	271

Source: Authors' calculations.

nutrition indicator of the health, so the weights have been adjusted accordingly. Data are also missing on cooking fuel; however, the weight of this indicator is low and it is usually highly correlated with other indicators in the living standards dimension. Weights within the dimension were adjusted to compensate for the missing indicator (Table 6). For the assets

indicator, the standard MPI methodology requires the number of assets owned, not just yes/no. However, the weight of this indicator is low and the basic idea behind the asset indicator remains captured in our data. Therefore, the basic principle of the MPI approach remains valid despite the partially missing data (with the above caveats).

► **TABLE 6:** Weights used for multidimensional poverty index

Section	Indicator	Weight
Education	No household member completed five years of schooling	1/6
	Any child 6–14 is not attending school	1/6
Health	Any child died in the five-year period preceding the survey	1/3
Living standards	The household has no electricity	1/15
	The household's sanitation facility is not improved	1/15
	The household does not have access to improved drinking water	1/15
	The household has a dirt, sand, dung, or other type of floor	1/15
	The household does not own any one of these assets: radio, TV, phone, bicycle, motorbike, or refrigerator, and does not own a car/truck	1/15

Source: Authors' calculations.

