RDPP in Kenya (Kalobeyei): Endline assessment
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Key Take-Aways

1. Relevance

**RDPP interventions are well aligned with the global & regional refugee response framework and have provided a solid foundation for integrated service delivery**

The RDPP action is well aligned with global and national frameworks - RDPP follows the New York Declaration, was a precursor to the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) and is suited to the devolved government which invests responsibilities for service delivery at the county level. Those global, national and local agendas need to be better linked in the second phase of funding, to live up to the promises of a 50/50 integration of refugee and host populations. The objective is critical given the continued tensions between groups reported in this endline report.

2. Coordination

**RDPP coordination with partners, authorities and the local community improved over the implementation period**

Many committees have been set up in Kalobeyei – from peace, to child protection or water management committees. Their feedback details challenges faced in changing mindsets and behaviours to support the integrated programme and its ambitions in key sectors. More design thinking, community-driven strategic programming can ensure that activities in Kalobeyei are locally driven.

3. Effectiveness

**A positive impact in some sectors, missed opportunities in others**

RDPP realised varying level of success in terms of integrated access to and use of energy, water, nutrition, education, health and employment opportunities for refugees and host communities. The gender dimension needs to be better understood - men and women’s interactions can be positive, as seen through the increased economic roles of women, but they remain problematic, with continued sexual violence and insecurity, worsened with COVID. Supporting women in Kalobeyei will have a generational impact: the regression analysis reveals that having a female head of household is a significant predictor of increased likelihood of school attendance. The age dimension is similarly critical – Kalobeyei is mainly composed of children and youth who, without adequate education, training and support, may not fulfil their potential. Further integration of gender-, child- and youth-sensitive programming is needed.
Key Take-Aways

4. Impact

Integrated approaches have become a reality in some sectors and social cohesion has improved, although a stronger engagement is needed

The literacy of the head of household positively correlates with regular school attendance of children, and education levels positively correlate with income levels for both refugees and hosts.

These links between literacy, education, and income are central and should frame the way programming is designed and delivered. Beyond focusing on integrating population groups, the potential for joined-up or integrated programming between key sectors (here education and livelihood interventions specifically) is clear. Without it, gains made in one sector will not be sustainable, nor will they have the outcome level impact desired. This will need to be accompanied by stronger evaluations focused not on outputs, as has been the norm under the funding streams, but on key outcomes sought and achieved. This impact evaluation was written with such a focus in mind and can be used as a frame to further assess the work done under Phase 2.

5. Sustainability

Aligning durable solutions programming with the Government’s priorities

Analysis using an outcome metric focused specifically on sectors RDPP programming in Kalobeyei aims to improve (health, livelihoods, food security, education and child protection) shows considerable gains in the livelihoods and education / child protection dimension for both refugees and hosts. The gains made on water and sanitation are also clear, but progress is endangered by a global pandemic and by insufficient resources and capacity locally. Given the limitations placed on agencies to be present on the ground, COVID-19 should be a time to adapt towards more agile programming: putting civil society organisations and development action at the centre.
Kalobeyei green house

Village 2 AIC Clinic

A makeshift latrine

Horticulture farm

Village 1 integrated market

Village 2, Community Center Cyber

Village 3 market

Bright ECDE Centre construction of latrines

Youth Business Hub in village 3

Health centre
# Table of Contents

**Key Take-Aways** .................................................................................. 2

**Acronyms** .......................................................................................... 6

1. **Introduction** .................................................................................. 7
   1.1 Overview ....................................................................................... 7
   1.2 Context ......................................................................................... 9
   1.3 Methodology ............................................................................... 10
   1.4 Limitations and Constraints ....................................................... 10

2. **Background: The RDPP Story** ...................................................... 11
   2.1 Healthcare Access ....................................................................... 12
   2.2 Food and Nutrition Security ....................................................... 12
   2.3 Education and Child Protection ................................................ 13
   2.4 Fostering Livelihood and Resilience .......................................... 14
   2.5 Social Cohesion ........................................................................... 14

3. **Results Overview: Baseline to the Endline Comparison** ........... 15
   3.1 A Review of Key Indicators ......................................................... 15
   3.2 The RDPP outcome metric ......................................................... 16

4. **Results Findings** ........................................................................... 18
   4.1 Health .......................................................................................... 18
   4.2 WASH ......................................................................................... 21
   4.3 Protection .................................................................................... 22
   4.4 Education ................................................................................... 25
   4.5 Food Security .............................................................................. 29
   4.6 Livelihoods ................................................................................. 32
   4.7 Social Cohesion .......................................................................... 42

5. **Evaluation Conclusions** ............................................................... 46

6. **Recommendations** ........................................................................ 49
   6.1 Overall ......................................................................................... 49
   6.2 By Sector ..................................................................................... 50

Annex 1: **Components of the Outcome Metric** ................................ 53
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAH-I</td>
<td>Action Africa Help International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>Africa Inland Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHV</td>
<td>Community Health Volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COVID-19</td>
<td>Coronavirus Disease 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRRF</td>
<td>Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Danish Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECDPM</td>
<td>European Centre for Development Policy Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGD</td>
<td>Focus group discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBV</td>
<td>Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KII</td>
<td>Key Informant Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KISED P</td>
<td>Kalobeyei Integrated Social and Economic Development Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRC</td>
<td>Kenya Red Cross</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KSH</td>
<td>Kenya Shilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LET</td>
<td>Learning and Evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWF</td>
<td>Lutheran World Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MoE</td>
<td>Ministry of Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>Norwegian Refugee Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDPP</td>
<td>Regional Development Protection Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SGBV</td>
<td>Sexual and Gender Based Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TB</td>
<td>Tuberculosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TVET</td>
<td>Technical and Vocational Education and Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHCR</td>
<td>United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNICEF</td>
<td>United Nations Children's Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VSF</td>
<td>Veterinaires Sans Frontieres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>Water, Sanitation and Hygiene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WFP</td>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Introduction

1.1 Overview

The Regional Development and Protection Programme (RDPP) is a European programme to create evidence-based, innovative and sustainable protection and development approaches for refugees and their host communities in Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya, Somalia and Uganda. The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs contracted the Learning and Evaluation Team (LET), co-led by MDF and Samuel Hall with Maastricht University and ECDPM, to conduct evaluations of RDPP over the three-year implementation period, 2017-2020. This country report provides an overview of the results from Kenya’s Kalobeyei integrated settlement. It can be read in complement to the full Final Regional Progressive Effects Evaluation, which synthesises learning from all five countries.

The RDPP action in Kenya is part of Kalobeyei Integrated Social and Economic Development Plan (KISED) in Turkana County (Table 1). It was launched in 2018 to ensure an enabling environment and a sustainable development for this refugee complex and the local population, targeting 182,000 refugees and 320,000 host community members. The €15M budget aims to contribute to promoting the self-reliance of refugees and host communities by providing them with better livelihood opportunities and integrated service delivery. The first phase of the project ran for three years, from July 2016 to July 2019.

Table 1. RDPP in Kenya

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full Project Name</th>
<th>IPs</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support to the Kalobeyei Development Programme</td>
<td>UNHCR in a consortium with FAO, UNICEF, WFP</td>
<td>Kalobeyei integrated settlement, Turkana county</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objectives of the RDPP in Kenya (Kalobeyei) are to create improved health standards for the population in Kalobeyei and surrounding areas; improve food and nutrition security; strengthen economic resilience; increase school enrolment of children; and improve child safety and wellbeing. Overall, by targeting both refugees and the nearby host communities, the programme aims to increase social cohesion and reduce conflict over scarce resources.
This endline report builds on the 2018 baseline evaluation, with a new round of data collected at the field level. The evaluation was guided by 12 key questions listed in Table 2.

**Table 2: Key evaluation questions**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevance</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ1. How does the RDPP adapt to context dynamics?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ2. To what extent have different sub-groups actively contributed to needs- and context assessments? What are mechanisms for feedback and influence of refugees and host communities on projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coordination</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ3. How does the RDPP coordinate with partners and authorities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ4. Did the RDPP help to strengthen the capacity of IPs and local authorities to develop and implement an integrated approach towards refugees?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ5. To what extent and how did RDPP help to strengthen the legal protection of refugees, with emphasis on vulnerable groups?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ6. What results have been achieved in integrated access to/use of energy, water, education and health, and employment?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ7. Which factors positively or negatively impact the effectiveness of individual interventions?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ8. What is the impact on beneficiaries? What is the income effect? How is social cohesion influenced by the RDPP?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ9. How do project and programme results impact potential future migration decisions of refugees?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sustainability</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EQ10. Which challenges hinder the successful implementation of projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ11. Is it possible to elaborate on the sustainability of individual interventions? What are the main determinants for sustainability? Which challenges hinder the successful implementation of projects?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EQ12. What are key governance factors for effectively implementing policies aimed at sustainable protection and development approaches for refugees and their host communities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.2 Context

Kenya has been taking steps to implement more concrete refugee policies. An important part of these efforts is the intent to operationalise the Comprehensive Refugee Response Framework (CRRF) Action Plan. It was announced in Kenya in 2017, and the roadmap for its completion followed, developed by UNHCR with the support of different governmental and nongovernmental bodies. Moreover, the Kenyan government has made a number of commitments aligning with CRRF, such as the Nairobi Declaration on durable solutions for Somali refugees in 2017 and the Djibouti declaration on refugee education in 2017. So far, the progress in the policy domain has been rather slow. Kenya’s continuing policy of encampment makes it difficult for refugees to find formal employment outside of the camps. The launch of the KISED P in December 2018 marked an important strategic milestone as it laid the building blocks for support to the integrated approach in Turkana West.

As of August 2020, there were 498,422 registered refugees and asylum seekers. The vast majority lives in refugee camps: Dadaab (44%) and Kakuma and Kalobeyi Settlement (40%); only 16% resides in urban settlements in Nairobi, Nakuru, Mombasa and Eldoret. In March 2021, the Kenya government announced the order to close the two camps, Dadaab near the Somalia border and Kakuma, located next to the Kalobeyi settlement, which host over 400,000 refugees. Somalia is the most common origin country of the refugees and asylum seekers in Kenya (54.5%). The precarious humanitarian situation there is predicted to continue to generate a large number of refugees.

Challenges for RDPP in Kenya include climatic events. 2020 began with the heaviest rain season since 1964, and a locust infestation, leading to agricultural destruction and mass internal and interregional displacement, due to the risk of famine, communal clashes and land disputes which had been aggravated by agricultural failure. The COVID-19 pandemic is continuing to adversely affect the situation in Kenya. According to the World Bank, the locust infestation from the early 2020 and the global pandemic will take its toll on the Kenyan economy, bringing the average growth from 5.7% (2015-2019) to 1.5%.
1.3 Methodology

The RDPP in Kenya consisted solely of activities in Kalobeyei refugee settlement and surrounding Turkana County. The 2020 endline data collection included a phone-based quantitative survey, focus group discussions (FGDs), key informant interviews (KIIs), semi structured interviews (SSIs), and self-reflection (autoethnography) by following WHO recommended COVID-19 (Table 3). Further, a desk review was conducted based on submitted IP reports, related reports and evaluations, and output indicators. The LET team’s researchers and network of enumerators were closely involved in data collection in Kenya, despite the challenges created by COVID-19, and remotely, exchanging daily with key local stakeholders.

For the quantitative survey, conducted via telephone due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic (see below), the team relied on existing contacts of refugees and hosts who had been interviewed for a related investigation in 2019. Respondents who participated in the qualitative study were purposefully selected based on age, gender, nationality and population distribution in the study location. The study also produced field photo and video evidence, and community observations which contributed to the contextual analysis of key study sectors.

Table 3. Data collection for the endline study in Kalobeyei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Refugee</th>
<th>Host</th>
<th>Mixed</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FGDs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSIs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KIIs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autoethnography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Observations, including photos and video</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survey</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.4 Limitations and Constraints

Research activities had to be adapted to account for the challenging context in 2020, utilising both remote and minimum-contact methods. Given the COVID-19 pandemic and travel restrictions at the time of fieldwork, an adapted COVID-19 sensitive research approach was employed, using methods that minimised in-person interaction. This had an impact on the project’s timeline and scope. The fieldwork schedule was re-adjusted several times in order to follow changing government regulations.

Remote data collection using phone-based interviews allowed the research team to allocate more days to the survey to counter a number of challenges. Most calls were unsuccessful at the first attempt (partly as a result of poor cell phone reception in the camp), and in some cases a respondent was either not available or someone other than the targeted respondent answered the call. In the latter case, an interview was scheduled when the respondent was available. While the remote survey limited first-hand interaction with respondents, proper planning and training of field enumerators made the strategy largely successful. The LET team’s researchers and network of enumerators were closely involved in data collection in Kenya, despite the challenges created by COVID-19, and remotely, exchanging daily with key local stakeholders.

8 Originally, the Terms of Reference for the evaluation did not include a quantitative component. This was added in light of Samuel Hall’s previous data collection for a European Union-funded Mid Term Review in Kalobeyei (2019) targeting a similar cohort of respondents for the purpose of adding more substance and nuance to the investigation. 9 LET objectives and approach are distinct from the ongoing monitoring and learning efforts by Altai Consulting across all projects (focused on EU Trust Fund (EUTF) Horn of Africa portfolio level).
2. Background: The RDPP Story

The RDPP was launched in June 2015 and has been incorporated as one of the flagship initiatives of the broader Valletta Action Plan in support of the European-African migration dialogue. While Kenya has one of the biggest economies in the region, its main refugee hosting areas are economically and politically underdeveloped. The task of supporting refugees has mainly been left to international organisations, initially by means of emergency relief operations and then through longer-term 'care and maintenance'. As part of KISED, the Kalobeyei settlement was implemented just 30km from Kakuma in Turkana County to launch a new model for refugee and host community assistance and integration, through integrated services and development-approaches to displacement.

RDPP activities were implemented within the framework of KISED with specific objectives focused on the following areas:

1. Improved health standards for the population in Kalobeyei and surrounding areas
2. Increased food and nutrition security for host communities and refugees, as well as strengthened economic resilience and well-being
3. Increased school enrolment of children in Kalobeyei and surrounding communities according to educational standards
4. Improved child safety and wellbeing
5. Greater economic resilience and well-being in the target area.
6. Increased social cohesion and reduced conflict over resources

The goal is to establish an integrated settlement area, in which refugees and the host community live together peacefully, have access to social services and develop economic ties to build sustainable livelihoods. The following provides a high-level overview of actions implemented along these six key result areas within Kalobeyei before proceeding with a detailed assessment.
2.1 Healthcare Access

Under this programme, RDPP’s aim was to establish a “super health centre”, providing full integration of Kalobeyei into Turkana County health services, and capacity building of staff. The health centre was constructed and operationalised in 2017 and has been delivering primary healthcare and reproductive health targeting both refugees and the host community. Additional services that community members continue to access from the facility include infant and maternal health care services, tuberculosis (TB) and HIV/AIDS services, consultation for adults and children for all common causes of illness, as well as mental health problems.

Moreover, the Kalobeyei health services continue to be integrated into the Turkana county health services and the various services provided in the health facility are reported into the national health information system. This enables the facility to be considered in planning of national programs such as provision of anti-TB medication, anti-retroviral and antimalarial medication with supplies assisting both host and refugees accessing the health facility. According to Altai reporting, over the three-year implementation period:

- 154,612 people received services at the health centre
- 41,794 people with improved access to the health centre
- 38,594 people reached by sensitisation campaigns

2.2 Food and Nutrition Security

The population in Kalobeyei is composed of small-scale farmers with interest in a diversity of agro-ecosystems. Through the management plan for agricultural production that was developed at the inception stages of the programme, initiatives targeted establishment of junior field school activities, improvement to irrigation infrastructures. This included training of selected targeted groups from both communities in irrigation and conservation agriculture, trade and market orientation, rehabilitation of land and development of water harvesting structures, including development of a sustainable fuel, wood, and fodder value chain.

Led by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and WFP, several activities were implemented in collaboration with the county government, Department of Agriculture, Pastoral Economy and Fisheries. By 2018, land use management committees been established to manage the land allocated for agricultural activities within the settlement. To enhance the committee’s functionality, members were taken through periodic formal training, hands-on coaching, and mentoring. Combined, these activities resulted in 944 local authorities and service providers receiving training and capacity building to support improved nutrition and expanded commercialisation of agricultural outputs.11
At the school level, different junior field school activities which were implemented in both host and refugee schools targeted learners who had interest in various agricultural practices. Those who joined field school associations were trained and thereafter actively engaged in different livelihood activities including horticultural production, rain fed crop production (cereals and pulses), small stock production, poultry keeping, fodder production and natural resources management. A total of 55,595 people trained in nutrition practices and related Home-Grown School Meals Programme that linked farmers and school feeding programmes.\textsuperscript{12}

In collaboration with the Turkana County Government, WFP rehabilitated irrigation structures to improve the host community’s capacity for agricultural production. The interventions which included training on crop diversification resulted in an increase in farmland use, increased production for farmers, crop consumption, an extra income for the two communities, and reduced conflict amongst farmers. \textbf{14,729 people benefited from improved irrigation systems, while 34,943 were involved in the kitchen gardens.}\textsuperscript{13}

Finally, food assistance (cash and in-kind) was provided to all refugee households in Kalobeyei and the surrounding host community.

\section*{2.3 Education and Child Protection}

Activities on education and child protection aimed at improving enrolment of children in Kalobeyei and surrounding communities, including boosting of education standards, and equitable access to children protection services. Overall interventions targeted learners in pre-primary, primary and secondary school levels. Direct support entailed interventions such as expanding access through infra-structure construction and rehabilitation, recruitment, capacity enhancement and retention of teachers, supply of teaching and learning materials including recreational and laboratory materials, desks, and assorted stationeries. Protection services such as provision of provision of child-centred livelihood support, and development of a case management system were also implemented.

UNHCR in collaboration with other partners managed to progressively pursue integration of refugees and asylum seekers in the national education system through strengthened collaboration and partnership with the Government and the Ministry of Education (MoE). In this regard, all schools have been registered as public entities, which has boosted enrolment of host community children in public schools. A total of 41,858 students were enrolled in school.\textsuperscript{14}

Under the stewardship of UNICEF, child protection services were extended beyond the settlement to the host community of Turkana. Through child protection services, children benefited from group psychosocial support sessions, mainly involving play and art therapy facilitated by community play and art animators trained by UNICEF partners. The protection interventions were deliberately linked with education interventions such advocacy around (re) enrolment in school and other skills training programmes. Technical support also directly targeted partners which resulted in recruitment of social workers, identification, and training of community child protection committee members, and setting up the first child-friendly spaces within the communities. A total of \textbf{5,611 children were assisted and 226 community works were trained in child protection.}\textsuperscript{15}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{12}Ibid \textsuperscript{13}Ibid \textsuperscript{14}Altai Consulting, Output indicator monitoring \textsuperscript{15}Ibid
\end{flushright}
2.4 Fostering Livelihood and Resilience

Implementation of livelihood interventions was achieved at two levels: i) capacity building and linking smallholder farmers and local traders to markets in the county and, (ii) developing and implementing a retail engagement strategy in the county, both led by WFP. UNHCR on the other hand targeted different groups of youth and women with the intention of improving skills development through vocational training, financial literacy, and business skills development (Table 4).

Table 4: Key livelihood indicators (Altai)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Altai indicators</th>
<th>Ethiopia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Number of direct jobs created or supported</td>
<td>1,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Number of Micro, Small, and Medium Enterprise created or supported</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Number of people assisted to develop economic income-generating assistance</td>
<td>44,534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.4 Number of people benefiting from professional training (TVET) and/or skills development</td>
<td>18,206</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To address supply value chain inefficiencies, WFP targeted retailers and selected officials from the county government for capacity building, which resulted in development of structured local retail markets, improving the availability and affordability of fresh produce and nutritious foods in Kakuma and Kalobeyei markets. By extension, the targeted populations benefited from dietary diversification and self-reliance as a result of newly created economic opportunities. Additionally, WFP facilitated infrastructural development, provision of business assets, and linkages of local traders within and beyond Kalobeyei.

Lastly, establishment and involvement of community members in Village Savings and Loans Associations (VSLAs) led to improvement in financial inclusion, financial literacy, and household business outcomes.

2.5 Social Cohesion

Beyond improving access to integrated services delivery for both host communities and refugees, RDPP activities directly contributed to peaceful co-existence between refugees and the host community. Bringing all stakeholders and implementing partners together under different working groups ensured harmonised implementation of programme activities. Coordination at the community level through the stewardship of the Refugee Affairs Secretariat brought the two communities together, especially during trainings on conflict resolution, integrity, leadership, and referral/reporting pathways.

The establishment of village-based peace committee and regular joint committee meetings provided a linkage of leaders from the two communities which strengthened the existing dispute resolution mechanisms. 1,142 people participated in conflict prevention activities.16

16 Altai Consulting, Output indicator monitoring
A high-level analysis of key indicators in and around Kalobeyei Camp, directly in the RDPP results framework, shows a mixed picture with some improvements but also a number of areas where conditions have deteriorated. Not always did activities result in gains for both refugees and hosts—in a few domains, conflicting evolutions can be observed.

3.1 A review of key indicators

The following table highlights key indicators and their evolution between 2018 and 2020 in and around Kalobeyei Settlement:

- **Green**: rising values highlighting significant improvement
- **Red**: decreasing values between the baseline and the endline highlighting challenges

### Table 6. Data comparison on key sectors and indicators – 2018 vs 2020 – for hosts and refugees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food security</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was never without food</td>
<td>Hosts: 11%</td>
<td>Refugees: 18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to land for agriculture</td>
<td>Hosts: 48%</td>
<td>Refugees: 31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or livestock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WASH</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tap as primary water source</td>
<td>Hosts: 46%</td>
<td>Refugees: 79%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borehole as primary water</td>
<td>Hosts: 32%</td>
<td>Refugees: 16%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to private pit latrines</td>
<td>Hosts: 13%</td>
<td>Refugees: 43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protection</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children are deemed safe in the</td>
<td>Hosts: 52%</td>
<td>Refugees: 67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regular school attendance</td>
<td>Hosts: 42%</td>
<td>Refugees: 75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 50 children per</td>
<td>Hosts: 32%</td>
<td>Refugees: 3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teacher</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of education judged</td>
<td>Hosts: 23%</td>
<td>Refugees: 24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>high or very high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livelihoods</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household with a source of</td>
<td>Hosts: 46%</td>
<td>Refugees: 26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Earner redundancy (more than</td>
<td>Hosts: 60%</td>
<td>Refugees: 47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one income earner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. weekly income - HHs min. 1</td>
<td>Hosts: $60</td>
<td>Refugees: $79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working member</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>p-value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. reported weekly</td>
<td>Hosts: $40</td>
<td>Refugees: $36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The p-value is the probability of finding the observed difference in sample proportions or greater if the underlying populations had the same proportion (the null hypothesis). In line with industry standards, this null hypothesis is rejected for p-values below 0.01.*
3. Results overview: Baseline to the endline comparison

3.1.1 Improvements and Challenges

Over the period monitored for this evaluation, improvements can be observed in a number of domains relevant to RDPP. This can be seen in the share of respondent households which report having some kind of source of income, which more than doubled between the two rounds of data collection. At the same time, it stands to reason that not all of these income sources are sustainable and resilient. Indeed, among those who do have a source of income, the share of those relying on more than one income earner has dropped in the refugee population. This might be a sign of certain households having to find some kind of income, no matter how unsustainable, given the challenging circumstances of 2020. This is supported by a larger share of refugees worrying about their food security, and a significant drop in average weekly income and weekly expenditures. This means that while gains have improved across refugee and host population groups, certain households have been adversely impacted, and are earning less than they used to, with fewer able-bodied members working.

Possibly also a testament to integrated RDPP impact, host children appear considerably more likely to attend school regularly than in 2018 (or rather, did pre-Covid), and are deemed to be safer. How good this education is is a different question - both groups have very different perceptions of the quality of education.

3.2 The RDPP Outcome Metric

A metric was designed to summarize the evolution of outcomes in specific sectors and dimensions of particular interest to the RDPP vision and theory of change.17 The aim was to be:

1. **Context specific**: focus on RDPP programming variables expected to influence durable solutions

2. **Targeted**: to identify gaps between hosts and refugees, and pinpoint areas of programming and dimensions most relevant for enhancing integration

3. **Locally situated**: ascertain whether improvements in dimensions have taken place in each context

A Kalobeyei-specific outcome metric was developed focused on domains directly relevant to RDPP activities in the field, specifically health, livelihoods, food security and education (See Annex 1 for further details). These are the areas in which one would expect to see changes in outcomes directly due to RDPP programming implemented by partners in Kalobeyei Settlement.

Between 2018 and 2020 for hosts and refugees, Figure 1 shows the evolution of livelihood, education and child protection. Scores have improved for both groups across time, while food security only improved for hosts. Reported levels of access to water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) under the health dimension remained unchanged.

---

17 cf annex 1 for a description of the indicators composing the metric.
Three key trends can be observed from a glance at the summary data:

1. **What has worked well:** The intervention improved livelihood and education for both hosts and refugees, with significant progress in a short period of time. Key programming adaptations were made between the baseline and the endline. Notably, child protection response has been strengthened.

2. **What has worked less well:** WASH levels for refugees remain well above those of hosts, showing further room to improve sanitation especially at a time of a global pandemic, in Kalobeyei to further integration and improve standards for all.

3. **Urgent need for improvement:** Food security levels remain extremely low overall and remain a key area for future improvement.
4. Results Findings

The endline country reports focus on the needs on the ground and how those needs were met by RDPP activities. This section explores selected achievements and issues to monitor within critical sectors, beginning with key sectors for integrated service delivery, including WASH, as well as consideration of gains in social cohesion more broadly.

4.1 Health

Achievements

All respondents agreed that access to healthcare services had improved. In 2018, the Kenya Red Cross (KRC) was the only health facility to service all three villages in Kalobeyei and the surrounding host community. The additional facility run by the Africa Inland Church (AIC) located in village II (and a new facility under construction in village III) has divided the workload, broadening the services delivered and increasing access to health care. KRC has expanded its activities to include healthcare on sexual and reproductive health, care for HIV and TB patients, care for gender-based violence (GBV) survivors. There is a dedicated one-stop centre for counselling and treatment on GBV, in recognition of the issues raised in previous assessments. For the host population, no services existed previously and required long trips to Kakuma. The host community recognizes that the arrival of refugees has led to greater access to medical and hospital service as well as accessing KRC services for free rather than incurring expenses at the Kakuma hospital. In total, 38,000 refugees and approximately 5,000 members of the host community now have access to health services. Moreover, partners reported a 92% immunisation coverage.

The Kalobeyei health services continue to be integrated into the Turkana county health services and the various indicators are reported into the national health information system. This enables the facility to be considered in planning of national programs such as provision of anti-TB medication, anti-retroviral and antimalarial medication with supplies assisting both host and refugees accessing the health facility. The county continues joint supervision with the health team.

“When we opened maternity, the majority of those who were coming to deliver were the refugees, with about 9% of the deliveries coming from the host communities. At the moment that percentage from the host community has gone up: having between 11-13%.

KII16 KRC HEAD OF OPERATIONS

When we talk about the improvement of health care in general compared to the last three years, there is a big improvement: before they were tents but now they have built enough blocks like they have built a good laboratory, maternity so I can say before they were only having few rooms but they are increasing, they have put power, they have built good drugs store and all medicine is now kept in the fridge so I can say there is a big improvement.

KII9 REFUGEE COMMUNITY LEADER
Health practitioners highlighted that increased access to medical equipment, medicine and staff has facilitated their work and transformed healthcare, with improvements on key indicators. This includes logbooks and clinical books, writing reports and filing patients’ records and diagnosis, drugs and laboratory machines that were provided by UNHCR from the Ministry of Health. Both the KRC and AIC have hired more staff and provide better maternal and childcare services, including vaccinations and malnutrition response.

- Malarial cases have reduced in the community, and treatment for children born with HIV initiated.
- Children with surgery problems are also being operated upon and treated.
- In 2016 many children were suffering from malnutrition. Now training is being offered alongside screening to identify and refer children to different nutrition support programs like the Outpatient Therapeutic Program and Blanket Supplementary Feeding Programme.

Improvements have been made in maternal and child care, in addition to sexual and reproductive healthcare access. With awareness raising, more women are giving birth in the maternity ward, improving maternal mortality rates. Malnourishment is being addressed.

"Before the coming of the refugees, there was no hospital at all and our women were giving birth at home. The biggest change for me in the health sector in this place is the maternity ward. Before, there were many of our women who were dying at childbirth but now, that has all changed. Today, there is now a maternity ward. Our women have been sensitized to give birth in the hospital"

FGD7 HOST COMMUNITY REPS

Issues to monitor:

**There are varying perceptions around the quality of care provided between the KRC and AIC facilities.** The Kenya Red Cross is open 24 hours a day, compared to AIC’s limited hours. In addition, KRC has more capabilities, including a laboratory to conduct tests and diagnose illnesses, and additional staff. KRS refers to the AIC for dental, mental and physiotherapy issues. Respondents from Village 2 recount experiences going directly to the KRC (and not AIC in Village 2) and being asked to attend AIC. Preference for the KRC facility has led to pressure on limited staffing and drug resources, causing long queues, overworked midwives and low admission rates. Suggestions have been made to improve service delivery at AIC, including changes to the consultation process and developing a better link between medicines prescribed and those available at the pharmacy.

**A major complaint – iterated in the baseline and reiterated in the endline - emerged around access to medicine and prescriptions.** In many cases, patients are prescribed medicine, but are advised to buy it from a private clinic or are given paracetamol due to shortages. Respondents recounted saving money from their incentive to buy their own drugs or going without. The KRC remains fully dependent on UNHCR to procure drugs and medical equipment, which has been marred by supply delays forcing them to reach out to other partners for support.

Though a Level III hospital, KRC is not able to handle minor surgeries. Gaps continue from the baseline stage notably on the lack of medicine and testing for different diseases. While better equipped than three years ago, it is still not able to fully meet the needs of the community.
Stronger referral systems are in place compared to the baseline, specifically to Clinic 7, Kakuma Mission, and in rare cases to Nairobi. Referrals are free for both refugees and hosts. One refugee leader was concerned regarding the limited number of referrals available, and the need for referrals for the maternity ward given an increase in reported teen pregnancies. The distance to Kakuma is an added burden on family members. The limited number of ambulances creates issues in emergency cases where patients need to be transferred quickly to Kakuma. Some report that getting a referral is difficult.

Although there are now three ambulances serving the community, it is not sufficient to fully meet community needs, in particular the host community, which is spread out and far away from the health centres in Kalobeyei. Some host community members are not aware of ambulance contact information.

Most respondents agreed that ambulances will come if you call but there will likely be a very long delay, which negates the purpose of an emergency response.

Generally healthcare staff are considered competent but lacking sufficient staff and resources to do their jobs properly. Community health volunteers are recruited from both the refugee and host communities. According to them, patients from across the communities are treated equally at the facilities. Others commented that this diversity allowed them to have someone from their ‘tribe’ present to care for them. The host community specifically advocated for Turkanans to be employed as well to ensure they were treated equally. One host community leader complained that refugees were still getting preferential treatment, saying “we need the government to help us get our own hospital. At least we can reduce the number at this hospital.” From the refugee perspective, refugee health workers are still earning less than Kenyans, despite providing the same level of care to patients. Unequal pay between healthcare workers based on their legal status could lead to tensions in the future.

For the host community, while the issue of host healthcare workers integration has been addressed, concern over distance to clinics in Kalobeyei continues to hamper healthcare access.

Finally, a 2019 evaluation further highlighted the non-inclusion of the health and education sectors in the County Integrated Development Plans planning process.18 This brings to the fore the need to strategise further how health needs can be targeted in local planning.

---

4.2 WASH

Achievements

Previously, residents got water from Kakuma. Water tanks and taps have been installed so the majority of villages are covered, which has reduced sites of conflict and increased health outcomes. For the nearby host community, water points have been built as well and they are able to access refugee water. Host families reported no longer needing to travel 35 km to fetch water and refugee community representatives linked the increase in water supply with a reduction in disease infection, property theft, and GBV, which occurred when refugee women left to fetch water. Overall higher host expectations have not been met, but they are pleased that their access to water has improved with additional water taps for refugees.

As a result, access to water has improved in Kalobeyei and nearby host communities. All refugees and the vast majority of host community respondents (91%) report having access to improved water sources (including borehole, shared or private tap, protected spring). 96% of refugee households and 36% of the host community use a shared tap as the main source of drinking water. The refugee camps appear better equipped with toilet facilities: 82% of surveyed refugees report using pit latrines vs. 44% of hosts.

While water remains a source of conflict within the refugee community and between refugees and hosts, some of these tensions have dissipated due to the improved water supply.

Issues to monitor

Some host communities, particularly those further from Kalobeyei, still have water accessibility problems. Host communities complain that they need to go to refugee communities to access water. Community health workers have been sensitizing communities on sanitation and waste management. The combination of personal hygiene and community cleanliness has improved overall community wellbeing. Implementing partners have been pushing this forward, employing community cleaners to clear the streets and raise awareness on the need to dedicate spaces for trash.
4.3 Protection

Achievements

The progress on protection awareness was seen as a big change in Kalobeyei. Refugees actively discussed the awareness campaigns around ending child marriage and sexual and gender based violence (SGBV). There was increased awareness not only of issues around protection, but also of existing protection mechanisms and processes. The biggest change reported by refugee women was feeling empowered to report cases and feeling confident that they would be treated and solved, recognising Danish Refugee Council’s (DRC) protection office’s role.

The linkage between healthcare and SGBV improved with the SGBV centre in Village 1 located within the KRC clinic acting as a one-stop counselling and treatment centre for SGBV victims from refugee and host communities. In addition, awareness activities regarding available services target girls in the nearby schools and the entire community. Non-governmental organisations (NGOs), community leaders, security and police work together to address SGBV. Health practitioners also participated in the trainings.

Box 2: Protection in times of Covid-19

The Covid pandemic directly impacted the lives of the most vulnerable. At the time of data collection, many were beginning to feel the impact on the economy with increased prices, loss of jobs, and declining businesses. With children home from school, domestic food needs had increased. People’s interactions with one another had been restructured. The KRC noted an increase in domestic violence since COVID-19 and suspected a possible increase in teen pregnancy cases. The economic link had been cut between Kalobeyei/ Kakuma, nearby towns such as Lodwar and Kitale, and cross border trade with Uganda. This has negatively impacted business and commodity prices. Misinformation on COVID and quarantine had led to reduction in access to health facilities. A majority feared they would catch the virus if they went to the facilities, which led to a rise of over-the-counter drug purchases in a context where most chemists are unlicensed. Some host women noted some positive impacts: COVID-19 brought their husbands home, bringing families together in new ways; as well as increased cleanliness and sanitation due to new protective habits. However, host leaders complained that refugee leaders were not enforcing COVID restrictions in the settlement; while refugees complained of being harassed by police.

Assaulting and raping women in the community or bush had been the order of the day. The defendant didn’t know the reporting channels, but now, women, leaders and the representatives of the community are being educated on these channels. Now everyone knows whom to start with and end with. We always start in the clinic for a medical check-up and you will be given the statement after a thorough screening is done, after which you report to the police while accompanied by a community leader. From the police, an investigation will take place and if found true, the assailant will be arrested and imprisoned. The victim will be seeking medical check-up from the hospital he was sent to and DRC gives guidance and counselling.
In 2016, there were children working in many places. There were no schools. When sensitization was done, this resulted in most children going to schools - a very big change. Schools provide protection. (…) DRC is providing training on protection, child rights and SGBV to people so that they can understand what they didn’t know before. In 2017, these trainings did not exist.

FGD4 REFUGEE FEMALE YOUTH

I can say many of them don’t know their rights and if they know they still believe in their culture which gives men power.

SSI1 REFUGEE FEMALE

Protection awareness raising was less prevalent for hosts than for refugees. Access to protection mechanisms seemed more limited and host women did not feel empowered in the same way as their refugee counterparts during focus group discussions. A female host member mentioned that the chief and police were not supporting women reporting issues of early marriage and SGBV. Similarly, a host community leader representing women explained that “Women have no power, they can’t overturn men’s decisions”. There were also ongoing issues with child labour.
Two challenges were raised in partners’ final narrative report. First, there was only one Sub-County Children Officer covering the entire Turkana West Sub-County during the program implementation period. This area has a child population of over 200,000. Second, distances are large between villages, which restricted the ability of child protection committee members to do outreach and consult communities further away. The unit cost for facilitating community outreach activities in reaching children and their families in the host community was higher than had been anticipated. This was further challenged by inadequate resources from the government side, requiring UNICEF to facilitate most joint outreach activities.

There were mixed feelings about security around Kalobeyei. On one hand, many felt safer with the police posts, security lights, actual housing, and number of existing mechanisms to address conflict in their neighbourhoods. Kenya’s Refugee Affairs Secretariat and community leaders were able to intervene if there were security issues or intra-community conflict.

However, many women still felt insecure and feared getting firewood or water alone, and the police are seen as both a source of security and a major risk. This relates to balancing power dynamics between refugees and hosts in the area, in view of integrated approaches at the heart of the RDPP funding. Refugee youth specifically spoke about the security challenge and arbitrary arrest by police.

...we were arrested one day just in our home, me, my husband, and my kid by the police and locked in. They demanded 6000ksh. Where can I get the money from? We have used the Bamba Chapa. A few days later, the same police officers came back and just entered our home and we were making noise. My kids and I managed to escape but my husband was arrested. We have to use the Bamba Chapa for the second time. Currently, we are taking credit for the month of July.

FGD4 REFUGEE FEMALE YOUTH

Questions of safety and security also depend on legal documentation and access to local offices representing refugees. UNHCR has worked to bring one stop shops to Kakuma to avoid travel to Lodwar to access facilities to establish businesses. Pairing Kenyans and refugees in businesses together has been seen as another added layer of collaboration that can minimize harassment. Lastly, women’s safety and security has been impacted by COVID-19. Gains made in protecting victims and preventing crimes are endangered by increased economic tensions between groups.
4.4 Education

Achievements

In 2016, Kalobeyei had one school with 11,000 learners; now it has 5 primary schools and 2 secondary schools. Respondents commented that the schools are well-constructed, with more in progress. For this reason, education was often highlighted as the biggest change – going from a very low standard to increased access to free education and creating more spaces for students. Refugee community leaders were quick to mention success stories of children being educated in Kalobeyei and provided with opportunities to expand their education further elsewhere.

Since the baseline, efforts have been made to encourage host community children to attend school in the settlement. Turkana teachers were hired, filling in a key capacity gap. However, few host community members attend schools in the camp at present. As a result of coordination efforts

We have specifically gone into addressing the issue on low participation of host community children, we did not realise the 50/50 ratio but towards the end of the program you could see a lot of encouragement and enthusiasm.

KII15 UNICEF, JONAH

and parental sensitization, a few host children are attending schools in the refugee camps – which is an improvement and a positive sign. Overall, refugee children find it easier to attend schools in the host community, as boarding schools outside of the settlement are easier to attend and reach. Distance remains an issue - most communities live far away from the settlement. Sometimes, children have to cross a river to get to school, which can be risky and dangerous. As a result, the government constructed boarding schools in the host community where they are provided with lunch and dinner. Feeding programmes remain a key incentive for school enrolment for both communities.

Refugee and host parents recognise the value of education for social cohesion and inclusion. Some report meeting for the first time at parent-teacher conferences and following up with informal parent meetings to discuss common issues affecting their children. In the previous baseline and midline, our research showed concerns expressed by hosts regarding bringing their children to Kalobeyei schools. While such concerns still remain, there are more host children enrolling in the schools within the settlement, leading to more positive interactions between hosts and refugees. While improvements are noted, refugee children still exceed the number of host children attending such schools.

When we talk about education it has brought more benefits to the community because currently our children are now communicating in English which is now reducing the language barrier and secondly our children are performing well in KCPE exams. We have children who have performed well and they got scholarships they are now learning in Kitale, others Eldoret and different places.

KII8 REFUGEE COMMUNITY LEADER
**Issues to monitor**

**Learning outcomes for the majority remained poor due to quality of teaching, limited resources and serious issues with overcrowding.** Overcrowding and high student to teacher ratio remain the greatest concerns, as teachers were unable to maintain order in the classroom or provide individual support to students. Issues were improving each year, but minimum standards were not achieved. UNICEF is continuing to prioritise these areas (textbooks, latrines, teachers). Hosts and refugees continue to complain about the quality of schools in Kalobeyei and some actively searched for other options due to their perceptions regarding the low quality of education in refugee schools. Host families diversify education depending on their children’s age, with the understanding that quality education is not free and must be planned. At the time of the endline, there was a small school under construction for the host community. Host families reported that their older children would attend school in Lokichogio, a two-hour driving distance from Kalobeyei. Some refugees were also able to afford private schools for their children.

Learning itself is poor because teachers are not qualified. I am a BOM (Board of Management). Most of them cannot talk fluently in English and only most of the time they speak in Kiswahili. We have good buildings in the school. The children don’t repeat classes even if they failed (in their exams) and my question is why learners are promoted if they have failed?

---

**FGD4 REFUGEE FEMALE YOUTH**

The student-teacher ratio is among the top challenges. A teacher is supposed to handle 50 students but in the school where I am teaching it is a different case. I am personally handling 210 students.

---

**KII7 DEPUTY HEADTEACHER**

Before the COVID-19 pandemic disrupted normal learning, interviewed refugee children (81%) and host children (80%) attended school regularly. This is an improvement when compared to the 2018 attendance rate (42% for the host and 75% for refugee learners). Awareness creation on the importance of educating children and upgrade of learning infrastructure were mentioned as some of the major contributing factors to an increase in school enrolment and commitment to learning, especially amongst the host community children, which was quite low as recorded during the baseline study in 2018.
In the last two years, agencies actively worked with local authorities and teachers to increase school enrolment of children within the settlement and surrounding communities. Additional assistance provided at school level such as meals, books, shoes and uniform motivated a number of learners to stay in school.

Considering the improved education context within the settlement, refugee children have almost double the student/teacher ratio, with an average of 181 refugee children per teacher compared to an average of 99 host children per teacher. The level of satisfaction with the quality of education has decreased in both communities since 2018 – from 44% to 36% for the host and from 32% to 9% for refugees (Fig. 3). Most schools, which were already overwhelmed, understaffed, and under-resourced at the beginning, did not achieve the required minimum standards prior to taking in new learners. Additionally, while incentive teachers have played a major role towards bridging the gap in terms of supporting national teachers, the majority have not received professional training. A mix of these factors have to a certain extent compromised the quality of education offered in the last 2 years.

We found one school with 60% refugee and 40% host children, which we supported via WASH and learning materials.

KII15 UNICEF

An infrastructure mapping of Kalobeyei settlement was done in coordination with UNHCR, host community and the government. However, education sites are still a distance for host community children. Host sites needed to be selected or other interventions, such as boarding schools, instituted. However, parity was not achieved.

There have been efforts to improve the quality of teachers and teaching standards, as well as class sizes. Lutheran World Foundation (LWF) recruited more teachers; FCA has provided more teachers and materials, such as books, pens, bags and shoes and the Board of Managers is more active. However, teachers are still expected to manage classrooms with large numbers of students, as the number of classrooms are inadequate and resources are limited. This had led to high rates of teacher turnover. The majority of teachers are incentive teachers who might not have the right lesson delivery skills, with few professionally trained teachers. Teachers have high workloads, as there are too few teachers to meet current demands. Additionally, teachers lack teaching materials. Some teachers attended trainings on classroom management, child development, child protection, and lesson development. Teachers were provided textbooks and workshops on guiding and counselling.

The issue of old learners: you find that we some of them who are so mature and are even parents. You would find a father and daughter are all in one class, such as class 8. With this, you’d find that sometimes they fear to ask questions in class. And also, when it comes to discipline you find that it is difficult to handle these cases when they have a son and daughter in the same class.

KII7 DEPUTY HEADTEACHER
School dropouts are a severe problem, often attributed to parents not valuing education, teachers who did not expose children to positive practices, or general peer pressure. Focus groups with teachers revealed that some resort to beating children – also a major cause for school dropouts - as well as the continued lack of understanding of the value of education – perpetrated within families and leading investments in education to be under-valued. However, over the project period, the final UNHCR narrative report indicates a 22.7% increase in school enrolment, as well as reduced out of school children. Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) ran an accelerated learning programme that supports older learners across schools in Kalobeyei in order to reach more learners in all villages. As integrating older learners into the classroom was a struggle, NRC started the programme with levels 1-3. Until this program was started in 2019, older learners were still sharing classes with other regular learners.

Kenya does not have a national curriculum on accelerated education. To bridge the gap in Kalobeyei, actors in the education sector, in collaboration with the Ministry of Education officials, came together and designed an approach to support accelerated learning for refugees. Its success remains unclear. The conversation is ongoing to enable refugee and host overage learners to re-join school. According to NRC, the refugee education bill is a hindrance to education management in Kalobeyei, including access to trained teachers. UNICEF had been working to push government thinking on this issue.

UNHCR, in collaboration with partners, has continued to pursue refugee and asylum seeker integration in the national education system via strengthened collaboration and partnership with the MoE. All schools have been registered as public entities, enrolment of host community children has been encouraged, there has been high level MoE engagement including a visit by the Minister of Education and a policy on inclusion of refugee children. However, these collaborations were raised among the key challenges in UNHCR’s final narrative report, which include:

- Changes in leadership and shifting priorities within key ministries
- Delayed approval of the draft policy for the inclusion of refugee learners
- Concerns over the source of financing for inclusion, and perceived potential negative impact of inclusion on the host communities. UNESCO, UNHCR and UNICEF continue to support the Ministry of Education and other stakeholders to work through these areas.
- Insufficient numbers of professionally trained teachers as a key barrier impacting quality education for refugees and host communities.
- About 24 percent of school aged children in Kalobeyei settlement are still out of school, which was partly addressed in 2019 through the building of new classrooms, and continued advocacy with the county government.
- Required infrastructure development in Kalobeyei settlement for early childhood development.
4.5 Food Security

Achievements

Refugees and hosts acknowledge an increase in access to a wider variety of foods and the greater options available to them. Increased numbers of farming plots and kitchen gardens have reduced the cost of vegetables. Previously, refugees and the host community went to Kakuma for vegetables, eggs, tomatoes, and watermelon, but buyers now come from Kakuma to Kalobeyei. Similarly, FGDs with host female members highlighted how the value chain has shifted from sourcing green vegetables from Kitale at a higher cost to transitioning to local farms. Hosts emphasised the role of refugee women in food production and diversity.

The agricultural sector and FAO-led kitchen gardens were seen as helpful, while WFP indicated their support to over 6,000 households to construct sunken beds for vegetables production. Other activities expanding food diversity included poultry projects (LWF), nutrition training, seed and farming implements distribution (FAO). UNICEF is also guiding people in diversifying their food.

FAO and WFP put in place initiatives promoting market linkages for smallholder farmers, especially for markets and traders around Kalobeyei and Kakuma. Promotion of agricultural practices has led to changed perceptions towards crop production amongst the host community: many are involved in sorghum and cowpea farming. Refugee youth recognise the ongoing changes, and the promotion of agricultural practices that enable the active involvement of women in agro-business. One example highlighted was the inclusion of refugees with disabilities and women in poultry farming. They also felt more confident due to the range of seeds given – some requiring a lot of water (Matabele) while others did not. They were more confident than in the baseline regarding when to plant seeds to maximise the rainy season. Youth have also found a stronger role in the agribusiness sector, as detailed by one interview with a 21-year old refugee man:

“In order to get a land at FAO site you need to be in a group then they will train you about agriculture and after the training you now have access and they will give you a plot for your farm. We also have some youth who have established their community based organization and some have livelihood projects, under this project there is agriculture so the organization will send its members to go in the community and mobilise people about agriculture and even create a team and some of its beneficiaries come in groups and start their farm. In case of those who have malnutrition, hospitals do assist them by giving them nutritious food such as chocolate, and porridge to bust their nutrition.”

SSI2 REFUGEE MALE, 21
4. Results Findings

Issues to monitor

The Action Africa Help International (AAH-I) area manager mentioned that value chains were analysed based on ability to generate food and expand markets. Beneficiaries have been able to sell small amounts of produce and diversify sources of income. The value chain now includes seed provision, farm production, and food preservation which has increased alongside new practices, such as baking bread or making millet flour. Host communities have felt the positive impact of farming. Previously their expenditures focused solely on food, but the extra income from selling farm products allows them to save enough to cover medical costs and clothing.

Food security and nutrition has increased due to seed-based food production in kitchen gardens with added money from Bamba Chakula. Refugees continue to receive food assistance through Bamba Chakula - WFP sends e-money to refugees to buy food dependent on household size. Currently, food produced at the household level is insufficient, despite progress being made in the agricultural sector and diversifying income sources. Health Practitioners cited Bamba Chakula as critical in reducing malnutrition. Both FAO and WFP noted that current dependency on Bamba Chakula will continue - this was flagged by FAO as a focus of the scale-up as part of phase 2.

Bamba Chakula by itself is seen as insufficient. If it does not last through the month, households often use a variety of methods to make ends meet, such as taking items on credit from shop owners. Community leaders complained that delays in putting money in the account, exacerbating issues with credit; while also highlighting that shops were raising prices, reducing the purchasing power resulting from Bamba Chakula funds. There are mixed reports on whether or not the transition to Bamba Chapa has increased prices of commodities.

Malnutrition was a big problem because people were not eating balanced food since they could not afford it but since bamba chapa was introduced, families are able to withdraw cash and buy fruits, green vegetables and meat to feed their families thus getting balanced diet.

HEALTH PRACTITIONER

This has resulted in families eating food on credit and when the money delays, the owner of the shops reports the matter to the police and they are arrested and from the same bamba chakula money, you get for the shop and also for the police to be bailed out remaining with nothing for the family.

REFUGEE REPRESENTATIVE
The changes of Bamba chakula to Bamba chapa brings balance in diet. With bamba chapa you can draw in money in cash and buy anything you want, unlike bamba chakula where you don’t have the choice, we are able to buy meat to change the diet because you withdraw cash and go and buy meat. Those days in 2016-2018 we were not able to spend money as we wanted.

FGD8 REFUGEE COMMUNITY REPS

Bamba Chakula has created some resentment among the host community. However, purchased food is sometimes exchanged for other items, such as firewood from host communities, which increases the economic activity between communities. There have been changes from Bamba Chakula to Bamba Chapa: instead of only being able to purchase food, money can be withdrawn in cash and used on anything. In conversations with refugees, they noted that Bamba Chapa can be saved and used to start a business. However, others complained there were negative effects, such as men taking the money and using it to purchase alcohol. Some raised concern that Bamba Chapa could worsen male-female power dynamics with refugee female youth reporting that “Bamba Chapa made it worse, because men are using their authority as husbands to take the money and use it for drinking. Many women end up in domestic conflict because of such behaviour.”

FGD4 refugee female youth
4.6 Livelihoods

Achievements

When faced with economic shocks, respondents’ coping mechanisms included friends and family, taking items on credit, and selling goods or livestock. Hosts mainly relied on selling firewood to refugees. Refugees mostly took credit on Bamba Chakula and sold the food purchased, or now use Bamba Chapa to buy medicine or pay off the police. Much of the conversation around coping strategies evolved around diversifying livelihood and economic strategies.

The self-reported number of income earners per household increased from 2018. Refugees reported 40% of households with at least one income earner in 2018 and 84% in 2020. Similarly, host households reported an increase from 38% to 99% in the same time period. Income redundancy - more than one income earner - appeared to increase in the last two years, from 23% to 53% for hosts and from 6% to 30% for refugees.

Issues to monitor

Hosts are more likely to be earning a weekly income below their weekly expenditure - 33% of refugee households with at least one income earner reported making less than their average spending, compared to 49% of host households.

4.6.1 Economic Well-being

Livestock is the main livelihood source for hosts, while refugees mainly rely on small scale business alongside some farming activity. The sub-county administrator recognized significant efforts made to integrate host communities and refugees through farming activities. The provision of greenhouses, equipment, water tanks and water pumps, as well as seed provision was critical.

As a pastoralist society, changing the mindset around agriculture was one of the biggest host community impacts. Key informants spoke of the ‘transformation of the host community’ while speaking about the impact on improving household incomes for refugees. According to FAO, the biggest success of the agricultural component of RDPP was proof of concept - “that agriculture production can be done in Kalobeyei and Turkana in a sustainable, profitable way.”

FAO’s project had four main aspects:

- An engineering study of how to tap into water resources for agricultural production and livestock, particularly in this very arid context
- A field school approach introducing livelihood components to refugees and hosts through hands-on learning
- Training farmers in commercial aspects of irrigated farming—focused on the larger Turkana county as part of an agreement with the county to expand the ‘host’ population
- Sustainable fuelwood value chain.

From FAO’s perspective the biggest and most unique success was the landscape design of Turkana, which convinced the EU to support them in the second tranche of funds to scale up and commercialise agriculture to “the next level.”
Other positive stories included the pastoral field schools and school kitchen gardens, which engaged with young learners who were interested in becoming farmers. They adapted the trainings to implementation techniques compatible with arid areas: weak irrigation within the schools, hydroponics, container gardening and shed nets.

WFP contributed to the enhancement of irrigation structures to improve the host community’s capacity for agricultural production. In collaboration with the Turkana County Government, the WFP improved three small-scale irrigation schemes: Nanyee, Napeikar, and Kolorio located in Loima sub-county, about 150 km from Kakuma town. The interventions resulted in an increase in farmland from 220 Ha to 285 Ha for the three areas, increased production for farmers, job opportunities in the region, and reduced conflict. Crop diversification trainings have also led to new crop production and consumption.

However, the transformational impact of the agricultural interventions in Kalobeyei and Turkana remains limited due to the scope of the program as well as structural hindrances, such as the lack of water for agriculture. Other obstacles include the lack of access to pesticides and fertilisers and the inability to have compost manure. Dependency on food and cash assistance remains at the household level. “For now I can say we’re midway (in terms of reaching programming objectives). And mostly, the government needs to be part of it.”

Farming remains small scale but has supplemented household income and food security. The Red Cross implemented “weak irrigation to help them utilise water well... it works well in homes where water was competing with domestic use and of course agriculture.” However, despite construction of dams and the irrigation infrastructure, water for agriculture remains a problem. The communities have not benefited as expected from farming high value crops. The level of success in crop production varies depending on climatic conditions. While there was a sense from NGOs that these efforts have started the move away from dependency, respondents expressed scepticism around the perceived potential for agriculture.

Veterinaires Sans Frontieres (VSF) - Germany implemented a component of the FAO project by mobilising and training farmers in the selected areas of Turkana. 90% of VSF’s activities were along with 10 irrigation schemes along river Turkwel. By the time the project ended in 2019, VSF saw an increase in acreage under crop production – by at least 24% - due to the increase in farming technology knowledge and skills. Furthermore, increased knowledge on crop husbandry led to an increase in yields – especially for key crops, such as cowpeas and sorghum. This ultimately led to an increase in food production at the HH level. There was also a component of kitchen gardening in the refugee camp just for purpose for nutrition and diet balance.

Refugees are not involved in livestock due to serious sensitivities around grazing land rights. Agricultural activities are divided evenly between host and refugee beneficiaries due to numerous consultations between FAO, WFP, and the county government. Agreements were reached and the local community handed over the land to the government for the purposes of setting up Kalobeyei with the understanding that interventions would be split 50-50 between hosts and refugees. When agricultural interventions began in the area, it became clear that giving hosts land put them at a disadvantage, as they were less likely to farm due distance from the settlement and lack of farming culture.
This skew in favour of refugees was solved through commitments to 1) take crop production activities to the host communities where they live and 2) form a management committee composed of equitable hosts and refugees to guide discussions on farm distribution.

Governance structures for irrigation schemes remained a key challenge. This was discussed during a consultative workshop between Turkana County government technical teams, political and opinion leaders (MPs, MCAs and administrators), FAO, WFP and VSF to formulate sustainable solutions challenges in irrigated areas of Turkana. Challenges related to water source sustainability led to a delay in the handover of the assets to the community. Five committees were trained on operations and maintenance of the dams, water pans and irrigation systems to address these challenges. Key planned actions include awareness-raising among the communities/users of the respective water structures on the composition, roles, and responsibilities of the committee and the registration for water users’ associations. Other key challenges included:

- The availability of water remains a major limiting factor to agricultural production in Kalobeyei.
- There is historic distrust between refugees and host communities and building a good relationship is a delicate process.
- Total failure of the 2018 short rains season adversely affected all agricultural activities including rain-fed crop, vegetables and pastures production.
- Heavy desert locust infestation of the crops and livestock forage in many project sites adversely affected the crop yield and livestock feed availability, especially in Turkana West.

The exceptionally high long rains of 2018 caused flooding of some irrigation schemes and damage to crops and infrastructure. This affected yields in the schemes.

![Figure 9: Mentioned income sectors for households with a source of income by gender and community (frequency, comparison hosts vs refugees)](image-url)
WFP helped construct markets in every village and area, which transformed economic life in Kalobeyei. Hosts from the surrounding communities can now access these markets. This is the start of exchanges that have to continue being observed. Changes are already being noted, including:

- refugees riding bicycles yesterday are not riding motorbikes
- wholesalers present in Kalobeyei
- additional market areas beyond the first one set up in village 1 two years ago, to many more accessible ones in each village and area
- presence of vegetable and fish market, and local produce such as honey

Additional challenges reported in the Phase I narrative report included flooding, reduced rainfall and pests which led to destruction and loss of crops and many irrigation schemes, reducing forecasted yields. Furthermore, market inefficiencies due to poor road transport and communication infrastructure and insecurity continued to hamper access to inputs and services. This affects production, flow of commodities to markets, and commodity prices at the county level. The restrictive encampment policy is an inconvenience for business owners when purchasing raw materials or products. Finally, the intake and turnout of students from the host community on vocational and Information Technology (IT) training was reported to be relatively low, due to lack of transport from their homes to the institution.

Lastly, UNHCR reports the overall challenges remaining:

- Challenges to access necessary documentation such as Refugee Identity cards to facilitate application for movement passes. This constantly exposed them to harassment while travelling out of Kakuma to purchase merchandise.
- Lack of reliable electric power in Kalobeyei constrained vocational skills courses in electrical wiring and solar technology. Limited education and vocational skills infrastructures undercut literacy and skills development.
- Absence of government entities affects enterprises’ access to business permits services.
- Inadequate market linkages to promote and facilitate firm-to-firm linkages that would otherwise support local suppliers to trade with refugees and host communities and link to markets.
- Underdeveloped market infrastructure in Kalobeyei constrained market access for goods and services affecting pricing, attributed to distance from Kenya’s major markets, despite the emergence of complementary cash economies in the ecosystem.

Gender implications. In both communities, men dominated the transportation, technical and institutional employment sectors (Figure 6). For hosts, farming activities were most frequently performed by men, while women dominated farming in the refugee community. This discrepancy extends to food-related employment, where women refugees are more likely to engage in than men.

Male hosts most frequently said that their households have taken part in vocational training or apprenticeships in the past (61%). Almost double the rate than for female and male refugee households interviewed (33%). Female hosts presented the lowest rates of training and apprenticeships, with 27%. Among all groups, between 65% and 75% of trained adults have obtained paid work due to past training.
4.6.2 Training

A large number of donors and NGOs joined the Kalobeyei project to provide different livelihood skills training in various fields (Table 6) in support of income-generating activities.

Table 3. Trainings provided in Kalobeyei

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organisation</th>
<th>Description of trainings provided</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Swiss Contact</td>
<td>“Offers training to any interested individual whether from the host or refugees’ community. Like tailoring, phone repair and this have helped individuals to create their own shop for repair.” – FGD1 refugee male youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“SWISS contact graduates are able to open the garage for repairing motorcycles after being given the tools in groups.” – FGD6 refugee male youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Offered hairdressing, barber and bakery training” – FGD3 host male youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRC</td>
<td>“Offered English courses, carpenter, plumbing and masonry. I personally did plumbing with DRC in the year 2018 but I am not able to get employment. Chances are limited, the organization that takes implementation water supply in the settlement mostly due to come with their workers from Kakuma, unless you’re connected. We are also not allowed to connect your own tap which was going to be possible for people to hire plumbers. We only have public taps.” – FGD6 refugee male youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“Conducting training on salon and Kinyozi (barbershop)”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAHI Japan</td>
<td>“Offers computers accessible by both refugees and the host community.” – FGD1 refugee male youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>“We have been trained by the AAHI about the production of bags, beads and baskets. I am now using the skills in tailoring and I am also producing clothes. I also sell the beads when I make them. We also started the production of the baskets, beads, and the bags as women who were trained.” – FGD5 host females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>Computer course offered by DRC facilitators</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CWS</td>
<td>Adult Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Bosco</td>
<td>“Construction related skills and graduates have only completed level one of which it may not help them to remain outstanding in the job market. For now, I am happy that those who have benefited from the training are the ones who are doing construction of houses in Kalobeyei. They are getting money and are sustaining their livelihoods.” – FGD4 refugee female youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIZ</td>
<td>Offers basic computer training through AAR-japan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNHABITAT</td>
<td>“Offers solar installation courses. I was involved in the solar installation and I also did the ICT training in 2018-2019. All these opportunities were for free.” – FGD3 host male youth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIMAR</td>
<td>A project of hydrophilic farming initiated by GIZ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LWF</td>
<td>Training on Bakery production – FGD5 host females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Bakery production and farming. “I did farming with FAO and am now able to grow vegetables for both consumption and business.” – FGD3 host male youth</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Training activities present an opportunity for those who have not completed school and a backup for youth who cannot attend university due to lack of funds or opportunities. Some organisations go further to train people on successful business development and management. DRC is training people on savings and loans, business skills, and business management, AAH-I on business incubation, and Danish Church Aid on business management, bookkeeping and poultry. “These are the organizations that are trying to train people to start their business especially in this settlement because job opportunities are not enough” explains a refugee community leader. He goes on further to explain that the lack of demand for labour has turned refugees into entrepreneurs – setting up mainly food and clothes businesses, other youth have printer shops, saloons, welding workshops.

The main concern is about the scope of the business start-up grants, which refugees do not consider sufficient to lead to sustainable activities. Many have thought of partnering up in order to collate the money at their disposal, and to be able to ‘do something’ with the overall sums. There are also loans offered by organisations such as AAH-I and African Entrepreneur Collective who provide a fraction of money in the business plan. There are various avenues to fund businesses after training, including the provision of start-up capital and getting individual and group loans. Pre-COVID-19, organisations frequently gave capital to training graduates for start-up businesses. Due to COVID-19, there are few people who receive financing – only a limited amount of people with strong business plans succeed.

Respondents noted that the training activities had positively impacted youth, providing outlets and reducing idleness, as well as enhancing youth contribution to the “common good”. Activities such as masonry and construction were particularly valued, as they symbolized Kalobeyei’s youth building houses and homes for community members. The number of constructors as a result of the training was seen as a positive force – and a transferable skill across contexts.

In 2018, many youth were idle and thus there were so many criminal cases because youth involved in criminal activities but since the implementation of different programs and trainings, they are all busy and thus the criminal cases like robbery, assaulting people and stealing from their home, beating and stealing from people are no longer happening making the security of this place a safe place to live. Also, the construction of permanent houses has helped reduce the criminal cases of people breaking in and stealing from others.

FGD6 MALE REFUGEE YOUTH
However, finding a job and a spot in a course was not guaranteed. Tools and resources were not always provided as part of the course. Some participants were not able to see and pursue opportunities once the course was completed. The limitations put on refugee businesses - traveling and acquiring loans - further hindered entrepreneurship. Those who graduated from trainings in 2016-2018 complained that they were given certificates but not followed up on, for a more holistic approach and better monitoring of those who were able to turn skills into livelihoods.

While both hosts and refugees touted the value of vocational training, some hosts felt that they were unfairly treated - not being able to access loans or receive equal pay, and not being able to open business at the same pace and rate as refugees. Many host youth interviewed rejected the “hosts” label, reflecting on the dual discrimination against them: not being paid as much as Kenyans ‘down county’, while not being given as much livelihoods support as refugees due to the consideration that their nationality and established home give them a well-established advantage on the labour market.

Hosts interviewed claim there are few employment opportunities available for them. A few were selling goods such as beans, cabbage, vegetables and maize or had a bamba chakula shop. Casual labour was common, such unloading trucks, construction or driving boda bodas. Women were making and selling alcohol, while others sold charcoal and firewood. Host youth complained that inadequate job opportunities and the lack of financial support will contribute to higher dropout rates amongst host youth. They also cited that many host youth are unable to pursue further studies due to drug addiction and unhappy homes.25 Young men drive boda bodas to Kakuma or are known to sell Mira, a drug business that is booming across Kenya. Many hosts and the refugee Somali community are engaged in this business to earn money. As for female youth, they engage in value chain work – delivering charcoal to the refugee communities and even in the market areas. They also sell firewood to refugees who cannot go deep in the local areas to collect firewood.

Respondents, particularly refugees, struggled to get bank loans and expand businesses substantially. A banking system has been introduced where money can be saved and withdrawn (linked to Bamba Chapa). Refugees recognized the improvements this led to, such as accessing services from Equity Bank’s branch in Kakuma and agents in Kalobeyei village 1. Youth have also learnt how the technology and system work and can now withdraw cash “unlike before when we were limited to only picking food stuff from the vendors”.26 However, refugees do not have the required documents for other forms of loans, such as national ID, nor are they able to secure a collateral or a guarantor. Financial trust remains a problem amongst hosts and refugees.

Female refugees insisted in multiple focus groups on positive initiatives that could be restarted, especially to support women’s inclusion in training opportunities and livelihood start-up activities:

Here in Kalobeyei there are a lot of opportunities to make money, some of the girls are practicing business such as selling fish, selling mandazi, and even some have open a small restaurant to sell tea and chapati, beans and they make money, some plant a small garden then sell the vegetables then people will come and buy vegetables there and you will get money. Many ladies here in our village attend training such as bakery training, hairdressing, tailoring and others after completing their training they implemented NGO will give them equipment to set up their business and utilize the skills that they get to generate income they will open saloons, bakeries, tailoring workshop and get money. After a three-month training organization like LWF does give them the assets for start-up and it is given into groups then you will be given assets to start their business and this has become a big help to ladies.
A day in the life of a refugee in Kalobeyei

Claude, a refugee living in Kalobeyei provided his own self-reflection on the space and activities present in the settlement, giving a local’s view critical changes over the last 3 years.

There is progress, especially in the business potential of Kalobeyei.

Kalobeyei is not one place, it is actually three places: Village 1, Village 2, and Village 3. While in Village 2, the market is integrated, in Village 1, businesses used to be separated until recently, while Village 3 market is located alongside the road, and does not have street lights or water available as in the other two villages. The contexts are different but there is progress.

People come from Dadaab with their businesses, others come from all over Kenya, and this has made Kalobeyei a good place for business. Instead of going to Kakuma to buy vegetables, as was the case three years ago, NGOs, WFP and FAO have helped with vegetable farming here. While it was a challenge to get food locally three years ago, everything can be picked up from Kalobeyei now, in cash or credit.

Each businessman has a competitor and everyone is improving day by day. The focus of people in Kalobeyei now is personal growth. Instead of being taken care of, they are now taking care of themselves. Three years ago, they were busy looking for firewood, water, moving from village to village in their search. Now there is water available and enough firewood, at least in villages 1 and 2. People have learned from trainings, applied for loans, and are doing business today with their savings, investments and loans. Now people are integrating, they have understood what to do and what not to do, both refugees and hosts are living peacefully, doing business together, sharing resources. Some hosts are living in the camp.

But the gains need to be consolidated and built on. Kalobeyei’s youth are concerned.

Ochulo, 28, is a trainee living in village 2. He has been a refugee all his life, originally born in Kakuma refugee camp. He has been living in Kalobeyei for three years, with his family, works as an incentive staff and has skills in both technology and agriculture. But as a TVET graduate, he needs a computer, power, and network to keep up with this skills. With no device, he fears that he will forget the skills he gained. He is well accepted by the community but he wants to go beyond – he wants to provide for the community, something which he cannot do due to the lack of capital. He is frustrated that he cannot play the role he had envisioned for himself: he pursued his tertiary education, finished the TVET training, but still has been jobless for a long time. He feels that now, slowly, people in the community were criticizing him. He sees that NGOs have reduced their training activities, with many youth in the community remaining without jobs, and instead with an increase in budget cuts. COVID19 is only making this situation worse, further limiting job opportunities. Espoir, 24 year old Congolese refugee, shares the same concerns. Although he graduated in electrical wiring and solar installation in Kakuma, and has now lived in Kalobeyei for 4 years, he fears that he is losing his skills, as he is not practicing what he learned in electricity, wiring, and solar installation. There is progress in every area within Kalobeyei overall, but competition has increased, and it is even tougher for youth to get a job.
The link to Kakuma still overshadows Kalobeyei’s potential.

Mwamba, 24 year old living in Kalobeyei village 2, is Congolese, he goes to Kauma town for his business to keep running since he cannot get stock in Kalobeyei. For his business to be registered, like many others, he went to Kakuma town. To access services unavailable in Kalobeyei, for instance a bank for those who do not have an ATM card, he goes to Kakuma town to pick up the money. Kakuma also has supermarkets, petrol stations, hotels that Kalobeyei does not have. The good thing in Kakuma town is that, once you are there, no one knows your identity – who you are, where you are from, and where you live. When you are there you are just like a Kenyan. In Kakuma 1? People don’t even look like refugees, and people think of the future. Healthcare and education are both better in Kakuma, which drives one question: what was the benefit of moving to Kalobeyei from Kakuma? This is a question on people’s minds especially as NGOs are not working as before, livelihood opportunities are going down again and Kakuma is more advanced because of services that still run there, when they have stopped in Kalobeyei.

The potential for agriculture is improving people’s futures in Kalobeyei, including women.

While being an incentive worker was, for a while, the best option for refugees, some are now leaving those coveted jobs. Kikanga Kani, a 40-year-old woman, married and a mother of three living in Kalobeyei Village 2, used to work as an incentive worker with DRC, but decided to leave her job and focus exclusively on farming. She is now earning more from farming than in her former employment. She can earn up to 2,000 KSH per week. Not only does she produce for the local supply, but also to other corners of Turkana. The other day she received a request for 20Kgs of onions from the other side of Turkana county. She used to rely only on Bamba Chakula and has now diversified, doing farming, consuming her produce and selling it as well.
Women are on the frontline of changing communities in Kalobeyei.

Three years ago, you could not find women in any area because they were denied the right to participate in anything outside of home duties. But people have since learned, through many NGO initiatives, that empowering women, creating awareness on gender-based violence, encouraging them to be self-reliant through women groups, receiving money to start businesses, can make them independent, aware of their own rights, and others aware too. Women’s lives have improved enough that in terms of business, women are present, selling different products, many owning businesses.

Women have created opportunities for others, slowly changing the community. For instance, many idle people are now bike (boda boda) operators working for women who bought their motorbikes, and created jobs for unemployed youth. This is helping to reduce drug abuse in the community and idleness among the youth. So women are saving youths in the community. Since their rights have been recognized, they have convinced me that they can contribute much to society. Women are the frontline to changing the communities in Kalobeyei. Women have the ability to change societies, and that is what is happening in Kalobeyei now with women and each sector developing.

Aid projects have contributed to changing lives of people in the community, and most importantly, of women. Women have been receiving grants of 20,000 KSH from DRC, and livelihood programs from AAHI, equipping people, especially women, with business knowledge and access to loans. Those who got help are today helping others in the community with skills and even giving loans.
4.7 Social cohesion

4.7.1 Levels of integration

Achievements

Hosts and refugees share the same social services, schools, health centre, markets and churches. There were instances of intermarriage and youth play recreational activities together, which was seen by most respondents as proof of integration. Intermarriage is one of the main indicators of integration mentioned in FGDs – for host community members it is a symbol of the unity between groups and of the prospects for future social cohesion and peacebuilding within communities as “they are able to step in and solve disputes.” The time spent waiting – most often at the health centre – has also been recognised by all as a quality moment between refugees and hosts where they sit, talk, share ideas, and learn languages from each other.

“KISEP has not reached the 50/50 goal. Kalobeyei is only really affecting communities in the immediate vicinity; the broader Turkana county doesn’t fully understand it.

SUB COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR

Trade between the two communities is often flagged as a positive sign of co-dependence and of socialisation. Hosts bring livestock and firewood to Kalobeyei and markets in Kalobeyei are key sites of interaction. The cash transfers to refugees infuse cash into the local economy. Refugees describe ‘social interactions’ or ‘socializing’ as moments where they buy firewood, charcoal, and medicinal herbs from the hosts, or moments where they may work together as teachers in a school. Beyond trade, hosts described the number of mothers who pass through and deliver in the maternity ward. Sharing and bonding over such an important moment of their lives has brought refugees and host women closer.

“KII9 HOST COMMUNITY MEMBER

We now understand each other. Our children study in the same school with refugees. We are all treated in the same place (hospital). We are mixed in the market. We buy from each other. For example, turkanas sells maize flour to refugees. We don’t choose, in fact we tell them that we are together. And if I don’t have one, they can buy from another refugee. In terms of farming, we buy vegetables from each other. Maybe if I have spinach and the refugee wants, I just sell it to him. There are many refugees who have married host community people. Even children have grown up. For example, my second husband is a refugee and he is a South Sudanese from the Toposa tribe. His daughter is in class 6 and my son is also in the same class.

“KII6 KOKADO PROGRAMME MANAGER

In the past few years, the truth is, when the refugees were settled in Kalobeyei, the host community was still scattered. So that is the reality of the matter, but recently the settlement has really attracted more pastoralist communities next to the settlement. And the way I am seeing, I think that things are improving currently in terms of cohesion. The Turkana go to the refugees. In fact, Kalobeyei is their marketplace and there is no point where you hear that they have fought. The Turkana do sleep at the Kalobeyei settlement with no issue of conflict.
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In the past few years, the truth is, when the refugees were settled in Kalobeyei, the host community was still scattered. So that is the reality of the matter, but recently the settlement has really attracted more pastoralist communities next to the settlement. And the way I am seeing, I think that things are improving currently in terms of cohesion. The Turkana go to the refugees. In fact, Kalobeyei is their marketplace and there is no point where you hear that they have fought. The Turkana do sleep at the Kalobeyei settlement with no issue of conflict.
Issues to monitor

Officials argue that the vision of the settlement’s integrated approach has not sunk in host community mindsets. “They have not understood the concept properly but when they see the integration aspect in the small level, they appreciate the need for such action” explains the sub-county administrator. There have been unequal levels of engagement overall with the host community – NGOs have not engaged as much with the host community within the Kalobeyei settlement. More progress can be seen with those living 50 kilometres away from the settlement.

Within Kalobeyei, some of the ‘low level integration’ mentioned by hosts includes the trade of charcoal and firewood sold to refugees in the settlement. However, when comparing standards of living, hosts explain that the refugee ‘side’ is more developed. While the vision was to have equal and equitable resources and standards, hosts note differences in housing standards and numbers of refugees living in the settlement as compared to hosts.

Hosts feel the Kalobeyei scheme favours refugees, who are given more resources and opportunities. One leader noted that the immediate community was more accepting of refugees compared to those living further away. Language barriers remain a critical issue, contributing to what leaders referred to as ‘silent rivalry’ between the groups.

“Maybe, we who are living here with refugees are the ones who understand this but those host living at the reserve will not understand this. We are now used to refugees but those at the reserve will not because they are not used to refugees. They will not live in peace. For us living here, it is good because we have seen the development that it brings to us such a business.”

KII9 HOST COMMUNITY LEADER
Issues to monitor

There are various nationalities and languages within the refugee population, which has caused conflicts. A number of efforts have been made to address conflict within the refugee community and between refugees and hosts -- actively bringing hosts and refugees together on various committees to solve issues, ensuring mixed football teams, community mobilisers, and forming groups for business opportunities. Sensitization and awareness campaigns have focused on building understanding. Host community and refugees are also in the same committee which delivers information that is based on hygiene and SGBV. The community health committee has 15 members - 5 from the host community and 10 from the refugee community. They come to the Red Cross in the mornings and discuss issues and receive information on hygiene or disease outbreaks to be passed by a clinical officer to the community. Conflict resolution mechanisms have been implemented and peace committees formed by both refugees and host community members. Trainings given by FAO, DRC, and NRC were critical to Turkanans and refugees learning to live together.

"Yes, there have been conflicts because we were not understanding each other and there was not that acceptance. For example, 2 years ago, we could not get sand from the nearby seasonal river (Laga). If Turkanas see you, they will come and attack you at night. But now things have improved a lot. I have not heard of anyone being attacked because of sand harvesting.

SSI2 REFUGEE MALE, 21"

Refugees cutting trees was a source of tensions with the host community. Previously, moving beyond the immediate vicinity of Kalobeyei could create problems, such as water-related conflicts and fears around attacks on women and children. One of the key negative aspects is the perceived destruction of the environment – as refugees are seen as cutting a lot of trees, with a potential conflict looming in the near future. Similar tensions have been reported across the last years – respondents reported a 2019 incident where refugees went to cut firewood and one refugee was beaten. Hosts see refugees as benefiting on the one hand from UNHCR’s humanitarian and protection aid, while also benefiting from the more tailored work done by NGOs on development.
4.7.2 Perceived Difficulties

When asked about the main three difficulties associated with living in/near Kalobeyei, hosts and refugees had different answers (Figure 10). Refugees considered insecurity as one of the main challenges in the community, while hosts believe access to business opportunities is the main problem. Both hosts and refugees consider access to water and health as two of the main difficulties in Kalobeyei.

Figure 10. What are the main difficulties you associate with living in/near Kalobeyei?

Women and men have different opinions about the main difficulties in Kalobeyei. Women more frequently mentioned water and health access as main problems while men more often mentioned issues of access to business and education opportunities.

Both communities observed an increase in NGOs dependency since last year: observed in 85% of refugee households and 60% in host households.

Local authorities need to play a more active role in the setting up and overseeing the operations of the community structures. Various government agencies will be expected to intensify their involvement and participation in making community self-management a reality, even as government services available for host community members are made available for refugees as well. Moreover, the leaders’ election in Kalobeyei has been delayed, which has directly affected the commitment of some interim leaders, with a few deserting their leadership roles unannounced. In addition, the crime rate in Kalobeyei has increased in the recent past, particularly regarding petty theft and robbery, complicating the work of leaders as community members expect them to provide an immediate solution. The settlement has also recently encountered a new wave of gangs with criminal characteristics, particularly comprising the youth. The police are working with leaders to find a solution.
5. Evaluation Conclusions

RDPP’s integrated approach towards provision of sustainable development and protection solutions for refugees and host communities yielded positive results in various sectors. This section provides a highlight of results and impact of programme activities with a specific focus on how the interventions (projects, strategies, governance) contributed to a sustainable development and protection solution for refugees and host communities in Kalobeyei.

1. Relevance

RDPP interventions are well aligned with the global & regional refugee response framework and have provided a solid foundation for integrated service delivery

*How does the RDPP adapt to context dynamics?*

*To what extent have different sub-groups actively contributed to needs- and context assessments? What are mechanisms for feedback and influence of refugees and host communities on projects?*

RDPP provided the much-needed structure and foundation for integrated service delivery in Kalobeyei. Benefiting from the coherence created out of the CRRF and national and county government development priorities, significant progress has been made towards inclusion of refugees and host communities in national and county services. By providing a platform for government agencies and development actors to jointly deliberate on crucial community development needs, change has been realised in terms of access to basic services in healthcare, education, WASH, and food & nutrition sectors. Improvements have been made in maternal and childcare, in addition to sexual and reproductive healthcare access. However, more training and resources are needed for healthcare staff, including further integration in the Turkana County Integrated Development Plan to ensure gains are sustainable.

Protection awareness was seen as a big change in Kalobeyei. Refugees actively discussed the awareness campaigns around ending child marriage and GBV. There was increased awareness not only of issues around protection, but also of existing protection mechanisms and processes.

As a pastoralist society, changing the mindset around agriculture and education was one of the biggest host community impacts. Key informants spoke of the “transformation of the host community” while speaking about the impact on improving household incomes and access to school. According to FAO, the biggest success of the agricultural component of RDPP was proof of concept - “that agriculture production can be done in Kalobeyei and Turkana in a sustainable, profitable way.” Farming remains small scale but has supplemented household income and food security.

To maximise on the gains made thus far, there is need to make a deliberate and targeted effort towards to align the global, national, and local agendas in order to live up to the promises of a 50/50 integration of refugee and host populations.
2. Coordination

RDPP coordination with partners, authorities and the local community improved over the implementation period

How does the RDPP coordinate with partners and authorities?

Did the RDPP help to strengthen the capacity of IPs and local authorities to develop and implement an integrated approach towards refugees?

In the context of Kalobeyei and the dynamics around refugees and the host community, stakeholder buy-in was needed as a first step towards achieving consensus on community needs and RDPP goals. RDPP capitalised on open dialogue with different stakeholders, including community members to communicate the goals, mission, and plans, and how these can be achieved. Creation of thematic work groups, multi-stakeholder consultation around the CRRF and community level committees provided a coordination platform for joint planning and seeking solutions to common problems. There were a lot of challenges at the inception, especially on change of mindset and behaviour towards the integrated approach at the community level. However, constant engagement on roles and responsibilities, dispute resolution mechanisms contributed to building trust between various stakeholders over the years.

While the roles and responsibilities are clear to all stakeholders, the level of commitment still varies, especially at the policy formulation level and mistrust from a section of the local community. To ensure that activities in Kalobeyei are locally driven there is a need to promote community-driven strategic programming and government accountability.

3. Effectiveness

A positive impact in some sectors, missed opportunities in others

To what extent and how did RDPP help to strengthen the legal protection of refugees, with emphasis on vulnerable groups?

What results have been achieved in integrated access to/use of energy, water, education and health, and employment?

Which factors positively or negatively impact the effectiveness of individual interventions?

RDPP realised varying levels of success in terms of integrated access to and use of energy, water, nutrition, education, health and employment opportunities for refugees and host communities. Improvements have been made in maternal and childcare, in addition to sexual and reproductive healthcare access. Targeted awareness on education contributed to an increase in enrolment of children in schools, especially from the host community. However, learning outcomes for the majority remain poor due to quality of teaching, limited resources, and serious issues with overcrowding.

On food security, refugees and hosts acknowledge an increase in access to a wider variety of foods and the greater options available to them. FAO and WFP put in place initiatives promoting market linkages for smallholder farmers, especially for markets and traders around Kalobeyei and Kakuma. Promotion of agricultural practices has led to changed perceptions towards crop production amongst the host community: many are involved in sorghum and cowpea farming. Refugee youth recognise the ongoing changes, and the promotion of agricultural practices that enable the active involvement of women in agro-business.

Protection issues, security, and access to clean water remain a concern. Protection awareness raising was less prevalent for hosts than for refugees. There were mixed feelings about security around Kalobeyei. While establishment of a police post, security lights, and better housing are appreciated, women still felt insecure and feared getting firewood or water alone, and the police are seen as both a source of security and a risk.

In terms business support grant funding, the scope of support is narrow. Only a few start-ups have benefited from direct funding and capacity building on business development. Respondents, particularly refugees, struggled to get bank loans and expand businesses substantially.
4. Impact

Integrated approaches have become a reality in some sectors and social cohesion has improved, although a stronger engagement is needed.

*What is the impact on beneficiaries? What is the income effect? How is social cohesion influenced by the RDPP?*

*How do project and programme results impact potential future migration decisions of refugees?*

The infrastructural investment made in education, healthcare and agricultural sectors will have long lasting impacts in Kalobeyei. Construction and equipping of schools and health facilities are part of the greatest contributions in terms of transforming lives of refugees and the host community. The “national integration” of the education curriculum positively contributed to a shift in focus by different partners, including government agencies, towards core competencies to be achieved in basic education for refugees and host communities. Despite the gap in resources, WASH sensitisation campaigns and rehabilitation of irrigation infrastructure has had positive impacts on health & sanitation and food production in Kalobeyei respectively.

In terms of social cohesion, the project focused on building capacities of county government officials, and community leaders to manage effective integration of refugees and the hosts, especially in ensuring everyone’s basic rights are protected and the two communities co-existed peacefully. However, local administrative officials argue that the vision of the settlement’s integrated approach has not sunk in host community mindsets. While they appreciate the support, they still feel there is an unequal level of engagement in terms of providing direct support. This has occasionally caused some rift over scarce resources such as use of land, firewood, water points and employment opportunities. However, with the provision of water tanks and installation of taps within the settlement, conflict has been reduced and health outcomes have increased.

To foster greater social cohesion, the programmes need to give more visibility to the host community to achieve the 50/50 integration goal.

5. Sustainability

Aligning durable solutions programming with the Government’s priorities

*Which challenges hinder the successful implementation of projects?*

*Is it possible to elaborate on the sustainability of individual interventions? What are the main determinants for sustainability? Which challenges hinder the successful implementation of projects?*

*What are key governance factors for effectively implementing policies aimed at sustainable protection and development approaches for refugees and their host communities?*

The continuation of the RDPP activities and sustenance of realised outcomes will largely be pegged on stakeholder commitment, local ownership, and policy & regulatory framework. Whereas a great level of effort has been made in each of these components, the level of engagement and commitment around infrastructural development and refugee regulatory framework has continued to undermine successful project implementation. Inadequate resources and capacity in the health and education sectors continues to exacerbate existing inequalities in access to quality and affordable services. While RDPP aims to promote self-reliance amongst refugees and host community, and building of the local economy, there are policy and political obstacles to the current operational interventions.

Kenya’s encampment policy restricts refugee movement, which negatively impacts on refugee rights and freedom around mobility, economic participation, access to the labour market and financial inclusion. Additionally, the recent government’s announcement of closure of Kakuma camp is likely to negatively impact on the progress achieved in Kalobeyei since there are close ties between the communities in these two locations. The government and other stakeholders need to ensure legal and regulatory frameworks are in line with the operational interventions to enhance sustainability.
6. Recommendations

6.1 Overall

Supporting women in Kalobeyei will have a generational impact: female heads of households reported significantly higher regular school attendance of their children than male ones. The age dimension is as critical and endangered – Kalobeyei is mainly composed of children and youth who, without adequate education, training and support, may not fulfil their potential. Further integration of gender-, child- and youth-sensitive programming is needed.

Many committees have been set up in Kalobeyei – from peace, to child protection or water management committees. Their feedback details challenges faced in changing mindsets and behaviours to support the integrated programme and its ambitions in key sectors. More design thinking, community-driven strategic programming can ensure that activities in Kalobeyei are locally driven.

The gains made on water and sanitation are clear, but they are endangered by a global pandemic and by insufficient resources and capacity locally. Given the limitations placed on agencies to be present on the ground, COVID-19 should be a time to adapt towards more agile programming: putting civil society organisations and development action at the centre.

The links between literacy, education, and income are central and should frame the way programming is designed and delivered. Beyond focusing on integrating population groups, the potential for joined up or integrated programming between key sectors (here education and livelihoods interventions specifically) are clear. Without it, gains made in one sector will not be sustainable, nor will they have the outcome level impact desired.
6.2 By Sector

Based on the findings of this study, there are several opportunities for various stakeholders, including the national and county governments, development partners and policy makers to sustainable development and protection solutions for refugees and their host communities in Kenya:

Education

- **Kenya does not have a national curriculum on accelerated education.** To bridge the gap in Kalobeyei, actors in the education sector, in collaboration with MoE officials, came together and designed an approach to support accelerated learning for refugees. Its success remains unclear. The conversation has to be supported and monitored to enable refugees and host overage learners to re-join school. **Government thinking on education management will need to continue to be supported by UNICEF.**

- **Advocate and support for the county government to take lead in education, skills and capabilities of refugee and host communities.** Whereas various interventions under the RDPP project have led to the realization of certain gains in the education sector in terms of infrastructure and enrolment, there are notable gaps in provision of quality and inclusive education. Overcrowding and high student to teacher ratio remain the greatest concerns, as teachers are unable to maintain order in the classroom or provide individual support to students. Recruitment of professionally trained teachers, provision of adequate learning materials and construction of more classrooms targeting the bulging population of host and refugee children will certainly address overcrowding, dropout rates, and dwindling education quality. With a more targeted and proactive approach, minimum education standards for both refugee and host learners can be achieved in the next five years.

- **Adopt a targeted approach towards providing access to education to disadvantaged, over-age, out-of-school children.** There is only one organisation that is running an accelerated learning programme within Kalobeyei, and is unable to meet the demands associated with accelerated learning. Older learners are still sharing classes and other learning materials with other regular learners. In collaboration with the national government and other stakeholders, including the communities, age range for such students and the implementation strategy needs to be clearly defined. Beyond the current approach that has been designed to support accelerated learning for refugees, there is a need to incorporate a clear and effective accelerated teaching and learning approach into the national education programme.

- **Develop a special learning model that would integrate learners with special education needs.** In addition to the already complex refugee environment, access to schooling becomes increasingly difficult when learners living with disability are not targeted in the approach of education delivery. The school and calls environment should be designed from the outset considering learners with special needs. Every school should have at least a teacher who is trained to handle learners with mental and physical disability.
Healthcare, WASH and Protection

- Kalobeyei is “a children-based settlement”. Child protection was an early component of Kalobeyei, establishing systems for child protection with the input of a number of organisations, and further expanding in phase 2. The present challenge for UNHCR is ensuring that partners adapt their programme content to children. The transition from adult to child sensitive programming is still in progress.

- Host and refugee women require further protection support. Awareness and sensitisation campaigns are needed in Kalobeyei and nearby host communities around ending child marriage and GBV, but also empowering women to continue to spread the word on mechanisms for reporting cases. Community outreach will require further funding as the costs had been higher than anticipated.

- To continue to improve security and safety in and around Kalobeyei, additional trainings are needed with the police who are still seen as both a source of security and a major risk. The work done by community leaders and the Refugee Affairs Secretariat has provided greater sense of security and safety, but additional work to build trust between women and the police is needed.

- Improve availability of medical equipment, supplies and drugs. Provision of quality healthcare relies on availability and accessibility of skilled health attendants and medical supplies. There are two main health facilities that are serving the host and refugee population in Kalobeyei, run by KRC and AIC. Due to the perceived difference in quality of service, especially around maternal healthcare, there has been a lot of pressure on limited staffing and obtaining drugs at the health facilities. Overcrowding at the KRC facility has contributed to long working hours and fatigue for the midwifery personnel. Lack of space at the delivery facility has also led to low admission of expectant women. To improve maternal health, there is need for a concerted effort towards expanding sources of service delivery and adequately equipping the existing facilities with the required medical supplies in order to meet the growing demand.

Social Cohesion

- Create more awareness around the settlement’s integrated approach for a better understanding of the framework, how it is supposed to be implemented and the role of the two communities. Positive strides have been towards integration and social cohesion between refugees and host community through promotion of positive interactions socially, culturally and economically. However, there are sections of the population, especially in the host community that are yet to have a complete mindshift. In order to enhance this further and achieve more gains, security issues and concerns around land need to be addressed to reduce animosity between the different groups and enable them to interact more freely and further build trust. NGOs should intensify engagement with the host communities beyond those that have a day-to-day interaction in local markets and other social avenues. More progress can be realised with those living 50 kilometres away from the settlement.
Livelihood and Food Security

- **Invest more in enabling infrastructure to support food production, resilience and wellbeing of refugee and host communities.** Although, effort has been made towards improving food security at the household level, current interventions can only support subsistence farming, with farmers still struggling to overcome challenges around drought and access to farm inputs and market. Subsistence farming however cannot meet the local market demand. The food security and livelihood sector there has an abundance of opportunities to scale up and expand if additional funding can be secured.

- **Address the supply chain inefficiencies to increase purchasing power of refugee and host communities.** There is an opportunity to improve retail engagement strategy in order to improve availability and affordability of fresh and nutritious food, and to contribute to self-reliance of the two communities. Local traders need more support to improve sourcing of goods and linkage with manufacturers and wholesalers upstream & Kakuma so as to cut the many brokers who might come in between to exploit them.

- **Invest more in infrastructure required for agriculture – both for subsistence and income generating purposes.** Maintenance of the dams, water pans and irrigation systems has also experienced a lot of challenges. There is a need to address these challenges by widening the scope of intervention, including onboarding the private sector for targeted investment. This for example will ensure farmers are able to produce high value crops to meet the increasing local and upstream demand for goods and services. making good incomes from agricultural activities both in crop production and service provision.

- **Engage more formal financial institutions to improve access to seed capital for entrepreneurs.** While there are avenues providing for acquisition of technical and entrepreneurial skills for youth and women, the majority are unable to access startup grants due to insufficient opportunities. There are only two commercial banks (Equity and Kenya Commercial Bank) that accept to enroll refugees with government recognised manifests, and by extension have a bank account.
Annex 1: Components for the Outcome Metric

A Kalobeyei-specific outcome metric was developed focused on domains directly relevant to RDPP activities in the field. In Kalobeyei, these activities focused on health, livelihoods, food security and education. Based on these broad categories, the following indicators were selected to form part of the location-specific RDPP outcome metric:

Table 3. Kenya-specific RDPP outcome indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>More than 20L of water collected per person per day</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Access to a latrine in the household</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of people sharing a latrine (less than 20 people per latrine)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livelihoods</td>
<td>Existing source of income</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More than one source of income</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dependency ratio (less or equal than 2)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approximate HH weekly income (KES) (more than 35 KES)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Security</td>
<td>Access to land on a seasonal basis for farming or other purposes (e.g. kitchen gardens) (yes)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Concerns over quantity of food for HH in the past month (None)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do you eat fruits and vegetables every week?</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water &amp; Energy</td>
<td>HH member ability to read and write (yes)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household member with formal education (yes)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Household member with at least secondary education (yes)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Child labour (free of child labour)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>School feeding program at school (yes)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with the quality of education received in the Kalobeyei settlement (yes)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfaction with the quality of the school infrastructure (yes)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Are children safe in your community?</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For each category, several binary (true/false) indicators were assembled, a set of weights were defined and used to compute a numeric score for each respondent household in each dimension.
The Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs contracted the LET - composed of Samuel Hall, MDF, Maastricht University and ECDPM - to conduct a combined quantitative and qualitative impact evaluation for RDPP in order to assess progress and provide learning for adaptation, feed a regional programme narrative and inform policy making and regional dialogues. Led by Samuel Hall and MDF, the evaluation team combines academic rigour and subject-matter expertise on migration, displacement, refugees, protection and integration.