Oxford Policy Management

IDS Institute of
Development Studies

HUNGER SAFETY NET PROGRAMME – M&E BASELINE REPORT – ANNEX TABLES

Final Draft for Comments

HSNP M&E Component:
Oxford Policy Management (OPM) and
Institute of Development Studies (IDS)

Jun-11

Table of tables

ANNEX TABLES

Table A. 2.1 a   Actual sample size achieved at baseline by beneficiary status, targeting mechanism, district and treatment and control areas

Beneficiary status	Targeting method	Mandera Treatment	Mandera Control	Mandera Total	Marsabit Treatment	Marsabit Control	Marsabit Total	Turkana Treatment	Turkana Control	Turkana Total	Wajir Treatment	Wajir Control	Wajir Total	Overall Treatment	Overall Control	Overall Total
Selected	CBT	133	131	264	133	131	264	136	131	267	198	67	265	600	460	1,060
	DR	117	97	214	132	132	264	131	131	262	132	132	264	512	492	1,004
	SP	132	121	253	128	133	261	133	132	265	66	198	264	459	584	1,043
	Total	382	349	731	393	396	789	400	394	794	396	397	793	1,571	1,536	3,107
Not selected	CBT	88	87	175	86	79	165	84	89	173	53	44	97	311	299	610
	DR	88	83	171	87	85	172	88	85	173	88	88	176	351	341	692
	SP	87	88	175	88	86	174	87	87	174	44	132	176	306	393	699
	Total	263	258	521	261	250	511	259	261	520	185	264	449	968	1,033	2,001
Total		645	607	1,252	654	646	1,300	659	655	1,314	581	661	1,242	2,539	2,569	5,108

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010.

Table A. 3.1 a   Population information and household composition

| Indicator | Randomisation checks By treatment status | | By beneficiary status CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | Overall | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Mean age	22*	24	22	20	28***	19	21*	22	23***	20	22	28,068
Proportion of females	50	49	51***	48	48	48	49*	47	50**	48	49	28,069
Mean HH size	5.9	5.6	5.7	5.5	5.6	5.3	5.9***	4.8	5.7***	5.3	5.5	5,108
Mean gender ratio per HH	1.3	1.3	1.2**	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.5	1.3*	1.4	1.4	5,032
Mean number of children (<6) per HH	1	0.9	0.9*	1.2	0.5***	1.2	1.2***	1	0.9**	1.1	1	5,108
Mean number of children (<18) per HH	3.4	3	3.2	3.1	2.7**	3.1	3.6***	2.4	3.2**	2.9	3.1	5,108
Mean number of elderly (>54) per HH	0.6*	0.8	0.5**	0.4	1.3***	0.2	0.5***	0.3	0.7***	0.3	0.5	5,108
Proportion of HHs caring for orphans	26	22	28***	9	21***	12	23	17	24***	12	18	5,108
Proportion of HHs with female head	34	33	42***	14	29***	18	28	23	33***	17	25	5,108
Proportion of HHs with child head	0	0.1	0.1	0	0	0.1	0	0.4	0	0.2	0.1	5,108
Proportion of HHs with elderly head	40*	51	33**	25	83***	14	36***	23	45***	21	33	5,108

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Gender ratio is defined as number of men per HH/ number of women per HH. Cases where there are no women are defined as missing values

Table A. 3.1 b   Population information and household composition by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
Mean age	21.01	21.9	22.19*	20.74
Proportion of females	48	49	51***	48*
Mean HH size	5.9*	5.2**	5.0***	6.0***
Mean gender ratio per HH*	1.43	1.36	1.24***	1.42*
Mean number of children (<6) per HH	1.02	0.92**	0.95*	1.26***
Mean number of children (<18) per HH	3.5**	2.8***	2.8***	3.5***
Mean number of elderly (>54) per HH	0.52	0.420**	0.49	0.52
Proportion of HHs caring for orphans	16	21	18	17
Proportion of HHs with female head	23	28*	30**	18***
Proportion of HHs with child head	0.08	0.11	0.03	0.16
Proportion of HHs with elderly head	33	32	35	33

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Gender ratio is defined as number of men per HH/ number of women per HH. Cases where there are no women are defined as missing values.

Table A. 3.2a Household labour capacity

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
Mean dependency ratio score	0.69	0.68	0.66***	0.59	0.73***	0.59	0.69***	0.56	0.69***	0.58	0.64	5,108
Mean labour capacity index	2.97	2.83	2.97	2.91	2.88	2.74	2.86*	2.72	2.91	2.81	2.86	5,108
Single-person HHs (%)	1.4	1.4	2.7*	1.1	1.9	1.3	0.2	0.5	1.4	1	1.2	5,108
HHs with no-one aged 18-54 (%)	6.2	7.6	5	2.7	13.9***	1.1	4.8**	2.1	6.8***	2	4.5	5,108
Proportion of elderly (>54) working	77	77	73	77	80	76	77	78	77	77	77	2,972

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Dependency ratio is defined as the number of people who are dependents (children (<18), people aged 55+, chronically ill or disabled people (18-54)) divided by the total number of HH members. (4) Mean labour capacity index assigns a value between 0 and 1 to the labour contribution of each HH member, and sums these to obtain an index value per HH (adapted from Kay Sharp (2003), 'Measuring Destitution', IDS Working Paper 217, Brighton: IDS). Values are: child<6=0, working child (6-14)=0.3, adult assistant (15-17)=0.6, adult (18-54) able to work=1, elderly (>54) able to work=0.5, ill/disabled unable to work=0; (5) Proportion of children/elderly working = # children/elderly (<15/<18/>54) listing either their main or other activity as working in either paid or unpaid work / total # children/elderly (<15/<18/>54).

Table A. 3.2 b   Household labour capacity by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
Dependency ratio	0.65	0.61***	0.64	0.64
Mean labour capacity index	2.99	2.86	2.636***	3.02
Proportion of elderly (>54) working	81	75	78	74

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Dependency ratio is defined as the number of people who are dependents (children (<18), people aged 55+, chronically ill or disabled people (18-54)) divided by the total number of HH members. (4) Mean labour capacity index assigns a value between 0 and 1 to the labour contribution of each HH member, and sums these to obtain an index value per HH (adapted from Kay Sharp (2003), 'Measuring Destitution', IDS Working Paper 217, Brighton: IDS). Values are: child<6=0, working child (6-14)=0.3, adult assistant (15-17)=0.6, adult (18-54) able to work=1, elderly (>54) able to work=0.5, ill/disabled unable to work=0; (5) Proportion of children/elderly working = # children/elderly (<15/<18/>54) listing either their main or other activity as working in either paid or unpaid work / total # children/elderly (<15/<18/>54).

Table A. 3.3a   Social characteristics

Indicator	Randomisation checks By treatment status		By beneficiary status CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
% of adult males (>=18 years) who are currently married or in consensual union	58	60	53***	71	54***	82	68	64	59***	72	65	6,329
% of adult males (>=18 years) who are currently married or in consensual union and have more than one wife	18	16	16	16	21	15	15	13	17	15	16	3,975
Mean number of wives for married adult males (>=18 years) with more than one wife	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.4	2	2.3	2.3	2.3	2.3	672
% Children aged 11-18 that have ever been married or in a consensual union	0.5	0.7	1	1.6	0.6*	2.5	0.3**	2.5	0.6**	2.1	1.2	5,587
% HHs belonging to a minority ethnic group	7	6	6	8	11	15	5	7	7*	10	8	4,894
% HHs with no member with a national identity card	36	36	36	37	47***	31	31**	40	36	36	36	5,108
Proportion children<6 with no birth certificate	94	97	93	88	98	98	96*	97	95	93	94	4,915

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Proportion of HHs belonging to a minority ethnic group = number of HHs belonging to an ethnic group not listed as majority group in community-level data / total number of HHs belonging to that community. Community-level ethnic group data missing for 214 HHs.

Table A. 3.3 b Social characteristics by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
% of adult males (>=18 years) who are currently married or in consensual union	66	62	69	65
% of adult males (>=18 years) who are currently married or in consensual union and have more than one wife	13	7***	30***	12
Mean number of wives for married adult males (>=18) with more than one wife	2.1***	2.2	2.4**	2.2
% Children aged 11-18 that have ever been married or in a consensual union	1	0.3***	1	3**
% HHs belonging to a minority ethnic group*	0.3***	33***	0.1***	0***
% HHs with no member with a national identity card	37	19***	53***	32
Proportion children<6 with no birth certificate	83***	98*	100***	95

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010.

Table A. 3.4 a   Main provider characteristics

Indicator	Randomisation checks — By treatment status		By beneficiary status — CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Mean age of main provider	45	47	43	42	53***	38	45***	41	46***	40	43	5,107
% of main providers that are female	32	28	39***	14	25	21	27	21	31***	18	24	5,107
% of main providers that are not the HH head	19	21	20***	8	27**	14	16	14	20***	12	16	5,107
% of HHs where main provider does not live within the HH	9	12	9**	3	15***	5	10	6	10***	4	7	5,107
% of main providers that live in HH who are not the HH head	14	15	16***	6	20**	11	10	11	14***	9	11	4,682
% of main providers that live in HH who are not the main budget decision maker	15	18	14	21	23	17	14	20	16	19	18	4,682
% of main providers without a national identity card	9	12	9	16	12	10	11	15	10	14	12	5,107
% of main providers that are illiterate	80	87	82*	70	87***	73	83	83	83**	74	79	5,107
% of main providers with no formal education	82	88	82	71	90***	72	85	84	85***	74	80	5,107
% of main providers providing for more than one HH	27	32	20***	32	31	34	36	32	29	33	31	5,107
% of HHs receiving regular support from someone outside of the HH	14	14	13*	7	18**	7	13	11	14***	8	11	5,107

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Main provider for a HH is defined as the person who provides the main source of income for the HH.

Table A. 3.4b   Main provider characteristics by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
Mean age of main provider	45	43	42	43
% female main providers	21	25	35***	14***
% main providers that are not the HH head	9***	19*	22***	11***
% of HHs where main provider does not live within the HH	4***	11***	7	7
% main providers without a national identity card	12	1***	27***	5***
% of main providers that are illiterate	79	69*	83	83
% of main providers with no formal education	81	68**	84	86
% main providers providing for more than one HH	18***	34	31	40***
% HHs receiving regular support from someone outside of the HH	5***	6***	12	19***

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010.

Table A. 3.5a   Intra-household decision-making

| Indicator | Randomisation checks — By treatment status | | By beneficiary status — CBT | | By beneficiary status — SP | | By beneficiary status — DR | | By beneficiary status — Overall | | Overall | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Mean age of main budget decision maker	46	48	44	41	54***	37	46***	41	47***	40	43	5,108
% of main budget decision makers that are female, for												
☐All HHs	45	46	50***	33	46**	37	41	41	46***	36	41	5,108
☐HHs where the main provider does not live in the HH	57	60	51	62	59	77	62**	88	59*	77	64	293
% of HHs where the main budget decision maker is the head of the HH	76	71	76	77	63***	75	77	76	74	76	75	5,108
% of HHs where the main budget decision maker is the main provider	82	78	83	78	73*	81	82	78	81	79	80	5,108
% of HHs where the main budget decision maker is both main provider and HH head	70	64	70	74	56***	72	72	70	68	72	70	5,108
% of main budget decision makers without a national identity card	11	12	9	14	13	11	11**	18	11	14	12	5,108

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Main provider for a HH is defined as the person who provides the main source of income for the HH.

Table A. 3.5 b   Intra-household decision-making by district

| Indicator | District variations | | | | Overall | |
| | By (greater) district | | | | | |
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N[1]
Mean age of main budget decision maker	43	43	43	44	43	5,108
% of main budget decision makers that are female, for						
• All HHs	56***	48	37	25***	41	5,108
•HHs where main provider does not live in HH	49	67	58	70	64	293
% of HHs where the main budget decision maker is the head of the HH	62***	72	78	86***	75	5,108
% of HHs where the main budget decision maker is the main provider	62***	73	94***	85	80	5,108
% of HHs where the main budget decision maker is both main provider and HH head	58***	64	75	80***	70	5,108
% of main budget decision makers without a national identity card	11	2***	27***	7**	12	5,108

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Main provider for a HH is defined as the person who provides the main source of income for the HH.

Table A. 4.1 a   Household consumption expenditure levels

Indicator	Randomisation checks		By beneficiary status								Overall	
	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall			
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Mean total monthly HH consumption expenditure per adult equivalent (KES)	1,939	1,805	2,011**	2,622	1,681***	2,118	1,865	1,930	1,878***	2,289	2,078	5,106
Mean monthly food consumption expenditure per adult equivalent (KES)	1,434	1,410	1,509***	1,949	1,259***	1,586	1,434	1,498	1,423***	1,720	1,567	5,106
Food share of consumption expenditure (%)	77	79	77	77	76	78	79	79	78	78	78	5,106
Mean monthly health expenditure *per capita* (KES)	21.8	21.6	26.7	31.5	23.2	19.9	16.7	16.8	21.7	24.1	22.9	5,106
Mean monthly education expenditure per child (KES)	103	81	101	139	104	88	81	81	93	109	100	3,929

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Mean monthly education expenditure per child = total education expenditure per month / total number of children 6-17 years.

Table A. 4.1 b   Household welfare by consumption expenditure by quintile

Indicator	By consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	Q1 (poorest)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Estimate	N
Mean monthly consumption expenditure per adult equivalent (KES)	868***	1,343***	1,783**	2,382***	3,996***	2,074	5,105
Mean share of food expenditure in total monthly HH expenditure (KES)	83***	80***	77	77*	73***	78	5,105
Mean monthly HH health expenditure (KES)	58***	72***	85***	138	277***	126	5,105
Mean monthly HH education expenditure (KES)	47***	137**	198	293**	415***	218	5,105
Mean value of all HH assets owned by HH (KES)	9,095**	12,478*	15,230*	27,226	66,917**	26,184	5,105
Mean value of productive assets owned by HH (KES)	718***	1,548***	2,370	3,011**	4,042**	2,337	5,106
Proportion of HHs currently owning agricultural land (%)	10	9	10	8	9	9	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Consumption quintiles are defined according to the distribution of consumption expenditure over the study population such that each quintile contains 20% of the population.

Table A. 4.1 c   Household welfare by consumption expenditure by district

Indicator	District variations				Overall	
	By (greater) district					
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N[1]
est)	6.754***	19.2	42.041***	5.008***	20	5,106
Q2	13.554***	25.371**	25.064***	13.946***	20.016	5,106
Q3	20.627	18.879	14.897***	26.827***	19.982	5,106
Q4	23.259	19.884	11.575***	27.747***	20.007	5,106
Q5 (richest)	35.807***	16.653	6.423***	26.473	19.99	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 4.2 a Household reports of their current and past welfare status

| Indicator | Randomisation checks — By treatment status | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	CBT Selected (type A/Bs)	CBT Non-selected (type C/Ds)	SP Selected (type A/Bs)	SP Non-selected (type C/Ds)	DR Selected (type A/Bs)	DR Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Overall Selected (type A/Bs)	Overall Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Current situation												
% HHs - doing well	1	1	2*	11	1***	3	1	1	1**	6	3	5,107
% HHs - doing just okay	27	20	26**	42	28	30	20	25	24***	34	29	5,107
% HHs - struggling	57	66	57**	43	58	59	66	67	61**	54	58	5,107
% HHs - unable to meet HH needs	14	13	15**	5	13	8	13*	7	14***	6	10	5,107
Situation compared with a year ago												
% HHs - doing lot better than 1 year ago	1	1	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	2	2	5,107
% HHs - doing little better than 1 year ago	25	25	18	25	37	36	25	25	25	28	27	5,107
% HHs - doing same as 1 year ago	32	30	38*	45	24	27	29	31	31*	35	33	5,107
% HHs - doing little worse than 1 year ago	23	28	21***	14	24	20	29	28	25**	19	22	5,107
% HHs - doing lot worse than 1 year ago	17	14	18*	12	13	14	15	14	16	13	14	5,107

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
% HHs - can't/won't say	1	1	3	4	0	1	0	1	1	2	2	5,107
Situation compared with two years ago												
% HHs - doing lot better than 2 years ago	2	2	2	4	3	5	2	3	2*	4	3	5,107
% HHs - doing little better than 2 years ago	28	25	25	26	38	33	22	21	27	27	27	5,107
% HHs - doing same as 2 years ago	20	16	22	25	12	17	18	17	18	20	19	5,107
% HHs - doing little worse than 2 years ago	28	37	25	20	28	29	40	41	32	28	30	5,107
% HHs - doing lot worse than 2 years ago	21	18	24	22	19	14	17	17	20	18	19	5,107
% HHs - can't/won't say	0	2	2	2	1	2	0	2	1*	2	1	5,107

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 4.2 b Household reports of their current and past welfare status by district

| Indicator | District variations | | | |
| | By (greater) district | | | |
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir
Current situation				
% HHs - doing well	6	7	1*	0.5**
% HHs - doing just okay	51***	33	22	15***
% HHs - struggling	41***	46***	62	78***
% HHs - unable to meet HH needs	2***	15***	15***	6**
Situation compared with a year ago				
% HHs - doing lot better than 1 year ago	2	4***	0.9**	0.1***
% HHs - doing little better than 1 year ago	41*	24	37*	6***
% HHs - doing same as 1 year ago	38	30	32	33
% HHs - doing little worse than 1 year ago	9***	31*	9***	41***
% HHs - doing lot worse than 1 year ago	5***	11*	19	20*
% HHs - can't/won't say	5	0.2**	2	0**
Situation compared with two years ago				
% HHs - doing lot better than 2 years ago	5	8***	1***	0.3***
% HHs - doing little better than 2 years ago	46***	22	31	10***
% HHs - doing same as 2 years ago	21	15	24	16
% HHs - doing little worse than 2 years ago	14***	42**	13***	54***
% HHs - doing lot worse than 2 years ago	12	12*	29**	19
% HHs - can't/won't say	3	1	2	0.04***

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 4.2 c   Reasons/causes for households doing worse than in the past

| Indicator | Randomisation checks By treatment status | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | Treatment group (type A HHs) | Control group (type B HHs) | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
			(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
Reasons for being worse off (proportions calculated over HHs stating that they were doing worse)												
% indicating loss/reduction in HH assets	79*	90	78	81	87**	78	87	84	84	81	83	1,920
% indicating reduction in income	16*	7	14	8	8	10	11	7	12	8	10	1,920
% indicating consumption cost shocks	36	29	32	28	30	43	35	31	33	34	34	1,920
% indicating loss of aid	2	1	1	0	1	3	2	1	1	1	1	1,920
% indicating other	6	6	10	11	2	5	4	10	6	8	7	1,920
Causes of being worse off (proportions calculated over HHs stating that they were doing worse)												
% indicating drought	68	84	68**	85	76	75	82	81	76	80	77	1,920
% indicating flood	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1,920
% indicating conflict	15**	6	12	15	5	8	13	14	11	12	11	1,920
% indicating injury/disease	25	23	32	19	23	16	19	14	24**	17	21	1,920

| Indicator | Randomisation checks By treatment status | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	CBT Selected (type A/Bs)	CBT Non-selected (type C/Ds)	SP Selected (type A/Bs)	SP Non-selected (type C/Ds)	DR Selected (type A/Bs)	DR Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Overall Selected (type A/Bs)	Overall Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
% indicating aid project ending	5**	1	2	2	1	3	5*	1	3	2	3	1,920
% indicating more/less trading activity in the area	8	5	11*	2	5	6	4	2	7	3	5	1,920
% indicating other	3	6	3	5	6	15	4	6	4	9	6	1,920
% indicating can't/won't say	9	16	11	7	18	17	11	12	12	12	12	1,920

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 4.2 d   Reasons/causes for households doing better than in the past

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Reasons for being better off (proportions calculated over HHs stating that they were doing better)												
% indicating increase in HH assets	64	60	37***	57	82**	66	64*	53	62	60	61	1,505
% indicating increase in income	17	25	26	23	8*	21	26	35	20	25	23	1,505
% indicating lower consumption costs	19	18	39	41	17	15	7	13	19	25	22	1,505
% indicating increase in aid	27	38	31	21	35	33	30	27	32	27	29	1,505
% indicating other	6	6	9**	1	5**	1	6	4	7**	2	4	1,505
Causes of being better off (proportions calculated over HHs stating that they were doing better)												
% indicating good rains	73	69	51	57	84**	64	76	83	72	65	68	1,505
% indicating new aid project	20	13	20	16	19	17	13	10	17	15	16	1,505
% indicating external investment in the area	3	5	10	20	1	5	1	0	4**	9	7	1,505

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
% indicating more/less trading activity in the area	9	12	23	19	4	7	6	4	10	11	11	1,505
% indicating other	2	2	3	1	1	6	1	2	2	4	3	1,505
% indicating can't/won't say	5	12	7	16	4	8	13	15	9	13	11	1,505

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.1 a Dietary diversity

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
% HHs consuming the following food groups in the past 7 days												
Cereals	99	100	100	100	99	98	100	99	99	99	99	5,108
Eggs	6	3	3	6	2**	5	7	4	5	5	5	5,108
Fish	1	3	2	2	7	11	0	0	2	5	3	5,108
Fruits	11	4	7	10	4	5	9	4	7	7	7	5,108
Meat	43	36	43***	63	26**	37	45	44	40**	50	45	5,108
Milk and milk products	77	87	79	90	87	84	81	78	81	85	83	5,108
Oils and fats	92	92	96	92	90	92	90	86	92	90	91	5,108
Pulses, legumes and nuts	72	68	69	64	65**	73	74	72	70	69	70	5,108
Roots and tubers	28	15	29**	41	14	20	21	16	22	28	25	5,108
Salt and spices	94	92	93	93	91	92	95	92	93	92	93	5,108
Sugar	89	91	90	93	95	93	87	81	90	90	90	5,108
Vegetables	43*	20	45	51	17	24	30	23	33	35	34	5,108
Mean dietary diversity score (0-12)	6.6	6.1	6.5	7.1	6.0*	6.3	6.4	6	6.4	6.6	6.5	5,108

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Dietary diversity score = number of food groups consumed by the HH (maximum possible is 12).

Table A 5.1b Dietary diversity by district

Indicator	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Overall Estimate	N[1]
			District variations			
			By (greater) district			
% HHs consuming the following food groups in the past 7 days						
Cereals	100*	100*	97**	100**	99	5,108
Eggs	4	7	2**	7	5	5,108
Fish	0	0	11	0	3	5,108
Fruits	10	7	2**	11	7	5,108
Meat	42	49	56*	29*	45	5,108
Milk and milk products	97***	92*	55***	98***	83	5,108
Oils and fats	89	99***	80***	99***	91	5,108
Pulses, legumes and nuts	52***	86***	74	63	70	5,108
Roots and tubers	27	37	14	26	25	5,108
Salt and spices	93	99***	83***	99***	93	5,108
Sugar	99***	99***	68***	100***	90	5,108
Vegetables	43	36	31	28	34	5,108
Mean dietary diversity score (0-12)	7	7**	6**	7	6	5,108

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010

Table A 5.2a   Primary food sources of food by season and beneficiary status

Indicator	Randomisation checks		By beneficiary status								Overall	
	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall			
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Before last long rains, primary food source												
% HHs - own production	2	4	3	5	4	7	3	7	3*	6	5	5,107
% HHs - purchase/barter	53	49	61*	76	44*	56	47	50	51**	63	57	5,107
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	6*	2	6.1*	2	3	3	2	1	4	2	3	5,107
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	5,107
% HHs - food aid	36	41	28	16	46**	32	44	38	38**	27	33	5,107
% HHs - other aid	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5,107
% HHs - collecting bush products	1	1	1*	0	1	0	1	1	1*	0	1	5,107
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	5,107
% HHs - other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5,107
During last long rains, primary food source												
% HHs - own production	10	12	10	14	9.6*	16	13	21	11**	16	14	5,107

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
% HHs - purchase/barter	49	47	57	68	41**	53	44	42	48*	57	52	5,107
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	7**	3	8	4	4	3	4	3	5	3	4	5,107
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	1	1	0.6*	0	1	0	1	1	1**	0	1	5,107
% HHs - food aid	31	35	23*	12	43***	25	35	31	33***	21	27	5,107
% HHs - other aid	1	1	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	1	1	5,107
% HHs - collecting bush products	1	1	1	1	0	0	1*	0	1	1	1	5,107
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	5,107
% HHs - other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	5,107
Before last short rains, primary food source												
% HHs - own production	2	4	2	6	4	7	3	5	3	6	4	5,106
% HHs - purchase/barter	52	47	58**	73	43	54	46	52	50**	62	55	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	7*	3	8	4	3	5	4	2	5	4	4	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other	1	1	1	1	0.6*	0	0	1	1	0	1	5,106

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
HHs												
% HHs - food aid	36	42	29**	16	46**	31	44	36	39***	26	32	5,106
% HHs - other aid	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	5,106
% HHs - collecting bush products	1	1	1.2**	1	1	0	1	1	1**	1	1	5,106
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	2	1	1	1	5,106
% HHs - other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,106
During last short rains, primary food source												
% HHs - own production	10	12	9	12	8**	15	14	21	11*	15	13	5,106
% HHs - purchase/barter	49	49	59	71	44	53	44	43	49*	58	53	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	7	4	7**	2	5	5	4	3	6**	3	4	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	1	1	2**	0	0	0	1	1	1**	0	1	5,106
% HHs - food aid	30	32	23	14	41**	25	34	31	31***	21	27	5,106
% HHs - other aid	1	1	0	0	1*	1	1	1	1	0	1	5,106

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
% HHs - collecting bush products	1*	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	5,106
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0	1	0	0	0	2	1	1	1	1	1	5,106
% HHs - other	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.2b   Secondary sources of food by season and beneficiary status

Indicator	Randomisation checks		By beneficiary status								Overall	
	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall			
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Before last long rains, secondary food source												
% HHs - own production	3	3	2	2	3	6	5	9	3	5	4	5,106
% HHs - purchase/barter	33	29	23	25	34	31	36	38	31	30	31	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	12	8	16	16	7	12	6	6	10	12	11	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	3	3	3	3	1	3	4	2	3	3	3	5,106
% HHs - food aid	28	40	33	27	40	33	30	27	33	29	31	5,106
% HHs - other aid	2	0	0.4*	1	0	1	2.2*	1	1	1	1	5,106
% HHs - collecting bush products	3	3	1	4	1	2	5	6	3	4	3	5,106
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0 **	0	0	5,106
% HHs - other	16	14	21	23	14	13	11	10	15	17	16	5,106
During last long rains, secondary food source												

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
% HHs - own production	7	5	2	7	6	6	9	10	6	7	7	5,106
% HHs - purchase/barter	35	33	30	35	35	32	37	39	34	35	35	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	12	9	14	12	9	12	8	10	11	12	11	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	4	5	4	3	3	4	6	4	5	4	4	5,106
% HHs - food aid	21*	31	28*	17	32	27	20	18	26	21	23	5,106
% HHs - other aid	1	1	0	0	0.9*	0	2	1	1.0*	0	1	5,106
% HHs - collecting bush products	4	3	2	3	2	3	7	9	4	4	4	5,106
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,106
% HHs - other	15	13	19	22	13	15	10	9	14	17	15	5,106
Before last short rains, secondary food source												
% HHs - own production	3	2	0	2	2	4	5	10	2.6*	5	4	5,106
% HHs - purchase/barter	36	31	27	27	35	33	38	33	33	31	32	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from	11	9	15	17	7	13	8	9	10**	14	12	5,106

Indicator	Randomisation checks By treatment status		By beneficiary status CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
family or relative												
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	3	4	5	3	1	2	3	3	4	3	3	5,106
% HHs - food aid	27	36	31	28	38	30	28	28	31	29	30	5,106
% HHs - other aid	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	1	5,106
% HHs - collecting bush products	3	3	2	3	1	1	5	4	3	3	3	5,106
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0*	0	0	5,106
% HHs - other	15	15	20	20	15	15	12	10	15	16	16	5,106
During last short rains, secondary food source												
% HHs - own production	6	9	4	5	8	9	9	12	7	8	8	5,106
% HHs - purchase/barter	35	29	29	35	34	33	35	38	32	35	34	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	13	7	15	15	7	12	8	7	10	12	11	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	4	4	4	3	2	3	4	3	4	3	3	5,106

Indicator	Randomisation checks — By treatment status		By beneficiary status — CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall Estimate	N
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)		
% HHs - food aid	22**	34	27	19	33	28	24	20	27*	22	25	5,106
% HHs - other aid	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	5,106
% HHs - collecting bush products	5	4	2	3	2	2	8	8	4	4	4	5,106
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,106
% HHs - other	14	13	19	18	13	13	9	10	14	15	14	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.2 c   Primary food sources by season, by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By greater district			
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir
Primary food sources before last long rains				
% HHs - own production	1**	1**	13***	1**
% HHs - purchase/barter	55	26***	58	88***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	4	0.4***	7***	0.4***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	1	0	1	0
% HHs - food aid	37	72***	16***	10***
% HHs - other aid	2	0	0	0**
% HHs - collecting bush products	0.1*	0**	2**	0**
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0**	0**	3**	0**
% HHs - other	0	0	0	0
Primary food sources during last long rains				
% HHs - own production	2***	13	31***	3***
% HHs - purchase/barter	57	32***	45	79***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	6	2***	7***	2***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	0	0.1***	1	1*

Indicator	District variations			
	By greater district			
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir
% HHs - food aid	33	52***	12***	15**
% HHs - other aid	3*	1	0	0***
% HHs - collecting bush products	0**	0**	2**	0
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0**	0**	2**	0**
% HHs - other	0	0	0	0
Primary food sources before last short rains				
% HHs - own production	1**	1**	12**	2*
% HHs - purchase/barter	55	24***	58	84***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	6	2*	8***	1***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	0	0.2**	1**	0.2*
% HHs - food aid	36	71***	14***	13***
% HHs - other aid	2	1	0	0
% HHs - collecting bush products	0.1**	0***	3**	0.2*
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0*	0*	4**	0*
% HHs - other	0	0	0	0
Primary food sources during last short rains				

| Indicator | District variations | | | |
| | By greater district | | | |
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir
% HHs - own production	1***	13	29***	3***
% HHs - purchase/barter	57	34***	46	79***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	7	2**	7**	2***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	0	1	1	1
% HHs - food aid	32	50***	13***	15***
% HHs - other aid	2*	0.1*	0	0.04**
% HHs - collecting bush products	0.1***	0***	1***	0
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0*	0*	2*	0*
% HHs - other	0	0	0	0

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.2 d   Seasonal food sources by mobility status

Indicators	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	Partially mobile	Fully mobile	Estimate	N
Primary food sources before last long rains					
% HHs - own production was primary food source before last long rains	4	6	6	5	5,107
% HHs - purchase/barter was primary food source before last long rains	62**	31***	64	57	5,107
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative was primary food source before last long rains	3	2	2	3	5,107
% HHs - food aid was primary food source before last long rains	28**	56***	26	33	5,107
Primary food sources during last long rains					
% HHs - own production was primary food source during last long rains	11	24**	12	14	5,107
% HHs - purchase/barter was primary food source during last long rains	58***	26***	55	52	5,107
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative was primary food source during last long rains	5	3	4	4	5,107
% HHs - food aid was primary food source during last long rains	23**	43***	28	27	5,107
Primary food sources before last short rains					
% HHs - own production was primary food source before last short rains	4	7	7	4	5,106
% HHs - purchase/barter was primary food source before last short rains	61**	31***	61	55	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative was primary food source before last short rains	5	3	3	4	5,106
% HHs - food aid was primary food source before last short rains	28**	54***	26	32	5,106

Indicators	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	Partially mobile	Fully mobile	Estimate	N
Primary food sources during last short rains					
% HHs - own production was primary food source during last short rains	11*	24**	12	13	5,106
% HHs - purchase/barter was primary food source during last short rains	59***	28***	60	53	5,106
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative was primary food source during last short rains	5	3	3	4	5,106
% HHs - food aid was primary food source during last short rains	23**	41***	24	27	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Fully settled defined as the whole of the HH (all members, including head) is permanently settled. Partially mobile defined as some members of the HH are permanently settled and others move around in order to herd their animals. Fully mobile defined as the whole HH moves around in order to herd the animals.

Table A. 5.2 e   Secondary food sources by season, by district

Indicator	District variations By greater district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
Secondary food sources before last long rains				
% HHs - own production	0.4***	1***	7*	7
% HHs - purchase/barter	46**	45***	12***	25
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	7	3***	26***	5***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	1***	1**	3	6*
% HHs - food aid	8***	28	33	52***
% HHs - other aid	1	1	2	0.1**
% HHs - collecting bush products	0***	0***	10***	1*
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0	0	0	0**
% HHs - other	38**	22	6**	4***
Secondary food sources during last long rains				
% HHs - own production	0.4***	10	8	7
% HHs - purchase/barter	47*	37	20***	40*
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	6**	5***	23***	6**
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	0.6***	1***	5	10**
% HHs - food aid	7***	28	24	32*
% HHs - other aid	0.1*	0	2	0
% HHs - collecting bush products	0***	0.2**	14***	0.1***
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0	0	0	0*
% HHs - other	38**	18	5***	5**
Secondary food sources before last short rains				

Indicator	District variations			
	By greater district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
% HHs - own production	0.4***	0.7***	7	5
% HHs - purchase/barter	47**	45***	12***	31
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	5***	4***	29***	6**
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	0.2***	1**	5*	6**
% HHs - food aid	8***	27	34	46***
% HHs - other aid	0.2**	1	1	0
% HHs - collecting bush products	0.1***	0.04***	9***	0.4**
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0*	0	0	0*
% HHs - other	39**	21	3***	6**
Secondary food sources during last short rains				
% HHs - own production	0.4***	10	8	12*
% HHs - purchase/barter	49*	37	18***	37
% HHs - gifts/transfer from family or relative	6**	5***	26***	4***
% HHs - gifts/transfer from other HHs	0.3***	1**	5	5
% HHs - food aid	7***	27	26	36**
% HHs - other aid	0.1**	1	2	0***
% HHs - collecting bush products	0.1***	0***	13***	1**
% HHs - collecting food products for consumption	0*	0	0	0
% HHs - other	38**	18	2***	4**

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.3 a   Food shortage by season

Indicator	Randomisation checks By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
					By beneficiary status							
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Food shortages by season												
% HHs indicating a food shortage before last long rains	63	68	72	58	60	61	62	65	65	61	63	5,106
% HHs indicating a food shortage during last long rains	58	59	59	50	56	55	58	56	58*	53	56	5,106
% HHs indicating a food shortage before last short rains	66	70	72*	58	62	60	67	66	68	60	64	5,106
% HHs indicating a food shortage during last short rains	58	54	61**	47	52	44	54	52	56**	47	52	5,106
Most acute food shortage by season												
% HHs where food shortage most acute before last long rains	36	38	35	31	36*	47	39	40	37	39	38	5,106
% HHs where food shortage most acute during last long rains	27	36	31	27	31	26	32	31	31	27	29	5,106
% HHs where food shortage most acute before last short rains	20	17	18**	23	21	15	19	19	19	20	19	5,106

Indicator	Randomisation checks By treatment status		By beneficiary status									Overall	
			CBT		SP		DR		Overall				
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)		Estimate	N
% HHs where food shortage most acute during last short rains	12	7	12	10	9	7	9	8	10	8		9	5,106
% HHs where food shortage was never acute	4	2	4	9	4	5	2	3	3**	6		5	5,106
% HHs that went entire days without eating during worst period	63	72	65**	47	63	63	71	70	67**	58		63	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.3 b   Food shortage by consumption expenditure quintile

Indicator	By consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	Q1 (poorest)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Estimate	N
Food shortages before/during long/short rains							
% HHs indicating a food shortage before last long rains	80***	69*	66	58	41***	63	5,105
% HHs indicating a food shortage during last long rains	66**	60	59	52	41***	56	5,105
% HHs indicating a food shortage before last short rains	78***	72**	69**	59*	43***	64	5,105
% HHs indicating a food shortage during last short rains	61*	54	57**	48	38***	52	5,105
Acuteness of food shortage							
% HHs where food shortage most acute before last long rains	49***	44**	36	34*	25***	38	5,105
% HHs where food shortage most acute during last long rains	15***	28	36**	34*	34	29	5,105
% HHs where food shortage most acute before last short rains	22	18	16*	20	20	19	5,105
% HHs where food shortage most acute during last short rains	12	7*	10	7	9	9	5,105
% HHs where food shortage was never acute	2***	3	2**	4	12***	5	5,105
% HHs which went entire days without eating during worst period	79***	71***	65	59	40***	63	5,105

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Consumption quintiles are defined according to the distribution of consumption expenditure over the study population such that each quintile contains 20% of the population.

Table A. 5.3 c   Food shortage by district

Indicator	District variations By greater district			
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir
Food shortages before/during long/short rains				
% HHs indicating a food shortage before last long rains	31***	60	85***	66
% HHs indicating a food shortage during last long rains	31***	33***	69***	83***
% HHs indicating a food shortage before last short rains	35***	56	85***	71
% HHs indicating a food shortage during last short rains	32***	32***	71***	64**
Acuteness of food shortage				
% HHs where food shortage most acute before last long rains	14***	79***	41	12***
% HHs where food shortage most acute during last long rains	25	6***	13***	77***
% HHs where food shortage most acute before last short rains	34***	10***	26*	6***
% HHs where food shortage most acute during last short rains	17**	1***	14**	4**
% HHs where food shortage was never acute	10***	3	5	0.4***
% HHs which went entire days without eating during worst period	28***	63	77***	74**

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.3 d   Seasonal food shortages by mobility status

Indicators	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	Partially mobile	Fully mobile	Estimate	N
Acuteness of food shortage					
% HHs where food shortage most acute before last long rains	36	53***	21***	38	5,106
% HHs where food shortage most acute during last long rains	28	20**	55***	29	5,106
% HHs where food shortage most acute before last short rains	19	20	16	19	5,106
% HHs where food shortage most acute during last short rains	10**	6*	5*	9	5,106
% HHs where food shortage was never acute	6***	1***	2**	5	5,106
HHs going entire days without eating					
% HHs which went entire days without eating during worst period	58***	75***	72**	63	5,106
Food shortages before/during long/short rains					
% HHs indicating a food shortage before last long rains	61	66	72	63	5,106
% HHs indicating a food shortage during last long rains	55	49	69***	56	5,106
% HHs indicating a food shortage before last short rains	62	67	74*	64	5,106
% HHs indicating a food shortage during last short rains	51	50	57	52	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Fully settled defined as the whole of the HH (all members, including head) is permanently settled. Partially mobile defined as some members of the HH are permanently settled and others move around in order to herd their animals. Fully mobile defined as the whole HH moves around in order to herd the animals.

Table A. 5.5 a   Food aid, school feeding and supplementary feeding

Indicator	Randomisation checks By treatment status		By beneficiary status CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Food aid												
% HHs receiving food aid	69*	85	72**	60	91***	67	72	64	76***	63	70	5,107
Mean number of months food aid being received	6	7	6*	5	7	7	7	6	7**	6	6	3,966
Mean monthly value of food aid as reported by respondents (KES)	1,110	1,231	1,219	1,075	1,231	1,263	1,089	1,062	1,171	1,139	1,157	3,966
School feeding												
% HHs receiving school feeding (incl. HHs without children)	55	49	45**	33	48	49	60***	39	52***	40	46	5,107
Mean number of months of receiving school feeding	8	8	7	8	8***	8	8	8	8	8	8	2,345
Mean monthly value of school feeding as reported by respondents (KES)	1,216	856	1,354	1,119	1,029	1,285	888	870	1,063	1,132	1,092	2,345
Supplementary feeding												
% HHs receiving supplementary feeding	15	10	11*	4	17	15	12	9	12	9	11	5,107

Indicator	Randomisation checks — By treatment status		By beneficiary status — CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
Mean number of months of receiving supplementary feeding	4	4	4	3	5**	4	4.0*	3	4**	4	4	594
Mean monthly value of supplementary feeding as reported by respondents (KES)	465	323	271	335	226***	471	676	412	415	431	421	594

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.5 b   Food aid, school feeding and supplementary feeding by quintile

Indicator	By consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	Q1 (poorest)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Estimate	N
Food aid							
% HHs receiving food aid	8**	5	4	1	2***	0	106
Mean number of months food aid being received					***		966
Mean monthly value of food aid as reported by respondents (KES)	530***	090	109	062*	87***	157	966
School feeding							
% HHs receiving school feeding	5***	7***	8	0**	1***	6	106
Mean number of months of receiving school feeding	**		***	*	**		345
Mean monthly value of school feeding as reported by respondents (KES)	607***	002	40***	67***	83	092	345
Supplementary feeding							
% HHs receiving supplementary feeding		0	3	0	2	1	106
Mean number of months of receiving supplementary feeding							94
Mean monthly value of supplementary feeding as reported by respondents (KES)	54**	00	29	74*	57**	21	94

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Consumption quintiles are defined according to the distribution of consumption expenditure over the study population such that each quintile contains 20% of the population. (4) These estimates have been generated using adjusted quintiles that remove the value of food aid /school feeding / supplementary feeding received from the consumption aggregate.

Table A. 5.5 c   Food aid, school feeding and supplementary feeding by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
Food aid				
% HHs receiving food aid	69	91***	51***	72
Mean number of months food aid being received	5.8	6.9*	5.5**	6.8
Mean monthly value of food aid as reported by respondents (KES)	674***	931**	1,586***	1,468***
School feeding				
% HHs receiving school feeding	28***	60***	50	43
Mean number of months of receiving school feeding	8.3	8.3	6.9***	8.6***
Mean monthly value of school feeding as reported by respondents (KES)	800*	581***	1,856***	884
Supplementary feeding				
% HHs receiving supplementary feeding	24**	9	4.5***	8
Mean number of months of receiving supplementary feeding	4.5*	3.1***	3.2	4.2

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.6 a   Coping strategies by frequency

Indicator	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
In the 30 days before the interview	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Borrowing food												
% HHs never borrowing food or relying on help from family	42	37	39	47	45	40	38	39	40	43	41	5,107
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family less than once a week	27	32	27	21	25	26	34	32	29	25	28	5,107
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family once a week	15	17	18	21	14*	21	16	16	16*	20	18	5,107
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family 2-3 times a week	13	11	13	8	14*	10	11	10	12	9	11	5,107
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family 4+ times a week	3	2	3	2	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	5,107
Buying food on credit												
% HHs never buying food on credit	39	38	40	38	38	41	38	46	39	41	40	5,107
% HHs buying food on credit less than once a week	21	24	17	22	21	23	27	23	22	23	23	5,107
% HHs buying food on credit once a week	24	24	26	24	22	17	23	21	24	21	23	5,107

Indicator	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
In the 30 days before the interview	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
% HHs buying food on credit 2-3 times a week	14	14	16	15	18	17	10	9	14	14	14	5,107
% HHs buying food on credit 4+ times a week	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	2	1	1	1	5,107
Collecting and eating wild food												
% HHs never collecting/eating wild food/animals	87	83	83	84	84	82	87	87	85	84	85	5,107
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals less than once a week	3	5	5	3	5	7	4	3	4	4	4	5,107
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals once a week	3	5	3	2	6	4	4	4	4	3	4	5,107
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals 2-3 times a week	3	5	5	9	3	4	3	5	4	6	5	5,107
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals 4+ times a week	3	2	4	2	2	3	2	1	3	2	2	5,107
Reducing number of meals												
% HHs never having reduced number of meals	21	14	22	35	21	22	13	17	18**	26	22	5,107

49

Indicator	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
In the 30 days before the interview	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
% HHs having reduced number of meals less than once a week	22	26	23	20	23*	19	24	20	24*	20	22	5,107
% HHs having reduced number of meals once a week	18	23	20	20	21	21	20	20	20	20	20	5,107
% HHs having reduced number of meals 2-3 times a week	28	28	27	20	27	27	30	32	28	25	27	5,107
% HHs having reduced number of meals 4+ times a week	11	9	8	5	8*	11	12	11	10	8	9	5,107
Eating smaller meals												
% HHs never eating smaller meals	24	16	22**	37	25	20	16	20	20*	27	23	5,107
% HHs eating smaller meals less than once a week	21	26	25	25	23	22	22	18	23	22	23	5,107
% HHs eating smaller meals once a week	18	20	19**	14	20	18	18	22	19	17	18	5,107
% HHs eating smaller meals 2-3 times a week	26	30	26**	17	25	29	29	29	27	24	26	5,107
% HHs eating smaller meals 4+ times a week	12	9	8	7	7**	11	14	12	10	10	10	5,107

Indicator	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
In the 30 days before the interview	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
Going entire days without eating												
% HHs never going entire days without eating solids	40	31	38**	57	41	38	30	32	36**	45	40	5,107
% HHs going entire days without eating solids less than once a week	21	23	21**	12	21	24	23	24	22	19	21	5,107
% HHs going entire days without eating solids once a week	20*	28	22	20	21	22	25	23	23	21	22	5,107
% HHs going entire days without eating solids 2-3 times a week	16	17	17	10	14	14	17	19	16	14	15	5,107
% HHs going entire days without eating solids 4+ times a week	4	1	1.7**	0	2	2	4	2	3	1	2	5,107
Sale of livestock to buy food												
% HHs never selling animals to buy food	70	58	73	73	68	70	56	54	65	67	66	5,107
% HHs selling animals to buy food less than once a week	14	22	15	16	16	15	21	25	17	18	18	5,107
% HHs selling animals to buy food once a week	12	17	11	10	9	9	20	17	14	12	13	5,107

Indicator	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
In the 30 days before the interview	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
% HHs selling animals to buy food 2-3 times a week	3	3	1	1	7	5	3	4	3	3	3	5,107
% HHs selling animals to buy food 4+ times a week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,107
Sale of other assets to buy food												
% HHs never selling any other assets	98	97	98	98	96	98	97	96	97	97	97	5,107
% HHs selling any other assets less than once a week	2	2	1	1	2.5*	1	2	2	2	1	2	5,107
% HHs selling any other assets once a week	0.4*	1	1	1	1	2	0.3**	1	1	1	1	5,107
% HHs selling any other assets 2-3 times a week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,107
% HHs selling any other assets 4+ times a week	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,107

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.6 b   Coping strategies by district

Indicator	Greater district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
Borrowing food				
% HHs never borrowing food or relying on help from family	62***	35	26***	49**
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family less than once a week	12***	33	23	41***
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family once a week	18	19	25**	8***
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family 2-3 times a week	8	12	19***	2***
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family 4+ times a week	0.2***	1*	6***	0.2***
Buying food on credit				
% HHs never buying food on credit	32	50**	61***	10***
% HHs buying food on credit less than once a week	13***	22	15**	40***
% HHs buying food on credit once a week	29*	17**	12***	35***
% HHs buying food on credit 2-3 times a week	24***	10	10	14
% HHs buying food on credit 4+ times a week	2	1	1	0.4*
Collecting and eating wild food				
% HHs never collecting/eating wild food/animals	98***	96***	55***	97***
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals less than once a week	1***	2**	11***	2**
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals once a week	1***	2	10***	1**
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals 2-3 times a week	0.4***	0.2***	16***	0.1***
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals 4+ times a week	0***	0***	8***	0***
Reducing number of meals				
% HHs never having reduced number of meals	68***	15	5***	10**
% HHs having reduced number of meals less than once a week	7***	10***	18	52***

Indicator	Greater district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
% HHs having reduced number of meals once a week	12***	19	19	31***
% HHs having reduced number of meals 2-3 times a week	11***	43***	40***	8***
% HHs having reduced number of meals 4+ times a week	3***	13*	18***	0.3***
Eating smaller meals				
% HHs never eating smaller meals	68***	13**	5***	18
% HHs eating smaller meals less than once a week	8***	11***	19	51***
% HHs eating smaller meals once a week	11***	21	16	24**
% HHs eating smaller meals 2-3 times a week	8***	41***	41***	6***
% HHs eating smaller meals 4+ times a week	5	14*	18**	0.5***
Going entire days without eating				
% HHs never going entire days without eating solids	77***	29*	24**	38
% HHs going entire days without eating solids less than once a week	7***	20	22	31***
% HHs going entire days without eating solids once a week	8***	34***	19	27**
% HHs going entire days without eating solids 2-3 times a week	6***	17	30***	3***
% HHs going entire days without eating solids 4+ times a week	2	0.6*	5	0.6*
Sale of livestock to buy food				
% HHs never selling animals to buy food	92***	62	77*	34***
% HHs selling animals to buy food less than once a week	5***	22	13	29**
% HHs selling animals to buy food once a week	3***	14	7**	29***
% HHs selling animals to buy food 2-3 times a week	0.8**	1	3	7*
% HHs selling animals to buy food 4+ times a week	0	0**	0	0
Sale of other assets to buy food				

Indicator	Greater district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
% HHs never selling any other assets	99***	98	97	95**
% HHs selling any other assets less than once a week	0.7**	1	1	3**
% HHs selling any other assets once a week	0.3**	1	1	1
% HHs selling any other assets 2-3 times a week	0	0	0	0
% HHs selling any other assets 4+ times a week	0	0	0	0

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 5.6 c   Coping strategies by frequency (in last 30 days before interview) and mobility status

Indicators	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	Partially mobile	Fully mobile	Estimate	N
Borrowing food	43	36	42	41	5,107
% HHs never borrowing food or relying on help from family	24***	34	41***	28	5,107
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family less than once a week	20***	13**	9***	18	5,107
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family once a week	10	16	6	11	5,107
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family 2-3 times a week	3**	0.5***	2	2	5,107
% HHs borrowing food or relying on help from family 4+ times a week					
Buying food on credit					5,107
% HHs never buying food on credit	41	43	23**	40	5,107
% HHs buying food on credit less than once a week	20**	25	41***	23	5,107
% HHs buying food on credit once a week	23	19	26	23	5,107
% HHs buying food on credit 2-3 times a week	15	13	8**	14	5,107
% HHs buying food on credit 4+ times a week	1*	0.4**	1	1	
Collecting and eating wild food					5,107
% HHs never collecting/eating wild food/animals	85	80	87	85	5,107
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals less than once a week	4	3	4	4	5,107
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals once a week	4	4	2	4	5,107
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals 2-3 times a week	4	11	4	5	5,107
% HHs collecting/eating wild food/animals 4+ times a week	2	2	3	2	
Reducing number of meals					5,107

Indicators	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	Partially mobile	Fully mobile	Estimate	N
% HHs never having reduced number of meals	26**	12**	11**	22	5,107
% HHs having reduced number of meals less than once a week	20	18	42***	22	5,107
% HHs having reduced number of meals once a week	20	19	23	20	5,107
% HHs having reduced number of meals 2-3 times a week	26	36***	16**	27	5,107
% HHs having reduced number of meals 4+ times a week	8	15**	8	9	
Eating smaller meals					5,107
% HHs never eating smaller meals	27***	13**	12**	23	5,107
% HHs eating smaller meals less than once a week	20	18	48***	23	5,107
% HHs eating smaller meals once a week	18	18	16	18	5,107
% HHs eating smaller meals 2-3 times a week	24	37***	16*	26	5,107
% HHs eating smaller meals 4+ times a week	10	14	8	10	
Going entire days without eating					5,107
% HHs never going entire days without eating solids	44**	21***	41	40	5,107
% HHs going entire days without eating solids less than once a week	19	25	23	21	5,107
% HHs going entire days without eating solids once a week	22	24	22	22	5,107
% HHs going entire days without eating solids 2-3 times a week	12*	28***	11	15	5,107
% HHs going entire days without eating solids 4+ times a week	2	3	2	2	
Sale of livestock to buy food					5,107
% HHs never selling animals to buy food	79***	38***	21***	66	5,107
% HHs selling animals to buy food less than once a week	11***	33***	37***	18	5,107
% HHs selling animals to buy food once a week	8***	23***	32***	13	5,107

Indicators	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	Partially mobile	Fully mobile	Estimate	N
% HHs selling animals to buy food 2-3 times a week	1***	6**	10**	3	5,107
% HHs selling animals to buy food 4+ times a week	0	1	1	0	
Sales other assets to buy food	98***	96	95*	97	5,107
% HHs never selling any other assets	1**	2	3	2	5,107
% HHs selling any other assets less than once a week	1	1	2	1	5,107
% HHs selling any other assets once a week	0	0	0	0	5,107
% HHs selling any other assets 2-3 times a week	0	0	0	0	5,107

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 6.1 a   Household livelihood activities (%)

Indicator	By Quintile					Overall	
	Quintile 1 (poorest)	Quintile2	Quintile3	Quintile4	Quintile 5(richest)	Estimate	N1
Proportion of HHs engaging in different activities							
%HHs engaging in livestock production (rearing, herding, selling livestock and livestock products)	61	58	61***	54	32***	53	4807
%HHs engaging in farming own plot	7	5	5	5	3	5	4807
%HHs engaging in Agricultural labour (not own plot)	1	2	2	2	2	2	4807
%HHs engaging in Fishing (including sales)	2	3	2	1	0	2	4807
%HHs engaging in Selling firewood/charcoal	31***	25***	19	17	7***	20	4807
%HHs engaging in Selling other bush products (wild food)	8	5	4	3	2*	4	4807
%HHs engaging in Petty trading (selling at side of road	7	4	4	3	4	4	4807
%HHs engaging in Own or work in a shop (including kiosk)	0.7***	2*	3	5	8***	4	4807
%HHs engaging in Wholesale and other Trading	3	2**	4	5	9**	5	4807
%HHs engaging in Local brewing and selling alcoholic drinks	2	3	3	2	1**	2	4807
%HHs engaging in Selling prepared food and drinks	1	0.6***	2	2	4**	2	4807
%HHs engaging in Religious work - paid (pastor, duksi,)	0	1	1	1	1	1	4807

Indicator	By Quintile					Overall	
	Quintile 1 (poorest)	Quintile2	Quintile3	Quintile4	Quintile 5(richest)	Estimate	N1
%HHs engaging in Religious work - unpaid (in Church/Mosque)	0*	0	1	3	1	1	4807
%HHs engaging in Teacher (primary, secondary, etc.)	0***	0.2***	1*	1	4***	1	4807
%HHs engaging in Nursery teacher	0	0	0	3	0	1	4807
%HHs engaging in Domestic work (housemaid, servant etc.)	2	2	1	1	1*	2	4807
%HHs engaging in Laundry	0	0	0**	0	0	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Cleaner (not in a house)	0	1	0.2**	0**	1	1	4807
%HHs engaging in Nanny (look after someone's children)	0*	0	0.1*	1	0	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Crafts (making mats, baskets, etc.)	4	5	4	7	1	4	4807
%HHs engaging in Tailoring	1	1	1	1	1	1	4807
%HHs engaging in Medical profession	0	0	0	0	2	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Traditional healer	0	0.0*	0*	0	0.3*	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Askari (Watchman/guard)	0.6**	2	2**	1	1	1	4807
%HHs engaging in Driver (of people/goods)	1	0.4*	1	1	2	1	4807
%HHs engaging in Porter	1	1*	2	2	3	2	4807
%HHs engaging in Mechanic	0*	0*	0	0	1	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Blacksmith	0	0	0	0	0	0	4807

Indicator	By Quintile					Overall	
	Quintile 1 (poorest)	Quintile2	Quintile3	Quintile4	Quintile 5(richest)	Estimate	N1
%HHs engaging in Work in construction	2*	2***	5	4	4	4	4807
%HHs engaging in Begging	0	0*	0.6*	0	0*	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Carpenter	0	0	0	0	0	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Collecting bush products for domestic use	0	0	0	0*	0.1*	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Selling food aid	0*	0	0*	0	0*	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Vet	0	0	0	0	0	0	4807
%HHs engaging in Other (specify)	1	1	1	2**	1	1	4807
%HHs engaging in Salaried work (paid regular wage to work	0.8***	3**	3	6	16***	6	4807
%HHs engaging in Public sector work (employed by the State	1	1*	0.2***	4*	6**	2	4807
%HHs engaging in Casual labour (non-agricultural)	11	13**	8	8	5**	9	4807
%HHs engaging in Self-employment (not listed in cat 1)	2	1	2	2	3	2	4807

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 6.1 b   Main livelihoods mentioned across the locations

Mandera	
Eldanaba	• Casual work (e.g. building houses) – but remoteness means even such work is difficult to find • Pastoralism • Relief food • Fetching and selling firewood • Farming • "Hustling" • Cutting trees for sale • Teaching Qur'an
Kamor	• Small businesses like selling milk, charcoal, vegetables, meat, livestock trading at the market, tailoring (women) • Casual labour, local construction, burning charcoals, carpentry or work with donkey carts (men)
Mado	• Collecting firewood for sale (women) • Farming • Construction • Relief food • Wage/salary jobs • Casual labour (e.g. working on others' farms) • Livestock • Cutting grass/weaving mats from grasses
Marsabit	
Badasa	• Majority undertake casual labour, e.g. digging dams and working on others' farms. Men and women are equally engaged in picking the *khaat* (*Miraah*) and weeding the farm during rainy seasons. However, women don't undertake labour which involves breaking the earth [cultivating]. Casual labour on farms has also been disrupted by drought • Farming and pastoralism are also key livelihoods, but have been affected by persistent drought over the previous three years. *Miraah* is a key crop and more resistant to drought than other crops, although *"many foreign donors do not see this as a resource"* (male elders). Other crops are maize and beans • Many people rely on relief food for survival • Small-scale trading (e.g. selling foodstuffs, maize, flour, tea leaves, sugar, oil

Namarei	• Livestock (cattle, sheep, goats and camel) rearing and selling them (and animal products such as blood and milk) is the main source of livelihood • Minor sources of income include small-scale trading and working for government (e.g. digging boreholes) • Drought has resulted in selling of livestock
North Horr	• Pastoralism is a key source of livelihood but has been affected by prolonged and frequent drought • People rely on casual work (e.g. loading building stones, which happens very rarely and pays something like KES 200) as there is no permanent work • Small-scale livestock trading also provides a small income (e.g. KES 100 profit to run the family) • Some have larger businesses trading household goods or animals (camels, cattle, goats, sheep, donkeys). Other businesses include kiosks, shops, hotels
Turkana	
Kalemungorok	• Farming (e.g. vegetables, maize, sorghum). This sometimes only produces enough for subsistence • Casual labour on others' farms and construction • Charcoal burning (but this is risky) • Collection of firewood for sale • Fetching water • Preparing illegal alcohol
Kokiselei	• Casual labour (construction, carrying stones). Some of this is paid in food only, no wages • Fetching and selling firewood • Charcoal burning • Livestock keeping • Hunting and gathering wild fruit (e.g. when it rains, the *Edapal* get ripe and people go and collect to eat, also *Eng'omo*) • Work for Oxfam (i.e. cash for work)
Lorengelup	• Burning charcoal is a significant source of livelihood. However, tree numbers are falling • Weaving mats and baskets and selling them in Lodwar. "*We knit mats and sell them, if not, you all sleep hungry in the household*" (male non-beneficiaries) • Livestock were a key livelihood before the drought • Making products from palm • Growing crops • Depending on relief food

Napetet	• The sub-location is a peri-urban settlement. The inhabitants get income through fetching and selling of firewood and waged labour • Old women normally make brooms from palm leaves while sitting, then give them to their children to go and sell them • Collecting firewood, sometimes weaving of trays, and sell them at Lodwar • Burning charcoal (1 bag makes KES 200) • Casual labour (e.g. in construction) • Collecting wild fruits • Relief food • Livestock rearing and selling
Wajir	
Lafaley	• Livestock was a key source of livelihood, but drought has reduced livestock numbers and incomes • People now rely more on relief food and small-scale activities such as firewood collecting and selling • Some younger people work in the kitchens of local hotels • Small-scale trading
Sala	• 99% are pastoralists • Casual labour (e.g. in construction)

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Qualitative Study, Sep 2009-Oct 2010.

Table A. 6.2 a Weighted share of net cash income by livelihood category

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Share of income by livelihood category (income earned over last 12 months)												
Livestock share of total net cash income	37	44	24	33	53***	36	49	53	40	38	39	4625
Other agriculture share of total net cash income	3	3	3	3	4	6	3	7	3	5	4	4625
Employment share of total net cash income	22	18	22	30	11**	26	22	20	20*	27	23	4625
Self-employment share of total net cash income	6	4	4	3	4	5	6	4	5	4	4	4625
Craft share of total net cash income	5	1	7	3	2	2	1	1	4	2	3	4625
Services share of total net cash income	2	1	2	3	2	3	2*	3	2	3	2	4625
Sales share of total net cash income	23	27	36*	24	22	22	15	12	25	21	23	4625
Other share of total net cash income	2	2	2*	0	2*	0	2**	0	2***	0	1	4625

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 6.2 b Income sources and average annual cash income

Indicator	By Quintile					Overall	
	Quintile 1 (poorest)	Quintile2	Quintile3	Quintile 4	Quintile 5 (richest)	Estimate	N1
Mean HH net cash income (KES) of HOUSEHOLDS ENGAGING IN ACTIVITY							
Livestock production (rearing, herding, selling livestock	7,932***	14,807**	20,167***	23,238**	26,174***	17,544	2,801
Farming own plot (crop production, sale, etc.)	9,465**	8,716**	18,261	16,356	44,004***	16,819	277
Agricultural labour (not own plot) (including cas	16,315	14,714	5,560***	31,247	28,601	20,081	84
Fishing (including sales)	9,532	6,020**	9,987	12,293*	.	9,010	56
Selling firewood/charcoal	6,285***	11,431	11,544	11,896	16,961**	10,287	916
Selling other bush products (wild food etc.)	1,250***	10,135**	24,325**	27,497***	32,828***	13,778	235
Petty trading (selling at side of road etc.)	13,040***	22,796	24,269	38,729**	49,619***	26,941	175
Own or work in a shop (including kiosk)	38,441	23,159***	38,531	47,472	64,806**	50,628	170
Wholesale and other trading (not shopkeeper; buyi	68,205	55,199	32,084***	53,256*	106,633**	73,224	170
Local brewing and selling alcoholic drinks (work	6,354***	6,734	19,173	9,134	12,691	10,997	86
Selling prepared food and drinks (restaurant/café)	34,360	30,624	23,467***	39,790	39,633	35,165	80
Religious work - paid (pastor, duksi, etc.)	26,512*	21,264***	39,830	61,879	56,273	43,020	37
Religious work - unpaid (in Church/Mosque/Duksi etc.)	.	14,478	22,587	2,126**	64,455***	14,124	20
Teacher (primary, secondary, etc.)	246,000***	56,540***	76,423**	95,398**	169,197***	143,338	54

Indicator	By Quintile					Overall	
	Quintile 1 (poorest)	Quintile2	Quintile3	Quintile 4	Quintile 5 (richest)	Estimate	N1
Nursery teacher	24,000	54,553	.	27,515**	300,000***	55,149	10
Domestic work (housemaid, servant etc.)	8,221*	11,175	13,020	26,673	25,064	14,699	77
Laundry	3,600***	11,576**	.	28,758	26,000	22,415	8
Cleaner (not in a house)	10,438	22,767	15,022*	24,000	31,333	24,347	19
Nanny (looking after someone's children)	.	24,000	6,820	11,601	12,000	12,740	6
Crafts (making mats, baskets, etc.)	4,676	5,024	7,121	10,473	12,428	7,551	130
Tailoring (making, repairing and selling clothes	7,913**	22,075**	41,065	35,618	99,039**	47,609	35
Medical profession (doctor, nurse, community health worker, etc.)	.	120,000	20,800**	34,083**	154,398**	132,466	11
Traditional healer	12,000	.	.	30,589	54,047	40,659	6
Askari (Watchman/guard)	23,082***	31,486*	36,332	135,392***	45,900	51,811	61
Driver (of people/goods)	49,417*	15,617***	78,550	115,768	131,853*	95,722	46
Porter	50,061	35,877	34,759***	57,362	58,397*	49,067	59
Mechanic	.	.	25,000***	203,769***	91,153	103,098	11
Blacksmith	.	.	.	.	87,886	87,886	3
Work in construction, including making construction	11,476***	23,655	24,455	28,058	34,602**	25,933	201
Begging	14,824	4,000**	21,609	10,000	5,000**	16,966	13

Indicator	By Quintile					Overall	
	Quintile 1 (poorest)	Quintile2	Quintile3	Quintile 4	Quintile 5 (richest)	Estimate	N1
Carpenter	25,800**	.	46,300**	24,000**	7,000***	41,261	4
Collecting bush products for domestic use (firewood	0	0	5,625**	.	7,619**	2,686	15
Selling food aid	.	4,797	.	6,064	.	5,850	5
Vet	.	.	.	144,000	.	144,000	1
Other (specify)	12,360***	26,395*	21,224**	55,770**	60,267	40,091	68
Salaried work (paid regular wage to work for someone else)	40,020***	72,209**	54,793***	110,589	139,722***	114,597	225
Public sector work (employed by the State)	140,118	64,172***	46,655***	134,039	172,848**	146,861	59
Casual labour (non-agricultural)	14,713	13,566**	24,061	28,265	30,811**	20,289	364
Self-employment (not listed in cat 1)	12,270***	21,054**	30,416*	75,576	67,971	48,985	89

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 6.3 a Formal and informal transfers received and given, by households

| Indicator | Randomisation checks By treatment status | | By beneficiary status CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | Overall | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Informal transfers (past 3 months)												
% HHs – receiving informal cash transfers/ remittances	41	39	43**	34	47	38	34	34	40	35	38	5,107
➢ Mean amount received (by receiving HHs) (KES)	2,901	3,544	2,230	2,520	4,223*	1,491	3,486	3,673	3,181	2,394	2,824	1,879
% HHs – receiving informal in-kind transfers	40	37	41	31	35	37	39	44	39	36	37	5,107
➢ Mean amount received (KES)	575	415	564*	370	553	471	432	362	506*	403	458	1,794
% HHs – giving informal cash transfers	19	17	17	26	14***	32	22	21	18**	27	22	5,107
➢ Mean amount given (KES)	2,030	3,342	742**	1,855	1,838	2,054	4,023	1,478	2,571	1,867	2,162	981
% HHs – giving informal in-kind transfers	23	21	24	28	18**	30	22	24	22*	28	25	5,107
➢ Mean amount given (KES)	282	300	280**	561	346	418	275	219	289*	439	371	1,191
Formal transfers (past 3 months, not food aid or HSNP)												
% HHs – receiving aid from government agencies	2	4	5*	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	3	5,107

Indicator	Randomisation checks		By beneficiary status								Overall	
	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall			
	Treatment group	Control group	Selected	Non-selected	Selected	Non-selected	Selected	Non-selected	Selected	Non-selected		
	(type A HHs)	(type B HHs)	(type A/Bs)	(type C/Ds)	(type A/Bs)	(type C/Ds)	(type A/Bs)	(type C/Ds)	(type A/Bs)	(type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
➢ Mean amount received (KES)	1,463	1,781							1,653	909	1,340	221
% HHs – receiving formal aid from NGOs or religious organisations	8	9	9*	5	11	8	7	11	8	7	8	5,107
➢ Mean amount received (KES)	1,508	1,606							1,556***	1,208	1,398	587

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 6.3 b Formal and informal transfers received and given, by consumption expenditure quintile

Indicator	By consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	Q1 (poorest)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Estimate	N
Proportion of HHs receiving informal cash transfers/remittances	44*	38	38	41	27***	38	5,106
➢ Mean amount received (among those that received something)	864***	1,719**	3,046	3,742**	5,822**	2,824	1,879
Proportion of HHs receiving informal in-kind transfers	62***	51***	33	28***	14***	37	5,106
➢ Mean amount received	386*	428	505	414	871***	458	1,794
Proportion of HHs giving informal cash transfers	23	22	18**	23	27	22	5,106
➢ Mean amount given	570	1673	1,799	2,463	3,943**	2,162	981
Proportion of HHs giving informal in-kind transfers	40***	31**	20*	17***	16**	25	5,106
➢ Mean amount given	226***	264**	314	648	721***	371	1,191
Proportion of HHs receiving aid from government agencies(not food aid or HSNP)	3	3.5	4.3	1.8*	1.5***	2.8	5,106
Proportion of HHs receiving formal aid from NGOs or religious organisations (not food aid or HSNP)	10	8.5	9.3	8	3.8***	7.9	5,106
All HHs: amount of informal cash transfers/remittances received by HHs	381***	645**	1,164	1,544***	1587	1,064	5,106
All HHs: amount of informal cash transfers/remittances given by HHs	131***	368	319*	557	1,043**	484	5,106
All HHs: amount of informal in-kind transfers received by HHs	238**	219***	167	114***	119**	171	5,106

Indicator	By consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	Q1 (poorest)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Estimate	N
All HHs: amount of informal in-kind transfers given by HHs	89	82	64**	110	114	92	5,106
All HHs: amount of formal aid received from government agencies(not food aid or HSNP)	38	48	45	24	33	38	5,106
All HHs: amount of formal aid received from NGOs and religious organisations(not food aid or HSNP)	158	113	111	119	53***	111	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Consumption quintiles are defined according to the distribution of consumption expenditure over the study population such that each quintile contains 20% of the population.

Table A. 6.3 c Transfers by mobility status

Indicator	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	Partially mobile	Fully mobile	Estimate	N
Informal cash transfers – receiving					
Proportion of HHs receiving informal cash transfers/remittances	40***	32**	28***	38	5,107
Amount of informal cash transfers/remittances received by HHs	2,995	1,879	2,880	2,824	1,879
In-kind transfers – receiving					
Proportion of HHs receiving in-kind transfers	38	45	20**	37	5,107
Amount of informal in-kind transfers received by HHs	449	443	639	458	1,794
Informal cash transfers – giving					
Proportion of HHs giving informal cash transfers/remittances	25**	19	10***	22	5,107
Amount of informal cash transfers/remittances given by HHs	2,291	752**	4,539	2,162	981
In-kind transfers – giving					
Proportion of HHs giving in-kind transfers	26	27	13**	25	5,107
Amount of informal in-kind transfers given by HHs	391	270*	448	371	1,191
Formal aid – receiving from government					
Proportion of HHs receiving formal aid from government agencies (not food)	3	3	2	3	5,107
Formal aid – receiving from non-state actors					
Proportion of HHs receiving formal aid from non-state actors (not food)	8	10	4*	8	5,107
Amount of formal aid received from non-state actors (not food)	1,405	1,405	1,263	1,398	587

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Fully settled defined as the whole of the HH (all members, including head) is permanently settled. Partially mobile defined as some members of the HH are permanently settled and others move around in order to herd their animals. Fully mobile defined as the whole HH moves around in order to herd the animals.

Table A. 6.4 a Child work (including unpaid domestic work)

Indicator	Randomisation checks — By treatment status		By beneficiary status — CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
% HHs reporting a child 5-17 whose main activity is paid or unpaid work (exc. unpaid domestic work)	32	35	20	26	39**	29	41	32	33	29	31	4,554
% children 5-17 whose main activity is paid or unpaid work (exc. unpaid domestic work)	18	20	11	17	24	20	23*	29	19	20	19	10,983
% children 5-14 whose main activity is paid or unpaid work (exc. unpaid domestic work)	16	18	9	13	22	17	20*	26	17	17	17	8,723
% children 5-12 whose main activity is paid or unpaid work (exc. unpaid domestic work)	14	16	8	11	20**	13	18	23	15	14	14	7,074

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 6.4 b Main and secondary child work activities by education attendance and gender

Indicator	By education status			By gender		Overall	
	In education (6+)	Not in education (6+)	Aged 5yrs	Male	Female	Estimate	N
Main activity performed by children aged 5-17							
% children 5-17: main activity is Herding/Livestock production	0.2***	38***	0.8***	19**	13	16	11,785
% children 5-17: main activity is Farming/Agricultural production	0.0*	0.1*	0.0*	0.1*	0	0	11,785
% children 5-17: main activity is Collecting bush products: for sale	0.1*	1.2*	0.0*	0.2*	1	0.5	11,785
% children 5-17: main activity is Collecting bush products: for consumption	0.0**	0.1*	0.1	0.0*	0.1	0.1	11,785
% children 5-17: main activity is Self-employed	0.1**	0.5**	0.0***	0.2*	0.3	0.2	11,785
% children 5-17: main activity is Paid work including casual labour	0.0***	0.4***	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.2	11,785
% children 5-17: main activity is Help in family business	0.0*	0.1*	0.0*	0.0*	0.1	0	11,785
% children 5-17: main activity is Unpaid domestic work	0.7***	21.5***	0.8***	3.3***	16	9	11,785
% children 5-17: main activity is Unpaid other work	0.2***	1.7***	0.3**	0.7	1	0.9	11,785
% children 5-17: main activity is Fishing	0	0.1	0	0.1	0	0	11,785
Secondary activity performed by children aged 5-17							
% children 5-17: other activity is Herding/Livestock production	0.2***	0.9***	0.0***	0.4**	0.6	0.5	11,785
% children 5-17: other activity is Farming/Agricultural production	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,785
% children 5-17: other activity is Collecting bush products: for sale	0.0**	0.3**	0.0**	0.1	0.2	0.1	11,785
% children 5-17: other activity is Collecting bush products: for consumption	0.0***	0.9***	0.0***	0.2**	0.6	0.4	11,785
% children 5-17: other activity is Self-employed	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,785
% children 5-17: other activity is Paid work including casual labour	0.1	0	0	0	0	0	11,785
% children 5-17: other activity is Help in family business	0.1	0.1	0.0**	0	0.1	0	11,785
% children 5-17: other activity is Unpaid domestic work	22***	13	1.0***	15***	18	16	11,785
% children 5-17: other activity is Unpaid other work	7	8	2.5***	7	7	7	11,785
% children 5-17: other activity is Fishing	0	0	0	0	0	0	11,785

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 6.4 c Child work by mobility status

Indicator	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	**Partially mobile**	**Fully mobile**	**Estimate**	**N**
% HHs reporting child aged 5-17 whose main activity is	18***	51***	58***	28	5,108
➢ Children aged 5-17	11***	33***	41***	18	11,785
➢ Children aged 5-14	9***	28***	37***	15	9,525
➢ Children aged 5-12	7***	23***	33***	13	7,876
Main activity performed by children aged 5-17: *(% aged 5-17 for whom it is their main activity)*					
➢ Herding/Livestock production	9***	30***	39***	16	11,785
➢ Farming/Agricultural production	0	0.0*	0.1	0	11,785
➢ Collecting bush products: for sale	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.5	11,785
➢ Collecting bush products: for consumption	0.0**	0.2	0.1	0.1	11,785
➢ Self-employed	0.3*	0.1	0.1	0.2	11,785
➢ Paid work including casual labour	0.3**	0.0**	0.1*	0.2	11,785
➢ Help in family business	0	0.1	0.0*	0	11,785
➢ Unpaid domestic work	8*	12.4	12	9.4	11,785
➢ Unpaid other work	0.7	1.7	0.4	0.9	11,785
➢ Fishing	0.1	0	0	0	11,785

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Fully settled defined as the whole of the HH (all members, including head) is permanently settled. Partially mobile defined as some members of the HH are permanently settled and others move around in order to herd their animals. Fully mobile defined as the whole HH moves around in order to herd the animals.

Table A. 7.1 a Livestock ownership and rearing practices

Indicator	Randomisation checks		By beneficiary status								Overall	
	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall			
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
% of HHs owning/rearing livestock												
% HHs owning livestock	61*	80	53	63	82**	72	78	79	70	70	70	5,106
% HHs where main provider owns livestock separately from HH	4.4	7.1	6.3	9.7	7.2	6	4.2	5.6	5.6	7.5	6.5	5,106
% HHs rearing but not owning livestock	5.3	10	8.2	5.9	7.9*	4.1	6.5	6.6	7.4**	5.5	6.5	5,106
Mean number of livestock owned by HH and main provider (excluding donkeys, poultry, other)												
Mean number of cattle owned by HH and main provider	1.4	1.6	0.9***	4.1	2.2	1.9	1.5	2.1	1.5***	2.7	2.1	3,778
Mean number of cattle owned by HH and main provider 1 year ago	4.2	3.8	2.2***	5.8	4.5	3.1	4.8	5.7	4	4.8	4.4	3,368
Mean number of cattle owned by HH and main provider 2 years ago	9.3	5.9	3.8**	8	5.7	5.4	10.6	11.4	7.5	8	7.7	3,304
Mean number of goats/sheep owned by HH and main provider	29	31	26*	36	30	33	33	39	30*	36	33	3,778

												N
Mean number of goats/sheep owned by HH and main provider 1 year ago	44	47	45*	55	40*	46	49	55	46*	52	49	3,368
Mean number of goats/sheep owned by HH and main provider 2 years ago	67	72	72*	84	60	72	74	86	70**	80	75	3,304
Mean number of camels owned by HH and main provider	4.1	2.8	2	5.1	4.7	3.5	3.6	3.9	3.4	4.2	3.8	3,778
Mean number of camels owned by HH and main provider 1 year ago	5.9*	3.4	2.6	6.3	6.2	4.5	4.8	5.2	4.5	5.3	4.9	3,368
Mean number of camels owned by HH and main provider 2 years ago	7.5*	4.6	3.5	8.1	7.2	5	6.6	7.2	5.9	6.7	6.3	3,304
TLU for livestock owned by HH and main provider(excluding donkeys, poultry, other)												
Mean TLU *per capita* for livestock owned currently by HH and main provider	1.6	1.4	1.1	2.4	1.8	1.8	1.5***	2.3	1.5*	2.2	1.8	3,778
TLU for livestock owned currently by HH and main provider	8.5	7.3	5.4*	12.1	9.6	8.5	8.3	9.6	7.9	10.1	8.9	3,778
TLU for livestock owned 1 year ago by HH and main provider	14	11	8.8**	16	14	12	13	15	12	14	13	3,368
TLU for livestock owned 2 years ago by HH and main provider	21	16	14*	23	18	17	22	24	19	21	20	3,304

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 7.1 b Livestock ownership by quintile

Indicator	By consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	Q1 (poorest)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Estimate	N
% of HHs owning/rearing livestock							
% HHs owning livestock	78	77**	75**	70	53***	70	5,106
% HHs where main provider owns livestock separately from HH	5.7	3.5**	8.2	5.9	6.4	6.5	5,106
% HHs rearing but not owning livestock	4.5	7.1	7.4	6	5.1	6.5	5,106
Mean number of livestock owned by HH and main provider (excl. donkeys, poultry, other)							
Mean number of cattle owned by HH and main provider	1.4*	1.4***	2.3	2	3.4***	2.1	3,778
Mean number of goats/sheep owned by HH and main provider	32	35	34	33	32	33	3,778
Mean number of camels owned by HH and main provider	1.8***	3	4.5**	3.4	4.8***	3.8	3,778
TLU for livestock owned by HH and main provider (excl. donkeys, poultry, other)							
TLUs *per capita* for livestock owned currently by HH and main provider	1.0***	1.4*	2	2.2**	2.8***	2	3,778
TLU for livestock owned currently by HH and main provider	6.1***	7.7	10**	8.5	11***	8.9	3,778
TLU for livestock owned 1 year ago by HH and main provider	10***	12*	15*	13	16***	13	3,368
TLU for livestock owned 2 years ago by HH and main provider	19	19	21	20	20	20	3,304
Livestock owned specifically by HH (over those HHs owning any livestock)							
Mean number of cattle owned by HH	1.1**	1.2***	2	1.8	3.3***	1.9	3,786
Mean number of goats/sheep owned by HH	30.2	32.4	30	30.6	29.4	30.3	3,786

Indicator	By consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	Q1 (poorest)	Q2	Q3	Q4	Q5	Estimate	N
Mean number of camels owned by HH	1.7***	2.8	4.0**	3.1	4.2***	3.4	3,786
Mean number of donkeys/mules owned by HH	0.6*	0.6	0.7	0.7	0.7	0.7	3,786
Mean number of poultry owned by HH	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.6	0.6	0.6	3,786

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Households Questionnaire, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. Therefore the sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Estimates have been calculated using sampling weights for each HH equal to the inverse of the probability of being selected for interview. (3) Dependency ratio is defined as the number of people who are dependents (children (<18), people aged 55+, chronically ill or disabled people) divided by the total number of HH members. (4) Control group estimates that are significantly different to that of the treatment group are denoted as follows: *** $p<0.01$; ** $p<0.05$; * $p<0.1$. Standard errors are adjusted for the clustered structure of the sample.

Table A. 7.1c Livestock rearing and ownership by district

Indicator	District variations By (greater) district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
% of HHs owning/rearing livestock				
% HHs owning livestock	53	67	74	82
% HHs where main provider owns livestock separately from HH	5.5	2.4**	4	15***
% HHs rearing but not owning livestock	1.6***	4.2	3.9*	16***
Mean number of livestock owned by HH and main provider (excl. donkeys, poultry, other)				
Mean number of cattle owned by HH and main provider	2.8	2.6	1.2**	2.3
Mean number of cattle owned by HH and main provider 1 year ago	6.9***	5.9	2.4**	3.8
Mean number of cattle owned by HH and main provider 2 years ago	9.6	6.8	8.8	6.2
Mean number of goats/sheep owned by HH and main provider	25**	34	35	35
Mean number of goats/sheep owned by HH and main provider 1 year ago	35***	40*	62**	49
Mean number of goats/sheep owned by HH and main provider 2 years ago	43***	53***	114***	65
Mean number of camels owned by HH and main provider	6.6**	3	1.3***	5.7*
Mean number of camels owned by HH and main provider 1 year ago	11***	3.2**	2.2***	6.2
Mean number of camels owned by HH and main provider 2 years ago	12***	3.7**	4.3*	7.7
TLU for livestock owned by HH and main provider (excl. donkeys, poultry, other)				
Mean TLU *per capita* for livestock owned currently by HH and main provider	2.4*	1.7	1.2***	2.3
TLU for livestock owned currently by HH and main provider	12*	8.5	5.7***	11
TLU for livestock owned 1 year ago by HH and main provider	20***	12	10**	14
TLU for livestock owned 2 years ago by HH and main provider	24	14***	22	19

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 7.2a Mean value of non-livestock assets owned

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | | | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By targeting mechanism (for whole population) | | | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	CBT	SP	DR	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Mean value of HH assets															
Mean value of all HH assets (KES)	32,719	16,568	26,450	23,540	13,927	13,615	49,942	14,299	18,103	26,559	26,243	19,208	33,576	26,179	5,108
Mean value of total productive assets (KES)	2,056	2,682	2,383	2,704	2,236	1,977	2,128	3,031	2,446	2,660	1,851	2,493	2,171	2,337	5,108
Mean value of total non-productive assets (KES)	30,663	13,886	24,068	20,836	11,691	11,639	47,814	11,268	15,658	23,898	24,392	16,715	31,405	23,842	5,108
Mean value of non-productive assets															
Mean value of basic HH goods (KES)	6,222	5,538	6,432	6,189	6,233	5,856	6,553	5,741	5,401	6755**	5,814	6,209	5,989	6,102	5,108

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | | | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By targeting mechanism (for whole population) | | | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	CBT	SP	DR	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Mean value of consumer durables (KES)	2,185	1152**	4,300	2,794	2,070	1492**	2,809	665***	1,480	4,238	4,417	2,468	2,732	2,596	5,108
Mean value of other expensive durables (KES)	15,219	3,634	5,536	3,754	1,200	731	28,280	2,908	4,126	4058*	8,365	2,603	15,413	8,818	5,108
Mean value of furniture (KES)	7,037	3,562	7,800	8,099	2,188	3560*	10,172	1953**	4,651	8,848	5,795	5,435	7,272	6,326	5,108

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 7.2b Mean value of non-livestock assets owned by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
Mean value of HH assets				
Mean value of all HH assets (KES)	19,534	49,389	10,148**	28,299
Mean value of productive assets (KES)	1,834	1,985	1,616	4,019***
Mean value of non-productive assets (KES)	17,700	47,404	8,532**	24,280
Mean value of non-productive assets				
Mean value of basic HH goods (KES)	6,870	6,493	4,033***	7,602**
Mean value of consumer durables (KES)	1,820	5,186	1,197**	2,380
Mean value of other expensive durables (KES)	1,522	27,065	2,699	4,256
Mean value of furniture (KES)	7,488	8,661	603***	10,042

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010.

Table A. 7.3 a Land ownership by beneficiary status

Indicator	Randomisation checks		By beneficiary status								Overall	
	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall			
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
% of HHs currently owning land												
% HHs currently owning agricultural land	9	9	7	8	14*	8	8	14	9	9	9	5,107
% HHs where main provider currently owns agricultural land separately from HH	0.4	2	0.3	0.5	2	0.8	0.7	3	0.9	1	1	5,107
% of HHs farming land, currently and in the past												
% HHs currently farming agricultural land	7	6	6	7	7***	4	8	13	7	7	7	5,107
% HHs farming agricultural land 1 year ago	5	5	5	6	6	3	6	11	5	6	6	5,107
% HHs farming agricultural land 2 years ago	5	4	5	7	4	3	4	8	4	6	5	5,107
Mean size of land owned by HH, irrigated/non-irrigated												
Mean size of irrigated land owned by HH (ha)											0.8	574
Mean size of irrigated land owned by HH (ha), *per capita*											0.1	574
Mean size of non-irrigated land owned by HH (ha)											1	574
Mean size of non-irrigated land owned by HH (ha), *per capita*											0.2	574

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatme nt group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
Mean size of land farmed by HH, irrigated/non-irrigated												
Mean size of irrigated land farmed by HH (ha)											0.4	442
Mean size of irrigated land farmed by HH 1 year ago (ha)											0.4	375
Mean size of irrigated land farmed by HH 2 years ago (ha)											0.5	331
Mean size of non-irrigated land farmed by HH (ha)											0.6	442
Mean size of non-irrigated land farmed by HH 1 year ago (ha)											0.7	375
Mean size of non-irrigated land farmed by HH 2 years ago (ha)											0.7	331

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 7.3b Land ownership by district

Indicator	District variations By (greater) district				Overall	
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**	**Estimate**	**N**
% of HHs currently owning land						
% HHs currently owning agricultural land	5.4	14.9	9.4	6.2	9.1	5,107
% HHs where main provider currently owns agricultural land separately from HH	0.4	0.7	1.1	1.7	1	5,107
% of HHs farming land, currently and in the past						
% HHs currently farming agricultural land	5.2	10.7	7.4	4	6.9	5,107
% HHs farming agricultural land 1 year ago	4.4	9.8	6.5	1.8*	5.7	5,107
% HHs farming agricultural land 2 years ago	3.9	8.4	5.1	2.2	4.9	5,107
Mean size of land owned by HH, irrigated/non-irrigated						
Mean size of irrigated land owned by HH (ha)	0.4	0	0.4	4	0.8	574
Mean size of irrigated land owned by HH (ha), *per capita*	0.1	0	0.1	0.6	0.1	574
Mean size of non-irrigated land owned by HH (ha)	0.2**	2.0***	0.5**	0.0***	1	574
Mean size of non-irrigated land owned by HH (ha), *per capita*	0.00**	0.4***	0.1*	0.0***	0.2	574
Mean size of land farmed by HH, irrigated/non-irrigated						
Mean size of irrigated land farmed by HH (ha)	0.3	0	0.3	1.7	0.4	442
Mean size of irrigated land farmed by HH 1 year ago (ha)	0.3	0.000*	0.5	2.4	0.4	375
Mean size of irrigated land farmed by HH 2 years ago (ha)	0.4	0.000*	0.7	1.9	0.5	331
Mean size of non-irrigated land farmed by HH (ha)	0.1**	1.1***	0.3*	0.0***	0.6	442
Mean size of non-irrigated land farmed by HH 1 year ago (ha)	0.1***	1.2***	0.4	0.0***	0.7	375
Mean size of non-irrigated land farmed by HH 2 years ago (ha)	0.1***	1.2***	0.6	0.0***	0.7	331

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 8.1a   Adult literacy rates, by gender and beneficiary status

Indicator	Randomisation checks By treatment status		By beneficiary status CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Gender (if indicator individual level)		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Male	Female	Estimate	N
Proportion of adults 18+ who are illiterate (%)	76	84	77	72	82	75	81	83	80	76	69***	87	78	12,611
Proportion of male-headed HHs with an illiterate HH head (%)	76	85	77	66	85***	69	80	81	80**	71	n/a	n/a	75	3,846
Proportion of female-headed HHs with an illiterate HH head (%)	88*	94	90	90	93	87	90	92	91	89	n/a	n/a	90	1,259

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 8.1 b Adult literacy rates, by district

| Indicator | District variations | | | | Overall | |
| | By (greater) district | | | | | |
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N[1]
Literacy Rates						
Proportion of adults 18+ that are illiterate (%)	77	67*	86*	80	78	12,611
Proportion of male-headed HHs with an illiterate HH head (%)	75	64*	78	83	75	3,846
Proportion of female-headed HHs with an illiterate HH head (%)	95**	84*	93	87	90	1,259

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 8.1 c Adult levels of education

Indicator	Randomisation checks — By treatment status		By beneficiary status — CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Gender (if indicator individual level)		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Male	Female	Estimate	N
Proportion of adults 18+ that have finished primary school	15	10	14	21	11*	15	12	12	13	17	21***	8	15	12,611
Proportion of adults 18+ that have finished secondary school (Form 4 leavers)	6	4	6	11	5*	9	6	6	5*	9	11***	4	7	12,611
Proportion of adults ever attended primary school	24	15	24	28	17**	26	18	17	20*	25	30***	14	22	12,611

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 8.1 d Adult levels of education by district

| Indicator | District variations | | | | Overall | |
| | By (greater) district | | | | | |
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N[1]
Levels of Education						
Proportion of adults 18+ that have finished primary school	16	24**	6***	14	15	12,611
Proportion of adults 18+ that have finished secondary school (Form 4 leavers)	7	14**	2***	6	7	12,611
Proportion of adults ever attended primary school	23	34**	14**	18	22	12,611

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 8.2 a Current school attendance by gender and beneficiary status

Indicator	Randomisation checks — By treatment status		By beneficiary status — CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Gender (if indicator individual level)		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Male	Female	Estimate	N
Proportion of children currently attending school (excluding duksi and madrasah)	60*	45	60	57	48	52	51**	40	54	52	57***	48	53	10,540
Proportion of children aged 6-12 currently attending in primary school	51*	38	52	47	42	48	42*	34	46	45	48**	43	45	6,631
Proportion of children aged 13-17 currently attending in secondary school	7.5	6.7	7	11.7	7.7	5.8	7.1	6.9	7.2	8.8	9.2**	6.4	7.9	3,909

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 8.2 b Current school attendance by district

| Indicator | District variations | | | | Overall | |
| | By (greater) district | | | | | |
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N[1]
Current School Attendance						
Proportion of children currently attending school (excluding *duksi* and *madrassah*)	61	59	42	51	53	10,540

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 8.2c Proportion of children that have ever attended school and reasons for having never attended

Indicator	Randomisation checks		By beneficiary status								Gender (if indicator individual level)		Overall	
	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall					
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Male	Female	Estimate	N1
Proportion of children aged 6-12 ever attended primary school	51	43	54	48	44	48	45*	36	48	46	50**	44	47	6,631
Proportion of children age 13-17 ever attended secondary school	8.1	8.4	8.4	13	8.3	7	8.1	7.1	8.2	9.8	11***	6.8	8.9	3,909
Proportion of children who have attended duksi or madrasah only	6.9	6.5	9.4	11	7.2	5.6	4.5	4.4	6.8	7.6	8.0***	6.2	7.1	10,540
Proportion of children who have never attended school due to cost	1.4	1.8	1.3	3.4	1.1	1.1	1.9*	0.9	1.5	2.1	1.4**	2.2	1.8	10,540
Proportion of children who have never attended school due to HH labour requirement	20	23	13	19	28.1	24.7	24**	36	21	24	20***	25	22	10,540
Proportion of children who have never attended school due to belief that education is not important	3.8	5.6	3.9	3.5	4.3	2.9	5.2	6.6	4.6	3.9	3.0***	5.7	4.3	10,540

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 8.2 d Proportion of children that have ever attended school and reasons for having never attended, by quintile

Indicator	Consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	1 (poorest)	2	3	4	5	Estimate	N1
Current school attendance							
Proportion of children aged 6-12 ever attended primary school	36***	45	46	55**	57**	47	6,631
Proportion of children age 13-17 ever attended secondary school	2.8***	5.8**	7.7	16**	17**	8.9	3,909
Proportion of children who have attended *duksi* or *madrasah* only	2.9***	6.7	8.7	8.4	10	7.1	10,540
Proportion of children who have never attended school due to cost	2.6	1.3	1.9	0.7*	2.4	1.8	10,540
Proportion of children who have never attended school due to HH labour requirement	33***	27***	21	16**	8.8***	22	10,540
Proportion of children who have never attended school due to belief that education is not important	6.2	3.3	5.4	3.1**	2.7**	4.3	10,540

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Consumption quintiles are defined according to the distribution of consumption expenditure over the study population such that each quintile contains 20% of the population.

Table A. 8.2 e Proportion of children that have ever attended school and reasons for having never attended, by district

Indicator	District variations By (greater) district				Overall	
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**	**Estimate**	**N[1]**
Current school attendance						
Proportion of children aged 6-12 ever attended primary school	51	62**	38	40	47	6,631
Proportion of children age 13-17 ever attended secondary school	10	18**	1***	8	9	3,909
Proportion of children who have never attended school due to cost	1	2	3	1*	2	10,540
Proportion of children who have never attended school due to HH labour requirement	14**	16	38***	20	22	10,540
Proportion of children who have never attended school due to belief that education is not important	3	3	4	6	4	10,540

Table A. 8.3 a School supply, school feeding, and education expenditure

Indicator	Randomisation checks By treatment status Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	CBT Selected (type A/Bs)	CBT Non-selected (type C/Ds)	SP Selected (type A/Bs)	SP Non-selected (type C/Ds)	DR Selected (type A/Bs)	DR Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Overall Selected (type A/Bs)	Overall Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Gender (if indicator individual level) Male	Female	Overall Estimate	N
Mean annual HH expenditure on education	2,994	2,201	2,590	3,400	2,790	2,098	2,597	1,847	2,636	2,594	n/a	n/a	2,616	5,105
Mean monthly education expenditure per child	103	81	101	139	104	88	81	81	93	109	n/a	n/a	100	3,929
Proportion of communities with a primary school within community	50	40									n/a	n/a	45	242
Proportion of communities where the primary school that most people use is a government institution	94	97									n/a	n/a	95	237
Proportion of communities that are satisfied with the quality of education provided by the primary school that most people use in their community if it is a government school	75	78									n/a	n/a	77	227

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Gender (if indicator individual level) | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Male	Female	Estimate	N
Proportion of communities with a secondary school within community	15	12									n/a	n/a	13	242
Proportion of children currently attending school who are receiving school feeding	82	82	72	68	85	84	90	91	82	77	80	80	80	5,309

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Mean monthly education expenditure per child is calculated across all children per HH, not just those attending school. (4) Greyed out cells have not been estimated due to insufficient observations for disaggregation.

Table A. 8.3 b Education expenditure and school feeding, by quintile

Indicator	Consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	1 (poorest)	2	3	4	5	Estimate	N1
Mean annual HH expenditure on education	569***	1,641**	2,374	3,517**	4,979***	2,616	5,105
Proportion of children who are currently attending school and are receiving school feeding	96**	85*	83	78	55***	80	5,309

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Consumption quintiles are defined according to the distribution of consumption expenditure over the study population such that each quintile contains 20% of the population. The school feeding estimates have been generated using modified quintiles based on consumption expenditure adjusted to remove the value of school feeding received.

Table A. 8.3 c School supply, school feeding, and education expenditure by district

Indicator	District variations				Overall	
	By (greater) district					
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**	**Estimate**	**N[1]**
School feeding and education expenditure						
Proportion of children who are currently attending school and are receiving school feeding	52***	86	96***	92**	80	5,309
Mean annual HH expenditure on education	2,898	3,478	1,231***	3,213	2,616	5,105
Supply of education facilities						
Proportion of communities with a primary school within community (%)	52	28***	34**	74***	45	242
Proportion of communities where the primary school that most people use is a government institution	99	82**	100**	100**	95	237
Proportion of communities that are satisfied with the quality of education provided by the primary school that most people use in their community if it is a government school	68	34***	95***	99***	77	227
Proportion of communities with a secondary school within community (%)	10	15	7	22	13	242

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 9.1 a Health status and health-seeking behaviour by beneficiary status

Indicator	Treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Gender		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Male	Female	Estimate	N
Proportion of people ill/injured in the past 3 months (excluding chronic illness)	21	21	23	26	19	25	20	22	21	25	21***	25	23	28,065
Proportion of children immunised (BCG)	88	84	85	74	79	81	89	83	86*	79	84	81	82	3,666
Proportion of people ill/injured in past 3 months not going to formal health care provider	42	47	42*	51	44	42	47	40	45	46	41***	49	45	5,806
Proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider because they could not afford it	27	23	20*	9	23	22	30	26	25**	16	18**	22	20	2,679
Proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider because illness not severe enough	20	13	18	21	17	24	16**	24	17	22	18	21	20	2,679
Proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider because facility too far away	17	20	24***	39	13	6	16	17	18	25	24	20	22	2,679
Proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider because self-treated	23	35	31*	24	35	38	24	28	29	29	29	28	29	2,679
Mean spending on health care per annum (nominal terms)	1,558	1,483	1,859	2,032	1,507	1,193	1,245	959	1,524	1,496	n/a	n/a	1,511	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Indicators relating to proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider calculated as a proportion of those who did not consult a formal health care provider.

Table A. 9.1 b Health status and health-seeking behaviour by quintile

Indicator	Consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	1 (poorest)	2	3	4	5	Esti-mate	N1
Proportion of people ill/injured in the past 3 months (excluding chronic illness)	34***	25	20	20	13***	23	28,065
Proportion of children immunised (BCG)	87	84	81	77*	83	82	3,666
Proportion of people ill/injured in past 3 months not going to formal health care provider	52**	49	44	36***	35	45	5,806
Proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider because they could not afford it	23	22	21	13*	14**	20	2,679
Proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider because illness not severe enough	17	15	20	29*	26*	20	2,679
Proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider because facility too far away	17***	23	21	28	31*	22	2,679
Proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider because self-treated	32	29	29	24	20	29	2,679
Mean spending on health care per annum (nominal terms)	690***	870***	1014***	1,656	3,324***	1,511	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Indicators relating to proportion of people who did not consult a formal health care provider calculated as a proportion of those who did not consult a formal health care provider.

Table A. 9.1 c Health status and access by district

Indicator	District variations By (greater) district				Overall	
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**	**Estimate**	**N**
Health status and immunisation						
Proportion of males ill/injured in the past 3 months (excluding chronic illness)	4***	9***	57***	10**	21	14,485
Proportion of females ill/injured in the past 3 months (excluding chronic illness)	7***	12***	58***	15.**	25	13,584
Proportion of male children immunised (BCG)	85	97***	88	70**	84	1,893
Proportion of female children immunised (BCG)	84	98***	74	71	81	1,773
Health-seeking behaviour						
Proportion of males ill/injured in past 3 months not going to formal health care provider	39	38	45**	25***	41	2,661
Proportion of females ill/injured in past 3 months not going to formal health care provider	37	39*	56***	30***	49	3,148
Proportion of males who did not consult a formal health care provider because they could not afford it	14	47***	14**	24	18	1,206
Proportion of females who did not consult a formal health care provider because they could not afford it	18	44***	19**	29	22	1,476
Proportion of males who did not consult a formal health care provider because illness not severe enough	3***	27**	17	16	18	1,206
Proportion of females who did not consult a formal health care provider because illness not severe enough	19	31	21	13	21	1,476
Proportion of males who did not consult a formal health care provider because facility too far away	46*	13	23	32	24	1,206
Proportion of females who did not consult a formal health care provider because facility too far away	23	10	19	34	20	1,476

Indicator	District variations				Overall	
	By (greater) district					
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N
Proportion of males who did not consult a formal health care provider because self-treated	15*	11***	33***	16*	29	1,206
Proportion of females who did not consult a formal health care provider because self-treated	23	14**	32**	14***	28	1,476
Mean spending on health care per annum (nominal terms)	2,569**	1,558	679***	1,578	1,511	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 9.1 d Health status in the past three months and health-seeking behaviour by mobility status

Indicator	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	Partially mobile	Fully mobile	Estimate	N
Sickness in the past 3 months					
Male: Ill or injured in the past 3 months (excluding chronic illness)	22	18	14*	21	14,485
Female: Ill or injured in the past 3 months (excluding chronic illness)	26	24	18	25	13,584
Attending a formal health care provider					
Male: If sick in past 3 months, did not go to formal health care provider?	38***	54**	54**	41	2,661
Female: If sick in past 3 months, did not go to formal health care provider?	44***	60	66***	49	3,148
Reasons for not seeking formal health care					
Male: If not consulted, not going to formal health care provider because of cost	19	17	11	18	1,206
Female: If not consulted, not going to formal health care provider because of cost	23	22	14**	22	1,476
Male: If not consulted, not going to formal health care provider because illness not severe enough	18	12*	24	18	1,206
Female: If not consulted, not going to formal health care provider because illness not severe enough	23	15	21	21	1,476
Male: If not consulted, not going to formal health care provider because facility too far	21	25	38*	24	1,206
Female: If not consulted, not going to formal health care provider because facility too far	14***	32	41**	20	1,476
Male: If not consulted, not going to formal health care provider because self-treated	35***	15**	14**	29	1,206
Female: If not consulted, not going to formal health care provider because self-treated	34**	18*	9***	28	1,476

Indicator	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	**Partially mobile**	**Fully mobile**	**Estimate**	**N**
Spending on health care					
Mean spending on health care per annum	1754***	970**	645***	1,511	5,106
Health Facilities					
Person needs to walk 4 hours or more to the nearest functioning health facility	11***	26	44**	17	28,058
If consulted, did person use government health facility (hospital, health centre, etc.)	71	58*	87**	71	3,127
If consulted, did person use a non-governmental health facility	25	29	8***	24	3,127

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Fully settled defined as the whole of the HH (all members, including head) is permanently settled. Partially mobile defined as some members of the HH are permanently settled and others move around in order to herd their animals. Fully mobile defined as the whole HH moves around in order to herd the animals.

Table A. 9.2 a Supply of health care facilities by beneficiary status

Indicator	Randomisation checks		By beneficiary status								Gender		Overall	
	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall					
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Male	Female	Estimate	N
Proportion of people who need to walk 4 hours or more to the nearest functioning health facility	17	15	14	20	16	11	18	22	16	17	17	17	17	28,05
Of those consulting, proportion of people who choose to use a government health facility (government hospital, health centre or dispensary)	77	71	76***	58	79	69	71	78	74*	67	72	69	71	3,127
Of those consulting, proportion of people who choose to use a non-governmental health facility (private doctor/nurse, private hospital, NGO/faith-based organisation facility, pharmacist)	20	20	20***	38	16	24	23	18	20*	28	22*	26	24	3,127
Proportion of communities without any kind of health facility within community	74	76	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	75	242

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 9.2 b Supply of health care facilities by quintile

Indicator	Quintile					Overall	
	1 (poorest)	2	3	4	5	Estimate	N
Proportion of people who need to walk 4 hours or more to the nearest functioning health facility	18	18	19	19	10**	17	28,055
Of those consulting, proportion of people who choose to use a government health facility (hospital, health centre or dispensary)	67	77*	74	68	64	71	3,127
Of those consulting, proportion of people who choose to use a non-governmental health facility (private doctor/nurse, private hospital, NGO/faith-based organisation facility, pharmacist)	27	18*	19	27	33	24	3,127

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Consumption quintiles are defined according to the distribution of consumption expenditure over the study population such that each quintile contains 20% of the population.

Table A. 9.2 c Health supply by district

Indicator	District variations				Overall	
	By (greater) district					
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N
Supply of health care facilities						
Proportion of people who need to walk 4 hours or more to the nearest functioning health facility	13	10	30*	14	17	28,058
Of those consulting, proportion of people who choose to use a government health facility (hospital, health centre or dispensary)	53*	41***	73	87***	71	3,127
Of those consulting, proportion of people who choose to use a non-governmental health facility (private doctor/nurse, private hospital, NGO/faith-based organisation facility, pharmacist)	40	59***	21	10**	24	3,127
Proportion of communities that use either: i) private hospital; ii) NGO health facility; or iii) chemist	53*	97***	74	76	76	242
Proportion of communities without any kind of health facility within community	79	85	88**	40***	75	242
Supply of health personnel						
Average number of doctors available in government health facilities	2*	1	1	0.3**	1	242
Average number of nurses available in government health facilities	13*	8	4	2***	7	242
Average number of community health workers per community	0.3**	2	0.4*	1	1	240
Average number of traditional birth attendants per community	6**	3	1***	5	4	243
Average number of traditional healers per community	3**	0.6***	2**	0.3***	1	243
Average number of religious healers per community	31***	0.8***	1***	13	10	243

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 9.2 d Supply of health personnel

Indicator	Randomisation checks By treatment status		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Estimate	N
Average number of doctors available in government health facilities	1.1	0.9	1	242
Average number of nurses available in government health facilities	7.8	5.6	6.8	242
Average number of community health workers per community	0.6	1.5	1	240
Average number of traditional birth attendants per community	3.6	4	3.8	243
Average number of traditional healers per community	1.2	1.6	1.4	243
Average number of religious healers per community	10.7	9.8	10.3	243

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Community Questionnaire, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 9.2 e Supply of health personnel by district

Indicator	District variations				Overall	
	By (greater) district					
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N[1]
Supply of health personnel						
Average number of doctors available in government health facilities	2*	1	1	0.3**	1	242
Average number of nurses available in government health facilities	13*	8	4	2***	7	242
Average number of community health workers per community	0.3**	2	0.4*	1	1	240
Average number of traditional birth attendants per community	6**	3	1***	5	4	243
Average number of traditional healers per community	3**	1***	2**	0.3***	1	243
Average number of religious healers per community	31***	1***	1***	13	10	243

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Community Questionnaire, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 10.1 a Household access to water

Indicator	Randomisation checks — By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Proportion of HHs (%):												
➢ **whose main source of drinking water is**												
• unprotected well	16.6	30.3	18.6	16.8	27.2	27.7	24.1	18.7	22.7	20.9	21.9	5,107
• borehole	18.7	15.8	14.8	16.2	18.7	19.7	18.9	22.4	17.4	18.9	18.1	5,107
• dam	18	15.5	18.5	16.1	21.1	8.7	13.3	17.9	16.9	14	15.5	5,107
• protected well	9.8	14.2	4.6*	1.8	3.5	12	22.3***	12.1	11.8	7.7	9.8	5,107
• public tap	10.7	4.7	10.2	7.9	8.8	12.3	5.6	5.5	8	8.8	8.4	5,107
• water vendor	9.2	2.5	13.6	8.9	5.5	3.9	0	0	6.1	5.1	5.7	5,107
• piped into dwelling	4.6*	1.5	7	13.7	2.4	4	0.3	0.2	3.2*	7.2	5.2	5,107
• water tanker	2.2	4.3	6.3	10.3	1.5	1.5	1.3	0.9	3.2	5.1	4.1	5,107
• pan	6.2	1.3	0.3	1.2	6.1	3.9	6.1	7.5	4	3.6	3.8	5,107

Indicator	Randomisa-tion checks — By treatment status		By beneficiary status — CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
• rainwater catchment	0.7	2.2	0.5	2.5	0.4	1	2.6	4.6	1.4	2.5	1.9	5,107
• unprotected spring	0.7	1.8	0.8	0.4	0.5	1	1.8	4.2	1.2	1.5	1.3	5,107
• protected spring	0.5	0.9	0.2	0	0.9	1.1	1	1.2	0.7	0.7	0.7	5,107
➢ who walk over 2 hours to and from their main source of drinking water	19	21	22	37	17	17	20	18	20	25	23	5,107
➢ who have to pay for their drinking water	43	27	46	40	29	31	31	40	36	37	36	5,107

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 10.1 b Household access to water by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
Proportion of HHs (%):				
➤ whose main source of drinking water is…				
piped into dwelling or compound	10	9	3	0***
public tap	3**	15	13	0.2***
borehole	5***	4***	44***	12
water tanker (lorry)	16**	2	1	0.3*
dam	26	3**	0***	38*
pan	9	7	0.7*	0.2**
rainwater catchment	0.4**	6**	0.7	0.3**
protected well	3*	27**	0.4***	10
unprotected well	5***	21	24	35
protected spring	0**	0	0	2*
unprotected spring	0.02**	1	2	2
water vendor	21*	5	0*	0*
➤ who walk over 2 hours to and from their main source of drinking water	10***	18	32**	25
➤ who have to pay for their drinking water	56*	33	29	32

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 10.1 c Community access to water

Indicator	By (greater) district				By targeting mechanism (for whole pop)			By treatment status		Overall	
								Treatment group	Control group		
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	CBT	SP	DR	(type A HHs)	(type B HHs)	Estimate	N
Proportion of communities who (%):											
➤ **Have the following water source in their community:**											
• Borehole	19	15*	51**	33	32	25	36	35	26	31	242
• Well	16	24	1***	64***	15	20	38	16	32	24	242
• Piped water	11*	48**	25	0***	26	30	10*	24	20	22	223
• River	6**	2***	61***	0***	23	14	25	29	12	21	242
• Tanker/mobile vendor	48**	30	3***	2***	39**	13	3**	26	13	20	241
• Pan (not on a river)	21	14	11	28	22	13	17	18	18	18	236
• Pond	4	1**	13*	3	7	3	7	1**	11	6	242
• Dam	6	0**	2	16*	3	8	5	6	4	5	240
• Lake	5	0	11	0	3	11	0	0	9	5	241

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Community Questionnaire, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 10.2 a Dwelling characteristics

Indicator	Randomisation checks — By treatment status		By beneficiary status — CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Mean number of rooms per HH	1.6	1.5	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.6	5,107
% HHs with												
➢ Walls made of natural materials	84	95	90**	78	92	87	86	92	89	84	87	5,107
➢ Sand/earth floor	85	96	91*	80	93**	87	88	93	90	85	88	5,107
➢ Main source of cooking fuel is collected firewood	33	32	30	28	32	34	35	39	32	32	32	5,107
➢ Main source of lighting fuel is electricity	8	2	3	11	5	7	7	5	5	8	7	5,107
➢ No toilet (none/pan/bucket)												

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 10.2 b Dwelling characteristics by district

Indicator	District variations				Overall	
	By (greater) district					
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N[1]
Mean number of rooms per HH	1***	2	2***	1***	2	5,107
% HHs with…						
➢ Walls made of natural materials	➢ 82	➢ 76	➢ 99***	➢ 85	➢ 87	➢ 5,107
➢ Sand/earth floor	➢ 85	➢ 78	➢ 98***	➢ 88	➢ 88	➢ 5,107
➢ Main source of cooking fuel is collected firewood	➢ 51**	➢ 86	➢ 94***	➢ 82	➢ 80	➢ 5,107
➢ Main source of lighting fuel is electricity	➢ 7	➢ 14	➢ 0***	➢ 8	➢ 7	➢ 5,107
➢ Main source of lighting fuel is battery torch	➢ 72***	➢ 27*	➢ 14***	➢ 78***	➢ 45	➢ 5,107
➢ Main source of lighting fuel is collected firewood	➢ 7***	➢ 26	➢ 78***	➢ 4.191***	➢ 32	➢ 5,107
➢ Main source of lighting fuel is paraffin	➢ 14	➢ 30***	➢ 5***	➢ 7**	➢ 13	➢ 5,107
➢ Main source of drinking water is dam/pan/river/lake/rainwater catchment/unprotected spring or well	➢ 41	➢ 38	➢ 38	➢ 76***	➢ 48	➢ 5,107
➢ Main source of drinking water is borehole	➢ 5***	➢ 4***	➢ 44***	➢ 12	➢ 18	➢ 5,107
➢ No toilet (none/pan/bucket)	➢ 47***	➢ 58**	➢ 98***	➢ 94***	➢ 76	➢ 5,107

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 10.3 a Household access to key amenities

Indicator	Randomisation checks		By beneficiary status								Overall	
	By treatment status		CBT		SP		DR		Overall			
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
Average time (minutes) travelled for HHs to walk to and from:												
➢ the main place where they buy food	85	116	83*	126	91	85	118	127	99	112	106	5,107
➢ the closest primary education facility	80	105	78	97	86	84.9	105	112	91	97	94	5,107
➢ the closest health facility	139	141	111	143	137	106	167	176	140	138	139	5,106
Proportion of HHs (%) walking over 4 hours both ways to reach:												
➢ the main place where they buy food	14	17	13	21	14	11.3	17	21	15	18	16	5,107
➢ the closest primary education facility	10	15	10	13	12	10	15	18	12	13	13	5,107
➢ the closest health facility	21	20	18	23	22*	14	23	29	21	22	21	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 10.3 b Household access to key amenities by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
	Mandera	**Marsabit**	**Turkana**	**Wajir**
Average time (minutes) travelled for HHs to walk to and from:				
➢ the main place where they buy food	59***	53***	192***	92
➢ the closest primary education facility	56**	55***	148*	98
➢ the closest health facility	114	107	201**	116
Proportion of HHs (%) walking over 4 hours both ways to reach:				
➢ the main place where they buy food	7**	4***	35***	13
➢ the closest primary education facility	8	3***	24*	13
➢ the closest health facility	18	10*	36**	17

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 10.3 c Community-level access to key amenities

Indicator	By (greater) district				By targeting mechanism (for whole population)			By treatment status		Overall	
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	CBT	SP	DR	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Estimate	N
Proportion of communities with (%):											
➢ No access road	1	0	0	9	0	0	7	0	5	2	242
➢ Mud/dirt access road	84	62	95**	80	91*	85	66*	91*	70	81	242
Proximity to district services:											
Average time travelled from community to:											
➢ Greater district centre	310	179*	301	189	156**	320	293	226	275	249	240
▪ Proportion of communities travelling >4 hours one way	42	42	59	28	18***	57.1	64*	40	50	44.6	240
➢ Nearest place to send and receive money (includes MPESA)	121***	187	290**	152	173	172	250	196	198	197	237
▪ Proportion of communities travelling >4 hours one way	12**	19	48*	27	16*	29	42	20	37	28	237
➢ Nearest post office	124**	220	266*	148	153	238	208	202	191	197	238
▪ Proportion of communities travelling >4 hours one way	10***	46	55*	23	17**	46	47	33	39	36	238
➢ Nearest livestock market	239	236	224	161	177	252	229	225	206	216	236

Indicator	By (greater) district				By targeting mechanism (for whole population)			By treatment status		Overall	
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	CBT	SP	DR	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Estimate	N
▪ Proportion of communities travelling >4 hours one way	32	29	38	26	19*	51**	28	29	34	32	236
Proximity to shops:											
Average time travelled from community centre to:											
➤ Nearest place where basic supplies can be bought	106	95	164*	98	113	118	130	120	119	120	240
▪ Proportion of communities travelling >4 hours one way	13	8	31*	18	18	17	21	16	21	19	240
➤ Nearest place where fruit and vegetables can be bought	169	140	237	140	138	193	213	185	170	178	234
▪ Proportion of communities travelling >4 hours one way	22	30	39	23	17*	36	40	29	30	30	234
Proportion of communities with at least one shop	90***	81	50***	83	76	79	66	73	74	74	242
Average number of *dukas*/kiosks in communities with at least one shop	15.3	6.0**	6.3**	15.5	12.4	8.6	11.7	11.5	10.4	11	130

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Community Questionnaire, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 11.1 a Household mobility status

Indicator	By treatment status (randomisation check)		CBT		SP		DR		Overall		Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Selected (type A/Bs)	Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Fully settled - % of HHs that are permanently settled	76	66	86	80	64**	80	63	58	72	75	73	5,108
Partially mobile - % of HHs where some members of the HH are permanently settled and others move around in order to herd livestock	17	24	7	9	25**	13	29	26	20*	14	17	5,108
Fully mobile - % of HHs where the whole HH moves around in order to herd livestock	8	9	6	11	11	7	9	17	8	11	10	5,108

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 11.1 b Household mobility status by consumption expenditure quintile

Indicator	By consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	1 (poorest)	2	3	4	5	Estimate	N
Fully settled - % of HHs that are permanently settled	70	68	68*	75	84**	73	5,106
Partially mobile - % of HHs where some members of the HH are permanently settled and others move around in order to herd livestock	25**	23**	20	11***	8**	17	5,106
Fully mobile - % of HHs where the whole HH moves around in order to herd livestock	5*	9	12*	14	8	10	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Consumption quintiles are defined according to the distribution of consumption expenditure over the study population such that each quintile contains 20% of the population.

Table A. 11.1 c Household mobility status by district

Indicator	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir
Fully settled - % of HHs that are permanently settled	79	72	78	62
Partially mobile - % of HHs where some members of the HH are permanently settled and others move around in order to herd livestock	13	25	17	14
Fully mobile - % of HHs where the whole HH moves around in order to herd livestock	8	3**	5	25**

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 11.2 a Proportion of households within communities and types of household members undertaking migration

Indicator	By treatment status (randomisation check)		By (greater) district				Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N[1]
Proportion of population within a village that are mobile pastoralists (%):								
➢ 0%	57	38	28	43	80***	26	47	243
➢ 1-20%	16	25	25	33	12	12	20	243
➢ 20-50%	20	23	33	21	7***	31	21	243
➢ 50-100%	8	15	14	3**	0.5***	31**	11	243
Mean % of mobile pastoralists that moved in most recent three migrations	22	27	41***	22	15**	9***	25	297
% of migrations where								
➢ HHs moved in big groups	47	32	45	32	78***	27	40	285
➢ HHs moved in smaller groups	52	63	48	67	22***	73*	58	285
➢ HHs moved individually	1	4	6	1	0	0	3	285
% of migrations where HHs split	90	81	90	93*	88	68***	85	297
Specific HH members moving with the livestock… (*% of migrations where HHs split*)								
➢ young married couples	11	10	7	5	46	9	11	243
➢ warriors/young men	96**	78	75	95	100***	90	87	243

Indicator	By treatment status (randomisation check)		By (greater) district				Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N[1]
➢ male children ('boys')	32	31	67***	1***	53	2***	31	243
➢ women	18	19	43*	1**	15	3**	19	243
➢ female children ('girls')	17	21	35**	0***	52*	2***	19	243

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Community Questionnaire, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) The migration estimates refer to the previous three migrations reported by the community where many of the mobile pastoralists in the community moved. (4) Estimates relating to types of HH members moving with livestock can sum to more than 100% because HHs may have multiple types of members moving with livestock.

Table A. 11.2 b Migration duration, destination and distance from 'home' community

Indicator	By treatment status (randomisation check)		By (greater) district				Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N
Mean length of time of a 'migration' (months)	3	4	3	6*	4	3	4	195
% of migrations where people moved to the same place (rather than scattering)	25	27	14*	42*	15	29	26	297
Mean distance (in km) of the migration from 'home' community	119	99	122	102	159	66**	109	186

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Community Questionnaire, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) The migration estimates refer to the previous three migrations reported by the community where many of the mobile pastoralists in the community moved.

Table A. 11.2 c Resource flows between settled and mobile groups

Indicator	By treatment status (randomisation check)		By (greater) district				Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N
Mean number of times (per month) communication took place between those who migrated and those in the usual place of residence	3	3	3	3	1***	4**	3	297
Resources transferred to the shifted mobile pastoralists from the settled community… *(% of migrations in which the resource was shifted)*								
➢ Cash	58	39	59	3***	31	89***	48	297
➢ Water	6**	21	10	2***	4*	36***	14	297
➢ Food aid	92**	76	78	90	84	85	84	297
➢ Other food	4	4	9	0*	7	0*	4	297
➢ Milk	20	35	9**	88***	0***	0.2***	28	297
➢ Diesel	2	5	0	10	0	3	4	297
➢ Livestock	27	49	27	90***	2***	13***	39	297
➢ Medicines	51	32	75***	5***	71***	22*	41	297
➢ Other (specify)	7	4	0**	0**	57***	0**	6	297
Resources transferred from the shifted mobile pastoralists from the settled community… *(% of migrations in which the resource was shifted)*								
➢ Cash	30*	7	24	29	0.1***	2**	17	297
➢ Water	9	1	13	0	0	0	5	297
➢ Food aid	3	9	11	0**	0*	9	6	297

Indicator	By treatment status (randomisation check)		By (greater) district				Overall	
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir	Estimate	N
➢ Other food	11	18	42***	0**	0**	0**	15	297
➢ Milk	73	59	71	80	58	46*	65	297
➢ Diesel	0	4	0	0	0	8	2	297
➢ Livestock	94**	74	81	76	95*	90	83	297
➢ Medicines	2	7	7	0*	8	6	5	297
➢ Other (specify)	12	3	0*	0*	72***	0*	7	297

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Community Questionnaire, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) The migration estimates refer to the previous three migrations reported by the community where many of the mobile pastoralists in the community moved.

Table A. 12.1 a Savings, borrowing and credit by beneficiary status

Indicator	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	CBT Selected (type A/Bs)	CBT Non-selected (type C/Ds)	SP Selected (type A/Bs)	SP Non-selected (type C/Ds)	DR Selected (type A/Bs)	DR Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Overall Selected (type A/Bs)	Overall Non-selected (type C/Ds)	Estimate	N
Savings												
Proportion of HHs that currently have cash savings	6	5	7**	20	4***	18	5	8	5***	17	11	5,107
Mean HH cash savings, for HHs with savings	9,556	11,575							10,393	33,070	27,327	431
Of those that save, proportion of HHs that save that money with a bank or formal financial institution	24	26							25*	47	41	431
Of those that save, proportion of HHs that save their money with an informal savings scheme, NGO/MFI or cooperative/SACCO	2.5	3							2.7	2.6	2.6	431
Of those that save, proportion of HHs that save their money at home	69	67							68	49	54	431
Mean total HH cash savings, across all HHs	545	570	268	9,448	470*	3,803	850	942	557	5,543	2,976	5,107
Borrowing												
Proportion of HHs that have borrowed money in the last 12 months	13	10	14	20	10***	22	12	11	12*	19	15	5,107

| Indicator | Randomisation checks | | By beneficiary status | | | | | | | | Overall | |
| | By treatment status | | CBT | | SP | | DR | | Overall | | | |
	Treatment group (type A HHs)	Control group (type B HHs)	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	(type A/Bs) Selected	(type C/Ds) Non-selected	Estimate	N
Proportion of HHs in debt at time of interview (of those that borrowed in last 12 months)	69	79							73	65	68	662
Mean HH debt at time of interview, of those in debt	3,158	3,240							3,189	2,079	2,527	662
Mean total HH debt, across all HHs	425	331	323	221	358	724	446	220	383	392	387	5,107
Credit												
Proportion of HHs that bought something on credit in last 3 months previous to interview	61	61	59	59	65	57	61	58	61	58	60	5,107
Mean credit (from shops) outstanding at time of interview	4,202	3,553	3,458*	2,463	3,918	3,172	4,284*	3,310	3,909**	2,897	3,431	3,144
Total credit outstanding, among all HHs	2,560	2,172	2,055	1,449	2,529	1,809	2,595	1,906	2,385*	1,678	2,042	5,107

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 12.1 b Saving, borrowing and credit by quintile

Indicator	Consumption expenditure quintile					Overall	
	1	2	3	4	5	Estimate	N
Savings							
Proportion of HHs that currently have cash savings	5***	7**	6***	15	23***	11	5,106
Total HH cash savings, among all HHs - saving or not	128*	356*	296*	3985	10119**	2,976	5,106
Borrowing							
Proportion of HHs that have borrowed money in the last 12 months	15	16	15	20	11*	15	5,106
Proportion of HHs in debt at time of interview (whether borrowed or not)	11	12	11	11	8	11	5,106
Mean total HH debt, across all HHs	146***	270	336	478	706	387	5,106
Credit							
Proportion of HHs that bought something on credit in last 3 months previous to interview	40***	57	69***	68***	63	60	5,106
Mean credit (from shops) outstanding at time of interview	16,369***	24,859***	3,620	4,350**	4,236**	3,432	3,143
Total credit outstanding, among all HHs that bought on credit or not	662***	1,410***	2,500**	2,977**	2,666**	2,042	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%. (3) Consumption quintiles are defined according to the distribution of consumption expenditure over the study population such that each quintile contains 20% of the population.

Table A. 12.1 c Savings, borrowing and credit by district

	District variations			
	By (greater) district			
Indicator	Mandera	Marsabit	Turkana	Wajir
Savings				
Proportion of HHs that currently have cash savings	10	16	16**	1***
Borrowing				
Proportion of HHs that have borrowed money in the last 12 months	5***	13	30***	8**
Mean HH debt at time of interview, of those in debt	4,491*	5,129	571***	6,411**
Credit				
Proportion of HHs that bought something on credit in last 3 months previous to interview	74***	45***	40***	86***
Mean credit (from shops) outstanding at time of interview	4,046	1,327***	485***	5,774***
Total HH cash savings, among all HHs	1,100	10,377*	473	214*
Total HH debt, among all HHs	240*	665	173***	498
Total credit outstanding, among all HHs	3,013*	598***	193***	4,949***

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010. Notes: (1) The 'N' column denotes the overall sample size. The sample sizes for the disaggregated estimates in other columns are based on smaller sample sizes. (2) Asterisks (*) indicate that an estimate is significantly different to the relevant comparator, as explained in Section 1 of the report: *** = 99%; ** = 95%; * = 90%.

Table A. 12.1 d Savings, borrowing and credit by mobility status

Indicator	By mobility status			Overall	
	Fully settled	**Partially settled**	**Fully mobile**	**Estimate**	**N[1]**
Savings					
Proportion of HHs who currently have cash savings	14***	3***	2***	11	5,106
Total HH cash savings, among HHs saving	28,420*	10,449**	20,276	27,327	5,106
Proportion of HHs who save their money with a bank or formal institution	42	33	60	41	5,106
Proportion of HHs who save their money with an informal savings scheme	3	0**	7	3	5,106
Proportion of HHs who save their money at home	54	67	29	54	5,106
Borrowing					
Proportion of HHs who have borrowed money in the last 12 months	17*	10*	10	15	5,106
Proportion of HHs who were in debt at time of interview (whether borrowed or not)	68	63	81	68	5,106
HH debt at time of interview	2,570	2,052	2,813	2,527	5,106
Credit					
Proportion of HHs who bought something on credit in last 3 months previous to interview	58	57	74***	60	5,106
Total credit outstanding, among HHs who bought on credit	3,525	2,922	3,581	3,431	5,106

Source: HSNP M&E Baseline Evaluation Survey, Sep 2009-Oct 2010.