51601

United United
Economic Commission for Africa

ECA/MRAG/96/86/MR

Multidisciplinary
Regional Advisory Group

REPORT ON MISSION TO THE CENTRAL BUREAU OF STATISTICS (KENYA) TO REVIEW THE SECOND DRAFT OF THE REPORT ON MULTIPLE INDICATOR CLUSTER SURVEY, 1996 17 - 18 OCTOBER 1996

By
Parmeet Singh
Senior Regional Adviser on Organization
and Management of National Statistical System

NOVEMBER 1996
ADDIS ABABA

ECA/MRAG/96/86/MR

United Nations
Economic Commission for Africa
Multidisciplinary Regional Advisory Group

Report on Mission to the Central Bureau of Statistics, Kenya to review the second draft of the Report on Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey, 1996

17 - 18 October, 1996

By

Parmeet Singh
Senior Regional Adviser on Organization and Management of National Statistical System

Addis Ababa
November 1996

I. BACKGROUND

The Regional Adviser had from 5 - 13 September, 1996 participated in a joint UNICEF/ECA mission to Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) Kenya to review and revise the 1st Draft of CBS's report on Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS) 1996. That mission had participated in a series of working meetings with the staff of CBS and a representative of the Economic Association of Kenya reviewing each chapter of the 1st Draft. At the end of each working meeting a number of suggestions and recommendations were agreed on - which were subsequently recorded in the proceedings of each meeting[1]

CBS it was agreed would work on a 2nd Draft - which it was assumed could be presented and reviewed by a National Workshop of pertinent users of MICS 1996 data - especially from the functional ministries and departments of the Government.

II. TERMS OF REFERENCE

The Regional Adviser undertook a follow-up mission to CBS to review and comment on an updated draft - 2nd Draft of CBS's report on MICs 1996. The mission was undertaken on 17 - 18 October, 1996. Terms of Reference of the mission are detailed on the attached **Appendix I.**

III. THE MISSION

The Regional Adviser arrived in Nairobi on the evening of 16 October, en route to Addis from Lusaka. The whole of 17 October was spent on going through the 2nd Draft of MICS 1996 report - which was delivered to the Regional Adviser on his arrival in Nairobi. A copy of the 2nd Draft is being retained in the archives of MRAG.

---

[1] Parmeet Singh. Mission Report ECA/MRAG/96/64/MR

On 18 October,the Regional Adviser attended a joint UNICEF/CBS meeting which deliberated on his comments on the 2nd Draft.

IV. MISSION ASSESSMENT

The 2nd Draft which had been prepared by CBS incorporated by and large most of the comments that had been offered by Messrs Gareth Jones and the Regional Adviser on the 1st Draft during the preceding mission. The 2nd Draft, it was expected, was to be presented to a National Workshop and the intention of the Regional Adviser was not to offer further comments on it, but to participate in the National Workshop as an observer, with the specific objective of assessing the reception of the 2nd Draft by the national users of MICS 1996 data - particularly users from functional ministries and departments of Kenya Government.

However the decision to convene the National Workshop was postponed pending a further internal UNICEF/CBS review of the 2nd Draft. It was in this context that the Regional Adviser undertook yet another review of CBS's report on MICS 1996 - the 2nd Draft this time. A note detailing his comments, which were offered at this joint UNICEF/CBS meeting is here attached as **Appendix II**.

It would seem to appear that CBS is content with producing the report as a report on MICS 1996 - as a contractual obligation and is "shying" away from the task of writing a more analytical report in a narrative style. Most CSOs in this region do have problems with report writing and the Regional Adviser wishes CBS was to grasp the opportunity of converting the report on MICS 1996 into such a narrative report. In that context it would be appropriate for Economic Association of Kenya to lend its hand if need be. However if CBS feels reluctant for what-ever reasons to do so - time constraint, capacity limitation etc. etc, then the Economic Association should take on the burden. As a bottom line the Regional Adviser would prefer MICS should see the light of day in context of a narrative report rather then as a statistical

compendium on MICS 1996. Be that as it may the Report on MICS 1996 even as it stands now i.e. the 2nd Draft, with some editing to clear up some of the oddities noted by the Regional Adviser could be presented at a National Workshop.

V. MISSION OUTPUTS

The main output of the mission was the comments by the Regional Adviser on the 2nd Draft of the report by CBS on MICS 1996. These as noted above are detailed on attached Appendix II. A brief report on this meeting at which these comments were presented is detailed on attached **Appendix III** - prepared by CBS.

VI. FOLLOW-UP

The Regional Adviser is keen to have the report - in what-ever form, reviewed by a National Workshop and he feels he could participate in such a workshop usefully.

MSF-IN 828/09

FAX TRANSMISSION

Date : September 30, 1996

To : Parmeet Singh
Regional Advisor
UNECA
Addis Ababa
[illegible]

From : Nazim Mitha
Project Officer, M&E
UNICEF, KCO

Subject : Draft Report: Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey and Mid-Decade Review in Kenya

During your last visit to Kenya, UNICEF KCO had requested your technical assistance in improving the first draft of the Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey (MICS). Together with Gareth Jones, Chief, Statistics and Monitoring, UNICEF HQ, you had commented extensively on the structure as well as the various technical sections of the survey. Your detailed input especially as regards the methodological/statistical corrections was extremely helpful for us.

I understand that you are travelling to Zambia for a workshop in October, this year. As per our conversation, it may be possible for you to stop over in Nairobi. I am proposing a workshop with The Central Bureau of Statistics with your involvement as a resource person to discuss the Draft Report. The Bureau would like you to comment on the new draft (based on your earlier comments) and as such I am planning a follow-up internal meeting for 18th October. Thus, once again, I would kindly request you to join us for this follow-up session. Your feedback will improve this draft report so that it can be distributed to GOK/UNICEF KCO officers for final comments and approval.

Please confirm your availability by fax and do let me know if the date for the workshop is suitable. You, do, however, understand that there are no cost implications for UNICEF KCO for your participation or your extended stay.

Once again, we thank you for your commitment to this activity.

Best regards.

cc: C. Wilson
Representative

E. Gulunna
Programme Coordinator

Comments on 2nd Draft of CBS's report on Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey, 1996
by
Parmeet Singh

I. Introduction

The 2nd Draft which has been prepared by the CBS incorporates by and large most of the comments that had been offered by Messers Gareth Jones and Parmeet Singh on the 1st Draft. The 2nd Draft it was expected would to be presented to a National workshop, and the intention was not to offer further comments on it but to participate in the National Workshop, more as an observer, with the specific objective of assessing the reception of the 2nd Draft by the national users of MICS 1996 data.

However, the decision to convene the National Workshop was postponed pending a further internal UNICEF/CBS review of the 2nd Draft. The following comments on the 2nd Draft were offered at this UNICEF/CBS review meeting on 18 October 1996.

II. Overall Comments on 2nd Draft

1. The 2nd Draft is certainly a significant improvement on the 1st. It has a more pertinent structure and the content is more focused - on Children. Also it has incorporated all the definitions on terms such as "fully protected mother", "gross enrolment rate", "safe and unsafe water" etc., to make the text more meaningful for an informed layman. (In this context could the "Z scores" on nutritional definition

of status be also elaborated)

2. The text of the 2nd Draft has incorporated welcome cross references to a range of programs and policy issues -- to make the content matter pertinently relevant. Listed below are a selection of such cross references.

- Page 27 last sentence
- Page 51 first para
- Page 56 last para
- Page 58 last para
- Page 59 last para
- Page 63 para 5, last two sentences

All this adds-up to good stuff to make the text topical highlighting the relevance of MICS data to day to day reality.

3. Most statistical investigations like MICS make a "discovery". MICS 1996 has discovered three phenomena -- a large proportion, 63.5 per cent of mothers in rural areas have had primary school level education: 61.6 per cent of mothers immunised against tetanus carry antenatal cards; and 84.2 per cent of the households in rural areas have "safe", sanitation.

The text should give much more significance to the relevance of these three figures in context of their impact

on socio - demographic policy and trends.

4. A comment on the veracity of these three figures is called for. The accuracy of these three figures can be verified by ascertaining the methodology and techniques deployed in collection of these data, and by cross checking these data with comparable figures from alternative sources. On methodology and techniques of data collection the figures do pass the test of reliability. There are however no alternative sources of base line data to cross check these figures with. Under such circumstances, the done procedure is to present the data to a critical group of "informed" individuals for comment and assessment. It is strongly recommended that these three figures in question be so wetted as a part of the deliberations of the National Workshop (see below). Were the National Workshop to express reservations on the accuracy of these three data the next measure to take would be to effect a limited number of random checks in the field.

5. It is good to see a chapter on "Conclusions and Recommendations". The text in the 2nd Draft, however, is short on recommendations.

6. What should the character and structure of the "final" report be. As far as the CBSs and the Economic Associations inputs are concerned CBS would appear to have fulfilled its commitment, given that CBSs contractual

obligation was to conduct a MICS and to report on the results. CBS can be said to have done its bit.

But the report ie the 2nd Draft is still a "MICS Report" and not a report on the "Status of Children in Kenya in 1995". Should that not be an objective? if so it is recommended that the Report on MICS 1996 delivered by the CBS be further recast into a Report on the "Status of Children in Kenya in 1995". The status report would not for instance feature a chapter on survey methodology in the main body of the report but (perhaps as an appendix); or for that matter contain a review of "Mothers by Children Ever Born, Children Dead and Probability of Children Dying Based on the Trussel Version of Brass Method"!!. Of course such a review is well in place in a statistical report like the 2nd Draft. Hence a plea -- could the Economic Association take-up the CBSs report and do the necessary restructuring to recast it into a report on the Status of Children in Kenya, in 1995.

Both the CBS and the Economic Association could still there after claim joint ownership to the "Status" report--or would that be not so.

It is this status report which should be presented and reviewed by the National Workshop.

III. Comments Points of Detail On the 2nd Draft

1. At various places in the 2nd Draft the text does not clearly bringout the message that is intended to be communicated. Three instances of such text are noted below:

   - Page 18 para two
   - Page 20 para two
   - Page 22 last sentence

2. The reason to bold the last sentence on page 23 is not obvious.

3. The presentation of tabular data on review of the drop out rates fails to clearly bring out the magnitude of this phenomenon -- for a layman. Hence, could an informed layman inferred from Table 4.6 that the drop out rate was "widespread" as noted in the last sentence on page 25. Also the differentials in gross enrolment rates from MICs and from sources in Ministry of Education should be discussed.

4. The opening statement to Chapter 4 on Education is very pertinent and very well articulated. The rest of the text in the Chapter should sustain it and be consistent with it.

5. There is an imbalance in the review of incidents of

morbidity in pages 31-33. While a full page is devoted to the review ARI -- with an incidence rate of 1.5 per cent, no comparable review is included in the text for Malaria and Common Colds with respective incident rates of 16.4 per cent and 14.7 per cent.

6. Mid-decade Goals have been noted in the chapters on Health (Immunisation) and Water and Sanitation, but not in the chapters on Education and Nutrition.

These are essentially points of detail and concern editing -- but they would improve the 2nd Draft of the report on MICS 1996. It is recommended that the report be edited by one individual to give it consistency in style and presentation.

IV. Overall Recommendations

1. CBSs report on "Multiple Indicator Cluster Survey, 1996" should be restructured into a report on "Status of Children in Kenya, in 1995".

2. A National Workshop should review the report in its "Status" version.

3. However, if the Status version cannot or is not intended to be produced, a dully edited version of the 2nd Draft of the CBS report on MICS 1996 should be presented to the National Workshop.

187/012

MEETING FOR MULTIPLE INDICATOR CLUSTER REPORT HELD AT HERUFI HOUSE ON 18/10/96.

PARTICIPANTS

1. M.K Chemengich	Director	CBS
2. Parmeet Singh	Regional Advisor	UNECA
3. Nazim Mitha	Project Officer M&E	UNICEF,KCO
4. J.B Kirimi	Deputy Director	CBS
5. Rekha Shori	Senior Economist	CBS

The meeting was initiated by UNICEF office to discuss the Multiple Cluster Survey Report that presented results of the survey undertaken in April/May 1996.

The following comments were raised ;

1. Mr. Singh said the report has been restructured as recommended by the advisors during the Task force meetings held in September.

2. The report read well and now had focus as linkage with policy and programmes in the Kenyan context had been presented for all sectors. The definations that were not documented in the draft have been added . For example, definations for fully protected mother, Gross enrolment rate and Safe water have been presented.

3. Mr. Nazim from UNICEF asked Mr. Singh's opinion as to the validity of data quality and capture presented in the report. There was a consensus that the data represented the Kenyan situation in reference to the Mid-Decade goals and by and large the data compared well with the Welfare Monitoring data and Census data.

4. Mr.Singh felt that the inputs as required from CBS were complete and any further changes to the document could now be effected by the Kenya Economic Association. In this context Mr. Singh had the following to note:

i) Some of the text needed editing to clarify and highlight the message being communicated eg.

2nd Paragraph on Pg. 18.
2nd Paragraph on Pg. 20.
last sentence on Pg. 22.

ii) The report contained three very specific and significant findings which merrited being featured more prominently. These include the proportion 63.5 % of rural mothers with primary education compared to 45.8 % in the urban areas ; Households with safe excreta disposal 88.1 % and 61.1 percent of mothers with antenatal cards

iii) Explain further the reason GER's for MISC 1996 are different compared to the GER's from MOE .

iv) Mr. Singh felt that the introduction to the Education chapter was pertinent to the programme and policy issues. However, there was need to ensure that the rest of the chapter re-enforced the opening paragraph.

v) For the chapter on Health, it was felt that ARI incidence had received greater emphasis as compared to the other diseases. An explanation for this was needed in the text.

vi) Achievements and targeting of the Mid-Decade goals to be emphasised in the chapters on Education and Nutrition.

5. The meeting discussed the issue of the focus of the document .The document as it stands now is a report on the Multiple Cluster Survey data .It was upto the Kenya Economic Association to re-structure it into a Status report on the Children in Kenya in the Mid -Decade .

6. It was recommended that the findings should there after be presented at a national forum for dissemination at a future date.