

Cost-effectiveness in humanitarian aid and development: resilience programming

Athanasios Manis, PhD

4 October 2018

Question

What evidence is there that resilience in humanitarian response is cost-effective with respect to improving humanitarian outcomes and reducing the cost of responses?

Contents

1. Summary of findings
2. Methodology
3. Annotated bibliography

The K4D helpdesk service provides brief summaries of current research, evidence, and lessons learned. Helpdesk reports are not rigorous or systematic reviews; they are intended to provide an introduction to the most important evidence related to a research question. They draw on a rapid desk-based review of published literature and consultation with subject specialists.

Helpdesk reports are commissioned by the UK Department for International Development and other Government departments, but the views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, the UK Government, K4D or any other contributing organisation. For further information, please contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

1. Summary of findings

The results of the review show a gap in the literature in terms of providing conclusive evidence/data and analysis about the cost-effectiveness of resilience-related responses. Most of the reports, papers, briefs and notes that were reviewed tend to make normative assertions as to how important it is to provide humanitarian assistance early enough, and to direct efforts towards helping to protect, restore and improve livelihood systems with the objective of building resilience for populations that experienced humanitarian disasters. They provide information as to what initiatives have been developed, where and how much funding they received and by which donors. However, very few provide analysis of the impact of resilience-related responses and even fewer provide data and analyses of cost-effectiveness. Having said that, drawing on these studies, one can indirectly get a sense of conceptual, empirical and methodological challenges when it comes to designing and executing research over resilience and cost-effectiveness.

Only two studies were found that addressed the issue of cost-effectiveness: Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery, 2018; and DFID, 2012. The first report of 2018 discusses how “building back better” in the form of stronger, faster and more inclusively could reduce the cost of future disasters in several countries as well as globally. The report concludes that resilience building in terms of better planning and constructing can not only reduce future costs but can also ameliorate the effects of damage. Nevertheless, the report has a limited scope and does not compare cost-effectiveness of ‘building back better’ with other forms of resilience-related actions, such as developing training programmes and boosting the entrepreneurial spirit among individuals. The second report, written in 2012, provides evidence about how the effectiveness of resilience-building actions can significantly outweigh their cost. However, the scope of the study is limited, focusing on only two case studies (Kenya and Ethiopia) and one issue area (response and resilience for pastoralists in the face of drought). It cannot necessarily be assumed that the conclusions of this report are transferable to other issues and countries.

Although the rest of the documents that were reviewed did not present specific evidence/data regarding cost-effectiveness, they manage to highlight indirectly certain conceptual, empirical and methodological challenges vis-à-vis the study of cost-effectiveness of resilience-building measures. To begin with, despite the fact that there is a common understanding that resilience refers more or less to restoring and improving livelihood systems, there is a wide range of issue areas within which resilience can be discussed, making it difficult for researchers to prioritise among numerous different initiatives. It will be difficult to envisage plausible conclusions about the actions that could be most appropriate in specific cases and issues.

The BRACED report (2018) raised further significant empirical and methodological questions. It showed how levels of overall resilience change over time and that perceptions of recovery differ between female and male-headed households. This has two implications for future research that tries to address cost-effectiveness of resilience-building initiatives. The first is whether data gathering reflects effectiveness over a period of time or at a specific moment. The second is that the resilience measurement in terms of effectiveness and impact should take into consideration the ‘inside’ story as well – the perceptions of individuals and communities affected by disasters, so that externally defined measurements reflect the realities on the ground more accurately and plausibly.

2. Methodology

This literature review is a result of 5 days of desk research into the available evidence about whether resilience-building measures in the field of humanitarian aid and development are cost-effective. The ALNAP Humanitarian Evaluation, Learning and Performance (HELP) database was employed to extract secondary sources to be reviewed. Specifically, the review aims first at examining whether the literature identifies resilience-related initiatives that are ‘value for money’ within the resilience paradigm and secondly whether resilience is more cost-effective compared to other responses in the domain of humanitarian aid and development. Finally, it tries to identify conceptualisations, methodologies and frameworks that define the cost-effectiveness analysis in the literature.

Towards that end, the ALNAP database was searched with the keyword ‘cost effectiveness resilience’, and the search returned 4269 results. The search was then focused on the most recent (2018) work, returning 409 results from which 12 reports, 1 policy brief, 1 discussion paper, 1 working paper and 1 policy note were considered as relevant for the review.

Further searches were conducted on Google Scholar using the keywords ‘cost effectiveness resilience’ and ‘humanitarian resilience cost effectiveness’ with no specific dates selected. The first returned 674,000 results and the latter 384,000 results. Using the ‘relevance’ setting for the ‘humanitarian resilience cost effectiveness’ and given time and access constraints, the first 2 pages were scanned through. Two more studies, 1 report and 1 working paper, were deemed to be relevant to cost-effectiveness in terms of resilience and were added to the sample.

3. Annotated bibliography

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
Building Back Better: Achieving Resilience through Stronger, Faster, and More Inclusive Post-Disaster Reconstruction	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/127215.pdf	June 2018	How to strengthen resilience through a better reconstruction process	Report	Global Facility for Disaster Reduction and Recovery (GFDRR)	<p>Desk research and usage of computation analysis to produce estimates as to how much better countries and communities do when they build better during the recovery period.</p> <p>The computation analysis covers 149 countries. That covers 95.5% of the world's population and 94% of global GDP.</p>	<p>The report builds upon the 2017 Unbreakable report, which showed that disaster losses affect disproportionately poor countries. Most importantly, the 2017 report highlighted that the overall impact of a disaster on well-being depends on how losses of assets affect income and consumption during recovery and reconstruction phase and who is affected by a disaster.</p> <p>The current report presents estimates as to how much less assets and livelihood losses communities and countries that are hit by disasters more intensely and frequently incur if they “build back better”. Furthermore, the report argues for faster and inclusive reconstruction, which means that poor segments of a society will be able to recover faster and not fall into poverty traps. The report also highlights that building better cannot replace measures for disaster prevention and preparedness. However, the benefits of resilient recovery can be integrated into comprehensive disaster risk management frameworks, so that assets and livelihoods become less vulnerable in future shocks.</p> <p>All in all, the report identifies “building back better” with initiatives to repair assets more resilient (building back stronger) and make the recovery process shorter and more efficient (building back faster), while the poorest and most vulnerable parts of the society receive the support for a full recovery (building back more inclusively).</p> <p>The aggregate estimates of the report show that:</p>

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - if all countries were to “build back stronger” in the next 20 years ensuring that assets are rebuilt to resist hazards with a 50-year return-period, then well-being losses can be reduced by 12% or the equivalent of US \$65 billion annually. Countries that built either stronger or reformed in a way to build stronger after major catastrophes are Nepal, China, Fiji and Dominica - if the average reconstruction speed is reduced by two thirds – while keeping the quality of reconstruction the same – then global well-being losses could be reduced by 14%; the equivalent to US\$ 75 billion per year in annual global consumption. Countries that built faster or reformed to build faster are Indonesia, Turkey and Colombia - if all countries could provide to the poor citizens the same level of post-disaster support that developed countries can offer, then global well-being losses due to natural disasters could be reduced by 9%; the equivalent to US\$52 billion increase in annual global consumption. This percentage is higher in countries with high inequality, such as Angola, Benin, the DRC, the Republic of Congo. A country that has tried to provide inclusive recovery is Fiji. <p>If implemented together, the three strategies could reduce the current well-being losses by 31%; the equivalent of US\$ 173 billion per year</p> <p>All in all, the report maintains that a better recovery after a disaster not only can reduce the impact of future disasters but also reduce the impact of the disaster that caused damages in the</p>

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							first place. In addition, new construction in developing countries should take into consideration natural hazards. Resilient building standards should continuously and systematically be applied to new and existing facilities.
UNHCR Syria: Enhancing Resilience and Self-Reliance in Communities – End of Year Report 2017	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/UNHCR%20Syria%27s%20End%20of%20Year%20Report%202017.pdf	June 2018	The results of the UNHCR operations in Syria in 2017 in terms of saving lives, protecting civilians and increasing the resilience of the Syrian people	Report	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)	Desk review and interviews with IDPs	<p>In terms of resilience programming, according to the report, UNHCR supported 1,069 individuals by providing families and communities with business start-up grants and training, such as the provision of 375 equipped beehives to 75 IDPs, targeting the most vulnerable who had become unemployed due to the humanitarian crisis during the war. This helped to reduce dependency on aid, avoid exploitative economic practices and reducing vulnerabilities</p> <p>In addition, the report highlights that UNHCR provided 2,000 livelihood toolkits in 2016 for plumbers and carpenters through tradesmen all over Syria aiming at supporting income and resilience of families and communities. After investigating the impact of those kits, it was found that they improved the income of the beneficiaries and their families (no specific data is provided).</p> <p>Subsequently, the UNHCR in collaboration with IDPs identified nine types of livelihood kits that could help them to build resilience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plumbing kits - Carpenter kits - Electrician kits - Sewing kits - Hairdressing kits for females - Hairdressing kits for males - Painting kits

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Blacksmith kits - Air-conditioning maintenance kits - Computer maintenance kits - Mobile phone maintenance kits <p>Finally, the report provides a bullet point summary of the gaps and challenges in Syria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Limited access to population in need especially in besieged and hard to reach areas - Bureaucratic constraints - Lack of reliable information and credible assessments - Lack of clear monitoring approach and reports - Limited data (and/or access to/sharing of data on needs) - Limited beneficiaries' data-base being made available to actors leading to the inability to properly monitor and verify assistance delivery - Limited capacity (training needs, skills, knowledge) of local partners
'Leaving No One Behind' through Enabling Climate-Resilient Economic Development in Dryland Regions	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/12306.pdf	July 2018	How economic development in semi-arid regions can become more resilient and more equitable to climate change	Policy brief	Overseas Development Institute (ODI)	It summarises results of a five-year research conducted by the PRISE consortium in Senegal, Burkina Faso, Kenya, Tanzania, Pakistan,	<p>Drylands are home to 1 in 3 people of the world's population, and about half of them live in poverty. Low economic growth, shortages of water, food, and energy, and frequent climatic shocks characterise drylands. Accordingly, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development has three main goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ending absolute poverty - Stopping the group and/or area-based discrimination that has resulted in unequal outcomes for some

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
						Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan	<p>disadvantaged or marginalised populations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - and prioritising and fast-tracking action for the furthest behind <p>The policy brief identifies the following challenges for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 'Bad geography' meaning infertile soils that are prone to degradation, limited supplies of 'blue water' in rivers and lakes that can be used for irrigation to compensate for low and unreliable rainfall, and being in landlocked interiors that limit access to markets - In addition, 'bad geography' creates the view that marginalises these regions and their communities as areas and people that cannot drive economic development and progress towards achieving the SDGs - This view also ignores the importance of dryland agriculture to the national economies of the countries and to their local workforce, such as in Kenya and Pakistan - Finally, drylands tend to be highly mobile based on livestock and pastoralism, while governments tend to support sedentary agriculture <p>The PRISE research suggests two policy areas for government investment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Focusing on supporting major productive sectors in drylands that will build on the strengths, dynamics and characteristics of dryland systems

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Governments creating an enabling environment for the private sector, including larger firms and formal and informal micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) <p>The report concludes that these investments can help towards a climate-resilient economic development.</p> <p>The report does not provide evidence as to how cost-effective these initiatives are.</p>
Cash Alliance's Food Security and Livelihoods Project in Somalia: Learning, Review, and Impact Assessment	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/nrc_cash-alliance_final-report_v6_clean.pdf	April 2018	Evaluation and learning research of cash transfer programme in Somalia as part of the response to the ongoing drought in Somalia	Project review/Report	Five organisations who had applied for the ECHO 2017 Humanitarian Implementation Plan joined together to form the Cash Alliance (CA): Concern Worldwide (CWW), Cooperazione Internazionale (COOPI), Save the Children (SCI), Danish Refugee Council (DRC) and Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC). Forcier Consulting is the	<p>A mixed-methods approach was used. The qualitative survey included 55 districts in Somalia. The qualitative part was based on key informant interviews and focus group discussions.</p> <p>Desk review of all relevant documents, including project proposals, log frames, baseline reports, progress reports, success stories, relevant secondary</p>	<p>Food security and resilience are the primary goals of the cash transfer programme in Somalia. The project used two metrics in order to measure the effectiveness of the programme:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cash transfer experience for beneficiaries - Key food indicators <p>The Coping Strategies Index (CSI) was used to measure the frequency and severity of behaviours and strategies related to coping and resilience, or the ability to anticipate risks, absorb shocks, and adapt to evolving conditions.</p> <p>The report evaluated the cash transfer programme among others in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability and assigned scores to each one of these categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The programme was considered as highly efficient by the majority of beneficiaries, meaning that the cash process was timely and simple (quantitative survey) - The qualitative results indicated that the programme improved food security and

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
					author of the report.	literature and grey literature.	<p>resilience by providing them with the opportunity to purchase food and pay back debt. Therefore, it was considered as highly effective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - In terms of impact, it was found that the cash transfer programme did not help beneficiaries beyond food security and resilience. Social impact was low considering that when cash transfer was used for healthcare purposes, this meant that the beneficiaries cut down on the amount of food they bought per month. Some anecdotal evidence showed that very few of them managed to open their own informal shops and continue generating their own income with the use of cash transfer - Sustainability of food security and resilience is evaluated as low. It was found that food security scores were lower after the cash transfer programme was reduced compared to food security scores collected during Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM), probably showing that beneficiaries' food security and resilience had not sustainably improved <p>Overall, the results of the programme are mixed. The cash transfer programme achieves resilience partially.</p> <p>The report suggests that household sizes is a key intervening variable that influences the impact of cash transfer on food security, resilience, and social needs.</p>
Global Humanitarian	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/co	June 2018	Understanding humanitarian financing and	Report	Development Initiatives (DI)	Desk research of what donors and	The report does not provide any evidence or data on cost-effectiveness of resilience and at the same time, it highlights that the lack of subnational

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
Assistance Report 2018	ntent/resource/files/main/GHA-Report-2018.pdf		related aid flows			organisations report as humanitarian assistance	data “masks significant local variations in community resilience”.
Strengthening the Rule of Law and Human Rights for Sustaining Peace and Fostering Development – 2017 Global Programme Annual	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/UNDP_2017_AnnualReport.pdf	June 2018	Overview of UNDP’s contributions to strengthen the rule of law and human rights in crisis-affected contexts and progress achieved with partners at global, regional, and country levels	Report	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Desk research/Reporting on several initiatives in various countries in the context of <i>Global Programme on Strengthening the Rule of Law and Human Rights for Sustaining Peace and Fostering Development</i>	<p>The report highlights that building resilience also means to promote integrated rule of law and human rights programming in countries. However, it does not provide any evidence or data as to how this helps resilience overall or specifically cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>The only resilience programming that the report refers to is that of UNDP in Syria in terms of providing basic services, creating livelihood opportunities, enhancing social cohesion, and maintaining social infrastructure. In addition, in order to strengthen resilience, the report maintains that the UNDP initiated a plan for community security and access to justice in Syria. The aim of the plan is to address endemic insecurity, displacement, and protracted exclusion.</p> <p>The report does not provide any evidence or data as to how cost-effective this has been in terms of building resilience. The UNDP has only conducted gender-responsive assessments to better understand community needs in different parts of Syria. This led to the commencement of two pilot community security initiatives, one in Maaraba and another one in Baniyas. The objective is to bring IDPs and host community members together in:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - rehabilitating their cities - restoring public spaces - engaging in social dialogues to address daily problems

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							No further evidence or data is provided other than mentioning the willingness of the UNDP to continue area-based assessments of community needs.
UNHCR Jordan Cash Assistance Post Distribution Monitoring Report 2017: Protecting the Most Fragile and Supporting Resilience	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/63975%20%281%29.pdf	June 2018	Assessing cash-assistance programming in Jordan	Report	The UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR)	<p>Mixed methods: Quantitative and qualitative post-distribution monitoring.</p> <p>A random sample of 2,205 Syrian families and 1,520 non-Syrian families receiving cash-assistance were interviewed</p>	<p>The report states that more than 620,000 refugees and asylum seekers are hosted in cities, towns and communities in Jordan. Cash-assistance is considered as one of UNHCR's most important social protection tools. The aim is to build resilience through enabling refugees to pay rent, utilities, food, and has an added value by reducing harmful coping mechanisms, such as withdrawing children from school, child marriage, child labour, begging, and other survival tactics.</p> <p>The report does not provide evidence or data directly related to the cost-effectiveness of resilience programming.</p> <p>However, some of its key findings/data are indirectly related to the effectiveness of resilience programming for Syrians and non-Syrians:</p> <p>Syrians:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Almost all beneficiaries felt that cash assistance improved their living conditions (48% significantly, 48% slightly). Only 4% stated that it had no effect (high impact) - 28% of beneficiaries (biggest percentage) reported that cash assistance helped them with strengthening financial security through paying more debt back - 68% lived in the same house for over a year showing that it helped them to

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<p>meet shelter needs. The UNHCR/NRC 2017 Assessment found a correlation between the level of debt and threat of eviction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Over 98% stated that they were threatened respectfully by UNHCR staff and affiliated organisations (high efficiency) <p>Non-Syrians:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Almost all beneficiaries felt that cash assistance improved their living conditions (63% significantly, 33% slightly). Only 4% reported that their living conditions had not improved (high impact) - 21% of beneficiaries (third biggest) reported that cash assistance helped them with strengthening financial security through paying more debt back - 61% lived in the same house for over a year showing that it helped them to meet shelter needs - 96% stated that they were threatened respectfully by UNHCR staff and affiliated organisations (high efficiency)
Humanity in Action Annual Review 2017	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/4339_002_Humanity-in-action_web_1.pdf	June 2018	How the ICRC helped victims of armed conflict and other violence in 2017	Report	International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC)	Compiling data from all their activities all around the world	<p>ICRC's top 10 operations in terms of expenditure are in the Middle East and in Africa.</p> <p>Among the different programmes that ICRC is supporting livelihood support programmes assist people boost their food production, generate income and become self-sufficient again. Examples that support resilience are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Agricultural supplies, in kind or as vouchers

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Livestock/fishing supplies, in kind or as vouchers - Restocking - Small-scale equipment to produce goods and services - Agricultural machinery or mechanization services or vouchers to obtain them - Food-for-work or cash-for-work schemes to improve agricultural infrastructure - Support via microeconomic initiatives - Training <p>In addition, the ICRC helps at the level of protecting the vulnerable and promoting international humanitarian law. The aim is to reduce particular patterns of abuse, helping individuals and communities to avoid harmful coping strategies and strengthening their resilience.</p> <p>The ICRC report does not provide any evidence or data in terms of cost-effectiveness of their resilience programming.</p>
If Victims become Perpetrators: Factors Contributing to Vulnerability and Resilience to Violent Extremism in the Central Sahel	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/Sahel_ViolentExtremism_VulnerabilityResilience_EN_2018.pdf	June 2018	Factors that contribute to vulnerability and resilience to violent extremism among young Fulanis in the regions of Mopti (Mali), Sahel (Burkina Faso) and	Report/Study	International Alert	Comparative analysis of qualitative data: 36 focus groups and triangulation with in-person interviews	<p>This report constitutes a study of young Fulanis' vulnerability and resilience in Mopti (Mali), Sahel (Burkina Faso) and Tillaberi (Niger) to violent extremism.</p> <p>The study concludes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Violent extremism in the central Sahel is primarily a response to local conflicts - The most determining factor contributing to vulnerability or resilience to violent extremism is the experience (or

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
			Tillabéri (Niger)				<p>perception) of abuse and violation by government authorities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Strengthening social cohesion, supporting young men's and women's role in their communities, and mitigating social and gender exclusion could strengthen community resilience - The G5 Sahel Joint Force supported financially and politically by international powers threatens to fuel violence and conflict - International partners need to prioritise efforts to support state accountability towards citizens, improve supervision of the armed forces, promote youth employment <p>No data or evidence is provided as to the effectiveness of instilling resilience in the aforementioned communities by international organisations/community</p>
Water Management in Fragile Systems: Building Resilience to Shocks and Protracted Crises in the Middle East and North Africa	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/9789251306147.pdf	June 2018	The importance of water management in fragile systems and to propose strategic responses	Discussion Paper	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	Desk review	<p>The report maintains that the resilience of people and communities in the Middle East and North Africa is challenged as a result among others of water-related challenges. Resilience is defined as “the ability to prevent disasters and crises as well as to anticipate, absorb, accommodate or recover from them in a timely, efficient and sustainable manner. This includes protecting, restoring and improving livelihood systems in the face of threats that impact agriculture, nutrition, food security and food safety”.</p> <p>Accordingly, the report argues, the international community needs to ensure that water does not add to fragility, but rather promotes stability, and</p>

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<p>contributes to resilience in the region. Therefore, the paper has three main aims:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - describe how water-related challenges can act as risk multipliers - outline how improving water management and dealing with water-related challenges can contribute to building resilience beyond the water and agricultural sectors in the region - present the need to bridge humanitarian and development efforts to build resilience against future challenges <p>The paper argues for redoubling efforts towards sustainable and efficient management of water resources, reliable and affordable delivery of water services to all and protection from water-related disasters.</p> <p>In this context, the paper suggests options for improved water management to contribute to resilience and stability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Use decentralised, participatory approaches that local, inclusive, consultative and bottom up - Invest in innovative policies and practices - Working together within countries and between countries <p>The paper also suggests ways of how to build resilience through water management:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water management creates stability and peacebuilding through empowering communities and developing inclusive institutions for responsible and

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<p>transparent delivery of the resource. It also encourages cooperation at a regional level</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Water resource sustainability helps with the longer-term efforts to bridge humanitarian and development efforts - Water delivery services and ways to improve food security <p>The report does not provide any evidence or data with regard to the cost-effectiveness of resilience as a result of water management initiatives</p>
<p>How does resilience change over time? Tracking post-disaster recovery using mobile phone surveys</p>	<p>https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/12333.pdf</p>	<p>August 2018</p>	<p>Post-disaster recovery and changes in levels of resilience over time</p>	<p>Working Paper</p>	<p>BRACED</p>	<p>Employed a number of methodological innovations</p> <p>Quantitative research using a mobile phone panel survey of 1,200 individuals giving information on how households in eastern Myanmar recover from a series of extensive floods</p> <p>The paper also used a new way to measure resilience by focusing on people's perceptions of</p>	<p>The report focuses on measuring resilience over time using new methodological tools that are easier to coordinate and less costly.</p> <p>Drawing on BRACED's Rapid Response Research (RRR) in Myanmar, the report firstly uses subjective evaluations of resilience that capture people's own understanding of how they deal with crises and secondly it employs mobile surveys that can be cost-effective and provide researchers and practitioners with information frequently.</p> <p>Subsequently, the paper explores three main questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - What coping mechanisms are households employing in response to climate hazards? - How do levels of overall resilience change over time after a disaster? - How long does it take for people to feel they have fully recovered from a hazard?

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
						their own risk every two months (Subjectively Evaluated Resilience Scores [SERS])	<p>The paper maintains that there is little consensus on how resilience should be defined and that the main reason is that it has been applied across a range of different fields.</p> <p>One important finding with implications for the way we can measure cost-effectiveness of resilience programming is that the length of time it takes for a household to feel as though it has recovered may not be the same as the length of time it takes for resilient scores to return to prior levels.</p> <p>In addition, differences in the scores of recovery between female and male-headed households indicates that a methodology that does not take into consideration the 'inside' story (individuals' perception) of cost-effectiveness of resilience programming cannot provide a conclusive measurement. Technical experts or development practitioners design resilience frameworks based on a large list of indicators. However, these externally defined indicators might not reflect accurately the reality on the ground, i.e. how communities and individuals perceive the effectiveness of resilience. One would need to compare two resilient measurements in order to reach to plausible conclusions over cost-effectiveness.</p>
Words into Action Guidelines: Disaster Displacement – How to Reduce Risk, Address Impacts and Strengthen Resilience	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/58821_disasterdisplacement05a.pdf	July 2018	Ways to prepare for and respond to disaster displacement	Report/Guideline	United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction	Desk review	<p>The report consists of four parts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Explains why disaster displacement is a global disaster risk reduction (DRR) challenge and provides an overview of how the Sendai Framework addresses disaster displacement - Guiding principles to frame activities under the Sendai Framework's

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<p>priorities. Effective practices are illustrated with examples</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Assessment tool that summarises the most important activities for addressing disaster displacement within local, sub-national, national, regional and global DRR strategies - An annex with specific references to disaster displacement and human mobility in the Sendai Framework, a list of key sources, a glossary, cross-references to other Words into Action guides and an overview of how disaster displacement is relevant to various global policies and processes <p>One of the main arguments of the report is that disaster risk reduction (DRR) aims at reducing disaster displacement and strengthen the resilience of people.</p> <p>In that context, the report suggests several resilience-building activities, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - support for migration in terms of skills training and priority access to overseas employment opportunities to avoid aid dependency and prevent displacement becoming protracted - development planning, social safety net programmes and measures to protect livelihoods and productive assets - support for voluntary migration (short-term, circular, seasonal or permanent, internal or cross-border) from areas facing disaster risk - investment in green works that aim to increase resilience of vital public and private infrastructure through improved

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<p>irrigation systems, soil and water conservation, flood control measures, such as drainage systems and river bed protection, rural transport, forest management etc</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - sharing effective practices and ensuring coherence across systems, sectors and organisations - closely coordinate emergency relief with rehabilitation and development programming. For example, food for work programmes might be linked to longer-term livelihood development programmes based on market analyses - developing and sharing research on disaster displacement risk - coordinating the effective use of regional, sub-regional and bilateral tools, systems and resources to reinforce the resilience of sub-regions, countries and communities at risk of internal and cross-border disaster displacement <p>Finally, a checklist that can be used to assess whether DRR strategies are fully aligned with the Sendai Framework for reducing disaster displacement risk, reducing the impacts of disaster displacement and strengthening the resilience of people displaced by disasters is provided.</p> <p>The report does not provide any cost-effectiveness evidence in terms of resilience.</p>
United Nation Development Programme in Syria 2017 Annual	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main	August 2018	Resilience in Syria	Annual Report	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Desk review	The report constitutes a summary of UNDP's activity in Syria with regard to "building resilience through providing a durable substitute to humanitarian assistance by supporting emergency

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
Report: Resilience at the Forefront	/2017%20Annual%20Report%20Final%20Digital%20Version.pdf						<p>livelihoods, early recovery, and – at a later stage – sustainable livelihoods”.</p> <p>According to the report, in 2017, the UNDP contributed to the resilience of 4,647,744 people in Syria. It provided 89,866 monthly job opportunities by implementing 22 local projects that directly benefited more than 547,774 crisis-affected people.</p> <p>The UNDP community resilience response focused on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Basic local and social infrastructure rehabilitation including solid waste and debris management - Socioeconomic recovery, including business revival and restoration, and income generation support for female-headed households - Rehabilitation and social protection support to persons with disabilities - Youth-led initiatives promoting tolerance and acceptance - Capacity development of local partners for resilience building - Advocacy and coordination for enhanced resilience building
							<p>UNDP applied three mechanisms to monitor field activities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community-based monitoring - Third-party monitoring and evaluation - Site visits <p>However, the organisation did not run an evaluation of the cost-effectiveness of its programme in Syria.</p>

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							The only exception is the wheat value chain analysis “which allows different organisations to use their expertise and plan their activities around wheat and wheat-based products for cost-effective and impactful implementation”. However, no data or evidence is provided in the annual report.
Displaced in Cities: Experiencing and Responding to Urban Internal Displacement	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/4344_002_Displaced-in-Cities_web.pdf	August 2018	Response to internal displacement	Report	The International Committee of the Red Cross	Desk review, selected case studies and interviews with key informants	<p>The report identifies four key pathways of humanitarian response to urban displacement:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Putting people at the centre of humanitarian planning and response - Focusing on their dignity and resilience - Building responses on reliable data - Exploring reliable data <p>‘Dignity and resilience’ refers to the humanitarian goals of reviving displaced people’s sense of autonomy, their ability to make choices, their feeling of being respected and valued by others.</p> <p>Particularly, the report highlights the need humanitarian organisations to respond from the outset of displacement in terms of resilience-building together with emergency support. Long-term considerations of resilience-building should not be postponed and instead they should be incorporated into the early stages of humanitarian response to the benefit of displaced people. The report acknowledges that livelihood programmes can be costly and time-consuming. It is due to the fact that resilience-building entails significant short-term as well as long-term investments.</p> <p>The report gives the example of enhancing the operational resilience of urban services in Iraq, such as maintenance, rehabilitation and the expansion of water-delivery systems. The objective was to respond to immediate needs of</p>

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<p>the population and show the potential for sustainable normalisation of daily life.</p> <p>Other than that, it does not provide any evidence or data on cost-effectiveness of resilience programming.</p>
Adolescents with Disabilities: Enhancing Resilience and Delivering Inclusive Development	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/12320.pdf	July 2018	Adolescents with disabilities	Policy Note	Overseas Development Institute (ODI)	Summarises key findings from a new Gender and Adolescence report that used mixed methods	With regard to resilience, the summary highlights that there is lack of evidence as to what works to support the wellbeing and resilience of adolescents with disabilities. There is no evidence or data with regards to cost-effectiveness of resilience.
Resilient Sydney: A Strategy for City Resilience 2018	https://www.alnap.org/system/files/content/resource/files/main/Resilient-Sydney-A-strategy-for-city-resilience-2018.pdf	August 2018	Strategy for the city of Sydney in terms of its ability to	Report	100 Resilient Cities	Desk review and consultations with elders, community groups, government and business representatives and working groups	<p>The definition of city resilience “is the capacity of individuals, communities, businesses and systems within a city to survive, adapt and thrive no matter what kinds of chronic stresses and acute shocks they experience”.</p> <p>City resilience, according to the report, can be achieved through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - preventing or mitigating stresses and shocks - adapting to unexpected shocks and stresses - rapidly returning to normal and revitalising after disruptions - accessing benefits when there are no disruptions - productive, peaceful prosperity and improved equality in times of stability <p>The report employs the City Resilience Framework that involves four dimensions and</p>

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<p>twelve drivers that can be used to determine a city's ability to withstand a wide range of shocks and stresses.</p> <p>The four dimensions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Health and wellbeing - Economy and society - Infrastructure and environment - Leadership and strategy <p>The report maintains that Sydney is highly vulnerable to fires and flooding.</p> <p>Accordingly, the report has identified key priorities through consultation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Community agency (communities are willing to give solutions based on their needs and local knowledge) - Adaptation to climate (reducing carbon emissions) - Social cohesion (increasing tolerance for cultural diversity) - Community preparedness (a number of actions, including improving collaboration between organisation that manage city systems and providing multiple ways for delivering essential services to communities) - Governance collaboration (connecting many private and public sector organisations responsible for city plans) <p>The report does not provide any data or evidence in terms of cost-effectiveness of city resilience programming.</p>

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
Towards a Quantifiable Measure of Resilience	https://online.library.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.2040-0209.2013.00434.x	September 2013	Measurement of resilient	Working Paper	Institute for Development Studies (IDS)	Literature review	The paper does not provide evidence or data in terms of cost-effectiveness of resilience programming. However, it discusses issues related to the measurement of resilience in relation to food security. Specifically, it argues that the 'costs of resilience', such as investments, losses, sacrifices and costs that people have to undertake at individual and collective level, constitute an appropriate and independent metric to measure resilience across scales and dimensions.
The Economics of Early Response and Disaster Resilience: Lessons from Kenya and Ethiopia	https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/uploads/attachment_data/file/67330/Econ-Ear-Rec-Res-Full-Report_20.pdf	July 2012	cost-effectiveness of building resilience to disasters as compared with the cost of relief and early response and 'value for money' interventions	Report	DFID	Consultations with key experts by phone/skype and face-to-face meetings	<p>The report has three main objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - present evidence on the cost-effectiveness of building resilience to disasters as compared to the cost of relief and early response - identify the types of interventions that can provide the highest "value for money" - incentivise donors, partner governments, multilaterals and implementing agencies to invest in and work more on resilience to disasters <p>The report focuses on Kenya and Ethiopia.</p> <p>The conclusions of the report in terms of cost-effectiveness of resilience and 'value for money' initiatives are the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - There is great deal of uncertainty around the cost of building resilience - However, the estimates in the paper show that the cost of resilience is high, but the wider benefits of building resilience can significantly outweigh the

Title	Link	Date	Focus	Document	Organisation	Methodology	Cost-effectiveness Evidence
							<p>costs (investment in resilience is best value for money)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Early response and resilience building measures should be a priority as it is more cost-effective - There are many resilience-building measures that are likely to be value for money and others that are not. Whether it is the former or the latter depends on the case and the context. Different measures can give different results in different contexts and cases.

Suggested citation

Manis, A. (2018). *Cost-effectiveness in humanitarian aid and development: Resilience programming*. K4D Helpdesk. Brighton, UK: Institute of Development Studies.

About this report

This report is based on five days of desk-based research. The K4D research helpdesk provides rapid syntheses of a selection of recent relevant literature and international expert thinking in response to specific questions relating to international development. For any enquiries, contact helpdesk@k4d.info.

K4D services are provided by a consortium of leading organisations working in international development, led by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS), with Education Development Trust, Itad, University of Leeds Nuffield Centre for International Health and Development, Liverpool School of Tropical Medicine (LSTM), University of Birmingham International Development Department (IDD) and the University of Manchester Humanitarian and Conflict Response Institute (HCRI).

This report was prepared for the UK Government's Department for International Development (DFID) and its partners in support of pro-poor programmes. It is licensed for non-commercial purposes only. K4D cannot be held responsible for errors or any consequences arising from the use of information contained in this report. Any views and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of DFID, K4D or any other contributing organisation. © DFID - Crown copyright 2018.

