

Evidence Synthesis

**The Humanitarian
Innovation and Evidence
Programme (HIEP): Bringing
New Evidence and Methods
to Humanitarian Action**

August 2020

Tina Nelis, Jeremy Allouche and Lewis Sida

The Institute of Development Studies (IDS) delivers world-class research, learning and teaching that transforms the knowledge, action and leadership needed for more equitable and sustainable development globally.

For more information visit: www.ids.ac.uk



© Department for International Development 2020

Evidence Synthesis

The Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP):
Bringing New Evidence and Methods to Humanitarian Action

Tina Nelis, Jeremy Allouche and Lewis Sida

First published by the Institute of Development Studies in August 2020

Nelis, T.; Allouche, J. and Sida, L. (2020) *The Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP): Bringing New Evidence and Methods to Humanitarian Action*, Evidence Synthesis, Brighton: Institute of Development Studies

ISBN: 978-1-78118-667-1

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library



This is an Open Access report distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International licence (CC BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original authors and source are credited and any modifications or adaptations are indicated. <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/legalcode>

This report has been funded with UK Aid from the UK government. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of IDS or the UK government.

Copy-editor: Monica Allen. Designer: Lance Bellers.

Available from:

Institute of Development Studies, Library Road
Brighton, BN1 9RE, United Kingdom
+44 (0)1273 915637

ids.ac.uk

IDS is a charitable company limited by guarantee and registered in England
Charity Registration Number 306371
Charitable Company Number 877338

Evidence Synthesis

**The Humanitarian
Innovation and Evidence
Programme (HIEP): Bringing
New Evidence and Methods
to Humanitarian Action**

August 2020

Tina Nelis, Jeremy Allouche and Lewis Sida

Summary

In 2013, the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) created the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP). The programme was established in response to the paucity of evidence and the need for innovation to identify and help overcome the methodological and operational barriers to delivering humanitarian interventions and programming in fragile and conflict affected contexts. HIEP was closed in March 2020. As part of an uptake project carried out by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) to increase engagement with the evidence commissioned by HIEP, this paper identifies a number of findings and recommendations in relation to the thematic areas of protracted crises, resilience, basic services and research uptake.

Keywords

Humanitarian, innovation, evidence, resilience, protracted crisis, basic services, impact, uptake.

Authors

Tina Nelis is a Knowledge and Learning Officer in the Humanitarian Learning Centre and Knowledge, Impact and Policy Cluster at the Institute of Development Studies (IDS). Since joining IDS in 2013, she has worked across a portfolio of projects on social protection, the wellbeing of urban informal workers across South Asia, and inclusive urbanisation. More recently, she was part of a team that carried out an **independent evaluation of UNHCR's response to the Rohingya refugees crisis in Bangladesh** and is currently supporting the World Food Programme (WFP) to operationalise the humanitarian-development-peace nexus (Triple Nexus) in Afghanistan.

Jeremy Allouche is a co-director of the Humanitarian Learning Centre and Professorial Fellow at IDS. He is a political sociologist trained in history and international relations with more than 20 years' research and advisory experience on conflict and borderland areas, and the difficulties of aid delivery in such contexts, as well as studying the idea of 'islands of peace'. He has extensive fieldwork experience in West Africa, most notably Côte d'Ivoire and Sierra Leone, conducting research with international donor and aid agencies, international non-governmental organisations and local civil society groups engaged in peace-building, and human rights activists. His advisory experience includes work with Conciliation Resources, the Department for International Development (DFID), Irish Aid, the Swiss Agency for Development and Cooperation (SDC), UNHCR and the World Food Programme (WFP). He is on the editorial board of *International Peacekeeping* journal.

Authors

Lewis Sida is an honorary associate of the Institute of Development Studies (IDS) and a humanitarian specialist working on organisation and system change. He is a founder and co-director of the **Humanitarian Learning Centre** at IDS. He has led several influential research projects and numerous evaluations, strategy, planning and policy processes. In 2010 he was the lead author of DFID's seminal evaluation of its humanitarian work, the **Humanitarian Emergency Response Review**, and following that involved in writing their humanitarian policy. Subsequently he led a four-year, **four country evaluation of multi-year humanitarian financing**, as well as being deeply involved in the early response to the Syria crisis in various UN roles. Currently he is leading the mid-term evaluation of the EU refugee response in Turkey and a DFID M & E project for their core funding to the UN and Red Cross Movement. He is also working on a follow up project to an **independent evaluation of UNHCR's response to the Rohingya refugees crisis in Bangladesh**, titled **'The Synergies and Inter-Linkages within the Water-Food/Nutrition-Energy Nexus in Cox's Bazar District, Bangladesh'**.

Executive Summary

In 2013, the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) created the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP). The programme was established in response to the paucity of evidence and the need for innovation to identify and help overcome the methodological and operational barriers to delivering humanitarian interventions and programming in fragile and conflict affected contexts. HIEP was closed in March 2020.

HIEP was externally evaluated (**Itad 2018**), but in addition DFID commissioned a small uptake project in late 2019 which was delivered by the Institute of Development Studies (IDS). The aim of the uptake project was to increase engagement with the evidence commissioned by HIEP through a combination of research mapping, evidence synthesis, and uptake grants. The key findings and recommendations are as follows:

Findings

- **Durable solutions in the context of protracted displacement depend on acknowledging the agency of the displaced and the role of social capital, connections, and market forces** to better understand the opportunities and constraints to adopting self-reliance and sustainable livelihood strategies.
- **The scale of the resilience challenge is far greater than commonly assumed.** In order to unpack this challenge, the humanitarian sector needs to adopt and practise a more nuanced understanding of resilience that looks at the structural factors that limit people's agency even in the absence of shocks. For people living in recurrent or protracted crises and in poverty, resilience is reflected in the choices that people are able to make when in difficulty. Resilience as agency-in-crisis is a more useful conceptualisation of resilience than one based on recovery times after large shocks.
- In protracted crisis situations where levels of vulnerability and poverty are high, **humanitarian assistance, whether multi-year or not, is unable to address the resilience challenge.** This requires long-term, scalable development finance over many years.
- **Shock-responsive social protection (SRSP) is not a 'silver bullet' for reducing the negative impact of shocks.** However, under the right conditions there is an opportunity to use the experience, capacity, and delivery mechanisms of social protection in an emergency response. To do this we need to better understand the entire social protection system and the level of coordination available on the ground to ensure an efficient response.

- In protracted crisis and recovery situations, **basic needs such as food, water, health and shelter are prioritised at the expense of other needs such as energy**, as the latter requires more than short-term emergency funding. Despite the importance of energy provision, and evidence of the willingness of the private sector to provide energy as a service, there is a lack of donor commitment to funding sustainable energy infrastructure in displacement settings.
- As with energy provision, **access to education has long been neglected in protracted situations**. Part of the reason for this relates to a lack of evidence of what works and under what conditions, with traditional approaches to the provision of education unable to overcome the barriers to access and to high-quality education in difficult contexts. Humanitarian innovation programmes can go some way to address these difficulties but are often only successful when supported by and aligned with ministry of education programmes.
- The challenges associated with delivering effective humanitarian assistance and providing access to basic services have called for a greater investment in humanitarian innovation to bring about much needed transformational change and improve aid effectiveness. **HIEP has played a prominent role in funding innovation**, not only through the large grant-making fund – the **Humanitarian Innovation Fund** (HIF) – but also through smaller projects which explored the importance of innovation in addressing these persistent challenges.
- **Robust research is possible in crisis situations**. HIEP funded a range of methods – some tried and tested, and others less commonly used in humanitarian contexts – across the portfolio. These include, but are not limited to, **randomised controlled trials, impact evaluations, re-designing tools normally carried out in rural areas for application in urban settings**, conducting remote surveying, **systematic reviews** (which include grey literature to overcome the challenges of data availability), mixed qualitative and quantitative methods, longitudinal cohort studies, quasi-experimental studies, participatory methodologies, and working closely with local communities to integrate and share research findings.
- More could have been done to **share and synthesise findings across the different projects and create synergies**. While the activities commissioned in terms of research uptake have been successful, one of the key issues is that most projects were struggling to disseminate these findings beyond the funded life of the project cycle. The Research for Health in Humanitarian Crises (R2HC) is a good example of a portfolio approach to the generation of evidence which has built in strong uptake beyond the life of HIEP.

Recommendations for future research:

- **Building the evidence base on how basic services can become more resilient**, both generally and in places where the State is either unable or unwilling, should be a major focus for research.
- **Increasing focus should be placed on (renewable) energy and education needs and sustainability** with a shift to bridge the siloed approaches between short-term emergency need and long-term development planning.
- **Providing effective approaches to a safety net of last resort** in long-term instability, fragility and protracted crisis is the policy area that DFID and humanitarians more generally are struggling with above all else.
- **The humanitarian sector needs to adopt and practice a more nuanced understanding of resilience** (individual and community) that looks at the structural factors that limit people's agency even in the absence of shocks.
- **Investing in research uptake should be encouraged from the outset of a project life-cycle.** In addition, further financial investment should be provided to ensure project outputs are easily accessible and centrally located for further uptake.
- With expectations mounting around the role of innovation in addressing persistent humanitarian challenges, it is important for actors to ensure that the **main building blocks are there before going to scale.**

Contents

Summary	4
Keywords	4
Authors	5
Executive Summary	7
Acronyms	12
1. Introduction	13
2. Protracted crises, resilience, and basic services	15
3. Innovation in the humanitarian sector	26
4. Research methods	30
5. Uptake	32
6. Conclusions and recommendations	34
References	35

Boxes

Box 2.1 Key findings of the HIEP-funded 'Protracted Displacement: Uncertain Paths to Self-reliance in Exile'	16
Box 2.2 Key findings of the HIEP-funded 'Multi-year Humanitarian Funding:A Thematic Evaluation' project	18
Box 2.3 Key findings of the HIEP funded 'Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems' project	20
Box 2.4 Key findings of R2HC-funded research on public health	22
Box 2.5 Main findings from HIEP-funded 'Moving Energy Initiative (MEI)' project	24
Box 3.1 Key findings from HIEP-funded Mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (mVAM) project	27
Box 3.2 Main findings from the HIEP-funded Humanitarian Education Accelerator (HEA)	28
Box 5.1 HIEP Impact Grantee Case Study	32

Acronyms

CAID	Cellule d'Analyses des Indicateurs de Développement
CVA	cash and vouchers assistance
DFID	Department for International Development
DRM	disaster risk management
DRC	Democratic Republic of Congo
ECW	Education Cannot Wait
HDX	Humanitarian Data Exchange
HEA	Humanitarian Education Accelerator
HEP	Humanitarian Evidence Programme
HERR	Humanitarian Evidence Response Review
HIEP	Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme
HIF	Humanitarian Innovation Fund
IDMC	Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre
IDP	internally displaced persons
IVR	Interactive Voice Response
JRP	Jordan's Response Plan
MEI	Moving Energy Initiative
mVAM	Mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping
MYHF	multi-year humanitarian funding
NRC	Norwegian Refugee Council
OCHA	United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs
ODI	Overseas Development Institute
PTSD	post-traumatic stress disorder
R2HC	Research for Health in Humanitarian Crises
SRSP	Shock-responsive social protection
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Refugees
VAM	Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping

1. Introduction

In 2013, the Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme (HIEP) was set up by the United Kingdom Department for International Development (DFID) to drive forward DFID's commitment to improving humanitarian effectiveness through research, evidence and innovation. It closed on 30 March 2020.

Partly in response to the 2011 Humanitarian Evidence Response Review, which concluded that there is a paucity of humanitarian evidence and an under-emphasis on risk management (**Ashdown et al. 2011**), and aligned with the priorities of the DFID Humanitarian Reform Policy of 2017 to strengthen national and local systems while safeguarding humanitarian principles (**DFID 2017**), HIEP had three main programme outcomes:

1. International donors, including DFID, develop funding instruments and frameworks for investment into evidence, innovation, and its applications.
2. Humanitarian actors change skills, behaviours, relationships, cultures and systems to promote the regular integration of evidence into humanitarian and disaster risk management (DRM) interventions.
3. Policy and practice actors invest in social, economic and political innovations that focus on benefits for poor people in humanitarian crises.

(**Itad 2018: ix**)

HIEP's portfolio of work was significant, innovative in its approach, and relevant and responsive to changing humanitarian contexts and priorities. The programme has funded 24 research and innovation projects, 2 large grant-making funds (Research for Health in Humanitarian Crises [R2HC]) and the Humanitarian Innovation Fund [HIF]), 160 research papers, and 10 impact evaluations, and 127 humanitarian innovations have been tested and piloted with 15 supported to scale (Bellers, forthcoming 2020). Top-level thematic areas that are covered include health in emergencies (with most grants funded through R2HC), protracted crisis and displacement, scaling-up cash-based responses to humanitarian crises, urban risk, disaster risk reduction, providing and implementing humanitarian assistance in volatile contexts, and support to innovation in the humanitarian sector (mainly funded through HIF and the Humanitarian Education Accelerator). As a multi-year evaluation of the programme (**Itad 2018: xii**) identified, 'HIEP is a highly relevant initiative addressing key issues affecting humanitarian action and people impacted by humanitarian crises.'

The 2018 multi-year evaluation of the HIEP (**Itad 2018: xii**) found that **HIEP had achieved considerable success in its five years of implementation**. Further, the evaluation found that HIEP

established a high profile and level of respect for DFID's role in supporting evidence and innovation. External stakeholders perceive DFID as having distinctive advantages among donors because it has the potential to work across functions in research and operations, and across sectors, to bring together a range of expertise, and is able to balance openness to taking risks, essential in research and innovation, with achieving results.

(Itad 2018: xii)

This synthesis note builds on the work of the evaluation but forms part of the HIEP Impact project – a research uptake project commissioned by DFID to increase engagement with the high-quality evidence commissioned by HIEP and to strengthen networks and relationships that support evidence use through event coordination and a grant-making facility. In addition to this synthesis note, the project also carried out a thorough mapping of the HIEP programme and provided impact grants to four HIEP-funded projects to carry out a range of research uptake activities. These included workshop facilitation, creation of a digital platform to preserve and disseminate project findings, the design of a database, documentation of learning processes, and the production of accessible briefing materials.

With a focus on the thematic areas of protracted crises, resilience, and basic services, this synthesis paper draws on the impressive body of research and cross-programme clusters of evidence generated by HIEP to address broader policy questions around the need for evidence and innovation to identify and help overcome the barriers (methodological and operational) to delivering humanitarian interventions and programming in challenging contexts. It provides a series of short snapshots on key HIEP projects which address these themes before looking more closely at methodology used across the portfolio. The paper also reflects on lessons learned with respect to research uptake. The final section of the paper will provide some concluding thoughts and recommendations for future research.

2. Protracted crises, resilience, and basic services

A **systematic review carried out through the HIEP-funded Humanitarian Evidence Programme** (HEP) found that there is a paucity of high-quality evidence on targeting vulnerable populations in humanitarian emergencies. In fact, research in these contexts is limited, as is the availability of disaggregated data. This HEP systematic review highlighted that 'Perfect targeting approaches are, by nature, not possible in complex environments... this is not a license to practice indiscriminately' (**Patel et al. 2017: 31**).

These emergencies are becoming more complex as protracted crises are becoming the new norm. A HIEP-funded project on protracted displacement identified that, from 1978 onwards, fewer than 1 in 40 refugee crises were resolved¹ within three years. In fact, more than 80 per cent of refugee crises continue for ten years or more, with two in five lasting 20 years or more (**Crawford et al. 2015: 12**). Another HIEP project, which looked at the provision of basic services in informal settlements, also highlighted that, with overcrowded informal settlements being home not only to the poorest refugees and migrants but also to poor host communities who are unable to afford housing elsewhere, tensions between host and displaced populations are inevitable (**Lahn, Grafham and Sparr 2016**).

Under such conditions, and with limited government assistance and restricted development funding, humanitarian agencies have found themselves carrying out recovery activities and providing basic services such as food assistance, long-term health, nutrition, education, livelihoods support, and social protection. Yet this is not sustainable, nor is it appropriate for humanitarian organisations, whose mandate is to deliver relief and protection, to be responsible for such activities. Closer collaboration between humanitarian agencies, government authorities, and development organisations is required to enable this shift away from response to long-term sustainable change. In order to deal with these challenges, HIEP has funded projects which address the thematic areas of protracted crisis, resilience, and basic services. Below is a summary of some of these projects and their main findings.

¹ 'Resolved' is used 'to indicate that the caseload was reduced to 10% of the peak' (**Crawford et al. 2015: 12, note 12**).

2.1 Protracted crises

The HIEP-funded project '**Protracted Displacement: Uncertain Paths to Self-reliance in Exile**'² (Crawford *et al.* 2015) explored the global state of protracted displacement with reference to geographic spread, patterns, and trends in numbers displaced and funding allocations.³ It looked at how policy frameworks, humanitarian assistance, and institutional arrangements could support and improve livelihoods and self-reliance for the long-term displaced. Through the design of a typology to diagnose the opportunities and constraints for self-reliance and livelihood assistance for the displaced, the project piloted a tool to be used by practitioners to score and rank country receptiveness to self-reliance and livelihood programming. It does this by looking at four themes: 'Legal framework and protection environment'; 'Access to markets and the private sector'; 'Capacities, resources and assets of the displaced', and 'Environment for external intervention'. Country case studies were carried out in Uganda, Colombia, Sudan, and Jordan. Box 2.1 provides a summary of the main findings of the project.

Box 2.1 Key findings of the HIEP-funded 'Protracted Displacement: Uncertain Paths to Self-reliance in Exile'

Project title:	Protracted Displacement: Uncertain Paths to Self-reliance in Exile
Carried out by:	The Overseas Development Institute (ODI) in collaboration with independent consultants (John Cosgrave and Simone Haysom) and Nadine Walicki at the Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC)
Date:	2014–2015
Key findings:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Protracted displacement is becoming commonplace among refugees and IDPs with many experiencing more than one displacement in their lifetime. 'Durable solutions' such as return, local integration, or resettlement are rare, as is the ability of the displaced to achieve self-reliance and sustainable livelihoods.

2 The title submitted to DFID at proposal stage was 'Improving Outcomes for People Displaced by Conflict for Long Periods: A Programme of Research and Innovation'.

3 This project defines protracted displacement 'more broadly as a situation in which refugees and/or internally displaced persons (IDPs) have been in exile for three years or more, and where the process for finding durable solutions, such as repatriation, absorption in host communities or settlement in third locations, has stalled. This definition includes refugees and IDPs forced to leave their homes to avoid armed conflict, violence, violations of human rights or natural or human-made disasters. It also includes those living in camps or dispersed among host populations' (Crawford *et al.* 2015: 11).

- There has been a concerted effort by humanitarian and development agencies to move away from providing assistance in the form of care and maintenance to more holistic approaches that accept the complexity of the situation and agency and self-determination of displaced persons.
- A macro-level approach is required which places the micro-level approaches in the broader context of national and regional poverty reduction and development strategies to enable a shift away from humanitarian organisations unfairly playing a key role in creating pathways for self-reliance and livelihoods through short-term, piecemeal humanitarian projects with limited technical and managerial expertise.
- Donors and aid agencies should avoid making overarching generalisations about displaced people and their needs. As a heterogeneous group, their situation and needs will be in flux and very much context-dependent, which will also play a part in the livelihood and self-reliance strategies that they are able to adopt.
- Evidence shows that displaced people do not solely rely on external interventions and aid to survive. Rather, through social capital, connections, and market forces, they themselves have created the necessary conditions for positive livelihood outcomes to be achieved
- This study developed a pilot tool to help aid agencies identify opportunities and constraints for self-reliance and livelihood assistance of displaced persons in differing contexts. The typology allows practitioners to establish where external interventions would be welcomed and supportive of self-reliance and livelihoods strategies for the displaced.

Source: Authors' own, compiled from **Crawford et al. (2015)**.

2.2 Resilience

Creating enabling conditions to promote self-reliance and livelihood strategies is ultimately a means to foster resilience. Yet building resilience in situations of protracted crises is challenging. In 2014, DFID introduced multi-year humanitarian funding (MYHF) as a cost-effective way to better prepare for, and respond to, long-term humanitarian crises. Shifting away from short-term funding to longer-term timeframes, it was hypothesised that the quality of programming would improve and there would be a better understanding of the causes of crises and the factors that helped build resilience. To explore this hypothesis, HIEP commissioned a four-year Multi-Year Humanitarian Evaluation (see Box 2.2) which found that the 'resilience challenge is greater than commonly assumed, and the factors influencing

this are multi-dimensional' (**Levine and Sida 2019: 1**). In a situation where most affected people are living in extreme poverty and the poorest and most vulnerable are disproportionately affected, MYHF is not able to adequately build resilience on its own. Rather, a nexus approach which benefits from using multi-year financing and engages the strengths of the humanitarian and development communities would foster better resilience building.

Box 2.2 Key findings of the HIEP-funded 'Multi-year Humanitarian Funding: A Thematic Evaluation' project

Project title: **Multi-year Humanitarian Funding: A Thematic Evaluation**

Carried out by: Valid Evaluations in consortium with ODI and independent consultants Lewis Sida, Courtenay Cabot Venton, Simon Levine and Bill Gray

Date: March 2014 – November 2018

Key findings:

The scale of the resilience challenge is far greater than commonly assumed. The significant majority of those interviewed were surviving on incomes just over half the international poverty line, a threshold at which families could just about manage. Households were also being continually buffeted by shocks.

In all four countries studied, the factors which shaped people's agency in crisis were economic, social and personal. The study found that:

- Gender was the single biggest determinant of a person's agency, in and out of crisis.
- Social connections *outside* people's locality were an important contribution to coping, especially where these were with people in urban areas.
- The 'meso-economy' was the most important in determining livelihood opportunities. This refers to the local economy, but covering a much larger, and typically a combined rural–urban population than their very immediate, local economy.
- Asset accumulation and business investment played a surprisingly limited role in creating resilience, perhaps because people could not get to significant levels of either.

- Personal adaptive capacity is a critical skill but was comparatively rare. People's individual ability – part skill, part mindset – to take advantage of opportunities that are available is largely neglected in resilience thinking.
- Ill health is a major impediment to people's progress towards resilience. It typically robs households of over a quarter of their potential income.
- Access to basic services was critical but was largely determined by political status, and the ability of people to overcome marginalisation.

Levine and Sida (2019: 2)

The scale of the resilience challenge and the level of vulnerability meant that humanitarian assistance, whether multi-year (MY) or not, was not sufficient to address these issues. This requires long-term, scalable, development finance over many years.

With regard to Multi-Year Humanitarian Financing, the evaluation also found:

- MYHF can help improve the quality of humanitarian programming.
- Long-term presence in crises and in crisis-prone situations leads to faster and more effective response.
- There is limited evidence that agencies have used MYHF to develop better context and problem analysis.
- The existence of contingency funding did not lead to better contingency planning or preparedness.
- The cost-efficiency benefits of MYHF are more modest than had been hoped.

Levine and Sida (2019: 3)

Source: Authors' own, compiled from **Levine and Sida (2019) CC BY-NC-ND 4.0**, and other sources.

2.3 Basic services

Although multi-year humanitarian funding is unable to adequately overcome the resilience challenge on its own, other mechanisms, such as vulnerability and poverty targeted programmes, can be used to address some of the underlying factors preventing resilience building. Cash transfer programmes provide assistance to the poorest and most vulnerable and are implemented across different contexts with specific objectives. As a long-term approach, they provide basic income support to promote health, education, livelihoods, and food security and are a key component of an established social protection system. As a humanitarian response, cash-based transfers are used to provide basic needs (subsistence and non-food items such as sanitation, water, shelter, agriculture, and education) in times of crisis.

Yet with the recurrent and protracted nature of crises, governments and international agencies have sought to respond through shock-responsive social protection. However, in a HIEP-funded project on '**Shock-Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) Systems**' (see Box 2.3), the study found that SRSP is not a 'silver bullet' for reducing the negative impacts of shocks and is very much context dependent.⁴ Instead, improving 'routine social protection' systems that enjoy broad coverage may be more beneficial as 'it will help in a crisis by laying a better foundation for shock-responsiveness, and by reducing underlying vulnerability, including to the idiosyncratic shocks that can still affect households in the midst of covariate shocks' (O'Brien et al. 2018: 80). At the same time, there is a need for better coordination between actors (social protection, disaster risk management, humanitarian and development), sectors, programmes, and delivery systems to enable shock-response programmes and systems.

Box 2.3 Key findings of the HIEP funded 'Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems' project

Project title: Shock-Responsive Social Protection (SRSP) Systems

Carried out by: Oxford Policy Management (OPM) in consortium with ODI, the Cash Learning Partnership (CaLP) and INASP

Date: March 2015 – January 2018

Key findings:

- Social protection typically responds to idiosyncratic shocks at household level (illness, crop failure, accidents) and provides a safety net for poor and vulnerable households to maintain their wellbeing; while emergency response typically relates to covariate shocks (droughts, floods, civil conflict etc.).
- Humanitarian aid is largely spent on those living in protracted or recurrent crises. Social protection can be used to improve people's resilience. Investment in this preparedness stage is essential to ensure national level programmes can quickly adapt and respond to shocks. Previous specification of roles and resources is essential to ensure timely response.

⁴ The title submitted to DFID at proposal stage was 'Enabling the Diffusion of Cash-based Approaches to emergencies: The Role of Social Protection – Shock Responsive Social Protection'.

- SRSP will not work in all contexts; however, under the right conditions there is an opportunity to use the experience, capacity, and delivery mechanisms of social protection in an emergency response. To do this we need to better understand the entire social protection system and the level of coordination available on the ground to ensure an efficient response.

We need to move beyond conceptual thinking and hypotheses to a more practical understanding of what works. We need more research and evidence on equitable outcomes and inclusiveness – how do shocks affect people of different genders and disabilities?

Source: Authors' own, compiled from **O'Brien et al. (2018: 80)** and Farhat, forthcoming 2020

While social protection and cash programming provide a means for people to meet basic needs, access to basic services in protracted crisis contexts has long been a challenge. Several HIEP projects have explored this issue and findings highlight the competing priorities of basic services in emergency contexts. R2HC is an example of a HIEP-funded portfolio of projects in the health sector. Implemented by Elrha, the project aimed to improve health outcomes for people affected by humanitarian crises by strengthening the evidence base for public health interventions. R2HC focused on maximising the potential for public health research to bring about positive change in humanitarian response and helped to inform decision-making in humanitarian response. Since it was established in 2013, R2HC has funded more than 50 research studies across a range of public health fields, bringing together researchers and humanitarian practitioners to undertake vital research. Some of the highlights are shown in Box 2.4.

Box 2.4 Key findings of R2HC-funded research on public health

Project title: **Research for Health in Humanitarian Crisis (R2HC)**

Carried out by: Elrha

Date: April 2012 – March 2022
(now with the Health Research Team)

Key findings:

Maternal and sexual health:

- R2HC coordinated several studies to improve access to menstrual hygiene in **Kenya, Lebanon, Myanmar, Tanzania, and Uganda**.
- R2HC has funded research aiming to improve the **quality of reproductive care approaches** in emergencies and **understanding the burden** and improving access to **post-abortion care**.
- R2HC has researched saving mother's lives by **introducing a uterine balloon tamponade for the management of post-partum haemorrhage** in complex settings.

Mental health and psychosocial support:

- Colorado University used a rapid response grant to enhance community resilience in the acute aftermath of a disaster, in flood-prone areas in **Haiti and Nepal**. They successfully reduced levels of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), and varying reductions in depression and anxiety, in both settings.
- University of Colorado adapted and evaluated a disaster mental health intervention for **earthquake survivors in the Kathmandu Valley**. They found reduced levels of PTSD in both settings and varying reductions in depression and anxiety, against control groups.
- The War Trauma Foundation evaluated strengthening evidence and evaluation approaches for scaling **Psychological First Aid (PFA) in humanitarian settings**, such as post-Ebola Sierra Leone. PFA training effectively improved knowledge about psychosocial responses in acute adversities.

Refugee settings:

- Researchers at Yale University have worked on a scalable psychosocial intervention for **young refugees in Jordan**. They successfully demonstrated the effectiveness of an innovative approach to testing for stress via biomarkers and effectively reduced stress and improved mental health for these refugee youth. University of New South Wales is evaluating a scalable intervention aiming to improve the mental health of **young adolescent Syrian Refugees**.
- Researchers at Queen Mary University of London are developing and evaluating a phone-delivered psychological intervention (t-CETA) for **Syrian refugee children in Lebanon**.
- The World Health Organisation has tested the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of guided e-mental health care for **Syrian refugees in urban Lebanon**.

Source: Authors' own compiled from **R2HC** information.

The HIEP-commissioned project '**Moving Energy Initiative (MEI)**' (see Box 2.5), aimed to strengthen the evidence base around poor energy access through sharing policy-relevant research and learning from current projects in protracted displacement contexts, found that in protracted crises and recovery situations, basic needs such as food, water, health, and shelter are prioritised at the expense of other needs such as energy, which requires more than short-term funding (**Lahn and Grafham 2015**). In addition, concerns over creating a sense of inclusiveness and permanence for refugees weakens the political appetite of host governments to finance medium to longer-term energy solutions (**Lahn and Grafham 2015**). As such, energy provision is not a strategic priority and there are few incentives among humanitarian agencies to seek ways to provide low-carbon energy access despite estimates that 5 per cent of humanitarian agencies' expenditure is on diesel, petrol, and other associated costs – \$1.2bn on polluting fuel in 2017 (**Grafham and Lahn 2018: 4**).

As the HIEP-funded MEI project found, large-scale refugee settlements in urban areas, such as can be found in Jordan, create their own unique set of challenges for energy and water provision, among other public services. Jordan's Response Plan (JRP), for instance, considers these complexities and acknowledges the interconnectedness of water and energy difficulties faced by refugees and the national community. The JRP, therefore, looks beyond humanitarian relief to the longer-term resilience of the country. Energy investments must, therefore, be in agreement with the country's development objectives (**Lahn, Grafham and Sparr 2016**). Nevertheless, with the majority of Syrian refugees living in host communities and others

living within designated and informal camps, the demand for affordable housing, water, and energy remains high and energy efficiency little more than wishful thinking. Despite this, a paper prepared by the MEI project identified some successful interventions, one of which saw the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC) work closely with landlords to secure tenancy for vulnerable families in Irbid through financing the extension of landlord property to house a Syrian family over 12–18 months. As part of an EU-funded project, NRC also negotiated rent reductions in return for the installation of solar water heaters (**Lahn, Grafham and Sparr 2016**). The financing of energy services, however, remains a significant challenge. As the study found, in order to ration use, some have argued that refugees in Jordan should pay for energy services, while others have pointed to the impossibility of billing such a transient population. Moreover, the installation of smart meters would signal permanence and thus be undesirable, politically (**Lahn, Grafham and Sparr 2016**).

Box 2.5 Main findings from HIEP-funded 'Moving Energy Initiative (MEI)' project

Project title: **Moving Energy Initiative (MEI)**

Carried out by: Collaboration between Energy 4 Impact, Chatham House, Practical Action, the Norwegian Refugee Council (NRC), the Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and DFID

Date: May 2016 – March 2019

Key findings:

- Market-based approaches can bring together refugees and host communities to meet local needs and strengthen markets. It is, however, an approach that requires a time commitment and significant buy-in and technical understanding from market actors and humanitarian practitioners. MEI found that projects using market-based approaches in Burkina Faso and Kenya suffered from funding and time limitations, leading MEI to conclude that 'if humanitarian or development practitioners are going to try and adopt market-based approaches in protracted displacement contexts, greater support from donors is needed to help bridge the funding complexities between humanitarian and development programming' (**Whitehouse 2019: 31**).

- There are private sector companies that would be willing to provide energy as a service in displacement settings. This would shift operational risk to the private sector and free up the already constrained time of humanitarian agencies, which lack the necessary expertise. Infrastructure management contracts, however, would involve long-term service agreements which are often incompatible with short-term humanitarian funding. Financial mechanisms such as partial risk guarantees might be a solution to managing this risk (**Patel et al. 2019**).
- Donors need to address their commitment to the sustainability of energy infrastructure in displacement settings. This could be done through providing long-term funding for necessary operations and maintenance or permitting long-term partnerships with the private sector which will provide these services (**Patel et al. 2019**).

Source: Authors' own, compiled from **Patel et al. (2019)** and **Whitehouse (2019)**.

Debates over protracted crises, resilience, and basic services have raised important policy questions around policy coordination and integration along the humanitarian–development nexus, the role of the private sector, or geographical dynamics (urban–rural issues). Most often, detailed recommendations around these big questions have proven difficult to provide within the different HIEP projects, in part due to the lack of systematic data. More practical recommendations have emerged from the programme at different levels on debates over cash-based transfers and social protection, health interventions, and the need to consider (renewable) energy needs and sustainability with a shift to bridge the siloed approaches between short-term emergency need and long-term development planning. One cross-cutting issue has been the importance of social capital and connections especially around self-reliance, livelihood access, and resilience, and this might constitute an important finding to provide the basis for further research on protracted crises, resilience, and basic services.

3. Innovation in the humanitarian sector

Increasingly, the challenges associated with delivering effective humanitarian assistance and providing access to basic services have called for a greater investment in humanitarian innovation to bring about much needed ‘transformational change’ and improve aid effectiveness (see **HIF-ALNAP research on successful humanitarian innovation – Obrecht and Warner 2016; Ramalingam et al. 2015: 3**). HIEP has played a prominent role in this space, funding not only the large grant-making fund – the **Humanitarian Innovation Fund (HIF)** – but also smaller projects which explored the importance of innovation in addressing these persistent challenges. To provide an idea of the scale of investment, from 2011 to the end of 2016, HIF funded a total of 109 innovations (**Elrha 2017**) – too many to discuss in this paper – but included in this figure was a successful innovation developed by the World Food Programme (WFP).⁵

In particular, HIF funded the World Food Programme’s (WFP) Mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (mVAM) innovation (see Box 3.1). This innovation grew out of WFP’s need to better compile and measure information on food security and insecurity in unstable contexts. Earlier attempts through its Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) unit created in 1994 highlighted the need to employ more cost-effective and time-efficient ways to collate data on vulnerable populations in remote, hard to access, and insecure areas. With the need for real-time information to improve decision-making, coupled with advances in mobile phone technology, WFP launched mVAM to carry out high frequency data collection and monitoring of household food security using mobile technology such as SMS, live telephone calls, and Interactive Voice Response (IVR) (**Foley 2017**).

This project was initially piloted in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) and Somalia and was rapidly scaled up with additional donor funding. WFP now uses mVAM in its global operations as a remote data collection approach and has inspired other organisations (UNICEF and FEWS NET) to use mobile technology approaches for remote management and monitoring. Moreover, success of the project in the DRC led to a partnership agreement between WFP and Cellule d’Analyses des Indicateurs de Développement (CAID) of the Prime Minister’s Office to carry out a phone-based food security monitoring system, mKengela. Food price information was collected through bi-weekly calls to market traders in DRC’s 145 territories, and a household food consumption and coping strategy survey was piloted at the provincial level (**Foley 2017**).

5 For a full list of HIF projects see the HIF website, <https://www.elrha.org/programme/hif/>

Box 3.1 Key findings from HIEP-funded Mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (mVAM) project

Project title: Humanitarian Innovation Fund - WFP project
Mobile Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (mVAM)

Carried out by: WFP

Date: June 2013 – April 2015

Key findings:

- In comparison with traditional surveying techniques, mVAM is a quick and affordable way to collect high-frequency data in remote and hard-to-reach locations. To date mVAM has been used during the Ebola crisis, in Yemen, Iraq and Malawi.
- Survey indicators can be easily changed to reflect changing context.
- High-frequency monitoring data enables better decision-making and has the potential to improve programmatic response and impact.
- Important limitations to the use of mVAM are poor mobile phone connectivity and network coverage issues during times of conflict.
- In resource-poor organisations and field offices, it may be impossible to analyse all the data collected, leaving decision-makers uninformed.

Source: Authors' own, compiled from **Foley (2017)**.

Technology is high on the agenda in humanitarian innovation, but access to basic services still remains an important challenge, and more research is needed on scaling-up innovative practices to increase access. This is the case for delivering education in emergencies, which is not only a basic human right but is necessary to ensure the physical safety of and provide psychosocial support to children affected by crisis (**UNICEF n.d.**). Figures suggest that, in 2017, some 261.8 million (1 in 5) children, adolescents and youth between the ages of 6 and 17 were not attending school. For low- and lower-middle-income countries this figure increased to 1 in 3 children out of school (**UNESCO 2018**). The statistics are more concerning for refugee children where 3.7 million children are out of school (**UNHCR 2019: 4**), many of whom are living in protracted situations. Only 63 per cent of refugee children attended primary school and 24 per cent secondary school compared to global averages of 91 and 84 per cent respectively (**UNHCR 2019: 5-6**). With less than 3 per cent of the global humanitarian aid budget spent on education (**ECHO 2019**), education has not been seen as a humanitarian

priority (**INEE 2019**). Part of the reason for this relates to a lack of evidence of what works and under what conditions, with traditional approaches to the provision of education unable to overcome the barriers to access and good-quality education in difficult contexts.

The HIEP funded **Humanitarian Education Accelerator** (HEA) programme set out to address this issue of education inequality through providing much-needed evidence on what does and does not work when scaling-up Education in Emergencies innovations in protracted crises.⁶ HEA not only provided finance, mentorship, support, and access to investors – elements common to any accelerator; it also ensured rigorous evaluations were carried out to capture the interventions' effectiveness and potential to scale, as well as value for money considerations. In total, five humanitarian education innovation programmes were funded which ranged from providing safe spaces to learn through remedial classes or through mobile 'pop up' multimedia centres, playing educational games on tablets, to offering US accredited degrees to refugees through blended learning. As Box 3.2 shows, the findings from this programme go some way to filling the evidence gap on how to scale education innovations in humanitarian settings.⁷

Box 3.2 Main findings from the HIEP-funded Humanitarian Education Accelerator (HEA)

Project title: **Humanitarian Education Accelerator (HEA)**

Carried out by: DFID, UNHCR and UNICEF

Date: May 2015 – October 2019

Key findings:

- Building the evidence base from development. Drawing evidence from development settings in low- and middle-income countries could help fill knowledge and evidence gaps on the impact of education programmes in humanitarian contexts.
- Inability to scale-up programmes. Programmes were often implemented across multiple countries rather than scaled-up in one country. Reasons for this include uncertainty over future funding and inflexible funding models (limited access to core funding), which restricted the creation of programme management systems and organisational capacity to scale.

6 Initially HEA was a partnership between DFID, UNHCR and UNICEF. It is now an Education Cannot Wait (ECW)-funded programme, led by UNHCR – <https://hea.globalinnovationexchange.org/>

7 For a more detailed analysis, see the meta-evaluation of the first round of the HEA programme (**De Hoop et al. 2019**).

- Engagement with governments. For programme sustainability, it is important to engage with the relevant ministry of education prior to and during implementation of programmes. Not only will this encourage alignment of programme priorities with public policy priorities and national education systems, but it will also facilitate take up of the education innovation. Failure to do so can create non-formal school settings that lack accreditation capabilities. However, in some contexts the inclusion of refugees in national education systems is highly politicised and contentious.
- Labour market opportunities for refugees. Kepler's tertiary education programme found that in Rwanda (where refugees are permitted to work) employers who lacked knowledge about refugee employment status were less likely to employ relatively well-educated refugees than nationals with identical educational attainments. Better knowledge around recruitment of refugees is needed to improve their chances in the labour market.
- Funding should be provided to innovations of different scale: Larger education innovations in complex emergencies should continue to be funded alongside innovations at the proof of concept pilot stage.

Source: Authors' own compiled from **HEA (2019)** and **De Hoop et al. (2019)**.

DFID is continuing to invest in humanitarian innovation through a number of initiatives such as the HIF and will continue to document and share evidence and lessons on scaling innovation across the humanitarian system.

4. Research methods

Challenges associated with carrying out research in humanitarian contexts have been well documented. An R2HC report on research methodologies in humanitarian crises found that operational challenges have a significant impact on methodological decisions. In prolonged humanitarian crises, for example, issues around mobility (transient populations moving to and across dispersed urban areas) and insecurity, limit access, making it difficult to sample populations and carry out follow-up activities. Data collection tools envisaged at the beginning of a project (face-to-face interviews) invariably end up being significantly different at the end (remote electronic surveys). Ethical considerations relating to randomisation between control and intervention groups and difficulties establishing baseline or counterfactual data are common (**Smith and Blanchet 2019**).

Innovative methodologies have been touted as a way to address these challenges but are difficult to design and implement. A review of the R2HC portfolio to date revealed that 'Whilst no evidence was found of new or innovative methodologies, the reviewers found that methodology adaptation was commonplace and widespread, although not systematically documented' (**Smith and Blanchet 2019: 5**). As such, a range of methods – some tried and tested, and others less commonly used in humanitarian contexts – were adopted across the HIEP portfolio. These include, but are not limited to, **randomised controlled trials, impact evaluations, re-designing tools normally carried out in rural areas for application in urban settings**, conducting remote surveying, **systematic reviews** (which include grey literature to overcome the challenges of data availability), mixed qualitative and quantitative methods, longitudinal cohort studies, quasi-experimental studies, participatory methodologies and working closely with local communities to integrate and share research findings. As such, the evaluation of HIEP (**Itad 2018: xii**) found that 'HIEP projects' design has dealt well with the challenges of research in humanitarian contexts, showing that a range of methods are feasible and can produce high-quality evidence.' Below are some examples of methodological issues found in a number of HIEP projects:

Measuring resilience in urban settings (Urban Ark) The Household Economy Approach, normally employed in rural contexts, uses a livelihoods-based framework to look at household vulnerability to shocks and identifies whether humanitarian intervention might be required and what action could be implemented. Through adding additional indicators to the Household Economy Approach, the piloted methodology was successfully applied to the urban context; however, key challenges to measuring resilience amongst very poor at-risk households were identified (**Boubacar et al. 2017**).

Challenges of randomisation and attribution (Cash and Vouchers for Nutrition in Wajid Somalia). With famine declared in Somalia in 1992 and 2011, and near famine conditions in 2017, food insecurity has been a major issue for the country. With limited evidence on the impact of cash and vouchers assistance (CVA) on acute malnutrition in humanitarian contexts, this project looked at the role of CVA in improving the nutrition and health outcomes for pregnant and lactating women and children under 5 in the context of the 2017/2018 Somalia food crisis. The project experienced a number of methodological issues: firstly, as it was carried out during an acute food crisis, ethical issues precluded random assignment of beneficiaries. Instead, the project used a non-randomised prospective cohort design to compare household food security and nutrition outcomes. Secondly, with different humanitarian agencies implementing nutritional interventions, it was difficult to ensure that those in the study only received the agreed intervention, making attribution a challenge (**Doocy et al. 2020**).

Challenges of randomisation and establishing wait-list control groups (**Measuring the Health and Wellbeing Impacts of a Scalable Program of Psychosocial Intervention for Refugee Youth**). The project encountered common methodological challenges associated with robust impact evaluations, such as the lack of a control group, and carrying out a randomised controlled trial in a humanitarian context. To overcome this issue, the project set up a wait-listed control group that would eventually be brought onto the programme two months later. However, insecurity over the availability of future funding for the programme made randomising and establishing the wait-list problematic. As with the CVA project in Somalia, on ethical grounds, the project team would not randomise participants until funding was agreed. Once secured, the project worked closely with local families to create a transparent randomised controlled trial process (**Panter-Brick, Kurtz and Dajani 2018**).

5. Uptake

The HIEP Impact project sought to encourage the research uptake of HIEP-commissioned projects through identifying opportunities to draw upon and share lessons from across the programme's portfolio. Through an open call for proposals, four HIEP grant holders were awarded small impact grants to undertake such activities. Many of the projects reacted positively as they felt more could be done to share the key findings of their project with different audiences. At a more programmatic level, however, it appears that more opportunities could have been developed to share and synthesise findings across the different projects and create synergies such as this paper has done around protracted crisis, resilience and basic services. While the activities commissioned in terms of research uptake have been successful, one of the key issues is that most projects were struggling to disseminate these findings beyond the funded life of the project cycle.

Box 5.1 provides an example of the benefit of promoting research uptake beyond official project timescales. With a small financial investment, the HIEP Impact grants provided grantees, who hitherto had limited capacity, additional funds to promote their work and encourage uptake of findings.

Box 5.1 HIEP Impact Grantee Case Study

Project title: Humanitarian Data Exchange (HDX) Case Study

Carried out by: OCHA

Date: May 2015 – October 2019

The humanitarian data repository, HDX, launched by the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), has succeeded where many other repositories have failed in creating a cohesive, enduring community of users. Not only has it contributed to the innovation evidence base, but HDX is also of significant value in the humanitarian sector's quest for an evidence-based humanitarian system. With over 17,000 datasets from over 300 registered organizations, the HDX platform has the ability to inform humanitarian operations through the use and re-use of easily accessible and reliable data. Managed by OCHA's Centre for Humanitarian Data, HDX plays a key role in contributing to the increased use and impact of data in humanitarian response.

Through a HIEP Impact Grant, OCHA was able to capture and document key lessons on HDX's evolution to be shared with the wider humanitarian community.

Some of the key lessons identified include the need to:

- Ensure that platforms are designed with the needs of users in mind. Conducting user research and taking the time to analyse this research is necessary to inform the strategic direction and promote use.
- Be ambitious but perfect what you are good at first. One of the reasons why the HDX platform has been a success is that it has perfected what it knows how to do before choosing to add new builds to the platform.
- Foster and maintain trust with other data users. To facilitate data sharing, HDX promotes the safe, ethical, and effective management of data and encourages its users to share data responsibly.

Such institutional memory is rarely captured but the HIEP Impact Grant made this possible. As one of the main authors of the case study, Sarah Telford, notes:

The research grant gave us time to reflect on the experience of creating HDX. We were able to identify the key decisions and milestones that contributed to the platform's success and document these so that others can learn from our approach.

(Sarah Telford, pers. comm. 4 June 2020)

Source: Telford (forthcoming).

6. Conclusions and recommendations

The Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme has been one of the first research programmes of this scale and scope in the humanitarian sector. While a significant body of humanitarian research has been undertaken over the previous decades, it has been at a smaller scale primarily focused at a country level. Funding humanitarian research at this scale starts to bring the sector in line with mainstream development where research, evidence, methodology development, and analytics have been standard currency for many years.

Key recommendations from this research uptake project around HIEP are as follows:

- **Building the evidence base on how basic services can become more resilient** both generally, and in places where the State is either unable or unwilling should be a major focus for research.
- **Increasing focus should be placed on (renewable) energy and education needs and sustainability** with a shift to bridge the siloed approaches between short-term emergency need and long-term development planning.
- **Providing effective approaches to a safety net of last resort** in long-term instability, fragility and protracted crisis is the policy area that DFID and humanitarians more generally are struggling with above all else.
- **The humanitarian sector needs to adopt and practice a more nuanced understanding of resilience** (individual and community) that looks at the structural factors that limit people's agency even in the absence of shocks.
- **Investing in research uptake should be encouraged from the outset of a project life-cycle.** In addition, further financial investment should be provided to ensure project outputs are easily accessible and centrally located for further uptake.
- With expectations mounting around the role of innovation in addressing persistent humanitarian challenges, it is important for actors to ensure that the **main building blocks are there before going to scale.**

As humanitarian contexts increasingly merge with global challenges such as climate change and global health, and as pockets of humanitarian need emerge in middle-income countries (refugees in the Middle East), or highly urban contexts, programmes such as HIEP demonstrate the value of investing in new research. Relying on established ways of doing things purely because they are what people know how to do will become increasingly irrelevant and possibly harmful as complexity intensifies. HIEP demonstrates that while not all investments will yield major insights, the overall impact is high and can only be improved with experience and commitment to learning.

References

References

- Ashdown, P. et al. (2011) *Humanitarian Emergency Response Review*, London: Department for International Development
- Bellers, R. (forthcoming, 2020) 'Making Evidence Matter – HIEP', presentation at the Humanitarian Network and Partnerships Week, Geneva, 3–7 February
- Boubacar, S.; Pelling, M.; Barcena, A. and Montandon, R. (2017) *Small Disasters Erode Household Resilience: The Absorptive Capacity of Flood-Prone Households in Niamey, Niger*, Briefing 4, London: Urban Africa: Risk Knowledge (UrbanARK)
- Crawford, N.; Cosgrave, J.; Haysom, S. and Walicki, N. (2015) *Protracted Displacement: Uncertain Paths to Self-Reliance in Exile*, Humanitarian Policy Group Report, London: Overseas Development Institute
- De Hoop, T. et al. (2019) *Scaling Education Innovations in Complex Emergencies: Evidence from the Humanitarian Education Accelerator*, Washington DC: American Institutes for Research
- DFID (2017) *Saving Lives, Building Resilience, Reforming the System: The UK Government's Humanitarian Reform Policy*, London: Department for International Development
- Doocy, S. et al. (2020) 'Cash and Voucher Assistance and Children's Nutrition Status in Somalia', *Maternal & Child Nutrition*. doi:10.1111/mcn.12966
- ECHO (2019) *Education in Emergencies (EiE)*, Factsheet, Brussels: European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
- Elrha (2017) *Evaluation Response: Learning from Five Years of Action*, London: Elrha
- Farhat, Maham (forthcoming, 2020) 'Shock-Responsive Social Protection', presentation at the Humanitarian Network and Partnerships Week, 3–7 February
- Foley, C. (2017) *HIF Evaluation Case Study: WFP Mobile Vulnerability and Analysis Mapping*, London: IPE Triple Line
- Grafham, O. and Lahn, G (2018) *The Costs of Fuelling Humanitarian Aid*, Research Paper, Moving Energy Initiative, London: Chatham House
- HEA (2019) **Executive Summary: Meta-Evaluation of the First Round of the Humanitarian Education Accelerator (HEA): Lessons Learned on Scaling Education Innovations in Humanitarian Settings**, Medium (accessed 30 June 2020)
- INEE (2019) *Achieving SDG4 for Children and Youth Affected by Crisis*, New York: Inter-agency Network for Education in Emergencies
- Itad (2018) *Evaluation of Humanitarian Innovation and Evidence Programme: Summative Phase 2*, Final Report, Brighton: Itad
- Lahn, G. and Grafham, O. (2015) *Heat, Light and Power for Refugees: Saving Lives, Reducing Costs*, Chatham House Report for the Moving Energy Initiative, London: Chatham House
- Lahn, G.; Grafham, O. and Sparr, A. E. (2016) *Refugees and Energy Resilience in Jordan*, Research Paper, Moving Energy Institute, London: Chatham House
- Levine, S. and Sida, L., with Gray, B. and Cabot Venton, C. (2019) *Multi-Year Humanitarian Funding: A Thematic Evaluation*, HPG Report, London: Overseas Development Institute
- Obrecht, A. and Warner, A. (2016) *More Than Just Luck: Innovation in Humanitarian Action*, HIF/ALNAP Study, London: ANLAP/ Overseas Development Institute
- O'Brien, C. et al. (2018) *Shock-Responsive Social Protection Systems Research: Synthesis Report*, Oxford: Oxford Policy Management
- Panter-Brick, C.; Kurtz, J. and Dajani, R. (2018) 'What Strong Partnerships Achieve: Innovations in Research and Practice', *Humanitarian Exchange* 72: 15–19
- Patel, L.; Good, B.; Bharadwaj, A. and Chaudhry, S. (2019) *Infrastructure Management Contracts: Improving Energy Asset Management in Displacement Settings*, Research Paper, Moving Energy Initiative, London: Chatham House

References

Patel, R. B.; King, J.; Phelps, L. and Sanderson, D. (2017) *What Practices are Used to Identify and Prioritize Vulnerable Populations Affected by Urban Humanitarian Emergencies? A Systematic Review*, Humanitarian Evidence Programme, Oxford: Oxfam GB

Ramalingam, B. et al. (2015) *Strengthening the Humanitarian Innovation Ecosystem*, Humanitarian Innovation Ecosystem Research Project: Final Report, Brighton: University of Brighton

Smith, J. and Blanchet, K. (2019) *Research Methodologies in Humanitarian Crises*, London: Elrha

UNESCO (2018) '**New Education Data for SDG 4 and More**' (accessed 20 March 2020)

Telford, S. (forthcoming) *The Humanitarian Data Exchange: Critical Decisions, Key Results and the Road Ahead, Case Study*, Geneva: United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs

UNHCR (2019) *Stepping Up: Refugee Education in Crisis*, Geneva: Office of the United Nations Commissioner for Refugees

UNICEF (n.d.) '**Education in Emergencies**' (accessed 25 June 2020)

Whitehouse, K. (2019) *Adopting a Market-based Approach to Boost Energy Access in Displaced Contexts*, Research Paper, Moving Energy Initiative, London: Chatham House



Delivering world-class research, learning and teaching that transforms the knowledge, action and leadership needed for more equitable and sustainable development globally.

Institute of Development Studies
Library Road
Brighton, BN1 9RE
United Kingdom
+44 (0)1273 606261
ids.ac.uk

Charity Registration Number 306371
Charitable Company Number 877338
© Department for International Development 2020