

Building the Evidence on Forced Displacement Response Programs: the Role of Impact Evaluations

Paola Elice, World Bank, Fragility Conflict and Violence Unit

June 1, 2022



Welcome & logistics

- Session is being recorded!
- Zoom webinar
- Feel free to introduce yourself using the chat function
- You can ask questions via the Q&A function, questions in the Q&A can be upvoted
- You can also ask questions during the Q&A by raising hand
- 25 minutes presentation, followed by Q&A



About the Author

- 2020-present --- Impact Evaluation Specialist in the World Bank Fragility, Conflict, and Violence (FCV) Unit. Focusing on impact evaluations under the UK Aid-UNHCR-World Bank research program *Building the Evidence on Forced Displacement*
- 2018-2020 --- Impact Evaluation Consultant in the World Bank Development Impact Evaluation Unit (DIME)
- 2013-2018 --- Research Manager at Innovations for Poverty Action
- 2013 --- M&E Fellow at Village Enterprise



Context for the Paper

- Background paper for UNHCR report <u>People Forced to Flee: History, Change and</u> <u>Challenge</u>
- FCDO (UK Aid) UNHCR World Bank <u>Building the Evidence on Forced</u> <u>Displacement research program</u>; 6 years program; since 2016; completing in 2022.
- Within the program, impact evaluations pilar: <u>https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/building-the-evidence-on-forced-displacement/impact-evaluations</u>



Learning Objectives/Outline

- Learn the difference between M&E/process evaluation and impact evaluation
- Learn the core principles of impact evaluation
- Learn about the 'history' of impact evaluation in LMICs from 1990s
- Learn key terms, latest statistics related to forced displacement
- Learn about impact evaluations to study forced displacement programs
- Challenges
- Opportunities
- Recommendations
- Q&A



Impact evaluation

Example project: 'grant + mentorship' program for small businesses

	Inputs	Outputs	Intermediate outcomes	Final outcomes			
Definitions	Time, money, and resources (personnel)	Products resulting from the combination of inputs.	This is how the behavior, relationships, activities, actions of an individual, or group are expected to change.	This is the broader goal that we wish to achieve with the project.			
Example	Grants, business mentors	100 small business- owners receive grants and mentorship	Business owners adopt improved business practices, buy new business assets	Better income			
	Process evaluation / M&E	Process evaluation / M&E	Impact evaluation	Impact evaluation			



Impact evaluation

- Evaluations: formative and summative
- Process evaluation = formative evaluation
- Impact evaluation = **summative** evaluation
- Impact evaluations are quantitative + rigorous methods (comparison/control group)
- Process evaluation and impact evaluation are complimentary



Core principles of impact evaluation

• Comparison/control group

Example: Imagine evaluating the impact of a teacher training program which started in 2019-2020 in 2022: learning outcomes may be worse because of the pandemic disruptions to education. Can we conclude that the training made learning outcomes worse?

• Selection bias (randomized evaluations)

Example: Community-Driven Development program OR job-training program



Impact evaluation methods

- Methods: difference-in-differences, regression discontinuity, randomization. Methods vary based on how the comparison group is identified.
- Regression discontinuity design: targeting (altitude, eligibility scores); sudden policy change
- Summary:

https://www.povertyactionlab.org/sites/default/files/researchresources/impact-evaluation-methods-table.pdf



Seminal impact evaluations (in LMICs)

- Improving school enrollment, attendance, student learning (Western Kenya) --- textbooks? school uniforms? deworming? provision of meals? financial incentives for teachers based on students' test scores?
- Pratham `Balzakhi' (India)
- PROGRESA (Conditional Cash Transfer program) --- Mexico
- Microcredit
- 'Graduation' programs for ultra-poor households



Forced displacement

- By the end of 2020, 82.4 million people had been forced to flee from their homes because of war, conflict, persecution, violence, human rights violations. 48 million (58%) were internally displaced; 26.4 (32%) were refugees. The rest are asylum seekers and Venezuelans displaced abroad.
- 85% of the displaced live in LMICs.
- 76% of refugees reside in host countries for more than 5 consecutive years.

Global Compact on Refugees (2018):

- Coordination between humanitarian and 'development' actors
- Enhanced policy response will be anchored on the principle of 'shared responsibility' and on an effort to employ resources as effectively and efficiently as possible.



IE initiatives/partnerships

- IPA-J-PAL Governance, Crime and Conflict Initiative
- J-PAL's newly established Regional Research Center in Cairo
- IRC's Airbell Research Center
- WFP's impact evaluation unit and partnership with DIME
- IPA and J-PAL research hubs and data infrastructure to support research in locations critical for humanitarian response (for example Bangladesh and Tanzania, Colombia(?))
- LEGO Foundation-funded *PlayMatters* initiative
- UK Aid UNHCR WB Building the Evidence on Forced Displacement research program

This list is not exhaustive! IOM, etc.



Why evaluate?

- To ensure resources are channeled to effective programs
- To make sure a program works as intended before scaling it (pilots)
- To course-correct a program
- To support advocacy efforts
- Because forcibly displaced people may have a new set of challenges: trauma, language, loss of assets, documentation, legal barriers in the host country.
- For evidence-based policy making



Different and new research questions

 It may not make sense to ask whether a program works or not, rather which program type works best?

Example: delivery of 'aid' in cash vs. digitally (Niger IE), cash or vouchers (Niger(?)), OR does an inexpensive IPV prevention campaign - delivered as part of a cash transfer program - work in reducing violence (Cameroon IE)?

- New research questions: mental health --- group therapy?, social cohesion (Uganda)
- New focus areas: early childhood development, gender, social cohesion



Methods

- Non-experimental methods. *Examples*: regression discontinuity, difference in differences with statistical matching.
- Experimental: using phase-in designs; etc.



Challenges

Challenges	Ways to overcome them		
Attrition	'Smart' tracking protocols; WhatsApp surveys (?)		
Contamination	Coordination, geo-located 'aid' data(?)		
Quality data (?)	See next slide!		
Ethical standards	Need to develop guidelines (IRC pioneer on this)		
Ethical reviews	Need to develop guidelines (IRC pioneer on this); ad-hoc review committees		
Cost	Using M&E budgets in a smarter way; innovative & 'big data'		

... more on 'quality data'

- Joint Data Center on Forced Displacement (JDC)
- IPA/J-PAL panel surveys
- Public 'FCV' data-store:

https://microdata.worldbank.org/index.php/collections/FCV

• (Internal to World Bank):

<u>https://microdatalib.worldbank.org/index.php/collections/FC</u> V



... more on ethical considerations

From IRC paper:

- Introducing a staged review of research protocols and flexible reviews of modification requests to account for the need to adjust research protocols quickly to adjust to changing circumstances on the ground or to deal with uncertain information on the sample that can be confirmed later on;
- Introducing principles to address the traumatic experiences of participants;
- Addressing the difficulties in attaining meaningful informed consent among populations that may be dependent on the interventions provided;
- Ensuring reviewers are knowledgeable of the population involved in the research.



Opportunities

Opportunities	Examples	
'Nimble' evaluations	WFP VAM surveys; phone/WhatsApp surveys	
Ethical standards	Already discussed	
Innovative data	Already discussed. ACLED, IOM key informant data, phone-surveys, WhatsApp surveys, satellite, drone data, admin data	
Publication bias (?)	Registration requirement	
Cost-effectiveness analysis	Requirement to include	

Examples of completed IEs

Title	Country	Method	Findings
No Household Left Behind: Afghanistan Targeting the Ultra Poor Impact Evaluation	Afghanistan	Randomized	Increased consumption (30%); reduced poverty (20%)
Iraq's Universal Public Distribution System : Utilization and Impacts during Displacement	Iraq	Statistical matching	Helps – to some extent – displaced households: higher food and non-food expenditures, 20% more spending on education, etc.
Can Development Aid Change Attitudes toward Refugees? Experimental Evidence from Urban Microentrepreneurs in Uganda	Uganda	Randomized	Improved social cohesion



Examples of completed IEs

Title	Country	Method	Findings
More is Better: Evaluating the Impact of a Variation in Cash Assistance on the Reintegration Outcomes of Returning Afghan Refugees	Afghanistan	Regression discontinuity	Those that received the \$350 cash assistance were more likely to invest in durable assets (house), obtaining legal documentation
THE PSYCHOSOCIAL VALUE OF EMPLOYMENT	Bangladesh	Randomized	Engaging in productive activities may yield benefits that go beyond earning a wage or income, such as improved psychosocial wellbeing.
<u>Changing teachers' attitudes did not</u> <u>reduce school-based violence in</u> <u>Tanzania</u>	Tanzania	Randomized	Attitudes changed, but not the behavior
Effect of an Economic Transfer Program on Mental Health of Displaced Persons and Host Populations in Democratic Republic of Congo: A Randomised Controlled Trial	Democratic Republic of the Congo	Randomized	Vouchers to purchase Essential Household Items improved mental health, did not improve resilience, did not alter social cohesion

Examples of forthcoming IEs

- Impact Evaluation of a Program to Prevent Intimate Partner Violence among Refugees and Host Communities (Cameroon)
- Mental health 'imagery' intervention: effects on employment services take-up (Ethiopia)
- Informational intervention to increase women's participation in Community-Driven Development project (Kenya)
- Entrepreneurship intervention accompanying cash transfer program (Niger)
- New pedagogical and socioemotional skills curricula (Jordan)
- New teacher coaching method (Lebanon)



Recommendations

- Partnerships + internal impact evaluation capacity
- Drawing from lessons learnt from pioneer evaluations
- More operationally relevant and more 'nimble' evaluations
- Leveraging data
- Cost-effectiveness & publication bias
- Development of tailored ethical standards



Resources

- Paper: <u>https://www.unhcr.org/people-forced-to-flee-book/wp-</u> content/uploads/sites/137/2021/11/Paola-Elice Impact-Evaluations-in-Forced-Displacement-Contexts-A-Guide-for-Practitioners.pdf
- Blog: <u>https://www.unhcr.org/blogs/rising-role-of-impact-evaluations-in-evidence-based-programming-for-forcibly-displaced-and-hosts/</u>
- FCDO (UK Aid) UNHCR World Bank Building the Evidence on Forced Displacement research program: <u>https://www.worldbank.org/en/programs/building-the-evidence-on-forced-displacement</u>



Funding acknowledgment

This work is part of the program "Building the Evidence on Protracted Forced Displacement: A Multi-Stakeholder Partnership". The program is funded by UK aid from the United Kingdom's Foreign, Commonwealth and Development Office (FCDO), it is managed by the World Bank Group (WBG) and was established in partnership with the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR). The scope of the program is to expand the global knowledge on forced displacement by funding quality research and disseminating results for the use of practitioners and policy makers. This work does not necessarily reflect the views of FCDO, the WBG or UNHCR.





Thank you!

For any follow-ups: pelice@worldbank.org







