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# 1. Task Order plan #034 detail

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **USAID TOP Manager** | Patrick Brady, USAID COR |
| **MSI TOP Manager** | Paul Temple |
| **Activity Start and End Dates** | May 1 – May 30, 2015 |

# 2. Purpose

In 2014, the USAID mission to South Sudan (USAID/South Sudan) requested additional technical services to help advance operationalization of the Mission’s Operational Framework by developing the data collection methodologies for Levels 1 and 3 of the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) Framework. This report focuses specifically on Level 3: Assess Transition Objective (TO) level trends through mixed methods research and convening of an Advisory Council (AC) consisting of local notables. Specifically, the Evaluation Methodologist is tasked with the design of indices measuring Recovery with Resilience and Peace and Stability – two objectives furthering USAID/South Sudan’s goal of building a foundation for a more stable and socially cohesive South Sudan.

# 3. Background

The December 2013 political crisis in Juba[[1]](#footnote-1) resulted in a resumption of local armed conflict that was both politically and ethnically driven, disrupting development programming and threatening a return to outright civil war. As a consequence, the USAID/South Sudan developed a new approach to its programming known as the Operational Framework (OF). Work began in the fall of 2014 to operationalize the OF, and one key step was the development of the Mission’s 3-level Monitoring, Evaluation and Learning (MEL) framework to serve as a results framework for the OF. Figure 1 illustrates.

Figure USAID/South Sudan Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Framework

**Goal: *“Build the foundation for a more stable and socially cohesive South Sudan”***

The Monitoring and Evaluation Support Project (MESP) was tasked with identifying existing sources of data to help track each Transition Objective (TO), as well as develop new measures for household surveys and other data collection methods to track aggregate measures of Recovery with Resilience (Transition Objective 1) and Peace with Stability (Transition Objective 2). This design report focuses on proposed new measures that existing sources of data do not address.

The following sections provide a brief review of these high-level measurement constructs, followed by a first draft of proposed measures to operationalize measurement through household surveys and other data collection methods.

## Recovery with Resilience

Recovery with Resilience (hereafter Resilience) borrows from the ecological concept of a given system maintaining or recovering equilibrium in an environment of ongoing challenge and change.[[2]](#footnote-2) Part of the motivation behind the concept of resilience is to bridge humanitarian and longer term development efforts, integrate sustainability concerns into disaster responses, and better capture the nuance and complexity of the environments in which development programming takes place.

USAID defines resilience as the ability of people, households, communities, countries, and systems to mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses in a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth.[[3]](#footnote-3) The Food Security Information Network (FSIN) convened a Resilience Measurement Technical Working Group (RM-TWG), which similarly defined resilience as the capacity that ensures adverse stressors and shocks do not have long-lasting adverse consequences.[[4]](#footnote-4) The Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) likewise defines resilience as the ability of groups or communities to cope with external stresses and disturbances as a result of social, political, and environmental change.[[5]](#footnote-5) A comprehensive list of definitions may be found in Frankenberger (2013a), all of which follow the definitions mentioned here.

As a highly abstract concept, resilience is difficult to operationalize, and past practice has not yet generated a consensus among scholars or practitioners (FSIN No. 1 2014, Vaitla 2012). Recent theory (Frankenberger 2013b) and practice (Smith and Frankenberger 2015) identifies three dimensions of capacity that collectively make up resilience: Adaptive, Absorptive, and Transformative capacity. Absorptive capacity measures the ability to minimize exposure to shocks and stresses through preventative measures and appropriate coping strategies to avoid permanent, negative impacts when shocks do in fact occur. Adaptive capacity involves proactive and informed choices about alternative livelihood strategies based on an understanding of changing conditions. Transformative capacity addresses the governance mechanisms, policies/regulations, infrastructure, community networks, and formal and informal social protection mechanisms that are part of the wider system in which households and communities are embedded.

As would be expected given the definitions, adaptive and absorptive capacity are drawn primarily from household questionnaires, while transformative capacity is typically a village-level construct itself situated within a larger context of local governance. Each capacity constitutes its own multi-measure index. At a recent presentation of impact evaluation baseline results for a market expansion project in Ethiopia, Frankenberger identified the following core measures for each capacity:[[6]](#footnote-6)

Table Core measures of resilience capacities

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Absorptive | Adaptive | Transformative |
| Access to informal safety nets | Exposure to information | Access to formal safety nets |
| Access to disaster preparedness programs | Human capital | Access to basic services |
| Access to hazard insurance | Bridging social capital | Bridging social capital |
| Bonding social capital | Linking social capital | Linking social capital |

While some of these measures reflect donor activity and will therefore be specific to the investments made in a given context, many of the measures have a long history in the theoretical literature. Bonding social capital measures social solidarity within communities, often arising out of shared tribal, ethnic, religious, or national identities. Bridging social capital measures the ability of communities to function where social solidarity is complicated by a diversity of such identities (intra-community relations), or for two communities to coexist and collaborate whose social fabrics are knit by different sources of bonding social capital (inter-community relations). And while bonding and bridging social capital examines horizontal linkages within and between communities, linking social capital measures the vertical connections between citizens and local elites, communities and local government, or grassroots advocacy networks and regional or national policy deliberations.[[7]](#footnote-7)

Resilience is an inherently local concept that originated with humanitarian disaster response and was energized by attention to climate change mitigation at the local level. But, perhaps given its wide abstraction, the concept of resilience can be usefully expanded to any larger system exhibiting sensitivity to change and interdependence of its parts. Thus, in the South Sudan context, resilience might also refer to recovery and adaptation of the world’s newest nation subject to a deep and worrisome number of social, economic, and political shocks at scales spanning local communities to entire regions spanning North, East, and Central Africa.

These more macro views, however, beg a more political and governance-centric concept. This is more the role of Transition Objective 2: Peace and Stability.

## Peace and Stability

While recovery with resilience addresses more immediate needs of South Sudanese resulting from the national political crisis, USAID’s Transition Objective 2: Peace and Stability (hereafter Stability) tracks a longer term development path as South Sudan recovers from the political crisis and works to return to a status quo prior to the crisis. Stability as a development outcome has its roots in recent counterinsurgency doctrine that calls for a “clear, hold, and build” process for communities exiting a phase of sustained violence and/or conflict. Once these communities have been stabilized through a successful donor-led “build” phase, communities may then gradually transit to a more sustainable development path in which the national government increasingly assumes its mandated role in providing services.

While the concept of stabilization emerged out of coordination between development and armed actors in conflict-affected areas, it borrows the longstanding development principle of community-driven development in which small-scale community development funds are allocated to citizen communities who identify and prioritize needs, contribute in-kind support to approved projects, and take ultimate responsibility for the maintenance of completed projects.[[8]](#footnote-8) A more stable and socially-cohesive South Sudan, then, is one in which the political crisis subsides, ethnically-driven violence ceases, displaced people return or resettle, and economic activity resumes.

In addition to resilience and stability as development outcomes, there is also the concept of cohesion, which focuses more on the inter-relationships between people and communities. Cohesion may best be understand through a brief discussion of resilience in a peacebuilding context.

## Resilience and Peacebuilding

In the South Sudan context, ethnic tension and the use of violence are obvious sources of shocks that test individual, household, and community resiliency. While conflict as a shock affecting both resiliency capacities and outcomes such as food security is acknowledged in the general literature, Menkhaus (2013) offers a direct application of resilience to a peacebuilding context. In contexts such as South Sudan where peacebuilding is a critical need in the face of a national political crisis, an additional resilience capacity may be defined as the ability to maintain a positive peace (communities do not resort to violence in the face of the “shock” of the national political crisis), the ability to shepherd a process of transforming a negative peace (strained relations, but no violence) into a positive peace, the ability to help communities overwhelmed by conflict to work toward the status quo in place prior to the shock, and finally as the ability to effect transformational change that removes sources of potential shocks entirely.

Note the parallels between this additional resilience capacity the definitions of absorptive, adaptive, and transformative capacities offered previously. However, in the South Sudan context, the notion of communities resorting to violence may not be the most relevant dynamic. Rather, it is communities themselves that are overtaken by events driven at the national level. Thus, for South Sudan, applying resilience to peacebuilding at the local level would likely involve examining how communities are able to refrain from participation in violence, absorb and adapt to shocks from surrounding violence, and how to work towards the status quo that existed prior to the national political crisis. These objectives may be broadly understood as social cohesion, in which communities are able to function in relation to one another despite the onset of shocks related to tribal, ethnic, or other social identities.

## MSI and Other Performance Models

MSI has a strong past performance operating in conflict-affected areas and concretely measuring the high-level constructs of resilience, stability, and cohesion. The Measuring Impacts of Stabilization Initiatives (MISTI) project provides third-party monitoring and evaluation of stabilization projects in Afghanistan, including rigorous impact evaluation, convening a community of practice and communicating successes and lessons learned. MISTI conceptualizes stability as composed of local government legitimacy and effectiveness, an active citizenry working in partnership with government, and overall quality of life. Resilience also includes quality of life and an active citizenry, but replaces government capacity with social cohesion. See [Annex 1](#_Annex_1:_MISTI) for a complete listing of sub-indices.

The Pakistan Monitoring and Evaluation Program similarly tracks stability in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa province, although the construct of stability is defined slightly differently to fit the local context. The Pakistan project conceptualizes stability as freedom from violence or conflict, and consisting of physical and economic security, good governance, and community cohesion. Figure 2 illustrates.

Figure MSI-Pakistan diagram of Stability
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* Macro-political and economic inclusion reforms
* Status of Government of Pakistan – militant relations
* Major event timeline
* Status of women
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MSI’s past performance in these and other projects heavily inform MSI’s conceptualization of resilience, stability, and cohesion in South Sudan. Another model that MSI draws from is taken directly from the resilience literature and an ongoing impact evaluation of the Ethiopia Pastoralist Resilience Improvement and Market Expansion (PRIME) program. While MISTI serves as the primary source of measures of cohesion, social capital, and resilience with respect to conflict shocks, PRIME serves as the primary model for resilience with respect to natural or economic shocks that test individual, household, and community resilience.

# 4. proposed indices

*“If you look at these indicators that are included in resilience capacity measures, some of them are related to technical interventions… but some of them clearly fall outside of that and are more sort of adaptive solution sets around social capital and other things… How do we begin to actually invest in the types of things that matter even if they aren’t in our technical sector comfort zone?”*

* Greg Collins, USAID Resilience Secretariat

Conference Session on Measuring Resilience in Ethiopia, December 2014

USAID/South Sudan has expressed an interest in building indices from available contextual data as well as micro-level data through individual or household surveys. MESP proposes that a household survey could potentially contribute to (but likely not definitively answer) the following objectives:

* Provide a national (possibly state) level context of public perceptions of current conditions
* Construct local level measures such as resilience, stability, and cohesion that inform and supplement national efforts to resolve the political crisis
* Provide diagnostic services for donor programming purposes. For example, community level profiles of resilience, stability, cohesion, and level of public services could help prioritize which communities USAID engages and which sectors are targeted
* Establish baselines against which USAID and other donor programming could be evaluated for impact

Building on the previous section exploring the definition and background on the high-level concepts of resilience, stability, and cohesion, this section proposes concrete measures for these concepts. In most cases, the proposed measures are taken from existing surveys (primarily MISTI, Pakistan MEP, and Ethiopia PRIME[[9]](#footnote-9)) and therefore have some degree of prior testing for internal validity. They would be expected to require validation only to the South Sudan context and theory of change prior to application in the field.

## Recovery with Resilience Index

After consulting existing scholarship and reviewing past and current performance with regards to resilience measurement, MESP proposes that the Recovery with Resilience (Resilience) Index consist of six primary measures: economic activity, access to basic services, food security, internal and external population displacement, and collective community action. These measures are complemented by scores assessed by the Advisory Council.

The following sections explore each measure and its constituent parts.

### Economic activity

Economic activity may be conceptualized as both an outcome to be furthered and a shock that tests a household or community’s resilience. In the South Sudan context, primary attention will be given to economic activity as an outcome contributing to resiliency, measured by indicators such as the volume of commercial trucking traffic around regional and local markets, or sales volume at the retail level. For economic activity as contextual data or as a member of the family of shocks that test resilience, potential indicators include the price level and volatility of basic goods, or simply the availability of those goods in local markets at a given point in time.

Note that economic activity has the potential to confound resilience measurement. That is, if resiliency is seen as a capacity leading to an outcome of improved food security or practice of a livelihood, this outcome could then affect the measures of commercial trucking or retail sales. This circularity of measurement between shock, capacity, and outcome could lead to a simultaneity bias that would need to be addressed in any resilience measurement.

See [Annex 2](#_Annex_1:_Economic) for illustrative survey items for the Economic Activity Index.

### Access to Services

Household survey measurements of access to services typically follows two methods. Respondents can be asked to rate their general satisfaction with a range of public sector services such as education, health, and sanitation, and these ratings are then used as proxies for both the level and quality of public service provision. Alternatively, surveys may query households as to their direct experiences with public goods to assess availability and quality of public service provision. The latter approach tends to produce better-grounded data as opposed to rather abstract ratings of something labeled “water quality” or “schools”. However, it also tends to involve more questions and take up more time.

Provided that the survey instrument does not grow overlong, the experiential approach is recommended for the South Sudan context. See [Annex 3](#_Annex_2:_Access) for illustrative survey items.

### Food Security

Food security is the most critical measure for South Sudan’s recovery, and is the outcome measure for models of resilience. USAID has proposed standard measures of food security covering humanitarian need, hunger, and malnutrition – see [Annex 4](#_Annex_4:_Food).

### Population displacement

The International Organization for Migration’s humanitarian update for March 2015 reported that since the political crisis, two million South Sudanese have fled their homes, of which an estimated 500,000 dispersed into surrounding countries. Of the 1.5 million internally displaced, 112,200 were sheltering in UN bases across South Sudan. An estimated 2.5 million South Sudanese – roughly a quarter of the country’s population – were food insecure.

Tracking the number of displaced and returned is a critical contextual indicator tracking what is hopefully a gradual return to the status quo prior to the political crisis. Population displacement will be measured both by household survey (tracking household perceptions of population movement within their village or boma) and through existing reports from the IOM and other relevant bodies.

See [Annex 5](#_Annex_5:_Population) for a review of illustrative measures.

### Collective Community Action

Collective community action refers to communities working together to solve problems both internal and external to the community. This is a measure of both bonding and bridging social capital, depending on the relative makeup of a community. These measures are supplemented by measures of household capacity to give to and receive help from others in their community. However, given that MISTI and PRIME appear to operationalize constructs of social capital in slightly different ways, additional study and testing is needed to validate this index. See [Annex 6](#_Annex_6:_Security) for specific items.

## Peace and Stability Index

After consulting existing scholarship and reviewing past and current performance with regards to stability measurement, MESP proposes that the Peace and Stability (Stability) Index consist of five primary measures: safety and security, prospects for peace, freedom of movement, and community relations. These measures are complemented by scores assessed by the Advisory Council.

The following sections explore each measure and its constituent parts.

### Safety and Security

This index will track both externally monitored data on violence, but also individual and household perceptions of safety and security in their homes, communities, and major travel routes. The fear of motivated violence or random banditry are primary obstacles to both recovery with resilience and peace and stability. See [Annex 7](#_Annex_7:_Security).

### Prospects for Peace

This index measures both externally monitored developments in the national peace process and individual and household perceptions of how the peace process is faring and whether a settlement will translate to concrete recovery on the ground. It is theorized that prospects for peace is a factor in determining whether individuals or communities resort to local level violence. The indices for security, community relations, and community action are also considered to affect the risk of violence. Additional work is therefore needed in formulating a theory of change between events on the ground and the interaction of these four indices. See [Annex 8](#_Annex_8:_Prospects) for illustrative measures.

### Freedom of movement

The Freedom of Movement Index measure perceived security on roadways and the physical constraints to movement. Follow up probes would identify what factors are causing perceptions of insecurity or inability to move. See [Annex 9](#_Annex_9:_Freedom).

### Community relations

The Community Relations Index measures the incidence of perceived problems both internal and external to the community, and also the extent of communication or activity between villages and/or across a social identity such as tribe or ethnicity. As with the Community Action Index, this index requires further study and testing in order to integrate the two sources – MISTI and PRIME – from which it is drawn. See [Annex 10](#_Annex_10:_Community) for illustrative items.

# 5. The way forward

This design report has explored the theoretical foundations of the high-level constructs of resilience, stability, and cohesion, and provided an initial menu of survey items to operationalize the measurement of those constructs. If USAID/South Sudan approves the action of building indices with both contextual and household survey data, MESP recommends the following next steps:

* Draft an initial survey instrument using the items proposed here, along with standard modules such as demographics and living conditions (June)
* Commence small-scale pre-testing of the draft survey instrument using the cognitive “think-aloud” approach (June-July)
* Solicit local survey support and commence pre-testing of survey instrument in the field (July-August)
* Draft Inception Report / Pre-Analysis Plan that includes fully-worked theories of change, estimation strategies such as community fixed effects and multilevel models, and learning agenda questions that are concrete enough to be answered with the data at hand (June-September).
* Test theories of change with the July-August survey field pre-test, and finalize prior to first wave of household survey (October).
* Draft initial report based on first wave of household survey (January-February)
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# 7. Annexes

### Annex 1: MISTI Stability and Resilience Indices

### Annex 2: Economic Activity Index, illustrative survey items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Source | Item # | Note |
| Prices for basic goods (trend) | MISTI | 32 |  |
| Availability of jobs (trend) | MISTI | 33 | Would not apply to pastoralists, or perhaps any rural respondent |
| Market access | MISTI / MESP | 3 | Use MISTI security on roads items or MESP market assessment score |
| Economic activity across tribe / ethnicity | PRIME | N |  |
| Economic activity across tribe / ethnicity (trend) | PRIME | N |  |
| Oil production | CI |  |  |
| Oil exports | CI |  |  |

### Annex 3: Access to Services Index, illustrative survey items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Source | Item # | Note |
| General services (trend) | MISTI | 15 |  |
| Children in school | PRIME | G |  |
| Distance to school | PRIME | G |  |
| Rating of school | MISTI | 16g-h |  |
| Health center available | PRIME | G | Availability could measure both presence of a facility, but also drill down to operating hours, availability / quality of staff, and specific instances of when the household needed the service |
| Distance to health center | PRIME | G |  |
| Rating of health center | MISTI | 16f |  |
| Veterinary clinic available | PRIME | G |  |
| Distance to veterinary clinic | PRIME | G |  |
| Rating of veterinary clinic | Survey |  |  |
| Agricultural extension services available | PRIME | G |  |
| Distance to ag extension services | PRIME | G | How to measure mobile services? |
| Primary source of water | PRIME | D | dry / wet season ? |
| Distance to water source | PRIME | D |  |
| Round trip time to fetch water | PRIME | D |  |
| Rating of water quality | MISTI | 16a |  |

### Annex 4: Food Security Index, illustrative survey items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Source | Item # | Note |
| Depth of Poverty | USAID |  | Measures normalized by severity of drought or other relevant shocks |
| Household Hunger | USAID |  |  |
| Global Acute Malnutrition | USAID |  |  |

### Annex 5: Population Displacement Index, illustrative survey items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Source | Item # | Note |
| Time lived at this home | PRIME | E |  |
| Household members moved away | PRIME | E |  |
| Community members moved away | Survey |  |  |
| Tribal / ethnic makeup of community (trend) | Survey |  |  |
| Payam / Boma / Village Assessments | IOM |  |  |

### Annex 6: Community Action Index, illustrative survey items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Source | Item # | Note |
| Able to solve problems external to village | MISTI | 34c | Able to solve problems external to village |
| Able to solve problems internal to village | MISTI | 35c | Able to solve problems internal to village |
| Villages / neighborhoods work together to solve problems | MISTI | 36 | Villages / neighborhoods work together to solve problems |
| Turn to for help: relatives in village, neighbors in village | PRIME | M | MISTI and PRIME measures require further study to integrate |
| Provide help: relatives in village, neighbors in village | PRIME | M |  |

### Annex 7: Security Index, illustrative survey items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Source | Item # | Note |
| Violent incidents | ACLED, MESP |  |  |
| Other assessments | MESP |  |  |

### Annex 8: Prospects for Peace Index, illustrative survey items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Source | Item # | Note |
| Situation allows plans for future | MISTI | 30 |  |
| Prospects for lasting settlement | Survey |  |  |
| Nuer and Dinka can live together | Survey |  | Could be too sensitive |
| Trust questions | Survey |  | Could be too sensitive |

### Annex 9: Freedom of Movement Index, illustrative survey items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Source | Item # | Note |
| Security on roads (level) | MISTI | 3a |  |
| Security on roads (trend) | MISTI | 3b |  |
| Ability to get to local markets (level) | MISTI | 31 | Unclear whether the question is measuring security affecting travel, or the household's economic situation to enable travel |
| Ability to get to local markets (trend) | MISTI | 32 |  |
| Ability to travel to county/state capital, between states, national capital | Survey |  |  |

### Annex 10: Community Relations Index, illustrative survey items

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Item | Source | Item # | Note |
| Problems internal to village | MISTI | 34a | Could measure not just propensity for problems but also surrounding kinetics |
| Problems external to village | MISTI | 35a |  |
| Social activity across tribe / ethnicity | PRIME | N |  |
| Social activity across tribe / ethnicity (trend) | PRIME | N |  |
| Communicate regularly with person outside village | PRIME | N |  |
| Communicate regularly with person outside payam | PRIME | N |  |
| Communicate regularly with person outside county | PRIME | N |  |

1. See, for example, [Old Enmities in the Newest Nation](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0CB4QFjAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.newyorker.com%2Fnews%2Fnews-desk%2Fold-enmities-in-the-newest-nation-behind-the-fighting-in-south-sudan&ei=3aBcVdrrA838ggSN94OYAg&usg=AFQjCNGvTIeOr7N086hMJOYLlvWi-0Oj8w&sig2=HbDHKdlr1aHsmmtQ_clntA&bvm=bv.93756505,d.eXY). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For a theoretical introduction to resilience, see [Barret and Constas (2014)](http://www.pnas.org/content/111/40/14625.full.pdf). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. [The Resilience Agenda: Measuring Resilience in USAID](https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/Technical%20Note_Measuring%20Resilience%20in%20USAID_June%202013.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. See [Resilience Measurement Principles](http://www.fsincop.net/topics/resilience-measurement/en/), page 6. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. [Measuring Resilience: A Concept Note on the Resilience Tool](http://www.fao.org/docrep/013/al920e/al920e00.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. These items are culled from a broader set of measures applied in the Ethiopia PRIME baseline survey – see Smith and Frankenberger (2015) for the full set. The wider set of measures should continue to serve as candidates in operationalizing resilience to new contexts. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See Aldrich (2012) for an engaging discussion of resilience and social capital in relation to natural disasters, starting with the 1923 Tokyo earthquake up to the 2004 Indian Ocean tsunami and 2005 Hurricane Katrina. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. Immerwahr (2015) provides a social history of the United States’ application of community development both domestically and in conflict-affected areas such as Vietnam and the Philippines. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. Other relevant sources include the impact evaluation survey instruments for Kenya REGAL, Afghanistan National Solidarity Program, and Sierra Leone GoBiFo. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)