Impacts and Costs of Forced Displacement
Phase II

A Critical Evaluation of Methodological and Analytical Progress on Designing Development-led Strategies and Interventions in Forced Displacement

Emeritus Professor Roger Zetter

Refugee Studies Centre, Oxford Department of International Development,
University of Oxford, 3 Mansfield Road, Oxford OX1 3TB, UK.

FINAL REPORT 28 June 2017

Table of Contents page

Executive Summary

Significant progress has been made by intergovernmental organisations and donors in designing and implementing macro- and micro- economic policies, strategies, programmes and tools to mitigate the socio-economic impacts of forced displacement and to promote longer term sustainable development and resilience strategies for refugees, IDPs and host populations. However there has been little evaluation of the tools and methodologies to support these initiatives. The study addresses this gap.

Commissioned by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, researched by the Refugee Studies Centre University of Oxford and facilitated by the Fragility, Conflict and Violence Group of the World Bank, this study investigates and assesses the strengths and limitations of the methodological and analytical apparatus that supports current World Bank development-led strategies and interventions in humanitarian crises.

The study briefly assesses trends in addressing the development challenges of forced displacement crises and extant econometric research on the cost and impacts of forced displacement. Following discussion of the purpose and scope of the extant evaluations, and using a desk study method, the core of the paper provides a critical assessment of World Bank methodologies and analytical and diagnostic tools deployed to measure the socio-economic impacts and costs of forced displacement on: a) national economies; and b) affected populations – refugees, IDPs and local communities. The study examines the methodologies used for quantifying and modelling economic impacts focusing on the partial equilibrium modelling (PEM) methodology which has been used.

The study then explores then explores the challenges in quantifying and modelling the impacts on affected populations. Here the focus of the study is on tools for poverty, vulnerability and welfare (PVW) measurement. Next the study examines some of the cross cutting methodological challenges: these include dealing with counter factuals and exogeneity and the quality and scope of data that is available to undertake impact measurement.

The study concludes by reviewing the key findings, the main lessons learned and highlighting the remaining methodological and analytical gaps in current praxis.

The key findings are:

Partial equilibrium modelling (PEM) methodology has become the standardised and reasonably robust tool for measuring the impacts of the displacement shocks on the macro- and micro-economic performance of the impacted countries.

Methodologies to measure the socio-economic impacts of displacement on affected populations are less systematic and more diffuse. Significant progress has been made in developing poverty and welfare modelling and metrics. However, aligning the varied definitions of poverty, vulnerability and welfare (PVW) and refining the metrics to include disaggregating these conditions for different groups, locations, levels of service provision would significantly improve the quality of PVW programming.

Reliance on aggregates obscures analysis of the significant distributional differences (eg socio-economic and spatial) in the impacts of displacement. Refining methodologies to also include measurement of 'winners and losers' would enhance the efficacy of such analysis.

Likewise, refining the analytical tools to support medium and long term projections would enhance the value of current modelling approaches.

Progress has been made in dealing with counter factuals and exogeneity and endogeneity, and data availability and analysis. These are particularly acute challenges in the context of forced displacement and their persistence compromises the quality of the assessments. Insufficient weight is given to the fact that counter-factuals are still heavily assumption-based. Further investment in developing methods for dealing with counterfactual and endogeneity/exogeneity is recommended – for example, other proxies and better triangulation of evidence base.

Significant improvements in developing data sets with consistent baselines and time series, establishing panel data sets, improved standardisation, better alignment with the dynamics of displacement crises are advocated. These changes would yield a firmer basis for policy development and strategies.

The World Bank Group is encouraged to scale up collaborative analytic and advisory work as well as monitoring the fragility profile across relevant impacted countries. This will help to improve data availability and quality thereby enhancing analytical quality and improvements in strategy and policies.

A gap in current econometric modelling praxis lies in the neglect of resource and environmental costs and impacts generated by encamped refugee populations.

Developing multidimensional methods for measuring, assessing and monitoring fragility in countries experiencing conflict and violence, including in non-FCV neighbouring countries, would be a valuable addition to methodologies allowing improvements to predicting impacts of displacement.

Another gap in methodologies and analytical tools lies in developing metrics to assess progress on peace- and state-building. This is a key task for setting realistic stabilisation and development targets and adjustments in high-risk and dynamic conflict environments.

An additional methodological challenge lies in factoring in the multiplicity of interventions (notably financial spending of different humanitarian and evelopment actors and donors), and attributing their role in projected outcomes.

The study notes that the lack of political economy analysis remains a significant gap in current praxis. This has a bearing on the methodologies and analytical tools used to measure the impacts of forced displacement in terms of baseline contexts and metrics used.

PART 1 – INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

Introduction

The shifting characteristics and dynamics of forced displacement have precipitated a profound reframing of the humanitarian paradigm which has dominated international responses to refugee crises since the late 1960s. Now promoted by intergovernmental organisations and many donor countries the continuing necessity for humanitarian assistance is complemented by a strongly development-led and resilience-based paradigm. These strategies in response to refugee and IDP crises seek to mitigate the socio- economic costs and impacts of refugees[1] on host countries, to stabilise impacted economies, and to capitalise on the agency of refugees. In this way more sustainable and longer term socio-economic responses to situations of forced displacement can be promoted. This approach is underpinned by analytical tools to measure the economic and fiscal impacts for which economic development policies and strategies can then be created and implemented.

Within this context a two phase study of the Impacts and Costs of Forced Displacement has been commissioned by the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs, researched by the Refugee Studies Centre University of Oxford, and facilitated by the Fragility, Conflict and Violence Group of the World Bank. Phase I of the study (World Bank 2012) provided a conceptual framework and designed an econometric model, using a mixed methods approach, to assess the impacts and costs of forced displacement. Phase II of the study envisaged testing the model. However, operational experience in applying the model and developing variants of it tailored to specific contexts of forced displacement and refugee crises overtook the proposed testing. Consequently, a revised ToR for Phase II was therefore agreed with the Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Fragility, Conflict and Violence Group of the World Bank.

Although there is now significant experience in modelling the costs and impacts of forced displacement, the analytical and methodological challenges in developing this econometric apparatus to measure impacts have not been systematically surveyed and critiqued. Thus the potential to strengthen the tools and methodologies used to assess the development challenges and impacts of forced displacement has been neglected. Accordingly, Phase II of the study addresses these gaps by evaluating current methodologies and analytical tools deployed by the World Bank in preparing development-led strategies and interventions in forced displacement crises.

The study is in two parts. This part provides an overview of the aims objectives and methodology. The second and main part provides a synthesis report of the findings together with overall recommendations.

Aims and Objectives

The purpose of the study is to document and critically evaluate selected World Bank strategies and programmes that provide:

---

[1] Throughout the study 'refugee' is used as generic label to describe forcibly displaced populations; the term is not confined to the specific definition embodied in the 1951 Convention on the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol.

- methodologies for assessing the socio-economic impacts and costs of forced displacement on impacted countries, displaced populations and affected local communities; and
- analytical and diagnostic tools to measure and evaluate socio-economic costs and impacts of forced displacement (eg macro- and micro- economic performance, public sector impacts and fiscal stress, vulnerabilities of forcibly displaced and host populations).

The study aims to:
- assess the strengths, limitations and gaps in methodological and analytical approaches;
- provide a synthesis of the main lessons learned;
- catalogue a tool kit of methodological and analytical approaches; and
- deliver overall recommendations.

In satisfying these ToR the study narrows down the original ToR which was to provide a baseline survey of costs and impacts strategies, with a strong operational and policy orientation. The study, as originally conceived, aimed to assess the scope and efficacy of these strategies, policy instruments, and outcomes for mediating these impacts. The current study is now concentrated on one aspect of the original proposal - a detailed examination of methodological and analytical approaches and challenges in developing strategies and programmes designed to tackle the socio-economic impacts of forced displacement. The more detailed technical appraisal of this study will, nevertheless, help to improve strategies and programmmes design to accomplish these broader objectives.

Methodology and organisation of the report

A desk study methodology has been deployed, surveying secondary World Bank literature that reviews the socio-economic costs and impacts of refugees and forcibly displaced people. The study focuses on several Economic and Social Impact Assessments (EISAs) and an eclectic collection of fourteen World Bank evaluations, briefs and proposed studies of the costs and impacts of refugee shocks on selected countries (Jordan, Lebanon, Turkey, Kurdistan (KRG) – all impacted by the Syrian refugee crisis - Kenya, Lake Chad region, Mali, South Sudan) and populations (refugees, IDPs and host communities) – see Bibliography Section 1 for sources. It is important to clarify that these studies are not impact evaluations in the contemporary sense of the term. They are not Randomised Control Trials (RCTs) or even econometric attempts to conduct pseudo-randomised experiments, or discontinuity design experiments. They are broad economic assessments conducted ex-post, some of which use some economic modelling.

The first stage comprised the documentation and evaluation of methodologies and analytical and diagnostic tools using a pre-designed template.

1. Agency and Project/Programme title	2. Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus	3. Methodology and Approach.	4. Analytical and diagnostic tools	5.Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools – strengths, gaps, limitations, scope and efficacy

The literature covers methodologies, strategies, projects, project outlines, evaluations and analytical tools (listed in Section 1 of the bibliography). A summary of the template contents is provided in Appendix 1. This template also addresses the third aim of the study which is to 'catalogue a tool kit of methodological and analytical approaches'.

The original intention had been to survey the experience of other international and intergovernmental humanitarian and the development actors as well as other literature/research by academics and think tanks in addition to the World Bank. Whilst the study draws on wider literature, other than the World Bank there is a significant lack of an 'archive' of economic strategies and policies and associated econometric instruments and methodologies for other actors. For example much academic research tends to focus on micro-economic impacts of affected economies or specific impacted sectors. Intergovernmental/international actors have developed specific targeted policy tools and interventions which, likewise, do not address the wider performance of the impacted economy. Examples of these policy-driven interventions are the DFID-led Subsidised Temporary Employment Programme in Lebanon (STEP), and the EC-DEVCO 'Jordan Compact' (EC 2016). Similarly, a recent OECD meta-evaluation (2017) notes the efforts made at the policy level towards providing more coherent, and broadly developmental, responses to refugee crises, focuses on sector specific programming in urban environments, productive work, business creation and education; but it does not examine the design of comprehensive socio-economic strategies or, the focus of this paper, the analytical tools and methodologies on which such strategies are based.

The full literature review and the summary information and analysis entered in the template was then used as the basis for the second and main stage of the study, the synthesis and narrative assessment of the different methodologies, and analytical tools their comparative strengths and limitations of the different approaches, the lessons learned and some overall recommendations.

The third section concludes the study, outlining the key findings and recommendations.

PART 2 – SYNTHESIS REPORT

Introduction

In sharp contrast to the economic analysis of migration, refugee economies and the costs and impacts of refugees and other forced migrants have merited only limited investigation and analysis by economists until recently. Ruiz and Vargas-Silva's (2013) survey, complemented by a recent World Bank research paper (Verwimp and Maystadt 2015), confirms the rather disparate, although increasing, econometric literature in this field.

This paper contributes to the growing application of economic analysis to situations of forced displacement. In reviewing case studies of recent World Bank experience of economic, social and welfare and poverty impact assessments in refugee affected countries, this paper has three interlinked objectives.

The first and principle objective is to explore the methodological and analytical challenges associated with preparing these econometric evaluations of socio-economic impacts and costs. Its focus is on the diagnostic tools, data collection and metrics, but not on the results, outcomes and the policy implications of these assessments. Second, the focus is on methodologies that examine aggregate socio-economic conditions, not with specific sectoral or spatial analysis which characterises much of the academic research literature in this field. And third, by reviewing the methodological and analytical challenges, as well as gaps in current approaches, the overall aim is to enhance the quality of the econometric tools used to generate the evidence for such assessments. Better quality methodologies can thereby lead to improving the effectiveness of policy instruments and interventions that can better serve communities impacted by humanitarian/refugee crises.

Context

Ruiz and Vargas-Silva (2013) identify two dominant research themes in the econometrics literature on forced displacement: on the one hand the impacts of forced displacement on the refugees themselves; and on the other hand the impacts on host countries and communities - economic shocks, the positive and negative spill over impacts and costs as well as the often dramatic, transformative, outcomes for the economy. The latter theme tends to dominate current econometric analysis. They indicate that such analysis has essentially been partial - focused on evaluating: spatial aspects of impacted economies such as geographic regions (eg Alix-Garcia and Saah 2010; Maystadt and Verwimp, 2014) or camps (Republic of Kenya et al., 2010, Edwards et al., 2016); or particular sectors, inter alia example agricultural production/rural livelihoods (eg Kondylis 2008; Maystadt and Verwimp 2014), welfare losses (eg Ibañez and Velez 2008), infrastructure (Maystadt and Verwimp 2014), poverty (Verwimp and Maystadt 2015), labour markets (eg Calderon and Ibañez 2009; Akgündüz 2015), housing supply (Depetris-Chauvin 2017), or gender (Vargas-Silva 2017). In general, as these examples reveal, the academic literature has not analysed the overall aggregate macro and micro economic costs and welfare impacts on the host economy, nor the extent of fiscal stress which large refugee influxes place on public sector expenditure.

However, intergovernmental actors and donors, notably the World Bank, are seeking to remedy this lacuna by developing an increasingly sophisticated and multifaceted econometric apparatus that seeks to quantify the macro and micro economic shocks and fiscal stress of large scale refugee

displacement and other displaced populations such as IDPs on host countries. These assessments are the necessary prelude to devising economic stabilisation programmes, and guiding socio-economic strategies and policies to mitigate the economic shocks and the negative costs and impacts.

The drive to expand analysis of refugee economies and the economic costs and impacts of refugees comes from growing global concern with the phenomenon of displacement (IMF 2016; OCHA 2015; United Nations 2016, 2016a, 2016b; World Bank 2013, 2016; World Bank/IEG 2016; Zetter 2014a, 2015). Of the more than 65 million people forcibly displaced by conflict, violence and human rights violations worldwide, the majority are now in protracted displacement, the majority (some 40 million) are internally displaced, the majority are no longer contained in refugee camps but now self-settle in urban areas, increasing numbers migrate out of their regions of origin with consequential global impacts, and the costs of meeting the humanitarian needs of refugees have more than doubled in the last four years. In response to these and other dramatically changing characteristics of forced displacement, there has been a profound reframing of the humanitarian paradigm which has dominated international responses to refugee crises since the late 1960s.

Now the paradigm, promoted by intergovernmental organisations, such as the World Bank, IMF the EC [DEVCO and ECHO], UNHCR and UNDP, ILO, IOM, OECD and many donor countries is strongly development-led and resilience-based (OCHA et al ., 2015; Zetter 2014, ADB 2016). This reframing seeks to tackle, in a comprehensive way, the familiar 'burden' and 'dependency' syndromes of refugee crises. To reduce the burden on host countries and communities, developmental-led strategies seek to mitigate the short and longer term macro- and micro- economic costs and impacts of refugees on host countries (see eg OECD 2017; IMF 2016), whilst capturing development opportunities. At the same time refugees are significant economic actors in their own right and so these strategies seek to capitalise on the agency, the entrepreneurial skills and the economic potential of refugees (Betts et al., 2016). Decreasing refugee dependency requires long-term sustainable livelihood strategies to tackle conditions of protracted displacement (Jacobsen and Fratzke 2016).

Whilst the economic apparatus to guide economic policies and strategies for impacted countries is now extensive, varied in format and, to an extent, almost standardised, the unique diagnostic, analytical and methodological challenges in developing this apparatus have not been systematically surveyed (but see Households in Conflict Network (2014)). There is a pressing need to strengthen the tools and methodologies used to assess the development challenges and impacts of forced displacement. As a result, coherent learning from the experience has not been undertaken to date. For example, as a recent World Bank evaluation noted 'World Bank Group definitions, measurement metrics, and policy application are not entirely along the full spectrum of countries experiencing FCV [fragility, conflict and violence]' whilst also noting the potential offered by the FCV CCSA [Cross-Cutting Solution Area] for progress in 'redefining and finetuning fragility diagnostic and measurement instruments.' (World Bank/IEG:ix/8].

Purpose and Scope -what is being measured and how?
There are two key analytical tasks in evaluating the socio-economic impacts of forced displacement. The first is to quantify and model the macro- and micro- economic shocks to the economy caused by

the forced displacement. The second task is to quantify and model the socio-economic impacts on affected populations – refugees, IDPs and host populations. These two tasks form the two main parts of the paper which follow.

This empirical evidence then provides the baseline for stakeholders – host governments, intergovernmental agencies, donors and humanitarian and development actors – to develop and implement: a) comprehensive short-term economic stabilisation plans including, where relevant, rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts, and realistic strategies for medium and longer-term sustainable growth; and b) interventions to reduce vulnerability and increase the livelihood security of the displaced and impacted populations.

The core components of the impact-on-host country evaluations focus on measuring the performance of the economy in the light of the shocks associated with refugee influxes (and/or internal displacement where relevant) and quantifying the stabilisation costs. Impact refers to the immediate economic and fiscal effects on the country's economy and budget, while stabilisation costs refers to the additional spending that would be needed to restore the economy and the welfare of residents to pre-shock conditions.

In terms of the second main theme, the impacts on affected populations – refugees, IDPs and host populations – the focus of these assessments is to profile the poverty, vulnerability and welfare (PVW) outcomes in order to target safety net programmes for poverty reduction and more sustainable household livelihood strategies.

Quantifying and modelling economic impacts: approach and methodologies
In the studies reviewed, the standard approach to assessing the macro- and micro- economic impacts of refugees and forced displacement is an adapted form of Computational General Equilibrium Model (CGEM) combined in some cases with aggregate approaches. More precisely, the case studies which offer a comprehensive approach to modelling single or multiple market impacts deploy a partial equilibrium modelling (PEM) methodology. In effect this is a microsimulation which limits the analysis to selected variables and the effects of the given shock on market(s) that are directly affected. The main advantage of the PEM approach to analysis over the CGEM lies in the more limited data requirements: clearly this is an important caveat for many of the impacted countries where data quantity and quality may be limited and where the sudden shocks to the economy that derive from refugee inflows are unlikely to be fully quantified.

Thus, a more or less standard PEM methodology has now developed, exemplified by the Lebanon (World Bank 2013) and the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRG) (World Bank 2015a) ESIAs (Economic and Social Impact Assessments) and the Turkana (Kenya) study (World Bank 2017). In these ESIAs, typically the PEM measures three main components: economic impacts, human development and social impacts, and infrastructure impacts, and key sectors within each component. The key variables differ from case to case determined by the structure of the economy in question (where there tends to be limited variation in the macro-fiscal and sectoral variables assessed including inter alia, GDP, prices, outputs welfare), the social development conditions (where there tends to be

significant variation in the composition of variables), and infrastructure (which comprise a standard package).

Thus in the case of the Lebanon ESIA (World Bank 2013), the key sectors in the three main components were: economic impacts (trade and tourism which are significant factors in the Lebanese economy, and public sector finances, assessing supply and demand side shocks to the economy); human development and social impacts (estimated costs on health, education and social safety nets); and infrastructure impacts (watsan, solid waste, electricity and transportation).

Similarly, the KRG ESIA (World Bank 2015a) comprised the same three components but included more comprehensive social development sectoral coverage (analysing nine sectors) to evaluate the impact of displacement: macro-fiscal impacts (trade in goods and services, private sector and financial services, supply and demand side shock, micro-finance sector (highly developed in KRG), and fiscal transfers); social development impacts (health and education sectors, food security and agricultural livelihood, poverty and welfare, social assistance and labour, housing and shelter, and social cohesion and citizen security); infrastructure impacts (watsan, solid waste management, energy and transportation sectors).

In the case of the region specific Turkana study (World Bank 2017) which examined the costs of hosting refugees in Turkana camp, the focus was only on the economic impacts giving primacy to the impacts on incomes (including tradable and non-tradable goods), labour markets, agricultural production, food prices and consumption patterns.   This study provides a model for analysing refugee camp impacts, enhancing an earlier evaluation methodology used to analyse the impact of the Dadaab refugee camp in Kenya (Enghoff et al., 2010).

Methodologically, the principal challenges relate to the availability of data and the production of counter factuals both of which are discussed in more detail below.

In terms of the principal substantive challenges these arise in four main areas.

The first challenge is to determine the appropriate metrics which best capture the pre-existing structure of the impacted economy whilst also highlighting the sectors most impacted by refugees.

The second challenge is factoring in the effects of the economic shocks that unfold within countries that, characteristically, already have structurally weak public finances and long-standing distortions in their economies. For example in the KRG ESIA (World Bank 2015a), the methodology separated out the effect of the 'on going' budget 'crisis' from the main issues of the study, the Syrian civil war and ISIS.

The third challenge is to estimate the growth impacts of forced displacement on the economy. In the case of the Lebanon ESIA (World Bank 2013), several cross checks of the estimated growth impact of the Syrian conflict were used and produced very similar results. In the case of the KRG ESIA (World Bank 2015a) projections included three scenarios of increasing IDPs and refugee influxes – base line, middle and upper band.

Fourth, there is the distinction between studies measure the impacts on the current performance of the economy, and those which measure both current impacts but also seek to project forward different scenarios of displacement and policy response. Thus both the KRG study (World Bank 2015a), and the Turkana study (World Bank 2017) use the current base line to project likely future impacts with changing scenarios of high , medium and low refugee arrivals in the case of the KRG study and partial integration, complete integration and decampment scenarios in the case of the Turkana study.

Quantifying and modelling the impacts on affected populations: Poverty, Vulnerability and Welfare (PVW)

The second key task of the assessments is to measure how the economic shock of forced displacement impacts the standards of living of the subject populations - either or both the displaced populations of refugees/IDPs and their host communities depending on the study remit and objectives.

The policy objectives are to understand and analyse the welfare conditions of the designated populations with respect to: their coping strategies in relation to changes in living standards (decline is the norm for most impacted populations); needs assessment and targeting strategies to reduce vulnerability and poverty; and the effectiveness of assistance and stabilisation interventions to arrest the decline, restore welfare levels to the pre-shock conditions, and create more sustainable means to address the population's needs.

How to measure refugee (and other impacted populations') welfare and vulnerability is, therefore, both a fundamental task but also a major challenge.

Compared with the analytical task of assessing the overall shocks to the economy, the methodologies for assessing the impacts on affected populations are less systematic and the tools are more diverse; qualitative methods are used aligned with quantitative methods which dominate the assessment of economic impacts. The general approach comprises assessment of three key variables: poverty, vulnerability and welfare (PVW). It inevitably bridges the two main PEM components outlined above - the economic impacts, and human development and social impacts; some studies may also include assessment of infrastructure impacts.

From the survey of the case studies, selecting appropriate PVW metrics (including access to data), and then modelling key predictors are the principal and co-related challenges.

An initial difficulty is that different actors emphasise different variables and deploy different definitions and metrics for the three key terms of poverty, vulnerability and welfare. For development actors, welfare and poverty generally provide the core indicators of socio-economic wellbeing. For humanitarian actors such as UNHCR and many NGOs, vulnerability tends to be the predominant concern. And because different actors define each of these terms differently – for example protection and livelihood vulnerability is core to UNHCR, whereas for development actors vulnerability may be defined more in terms of quantifiable economic indicators - this leads to different metrics being deployed to measure the incidence of each variable. Aligning the PVW

definitions and the metrics therefore requires particular attention. The World Bank does not have a unique definition of vulnerability, although poverty and welfare definitions tend to be more standardised.

A related challenge of determining appropriate metrics, is access relevant and robust primary (or more usually secondary) data sources to create a profile of the populations under investigation on which the model can be constructed is key. Relevant household data usually includes, inter alia: demographic and household composition characteristics; refugees' employment and livelihoods; income and expenses; socio-economic conditions pertaining to education and health, food and nutrition, and social safety nets. There is significant variation in the metrics used to measure welfare aggregates and poverty: the variation is contingent in part on the aims of the study but also the availability of extant data versus the scope for collecting primary empirical data. The specific data challenges are discussed in a separate section below.

Developing a suitable econometric model of poverty and vulnerability that provides the key predictors of the target population's welfare is the second requirement. The instruments and tools to measure PVW vary from case to case. Measurement typically comprises some combination of orthodox micro-economic poverty, vulnerability and welfare instruments including, in some cases, distributional impacts. A full consumption module has proved infeasible in the studies reviewed, given data limitations, but typically a PVW assessment employs multi-dimensional measures of deprivation, in preference to a single aggregate index, as the basis for profiling the impacted populations. Such an approach typically includes indicators which cover, *inter alia*, four dimensions: household data; a welfare aggregate; poverty line indicators; and vulnerability indicators.

The studies under consideration emphasise the value of comprehensive analysis that includes, where possible, all four dimensions. For example, simply using welfare measures and welfare aggregates does not tell us directly about poverty or vulnerability. Moreover, whereas humanitarians tend to focus on vulnerability, development economists are more preoccupied with poverty and welfare. Yet, given the increasing synergy between humanitarian and development actors it is important to include all these metrics, at the same time distinguishing between the different conceptualisations that these actors have of terms such as vulnerability.

Furthermore, the studies highlight the important distinction between welfare and poverty modelling for the different actors involved and the outcomes of the two models in terms of policy implications for the actors, notably the targeting of interventions. The Welfare of Syrian Refugees Report (World Bank/UNHCR 2016) provides a detailed discussion of this issue and the scope for statistically testing their correlation – this was statistically significant in this case. Whereas welfare modelling provides results for the whole of the surveyed population – likely indicating falling standards for both the displaced and host populations - the latter focuses on factors that determine the incidence and distribution of poverty. The difference between the two results largely depends on the level of the poverty line selected. The higher the poverty line level the closer this will be to the results of the welfare model in terms of the factors that matter for humanitarian and development actors involved. Governments and development actors are likely to be more concerned with the results of welfare modelling, irrespective of the poverty line: humanitarian actors may well be more concerned with the outcomes of poverty modelling for the refugee population.

With these distinctions in mind, a nevertheless valuable overall finding, in terms of the potential contribution to policy design, is the importance of using similar data to derive both a poverty and a vulnerability assessment/indicator for the populations under investigation. Mapping the indicators in this way enables a bridge to be built between humanitarian vulnerability and wider poverty indicators and thus the potential balance between humanitarian and developmental interventions. These tools permit humanitarian and development actors to determine the extent to which specific humanitarian vulnerability is also associated with poverty and arrested development (eg, through a permanent loss of human capital).

Investigating this interplay ensures that humanitarian and development actors are better equipped to design a more effective continuum between their respective interventions. For example, findings from the studies suggest that although vulnerability, defined as the probability of experiencing poverty in the near future, was high among refugees it only partially overlaps with poverty. Many impacted populations, notably refugees, frequently move in and out of poverty, adding to the phenomenon of economic insecurity. There is a quite widespread incidence of impacted populations who were not found to be impoverished at the time of the studies but likely to experience poverty in the future.

Distinguishing between monetary and non-monetary vulnerability is also essential for two reasons which the studies reveal. First, this is because although both monetary and nonmonetary vulnerability are high amongst impacted populations, they are not necessarily co-related. Second, the distinction is significant because monetary and non-monetary measures of vulnerability can reflect very different types of needs. Clearly not all types of vulnerabilities, such as levels of health and nutrition can be addressed through financial interventions.

Experience from The Welfare of Syrian Refugees Study (World Bank/UNHCR 2016) assessed: 14 expenditure aggregates (from an initial total of 23 welfare variables and 22 poverty variables); poverty line indicators; and vulnerability indicators. Despite the number of variables, the range of good predictors of welfare and poverty was found to be rather narrow, consistent with populations characterised by high poverty. Nevertheless, although the welfare aggregate comprised a smaller number of items than might normally be measured in poverty studies, this was deemed acceptable given the inevitably more restricted consumption behaviour of refugees. The study also found that expenditure aggregates were preferable to income data which was deemed a less reliable poverty line indicator.

Findings from this study may act as a guide to the more significant variables that could be included in subsequent assessments. Overall in this study found that case (ie household) size was the first and most important variable, explaining 18% of the variability in welfare and 22% of the variability in poverty with the incidence of poverty being particularly significant in larger cases (five persons and more) and also jumping very significantly for each additional case member and for each additional child. Housing conditions were the second most important factor explaining between 3% and 4% of both the welfare and poverty. Important characteristics of the principal applicant associated with improved welfare were: a professional occupation prior to the crisis, older age, higher education, and married status. Together, these characteristics explained about half of the variability in expenditure: these predictors were very consistent across the two countries and data sets.

Whereas the Syrian Welfare Study used only secondary data, the ESIA Study of Lebanon (World Bank 2013) used a combination of secondary and primary data to develop a similar series of welfare and poverty measures which included health, education, employment and livelihoods, and social safety nets. Significant refinements on the Syrian Welfare Study include: plotting poverty rate variables and measuring the impacts for different population groups; developing measures such as capacity limits applied to service quality and access to services; producing where possible the spatial disaggregation of the impacts.

Dealing with counter factuals and endogeneity and exogeneity

A persistent challenge in developing the analytical methodologies is how to deal with the counter factual and exogeneity/exogeneity. In other words how would the economy and the welfare levels of the impacted countries (or displaced populations) have performed without the shock of a refugee influx and how can other factors that may account for observed changes in the economy be excluded?

These questions are important because comparing the differential performance and outturn of the economy impacted by the shock with 'normal' circumstances, indicates the scope of stabilisation measures needed to restore the economy to pre-conflict levels of, *inter alia*, production, revenue, spending, access to and quality of public services.

Typically, the studies reviewed for this paper approach these challenges using a counter factual rather than a difference-in-difference method. Both approaches are problematic as the Turkana study explains (World Bank/UNHCR 2017); but the latter is not favoured since it is less easy to simulate than counter factuals. This is because refugee and IDP emergencies often affect very large areas of a country or several countries, including the country of origin, making it impossible to find locations or control group populations similar to the affected populations but not affected, or affected by other unrelated conditions.

The approaches vary in detail but essentially follow the same basic three stage method. First, an empirical baseline prior to the shock is established, usually using extant summary statistics for selected sectors under consideration – eg employment, poverty, agricultural production, security expenditure welfare expenditure, government revenue, revenue and fiscal outlays. Next, the performance of each sector is then measured during the period of impact 't'. Third, the impact is assessed as the difference between the actual performance of each variable in this period and a simulated estimate of the performance that would have occurred should the displacement not have occurred – the counter factual.

Whilst the use of the counter factual is a 'standard' method in dealing with this kind of problem, three questions arise.

First, there are general issues of availability of baseline and time series data. These are discussed below in more detail.

The second question concerns selection of the variables that will be measured. Whilst the purpose and objectives of the evaluation determine the variables that are selected, there is substantial variation even for studies with broadly similar objectives. For example, two similar studies of welfare and poverty of displaced populations - The Welfare of Syrian Refugees: Evidence from Jordan and Lebanon, (World Bank/UNHCR 2016), and The Socio-economic Impact of the crisis in North Mali on Displaced People and the Prospects for Resolution (World Bank Trust Fund 2014) – both utilised multidimensional measures of deprivation but with different groupings of variables. The first study used more orthodox, largely quantitative, indices to model welfare, poverty and vulnerability; the latter study used multiple measures of deprivation rather than an index. Welfare was captured in a standard measure that included income and employment, but also wider factors such as living conditions, access to family, health status, as well as measurements of security, social cohesion, education, levels of trust in the government and its institutions, the potential for conflict resolutions.

Third, and more problematic is measuring the counter factual. Here there are two significant requirements. The first is to establish the base line conditions. This is usually guided by data availability and the range of sources that describe the socio-economic conditions before the transformation. For example, approaches considered in the KRG ESIA Study (World Bank 2015a) to assess the counter factuals included a) potential use of the Kurdistan Regional Government's (KRG's) strategic development plan (KRG Vision 2020); and/or b) extrapolating from pre-conflict trends. In this case, a qualitative assessment of the social impacts and institutional implications of the crisis complemented the quantitative methodology which was limited by the poor availability of quantitative data.

The Lebanon ESIA study (World Bank 2013) compares for each year the difference between a) the outturn and b) the counter-factual of no Syrian conflict.

The KRG ESIA (World Bank 2015a) study also deploys an innovative variation on the 'standard' model of projecting counter factuals. In addition to using on-budget data (for both current and capital budget), off-budget spending by UN and other international/bilateral donors and partners is taken into consideration for specific sectors. This is a significant innovation since although humanitarian and development assistance in refugee crisis is proportionately quite small with respect to the overall value of the economy of impacted countries, the targeting of assistance can have significant effects and thus needs to be factored into the modelling process. At a macro level, in theory one would expect interventions to stabilise the economy. However at the micro-economic level, evidence shows that assistance can distort sectors such as housing food and labour markets, notably with the expansion of cash and vouchers as the mainstay of humanitarian assistance.

The equally large challenge is that the simulation of the counter factual in the World Bank studies assumes that the base line structural conditions of the economy remain constant over the period of the projections. However, a significant concern in this regard is that displacement costs and impacts unfold in countries which already have long-standing economic distortions, the projection of which is self-evidently problematic.

The latter issue also bears on the need to incorporate exogenous and endogenous factors (such as policy changes, or output variations due to changes in market conditions, or the continuing impact

of pre-shock distortions in the economy) that impact the counter-factual forecast Acknowledged as an important element in evaluations, generally, this is accomplished by eliminating known factors from the data. But given the socio-economic turbulence and disequilibria created by largescale refugee influxes detecting exogeneity/endogeneity is problematic. Although credible evidence is invoked to measure exogeneity/endogeneity the selection of evidence is undoubtedly partial, often seems arbitrary, and relies on rather simple rule-of-thumb assumptions.

The consistent challenge is to find robust and verifiable counter factual data. One possibility might be to triangulate and/or aggregate different sources and data on counter factuals. In the studies examined. Neither of these techniques has been used.

Data

Data availability, whether using existing data sets or generating new data, constitutes a major challenge in the task of analysing impacts. As the Kakuma study notes 'refugee situations take place in areas that are poor in data and rich in informality' (World Bank/UNHCR 2017:3). Whether it is to establish base-line conditions or to model and project anticipated changing conditions for policy and strategy development, all the studies highlight how the nature, adequacy and accuracy of the data underpinning these exercises is very problematic and the main limitation to analysing impacts.

Extant data, like all secondary data, are inevitably limited in quality, scope, relevance and currency since they have mostly been collected for non-shock conditions and cannot easily be modelled onto unpredicted circumstances, whilst collecting primary data is beset with familiar impediments of time and resource availability, compounded by issues of safety and security for data collection in conflict situations. In both cases – extant and new data - there are common difficulties of determining the appropriate metrics and capturing the dynamics of displacement situations: the fast changing socio-economic dynamics of refugee crises can render data rapidly obsolete or lead to inappropriate time series intervals. In this respect the lack of panel (and thus time series) data is particularly significant.

Typically, the assessment of macro-economic shocks (fiscal, GDP, prices, national accounts and selected sectors) relies on extant, ie secondary, data sets which usually comprise national statistics and accounts. The assessment of micro-economic and the human development and social impacts usually relies on a combination of both secondary data and the collection of primary data. Existing data sets are used to determine the baseline (ie pre-shock) socio-economic conditions of the impacted populations - refugees, IDPs and hosts although in the case of refugees obtaining country of origin data may be difficult. Data sources on the impacts of displacement on these three populations vary but usually combine existing (ie secondary) data with primary data collection.

A number of examples illustrate some of the challenges in more detail and how they are resolved. Given the profound challenges of data, these examples are detailed here to indicate scope of data sources that might be appropriate for future studies.

The Welfare of Syrian Refugees (World Bank /UNHCR 2016) study tested two extant data sources - ProGres data and the Home Visits Database (HVD) already collected by UNHCR - to construct a welfare aggregate. The advantages of large databases such as the Profile Global Registration System (ProGres) - the main UNHCR global database which included all registered refugees in Jordan – are

its size, since it included all registered refugees, and the fact that it provided key socio-economic characteristics of refugees. On the other hand, the main shortcomings were: a) that it provided only selected variables which, importantly, did not provide welfare metrics that directly lent themselves to constructing a welfare aggregate; and b) that it only provided data at point of entry. Comprising time series information, the Home Visits database provided more current data and also included more socio-economic characteristics. However, it was not based on a random sample. Statistical tests were used to compare the two set sets and the scope for combining them to construct a 'proxy' welfare aggregate. In the outturn the HVD was used.

The ESIA for Lebanon (World Bank 2013) used data sets generated by the refugee registration process to establish the main dimensions of the quantitative study of welfare conditions complemented by more analytical studies and surveys that were commissioned to collect primary empirical data to assess vulnerability and to determine the protection and material needs of the refugee population. Thus a series of technical studies of key sectors such as health, education and housing was conducted.

In line with the 'standard' PEM methodology outlined above, the macro-economic and fiscal analysis employed secondary data sets to conduct the baseline-outturn-counter factual impact assessment of key sectors (trade and tourism, public sector finances and estimated costs on health, education and social safety nets) as the basis for the stabilization assessment. The projections were simulated against high and baseline Syrian refugee influx scenarios.

The KRG ESIA (World Bank 2015a) report used a mixture of bottom-up and top-down approaches on data collection. In the bottom-up approach, sector teams with expertise in human development and infrastructure conducted sectoral assessments of crisis effects. In the top-down approach, available information from national accounts, budget, trade flows, and current socio-economic conditions was used where possible. In this way limitations in quantitative data, especially at the regional level, were partially compensated for by the qualitative methodology.

The Turkana Study (World Bank/UNHCR 2017) similarly used a combination of extant data and 'bottom up' primary empirical data collected in local surveys. Extant sources included household characteristics from three Kenyan censuses as well as a registration census by the Hunger Safety Net Program (HSNP), price data from the Famine Early Warning System (FEWSNET) and the Livestock Information Network Knowledge System (LINKS). Data were also drawn from UNHCR refugee counts and aid delivery statistics from WFP. Primary data from household surveys undertaken in Kakuma refugee camp and in close and more distant residential areas included information on demography, income, and perceptions.

An Economic Brief for a proposed study of The Economic and Poverty Impacts of the Recent Conflict in South Sudan (World Bank, 2014), indicated that the PVW part of this study would rely on primary data collection to create a general profile of IDPs in order to understand their specific needs and how to address them. This had the obvious advantages that this could be tailored to precisely serve the purposes of the study rather than reliance and manipulation of secondary data.

With this in mind, the proposed methodology for this last study indicated several innovations in the data collection process. A clustered, multi-level and stratified methodology was proposed as the sampling frame combined with focus groups. The project intended to create panel and thus time series data (noted already that this is a significant gap) and then following IDPs over designated time periods through frequent follow-up surveys. This addresses a major gap in many studies, the lack of time series data on the changing status of the targeted populations vis a vis the impacts of both the dynamics of displacement to which the affected populations are exposed, and in order to assess the effectiveness of rehabilitation and reconstruction efforts – the latter was the main reason for collecting time series data in the South Sudan study.

A not unfamiliar challenge in situations of forced displacement was the fact that the IDPs were distributed across more than 100 sites with substantially different profiles in different locations. Significantly, however, for cost and security concerns, the data collection was to focus only on urban areas, although fortuitously these locations had absorbed 85% of IDP population.

Recalling earlier discussion on the methodologies for determining welfare and poverty metrics, The South Sudan study also proposed an innovative method for conducting a 'stress level' calculation by cross referencing data on the expected poverty increase in each survey district due to three variables: higher prices, food production deficits and IDP inflows. Each of the three variables was assigned a score by dividing the data into four quartiles generating a scale of 0-12, ie least to most stressed. The stress level would make it possible to determine those districts where levels of stress would warrant additional humanitarian assistance and the scope for reducing vulnerability in the medium term.

Perhaps surprisingly, none of the case studies used Needs Assessment Survey (NASs) data (widely used by NGOs), to assess PVW or to triangulate other socio-economic data sets that are used in PVW modelling. This is perhaps surprising given the fact that NASs are part of the standard tool kit of most humanitarian actors who generate large amounts of up to date data with these surveys. On the other hand the limitations include the multiplicity of methods used to conduct the assessments, the variety of sample frames, and the different time frames. Whilst statistical testing might help to standardise this data, so far NASs have not been used.

PART 3 – CONCLUSIONS
Key Findings, Recommendations and Outstanding Issues

Using World Bank case study experience, the study has examined the methodological and analytical challenges and the tools that can be used for collecting and generating the empirical evidence needed to determine and measure the socio-economic costs and impacts of forced displacement. The ultimate objective of these assessments is to inform economic stabilisation plans and sustainable growth strategies whilst reducing the vulnerability of affected populations. The study has explored the unusual circumstances and constraints that refugee crises pose for developing appropriate methodological and analytical apparatus, and it has demonstrated the strengths and weaknesses of current praxis.

The key findings of the study are as follows.

Pragmatically, a partial equilibrium modelling (PEM) methodology has been used in the few comprehensive studies that model single or multiple market impacts. The PEM approach has become the more or less standardised tool to determine the impacts of the displacement shocks on the macro- and micro- economic performance of the impacted countries. The variables used are context specific but this model seems to be reasonably robust and works effectively.

More generally the PEM approach reflects the distinction to be found in the other studies that do not undertake econometric modelling, that is the distinction between macro-economic studies covering the economy at large and micro-economic studies focusing on household welfare. This is a natural consequence of the organisation of the World Bank and the background of the authors of the reports - macroeconomists working for the macro and fiscal global practice and micro-economists working for the poverty global practice.

In contrast to the relative standardisation of the approach to macro-econmic impact analysis, methodologies to assess the socio-economic impacts on affected populations are less systematic and more diffuse, seeking to combine metrics of poverty, welfare and vulnerability. Nevertheless, aligning the definition of these terms between humanitarian and development actors (for example developmental concern with welfare compared with humanitarian emphasis on poverty, monetary or non-monetary indices), and developing the tools and metrics to quantify and model them remains a significant challenge. Refining the metrics to include the impacts for different population groups, service quality and access levels, and spatial disaggregation would significantly improve the quality of PVW programming.

Underpinning these two key analytical tasks, the study highlights significant gaps and cross-cutting challenges.

In terms of gaps in econometric modelling, the marked reliance on aggregates tends to obscure analysis of the significant socio-economic and spatial distributional impacts of displacement including on the host communities. Whilst strategies to mitigate the costs and impacts of displacement are predicated on measuring aggregates, refining these methodologies to also include measurement of 'winners and losers' would enhance the efficacy of such analysis.

16

Likewise the models tend to focus on analysis of short term impacts – from the inception of refugee arrivals to current time. This reflects the dominance of the short time horizons and budgeting periods for humanitarian assistance. However from a developmental perspective we need to know more about the medium and longer term impacts and costs of displacement. Again, refining the analytical tools to support medium and long term projections would enhance the value of current modelling approaches.

On cross-cutting challenges, dealing with counter factuals and endogeneity/exogeneity, and coping with the limited availability and quality of data are notable. Pertaining to any form of econometric analysis, these problems are particularly acute in the context of modelling the dynamics and the socio-economic impacts of forced displacement. The paper shows that some progress has been made in dealing with the uncertainties that determine counterfactuals and assessing endogeneity/exogeneity. However it is worth re-emphasising the earlier finding that the evidence base for establishing counterfactuals is partial and heavily assumption-based. Although this problem is always acknowledged in the search for counterfactual evidence, the caveats are then disregarded and the results of the modelling are uncontested.

Investment in developing stronger counterfactual methods in the context of forced displacement, for example searching for other proxies, more rigorous triangulation of the evidence base, would yield major benefits in terms of the accuracy and precision of projections. In turn this would provide a firmer basis for policy development and strategies based on these projections.

Data quality and robustness are equally endemic problems which the studies highlight. Despite the perhaps surprising conclusion that situations of forced displacement are often rather data-rich at least in terms of the social, demographic and welfare characteristics of affected populations – every agency and actor collects data for its own needs – the problem is less one of availability per se, but the lack of robust socio-economic data which: a) provides sufficiently detailed and up to date macro- and micro economic data (eg prices, outputs, welfare aggregates); b) which is systematically collected across multiple variables; c) provides reliable baselines; d) can be effectively standardised; e) is available in time series aligned to the dynamics of displacement crises; and f) is available in panel data sets. These are significant and persistent gaps which need to be addressed in order enhance the analytics. The speed of socio-economic change under conditions of forced displacement and the uncertainty of predicting change accentuate the problems of collecting or accessing robust data.

There is no easy answer. Optimal conditions to overcome these data limitations requires first that refugee crises can be predicted so that appropriate data can be collected in advance of displacement (both for the impacted country and the country of origin of putative refugees), and b) data collection on the displaced and impacted populations mobilised at the inception of refugee arrival. In the latter case some gaps can be filled, for example: ensuring that panel data collection methods are introduced as standard; improving the quality of macro and micro economic data collection in key impacted sectors; establishing baselines that are standardised across different data sets and actors which will help to ensure compatibility and facilitate more effective data sharing. Absence of these conditions means continuing reliance on non-compatible data sets, and thus enhancing techniques for data standardisation.

A number of other questions about the methodological and analytical challenges remain unresolved.

Some progress in joint analytic and advisory work in impacted countries between the World Bank and its country partners is evident from the case studies. Scaling up this collaborative working would likely yield benefits in improving the availability of data and data quality and collection, enhancing the robustness of analytical tools, and ultimately lead to improvements in strategy and policies.

Experience shows that encamped refugee populations may create resource competition and environmental degradation. A gap in current econometric modelling praxis lies in the neglect of these resource and environmental costs and impacts.

The lack of multidimensional instruments to measure and monitor fragility, including in non-FCS (fragility conflict and violence) countries, is a significant impediment to developing effective policy interventions and strategies. Developing and integrating such instruments would enhance the robustness of current analysis.

Relatedly, another gap in methodologies and analytical tools lies in measuring progress on peace- and state-building. The study has highlighted the severity of the *longue durée* economic spill over effects of conflict displacement and the profound uncertainty this creates for investment. At the same time the study has highlighted the difficulty in developing analytical tools that can measure these effects although some of the studies cover situations of displacement in the months and years after a crisis has unfolded. Analysing strategies for and measuring progress towards peace-building and state-building efforts is thus a key task for setting realistic stabilisation and development targets and adjustments in high-risk and dynamic conflict environments. At the same time measuring progress in peace and state building can provide vital metrics that feed into PWV strategies.

Of course, progress on peace and state-building is a long-term process and requires evaluation over long periods leading to crises or during protracted periods after a crisis. Whilst the studies reviewed for this report do not cover the long term impacts, what is missing is little if any evidence of investment in developing methodologies, data bases and base-line metrics to measure peace- and state-building in future country evaluations.

Focusing only on World Bank activities has highlighted another methodological gap. This lies in building into the modelling process the multiplicity of actors and the variety and volume of their interventions (notably financial spending), projected outcomes and project timelines that occur both simultaneously but also in series. The allied problem is of attribution: that is in terms of isolating and estimating the particular contribution of each intervention. As noted above the KRG ESIA (2015) introduced a significant innovation by factoring in budget spending by UN and other international/bilateral donors and partners. However developing appropriate methods to do this on a systematic and comprehensive basis remains a major methodological gap.

Standing back from the specific analytical and methodological challenges, the lack of analysis of wider political economy questions is noticeable and somewhat puzzling for an organisation that works with governments and aims at supporting engaged and well developed public policies. This omission likely reflects not so much a disinclination to factor in such consideration as recognition

that political economy analysis of the impacts of forced displacement is both potentially controversial but also lies outside direct measurable characteristics. Equally, political economy concerns bear on the design of policies and strategies to mitigate the economic shocks of forced displacement rather than the methodologies and analytical tools. Yet, as a nine country case study report by the World Bank on Political Economy and Forced Displacement (World Bank-GPFD 2014) makes clear, political economy analysis of forced displacement conducted at the outset of programmes provides important baseline contexts for later metrics on the scope for economic stabilisation and improvements in the lives of the forcibly displaced and the receiving country.

Analysis of the political economy context might explore, inter alia: the political articulation of developmental priorities in receiving countries and how the impact of forced displacement is factored into these political debates at different levels of government and different sectors of the economy; contestation about the distribution of development resources and the development challenges associated with forced displacement impacts. The lack of such analysis remains a significant gap in current praxis in the studies surveyed for this report.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Studies Reviewed
World Bank (2013) Economic and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) of the Syrian conflict on Lebanon for the 2012-2014 period, (World Bank, September 2013).

World Bank (2014) Economic Brief for a proposed study of The Economic and Poverty Impacts of the Recent Conflict in South Sudan (World Bank, February 2014).

World Bank (2014a) Socio-economic Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis in Turkey: Stocktaking of Existing Assessments & Proposal for Further Analysis, (World Bank, November 2014).

World Bank (2014b) The Syrian Refugee Crisis: Understanding the Distributional Impact of Refugee Influx on Turkish Host Communities, (ECA PSIA Trust Fund Application 2014).

World Bank (2014c) The Turkey CPS (Country Partnership Strategy), mid-term review 2014 [Proposed a program on regional development and vulnerability with stronger focus on poverty alleviation]

World Bank (2015a) Kurdistan Region of Iraq Economic and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) of the Syrian Conflict and Isis Crisis, Report No. 94032-IQ, (World Bank, 2015).

World Bank (2015b) Social Impact Analysis (SIA) of Refugee-Host Community interaction in Turkana County, (World Bank, January 2015), Concept note.

World Bank (2015c) Economic Impact Assessment of Boko Haram insurgence in the Lake Chad Region, (World Bank, March 3, 2015), Note.

World Bank-GPFD (2014) Political Economy and Forced Displacement: Guidance and Lessons from Nine Country Case Studies, (The World Bank Global Program on Forced Displacement, June 17, 2014).

World Bank/UNHCR (2016) The Welfare of Syrian Refugees: Evidence from Jordan and Lebanon, (World Bank/UNHCR, 2016).

World Bank/UNHCR (2017) The Economics of Hosting Refugees – A Host Community Perspective from Turkana, Report No: 113183, (World Bank/UNHCR 2017). http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/695271488823317264/The-economics-of-hosting-refugees-a-host-community-perspective-from-Turkana

World Bank/SIDA (2014) The Turkey CPS (Country Partnership Strategy) mid-term review in 2014, SIDA-financed World Bank Trust Fund Study to Support Improved Equity and Social Services in Turkey, (SIDA/World Bank 2014).

World Bank/SIDA (2014) Concept Note [to support improved equity and social services in Turkey - focus on areas of poverty alleviation, inclusive equitable development, and gender equality], (SIDA-financed World Bank Trust Fund SIDA/WBTF 2014).

World Bank –Trust Fund (2014)Geography of Poverty in Mali: Socio-economic Impact of the Crisis in North Mali on Displaced People and Prospects for a Resolution (Korean Trust Fund and the Innovation Challenge Grant of the World Bank, October 2014).

References cited

Akgündüz, Y.E., van den Berg, M., and Hassink, W. (2015) *The Impact of Refugee Crises on Host Labor Markets: The Case of the Syrian Refugee Crisis in Turkey*, IZA (Institute for the Study of Labor, Bonn), Discussion Paper No. 8841

Alix-Garcia, J., and Saah, D. (2010) 'The Effect of Refugee Inflows on Host Communities: Evidence from Tanzania', *World Bank Economic Review*, 24:1, pps. 148–170.

Asian Development Bank. (2016) *The Forced Displacement Crisis: A Joint Paper by Multilateral Development Banks*, issued by the ADB on behalf of an MDB grouping and the International Monetary Fund and the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees. https://www.adb.org/sites/default/files/related/43279/Joint%20MDB%20paper%20displacement%20 0%5Bfinal%5D.pdf

Betts, A., Bloom, L., Kaplan, J., and Omata, N. (2016) *Refugee Economies, Forced Displacement and Development*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Calderon, V. and Ibañez, A.M. (2009) 'Labor market effects of migration-related supply shocks: evidence from internally displaced populations in Colombia', Research Working Paper, No. 14, MICROCON

Depetris-Chauvin, E. (2017) 'The Impacts of Internal Displacement Inflows on Host Communities in Colombia', unpublished paper presented at *KNOMAD Conference and Policy Forum on the Impacts of Refugees and IDPs on Host Communities*, Washington DC, June 1-2, 2017.

E.C. (2016) *ANNEX to the Joint Proposal for a COUNCIL DECISION on the Union position establishing an association between the European Communities and their Member States and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan with regard to the adoption of EU-Jordan Partnership Priorities and annexed Compact,*Brussels, 20 September 2016 (OR. en) 12384/16 ADD 1 LIMITE MAMA 179 MED 38 CFSP/PESC 720 RHJ 21, http://data.consilium.europa.eu/doc/document/ST-12384-2016-ADD-1/en/pdf

Enghoff, M. et al (2010) *In* search *of* protection *and* livelihoods*:* Socio-economic *and* environmental impacts *of* Dadaab refugee camps *on* host communities, Danida – Danish International Development Assistance, Government of Norway, Republic of Kenya, http://www.alnap.org/resource/6334

Taylor, E.J., Filipskib, M.J., Allousha, M. , Guptaa, A., Rojas Valdesa , R.I., and Gonzalez-Estradac, E. (2016) 'Economic impact of refugees', *PNAS,* 113:27, pps. 7449–7453, July 5, 2016.

Households in Conflict Network (2014) *What methods may be used in impact evaluations of humanitarian assistance?*, HiCN Working Paper 193, December 2014, The Institute of Development Studies, University of Sussex.

Ibañez, A.M. and Velez, C.E. (2008) 'Civil conflict and forced migration: the micro determinants and welfare losses of displacement in Colombia', *World Development*, 36(4), pp. 659–676.

IMF (2016) *The Economic Impact of Conflicts and the Refugee Crisis in the Middle East and North Africa,* IMF Staff Discussion Paper SDN/16/08, Washington DC: IMF, https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/sdn/2016/sdn1608.pdf

Jacobsen, K., and Fratzke, S. (2016) *Building Livelihood Opportunities for Refugee Populations: Lessons from Practice*, Washington D.C. Migration Policy Institute. http://www.migrationpolicy.org/research/building-livelihood-opportunities-refugee-populations-lessons-past-practice

Kondylis, F. (2008) 'Agricultural outputs and conflict displacement: evidence from a policy intervention in Rwanda', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 57: 1, pps. 31–66.

Maystadt, J-F and Verwimp, P. (2014) 'Winners and Losers among a refugee-hosting population', *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 62:4, pps. 769-809.

OCHA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and the World Bank (2015) *Addressing Protracted Displacement: A Framework for Development- Humanitarian Cooperation*, A think piece drawing on collaboration between OCHA, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and the World Bank, supported by the Center on International Cooperation, New York.

OECD (2017) *Better Programing in Refugee Contexts and Response: Emerging Lessons from Evaluation,* OECD Working Paper, OECD-DAC Network on Development Evaluation, Ruaudel, H., and Morison-Métois, S. OECD: Paris, forthcoming.

Republic of Kenya, Royal Danish Embassy, Norwegian Embassy (2010) *In Search of Protection and Livelihoods: socio economic and livelihood impacts of Dadaab refugee camps on host communities*, available at: http://reliefweb.int/sites/reliefweb.int/files/resources/C477129C7D41DCFB852577B3006B2818-Full_Report.pdf

Ruiz, I., and Vargas-Silva, C. (2013) 'The Economics of Forced Migration', *Journal of Development Studies*, 49:6, pps. 772–784.

United Nations (2016) *Outcome of the World Humanitarian Summit*, Report of the Secretary-General, New York: United Nations, A/71/353, http://www.worldhumanitariansummit.org/sites/default/files/media/A-71-353%20-%20SG%20Report%20on%20the%20Outcome%20of%20the%20WHS.pdf

United Nations (2016a) *In Safety and Dignity: Addressing Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants*, *19 September High-level Meeting on Addressing Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants,* Report of the Secretary-General, New York: United Nations, A/70/--

United Nations (2016b) *Outcome Document for 19 September 2016 High-Level Meeting to Address Large Movements of Refugees and Migrants*, New York: United Nations, http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/population/migration/events/ga/documents/2016/1August2016/Outcome_Declaration.pdf

Vargas-Silva, C. (2017) 'The impact of hosting refugees on the intra-household allocation of tasks: A gender perspective', unpublished paper presented at KNOMAD Conference and Policy Forum on the Impacts of Refugees and IDPs on Host Communities, Washington DC, June 1-2, 2017.

Verwimp, P., and Maystadt, J-F. (2015) *Forced Displacement and Refugees in Sub-Saharan Africa An Economic Inquiry*, World Bank, Africa Region, Office of the Chief Economist, Policy Research Working Paper 7517.

https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/23481/Forced0displac00an0econo
mic0inquiry.pdf?sequence=1

World Bank (2012) *Assessing the impacts and costs of forced displacement: A mixed methods approach,* Washington DC: World Bank.
http://documents.worldbank.org/curated/en/447611467999137336/A-mixed-methods-approach

World Bank (2013) *Assessing the Impacts and Costs of Forced Displacement*, Washington DC: World Bank. Available online:
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTSOCIALDEVELOPMENT/Resources/244362-
1265299949041/6766328-1265299960363/ImpactCostStudy-VolumeI2.pdf

World Bank (2016) *Forcibly Displaced: Toward a development approach supporting refugees, the internally displaced, and their hosts*, Washington DC: World Bank.
https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/bitstream/handle/10986/25016/9781464809385.pdf?seque
nce=2&isAllowed=y

World Bank/IEG (2016) *World Bank Group Engagement in Situations of Fragility, Conflict, and Violence, World Bank Publications*, IEG/The World Bank Group, Washington D.C.,
https://ieg.worldbankgroup.org/Data/Evaluation/files/fcv-full.pdf

Zetter, R. (2014) *Reframing Displacement Crises as Development Opportunities,* Development Solutions Initiative, Copenhagen, Danish Ministry of Foreign Affairs.
http://www.solutionsalliance.org/system/files/resources/Policy-Brief_Zetter-paper.pdf

Zetter, R. (2014a) *Protecting Forced Migrants: A State of the Art Report of Concepts, Challenges and Ways Forward*, Monograph for Swiss Federal Commission on Migration (FCM) Art.-Nr. 420.933 E, Bern: Switzerland.
https://www.ekm.admin.ch/content/dam/data/ekm/dokumentation/materialien/mat_schutz_e.pdf

Zetter, R. (2015) *Protection in Crisis: Forced Migration and Protection in a Global Era*, Policy Paper for Transatlantic Council on Migration - Migration Policy Institute, Washington DC.
http://migrationpolicy.org/research/protection-crisis-forced-migration-and-protection-global-era

Appendix 1 Template of methodological and analytical approaches

Agency and Project/Programme title	Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus and Aims	Methodology and Approach	Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS	Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
1. The Welfare of Syrian Refugees: Evidence From Jordan And Lebanon *World Bank/ UNHCR 2016*	Measuring impacts on refugees First World Bank/ UNHCR collaboration Comprehensive socio-economic profile; poverty and welfare assessment and overview of Syrian refugees living in Jordan and Lebanon Analytical and diagnostic analysis to measure and predict welfare conditions in order to Inform policy design. Aim to improve the well-being of refugees, improve targeting and mitigate the crisis impact on hosting communities and simulate welfare effects of alternative policies Welfare analysis to help hosting governments better understand how to turn a humanitarian crisis into a development opportunity.	Attempts overall poverty and welfare assessment of a refugee population: who are the refugees, how poor they are, how vulnerable and why, how effective is refugee assistance? Develops econometric model to identify the key predictors of welfare and poverty Full consumption module infeasible; uses PEA deploying systematic multidimensional approach using multiple measures (from secondary data) of welfare and deprivation rather than an index. Develops three tools for welfare/poverty and vulnerability measurement and targetting Jordan and Lebanon comprising refugees' income and expenses, food and nutrition, health, education, employment, vulnerability, housing, and other measures of well-being.	Welfare aggregate captured in a broader index that includes hh data, employment status, living conditions, access to family, health status, location etc. Also comprises refugees' income and expenses, food and nutrition, health, education, employment, housing, measures of well-being. Poverty line threshold from UNHCR ProGres (PG) data for its cash assistance program 2005 PPP. Vulnerability - monetary and nonmonetary instruments to measure vulnerability. Vulnerability high but only partially overlaps with poverty.	Uses secondary data – as all the studies. Useful detailed description of data sets used, the sampling and data collection procedures, the unit of observation considered, the construction of the welfare aggregates, and the choice of the poverty line. How to Measure Refugee Welfare and Vulnerability? Useful discussion of choice of relevant PVW metrics and develops key tools for this; distinguishes between monetary and nonmonetary vulnerability; simple three variable model and methodology appropriate to data limitations of refugee populations and use of secondary data. Final welfare model includes a total of 23 variables and the poverty model includes 22 variables: but actual range of good predictors of welfare and poverty is rather narrow. Size and share of children are important predictors of welfare and poverty which alone explain 18 % of welfare variability and 22% of poverty variability. Informative assessment of predictive capacity of variables. Targetting: evaluates the targeting capacity of existing policies toward refugees and also devises a simple instrument to reach an optimal targeting strategy by maximizing coverage while minimizing leakage Tests and compares results of two alternative policy simulation methods to learn lessons on the potential of alternative policies toward refugees. The simulations indicate the limitations of the current approach to managing Syrian refugees and the economic implications Concludes that metrics of monetary and non-monetary vulnerability are not necessarily co- related even though both are high.

Agency and Project/Programme title	Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus and Aims	Methodology and Approach	Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS	Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
2. Economic and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) of the Syrian conflict on Lebanon for the 2012-2014 period *World Bank Sept 2013*	Measuring impacts on hosts Analytical and diagnostic tools to measure economic, human development and social, and infrastructure impacts on hosts Detailed quantification and assessment of selected, highly impacted, sectors and stabilisation costs Empirical knowledge base for Government and stakeholder consultations on developing and adopting a comprehensive short-term mitigation plan and medium- and longer-term sustainable growth strategy	PEM (i) Overview of sector prior to Syrian conflict and projected performance 2012-14 (ii) Impacts quantified - difference between actual out-turn for variables cf spending that would have occurred without conflict (counterfactual). (iii) Stabilisation assessment spending needed in order to maintain the pre-conflict level of access to and quality of public services	PEM of 15 main highly impacted sectors (i) Economic Impacts: macroeconomic, fiscal, and selected sectors (trade, tourism, real estate, banking); (ii) Human Development and Social Impacts: health, education, employment and livelihoods, poverty and social safety nets, and social cohesion and gender; (iii) Infrastructure Impacts: water and sanitation, solid waste management, energy, and transportation. Data sets: (i) quantitative data generated by refugee registration process; (ii) primary data to assess vulnerability and determine protection and material needs of refugee population (iii) series of technical studies of important sectors eg housing, education, health Macro-economic analysis - Uses IMF and World Bank forecasts of January 2012 and August 2013, to compare real GDP growth immediately prior to Syrian conflict with latest real GDP growth forecast under Syria-shock impact. Fiscal impacts measures spillovers on revenue collection	Methodological strengths (i) Using base line trends (ii) Measuring counterfactuals methodology (iii) Includes measures losses in direct eg tax and non- tax income eg state enterprises (iv) Spatially disaggregated metrics (v) Highlights how lower revenue and higher expenditure is widening fiscal deficit (vi) Explores how government expenditure is meeting increased demand through a combination of higher budgetary spending, and a decrease in the level of access to and quality of public services: ie two metrics of fiscal impacts. (vii) Deploys several cross checks of estimated growth impact of Syrian conflict (produce very similar results) (viii) Measures expenditure side impacts and implications of rising food prices for welfare, poverty, and employment

Agency and Project/Programme title	Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus and Aims	Methodology and Approach	Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS	Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
			and expenditure sides Human development and social impacts measures eg capacity limits, service quality, access to services, financial impacts	
3. The economic and poverty impacts of the recent conflict in South Sudan *World Bank: South Sudan Economic Brief February 2014*	NB proposed study Multi-sectoral in-depth assessment and preliminary estimates of the impact of the conflict on the economy and on poverty to guide IDP recovery programmes and maintain macro-econmic stability IDPs' livelihoods, water & sanitation and infrastructure conditions, intentions and conditions to return. Profiling of IDPs - education, employment and general health variables	PEM (i)retrospective baseline of economic events/trends before outbreak of conflict (ii) preliminary assessment of impact of conflict on economy (iii) impact on poverty (iv) policy implications – reconstruction needs, minimising long-term impact on economic growth and poverty PEM complemented by proposal to create a panel dataset following IDPs over the next months and – prospectively – years: aim to assess effectiveness of rehabilitation and reconstruction	Main impact sectors: (i) production (oil) livelihoods food production, war damage, displacement reduced output; (ii) prices (of staples); (iii) fiscal – taxes and non-tax income (oil) and trade Challenge of creating sampling frame for IDPs spread across more than 100 sites with substantially different profiles across sites. Proposed clustered, multi-level, stratified methodology and focus groups: cost and security concerns - focus on urban areas (85% of IDPs) Three-step sequential approach. (i) Sample from IDP registration (ii) Baseline survey of IDP in camps and host communities (iii) Frequent follow-up surveys to create panel set for understanding the dynamics Innovative data collection: use of tablets to increase data	strengths Valuable details on collection of primary data, survey methods etc. Innovative metrics for measuring stress

Agency and Project/Programme title	Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus and Aims	Methodology and Approach	Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS	Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
		quality, reduce production costs eg printing, manual data entry Mobile phone follow-up surveys Innovative data collection: use of tablets to increase data quality, reduce production costs eg printing, manual data entry Mobile phone follow-up surveys		
4. CLUSTER OF *PROPOSED* **PROJECTS** **I) The Syrian Refugee Crisis: Understanding the Distributional Impact of Refugee Influx on Turkish Host Communities** *ECA PSIA Trust Fund Application 2014* **Linked to** **2) The Turkey CPS (Country Partnership Strategy) mid-term review 2014 [Proposed a program on regional development and vulnerability with stronger focus on poverty alleviation]** **and** **3) SIDA-financed**	1.The primary objective of proposed studies: (i) assess the distributional impact of the socio-economic shock created by the Syrian refugees on different segments of the local host population - particular attention to poor and vulnerable (ii) develop regional approaches to poverty reduction focused on vulnerable communities Addressing Regional Fiscal Imbalances: (i) Assessing extent to which imbalances in development outcomes (specifically public services access and quality) across regions are driven by different	Proposals for household questionnaire survey and qualitative focus group discussion questions; household sample from host communities and Syrian refugees. Aim to assess distributional impacts on host communities in labor market, housing and commodity markets, public services (health, education, water, energy, waste water, solid waste, municipal infrastructure), and social impacts (public security, community tension, social cohesion). Proposals for stakeholder mapping, political economy and institutional analysis		Useful refinements in approach to measuring fiscal imbalances at subnational level and on measuring impacts on different segments of population Proposes novel survey and data collection methods Innovative metrics for measuring stress

World Bank Trust Fund Concept Note [to support improved equity and social services in Turkey - focus on areas of poverty alleviation, inclusive equitable development, and gender equality *SIDA/WBTF 2014*	fiscal, institutional and capacity-related factors (ii) Policy responses needed to offset imbalances. (iii) Develop national approaches to poverty reduction			
Agency and Project/Programme title	**Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus and Aims**	**Methodology and Approach**	**Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS**	**Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools** Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
5. Socio-economic impact of the crisis in North Mali on displaced people and prospects for resolution *Oct 2014 Geography of poverty in Mali Korean Trust Fund and the Innovation Challenge Grant of the World Bank*	Socio-economic survey of households. Study tracks the welfare of a moving population (returnees, refugees and IDPs) Adds to economic impact data (income, and employment) on the welfare of IDPs, refugees and returnees by measuring security, social cohesion, education, levels of trust in government and institutions, and the potential for conflict resolution Analyses both impact of	Face to face baseline survey identifies sample of respondents and collects core household characteristics Monthly mobile phone follow-up interviews update household welfare status and screen respondents for additional in depth interviews for those who have migrated in the last month – tracking welfare of mobile poplns.	Standard regression analyses of data Extends standard metrics by measuring security, social cohesion, education, levels of trust in government and institutions, and the potential for conflict resolution	Valuable study in establishing and deploying metrics for security social cohesion etc. Data collection by mobile phone *flexible and adaptive* technology useful for capturing socio-economic dynamics of mobile populations and adapting policies and strategies

Agency and Project/Programme title	Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus and Aims	Methodology and Approach	Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS	Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
	crisis and impact of returning home versus remaining in displacement			
6. Social Impact Analysis (SIA) of Refugee-Host Community interaction in Turkana County *Jan 2015 World Bank concept note*	Proposed study to assess and analyse social costs and impacts of presence of refugees on the host communities in Turkana County. To inform: (i) policy discussion on development and/or refugee issues; (ii) design and implement development and humanitarian assistance to address needs of displaced and host communities.	Rubric of Economic and Social Impact Assessment and to complement the Economic Assessment. Proposed rapid socio-economic survey of social and economic status, and interactions among the refugee and host communities	Metric proposed for: (i) qualitative, field-based analysis of key social issues (ii) socio-economic mapping (iii) social organization and structure (iv) economic participation levels (iv) community organisations and Institutions (v) changes in the prevalent rules, incentives and social norms	.
Agency and Project/Programme title	**Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus and Aims**	**Methodology and Approach**	**Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS**	**Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools** Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy

7. Kurdistan Region of Iraq Economic and Social Impact Assessment of the Syrian Conflict and Isis Crisis Report No. 94032-Iq *2015 World Bank*	Comprehensive study ESIA providing technical assessment of impact of regional crises on KRG and stabilization costs associated with refugees and IDPs influx Impact = immediate economic and fiscal effects on economy and budget Stabilization cost = additional spending needed to restore welfare of residents in key sectors - health, education, social safety nets, Overall aim to inform dialogue between regional and central governments and provide input for international efforts to address socio-economic issues food security	Analysis of impacts of shocks (refugee and IDPs) through macro-fiscal and sectoral approach Stabilization assessment for nine sectors and aggregated needs to address human development and infrastructure issues Standard PEM methodology (i)baseline of sectors prior to conflict (ii) measure performance during conflict (iii) Impact assessment measured as difference between out-turn (spending) for each variable in review period and spending that would have occurred without conflict (counterfactual) Stabilisation assessment measures spending needed in review period to maintain pre-conflict level of access to and quality of public services Data collection: (i) bottom-up: sector teams with expertise in human development and infrastructure conducted sectoral assessments of crisis effects (ii) top-down: available data from national accounts, budget, trade flows, and current socio-economic conditions	(i) Macrofiscal impacts focus on trade in goods and services, private sector and financial services and fiscal implications (ii) Social development impacts and stabilisation costs in health and education sectors, food security and agricultural livelihood, poverty and welfare, social assistance and labour, housing and shelter, social cohesion and citizen security (iii) Infrastructure impacts water and sanitation, solid waste management, energy and transportation sectors Study also includes investigates impacts on Sustainability of Iraq Microfinance Sector, with specific reference to microfinance institutions (MFIs) operating in the KRI – significant sector for small businesses and low-income households. Estimating counter-factual guided by data availability (i) current and capital budget data actuals (ii) KRG's Vision 2020 (iii) extrapolating from pre-conflict trends (iv) as regional level quantitative data are limited, the methodology is complemented by qualitative approaches assessing social impact and institutional implications of the	Presents most fully detailed account of PEM methodology and Poverty and Welfare Assessment. Detailed explanation of counter factual methodology Recognises and factors in long-standing distortions in the economy

		Quantitative methodology complemented by qualitative approach as regional level quantitative data limited	crisis Special care to incorporate exogenous factors (eg eliminating policy change not related to the conflict)	
		On-budget data (both current and capital budget), and off-budget spending included (i.e., spending by UN, International/bilateral partners		
		Effects of ongoing budget crisis and long-standing distortions' separated from refugee crisis impact transfers		
		Direct and indirect costs analysed		

Agency and Project/Programme title	Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus and Aims	Methodology and Approach	Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS	Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
8. Political Economy and Forced Displacement: Guidance and Lessons from 9 Country Case Studies *June 17, 2014, The World Bank Global Program on Forced Displacement*	Describes why and how to conduct political economy analysis (PEA) of forced displacement Illustrates how PEA may contribute to understanding forced displacement crises: informs policy dialogue and operations to incorporate interests of vulnerable forcibly displaced populations and hosts in resource allocation decision-making and in poverty	Recommendations on development policies and programs from PEA in at least four categories (i) improving access to land, housing and property (ii) reestablishment of livelihoods (iii) improving delivery of services (iv) strengthening accountable and responsible governance		PEA adds another dimension to the analytical frame PEA of forced displacement at outset of programs can provide baseline contexts for later metrics on improvements in lives of forcibly displaced.

Agency and Project/Programme title	Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus	Methodology and Approach.	Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS	Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
	alleviation initiatives Nine case studies			
9. Economic Impact Assessment of Boko Haram insurgence in the Lake Chad Region **March 3, 2015, World Bank Note**	Summarises preliminary findings and data gathered by Bank teams on the economic impact of Boko Haram insurgence in Nigeria, and extensions to Cameroun, Niger and Chad Assessment focuses on the economic and fiscal impacts through: (i) reduced households' welfare dues to economic disruption, lower service delivery and changes in relative prices (ii) additional fiscal resources devoted to security spending (iii) additional fiscal resources devoted to hosting refugees and internally displaced (IDPs) (iv) lost fiscal revenues due to trade and economic disruption			Useful analyses fiscal impacts of additional security costs; costs of hosting refugees and disruption of trade, customs revenues Concept of Downward Risks

Agency and Project/Programme title	Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus	Methodology and Approach	Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS	Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
10. The Economics of Hosting Refugees: A Host Community Perspective from Turkana *World Bank/UNHCR 2017* *Report No: 113183*	Assesses welfare implications of refugee arrivals and consequences of refugee presence in Kakuma camp. Demonstrates overall positive impact. Specific focus on regional economy rather than national level aggregates.	Captures price, income, and labor reallocation effects of refugee arrivals in the short-term and in the long-term by simulations using a multi-sector (general) equilibrium model. NB it does not include impacts on direct fiscal costs for host government cf with other studies such as 1, 2 above	Uses prevailing data sources and original household surveys of poplns near and distant from camp Explores potential for difference-in-difference method but uses counterfactuals with some other towns as comparators	Clarity in deploying simulation model and in presenting and analysing results Strengths of study Pays special attention to mobility/reallocation effect of labour across geographic regions and sectors; Highlights impacts for tradable and non-tradable goods; Highlights spatial effects of refugee presence on hh incomes and labour markets Provides projected scenarios based on current impacts for Partial integration scenario (PIS), Complete integration scenario (CIS), Decampment scenario (DS) Concept of winners and losers Valuable and clear findings

Agency and Project/Programme title	Type of Instrument and Socio-Economic Focus	Methodology and Approach.	Analytical and diagnostic tools METRICS	Summary evaluation of Methodology and Analytical and Diagnostic tools Strengths, limitations, gaps, scope and efficacy
11. Socio-economic Impact of the Syrian Refugee Crisis in Turkey: Stocktaking of Existing Assessments & Proposal for Further Analysis *World Bank - November 2014*	Proposed project to undertake analysis that strengthens the identification and quantification of the impact of the Syrian refugee crisis on host communities. World Bank partner with the Government of Turkey Identify policy and program responses that: (i) mitigate potential negative socio-economic impact of refugees on host communities (ii) maximize social-economic benefits of refugee presence for host communities and Turkish economy (iii) support Syrian refugees self-reliance until return	Proposed standard PEA	Particular focus on housing and rent as two greatest challenges identified by refugee and point of greatest tension between host communities and refugees	Useful overview of issues and approach