



international
alert



Economic development and peace

Practice note 4: Monitoring, evaluation and learning for peace-conducive economic development

Funded by:



Peace
is within
our power

Introduction

Economic development covers a wide range of processes and interventions that aim to improve the functioning of an economy at a global, regional, national or local level. These interventions have multiple, often interconnecting, goals ranging from increasing economic growth or promoting equity to boosting entrepreneurship or employment, or tackling barriers to doing business.

In fragile and conflict-affected settings (FCAS), economic development has become part of the 'toolbox' for actors working in development and peacebuilding. Adapting economic development approaches and methodologies to the specificities of FCAS has generated considerable research and raised questions ranging from the role of the private sector in rebuilding the infrastructure of the state to how to increase human capital in post-conflict situations. These questions highlight some of the challenges of promoting economic development where the state is absent or has limited legitimacy, capacity or reach.

Initiating economic interventions and investments into a conflict-affected context can contribute to the processes of building peace as well as risk exacerbating conflict dynamics. Conflict and economic factors interact and impact each other in both positive and negative ways. It is therefore critical for project designers, implementers and donors to understand how this happens in order to design, implement, monitor and evaluate economic development interventions that are relevant, effective and sustainable in their economic outcomes and in their contribution to peace.

What is the purpose of this practice note series?


This practice note is part of a resource series to address the design, monitoring, evaluation and learning (DMEL) challenges for peace-conducive economic development interventions in FCAS. These are interventions that are conflict-sensitive and explicitly integrate a peace objective. **These practice notes are intended for project designers and implementers as well as policy-makers working in/on FCAS who wish to see peace impacts from economic development interventions or who want to integrate economic elements into peacebuilding projects.** They are not intended as a step-by-step 'how-to-guide' but rather as a tool to spark greater analysis and critical engagement with the potential for more peace-conducive economic development in FCAS. They consolidate key good practices – 'what works well' – based on emerging evidence and analysis of key gaps and challenges, from a peacebuilding perspective, observed among diverse economic development programmes in FCAS. The practice notes ground the considerations and good practices in case studies and examples from the East and Horn of Africa region, including Kenya, Somalia and Uganda, as well as International Alert's work in Tajikistan.

This practice note highlights considerations and good practices in developing monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL) systems that assess both the economic impact and peace impact of economic development programming in FCAS, thereby promoting and informing peace-conducive programming that reflects and acts upon the complexity inherent in such contexts. Specifically, it focuses on measuring the peace impact of economic development programming in FCAS, as well as monitoring and evaluating conflict sensitivity. This builds on the conceptual challenges of understanding how economic development can be peace-conducive (**practice note 1**), as well as the practical guidance on designing interventions anchored into relevant analyses (**practice note 2**) and developing robust theories of change (**practice note 3**).



What will this note help you with?

This fourth practice note will help you think through *why MEL matters*, *what should be considered* and *good practices* for each element of the MEL cycle, as shown in the following figure.



Why monitoring, evaluating and learning from economic development programming in FCAS matters

Regardless of the context and type of intervention, MEL is fundamental to promote an intervention’s accountability towards project participants, broader communities and donors. In the case of economic development programming in FCAS, their complexity, volatility and specific political economy means that designing, monitoring, evaluating and learning (DMEL) requires different and additional considerations to those in more stable contexts. It also means that MEL, provided that it is carried out in a relevant, gender-sensitive and conflict-sensitive way, is a worthwhile effort that can help donors and implementers determine whether they have any impact on peace, reflect and act upon the complexity, and bridge knowledge gaps (what works). It is all the more critical that ‘what works’ for economic development may not be ‘what works’ for peacebuilding, and that a positive impact on economic indicators will not automatically translate into a positive impact on peacebuilding. Indeed, it may have no impact or even a negative one.¹

Assess both the economic development impact and the peace impact of any economic development programming intervention in FCAS, and how these impacts intersect

Identify the conditions that are necessary for economic development to contribute to peace

MEL helps donors and implementers...

Enable practitioners to integrate a peacebuilding lens in a coherent, effective and sustainable way that goes beyond simply ‘adding peace and stirring’ – for interventions to pursue both peacebuilding and economic development objectives

Make the case for ‘economic development for peace’, through contributing to the building of an evidence base on the peacebuilding impact of economic development programmes



What are the challenges facing practitioners?

Any economic development intervention in FCAS should contribute to building peace, as a primary or secondary objective.² Yet, little effort is made to define and assess the effect such programming can have on peace in the short and longer term.³ The following table reflects on the most common challenges that practitioners have shared to explain this gap.⁴

Gathering information and data for intangible changes

Such as changes in relationships (e.g. levels of trust or collaboration) or reduction/exacerbation of conflict or violence, in particular at the outcome level. Outcomes are the difference or changes made through our intervention or activities at different levels, such as individual, community or societal.

Peace is complex and results from a combination of multiple factors such as the distribution of power, income and assets and perceptions of safety, security, justice and wellbeing among others.

Economic development is only one of these factors, which means that indicators for peace may improve owing to other factors (contribution versus attribution), and economic development is not sufficient to address the complex root causes of a conflict.⁵

Promoting and measuring sustainable change in volatile contexts

Promoting sustainable change requires more time than usual donor planning cycles (two to five years) allow. Practical challenges, population movements and volatility make it difficult to monitor changes among the same control group (attrition bias, e.g. where it is not possible to follow up with some or all participants).

Limited access to data in certain areas owing to security, operational or reputational risks

This has ethical implications as well as repercussions for the resources (capacities, time, funds) needed for robust MEL, which need to be anticipated from the design of the intervention.



Why is it important to build and gather an evidence base to better understand the link between economic development and peace?

Owing to the limited evidence on the impact of economic development programming on peace (see **practice note 3**), there is an urgent need for systematic learning at the organisational, sectoral and cross-sectoral levels to bridge persisting knowledge gaps, which may hamper the sustainable contribution of economic development interventions to peace in FCAS, and influence discourses, policies and actions in an informed way. Therefore, programmes need to ensure that they gather evidence of what works and does not work for interventions to create change and the conditions that are necessary for change to happen. **Evaluation findings** should be articulated and disseminated in a way that fosters greater learning, for the implementer and the wider sector influencing how people conceptually think about such types of programming.



How to monitor economic development interventions in FCAS

Defining the peace objective

Why does it matter?

Specific and measurable objectives constitute the linchpin of robust monitoring systems. This means that, once the desired change has been defined (Step 1 of developing the theory of change; see **practice note 3**), any project design should include specific, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound (SMART) economic development objectives and explicit peace objectives (as opposed to a mere reference to peace in the project proposal). The more specific an objective is, the ‘easier’ it will be to monitor, measure and evaluate whether progress has been made towards the expected change.

What do you need to consider?

Depending on the theory of change and type of intervention, you need to consider whether measuring the peace impact means:

- **measuring the peace effect of economic development activities** (see the Zoom in: Peace effect of employment interventions); or
- **measuring the peace effect of peacebuilding activities integrated within an economic development intervention** (for instance, training representatives of businesses in conflict analysis and conflict sensitivity).

 For concrete examples of peace and economic development objectives, in particular employment objectives, see ILO’s Handbook: How to design, monitor and evaluate peacebuilding results in Jobs for Peace and Resilience programmes, https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/documents/instructionalmaterial/wcms_712211.pdf.

Zoom in: Peace effect of employment interventions: job effect vs programme effect

The ILO distinguishes between two types of ‘impact channels’ for the peace effect of employment interventions, namely the job effect (i.e. addressing economic drivers of conflict by creating employment, or promoting economic development more broadly) and the programme effect (i.e. addressing the drivers of conflict through the programme itself – regardless of whether or not it creates jobs successfully in the long term, or promotes economic development more broadly – for instance, by bringing diverse social groups together in a skills training). For the practitioner, it is important to understand through a robust theory of change how the interventions will lead to change in the specific context.

T. Brück, N. Ferguson, V. Izzi and W. Stojetz, *Jobs aid peace: A review of the theory and practice of the impact of employment programmes on peace in fragile and conflict-affected countries*, Berlin: International Security and Development Center, 2016

Developing both output- and outcome-level indicators

Why does it matter?

Developing SMART indicators at both the output and outcome levels will help you track progress and move away from the usual reliance on output-level indicators. Such indicators do not offer any insight on actual progress out of protracted situations. In other words, while counting the number of jobs created or young women and men trained may be less time-consuming and resource-demanding, it is not enough to measure and demonstrate the actual effect of these achievements on the broader peace and stabilisation processes.

Remember: Indicators do not determine causality nor are they evidence, in particular for intangible changes, such as levels of trust or collaboration between identity groups, but rather approximations of a change. For instance, an increased ‘percentage of participants willing to interact with members of the “other” group at the workplace’ may not signal an increased level of trust, but perhaps the willingness to keep working in this specific setting. It would need to be probed by other indicators, such as ‘percentage of participants from adversarial groups who have carried out joint initiatives in the workplace’.

V. Corlazzoli and J. White, *Back to basics: A compilation of best practices in design, monitoring and evaluation in fragile and conflict-affected environments*, DFID, 2013, www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/M-files/CCRVI/CCVRI-DFID-Back-to-Basics.pdf

What good practices can you adopt and adapt?⁶

Indicators can be qualitative or quantitative measurements (‘signals’) of change and should be developed based on the specific theory of change of a given intervention.⁷ Indicators need to be revised if the conflict context evolves, based on an updated peace and conflict analysis and revised theory of change.⁸

Good practice: Peace and conflict indicators, economic development indicators, as well as indicators (based on good and regularly updated conflict context analysis) to analyse the relationship between peace and economic development are developed and reported against.

How does it help? This combination of indicators can help you assess progress towards both peace and economic development, as well as reflect on the intervention’s assumptions on how economic development intervention contributes to peace (theory of change).

Example: if your objective is to improve trust between marginalised communities and the state through promoting equal access to infrastructures and services, indicators could include:

- % of participants who report increased trust towards representatives of the state at the local level
- % of participants who feel access to infrastructures and services in their areas has improved
- Decrease in % of participants who perceive economic inequality to be to the detriment of their community/region.

Good practice: Peace and conflict indicators at the outcome level (and impact level) reflect the conflict and fragility drivers and peace opportunities assessed in the analysis.

How does it help? The peace and conflict analysis provides a baseline for developing context-anchored outcome-level indicators around addressing specific conflict drivers and strengthening peace opportunities.

Example: An employment-promotion programme in south-central Somalia used a 'stability index' composed of nine sub-indicators informed by the programme's analysis (such as freedom of movement, perceptions of security, rights to access and use resources, harmonious coexistence among clans, local perceptions of government). Respondents were asked their perceptions on each of the nine components, using a five-point rating scale or a simple yes/no, which were quantified and weighted to provide an overall 'stability score' for four sub-regions of Somalia.⁹

Good practice: Economic development indicators capture the quality and distribution/inclusion of economic development.

How does it help? From a peacebuilding perspective, focusing on the quality of economic development – i.e. ensuring it is inclusive, responds to people's aspirations and is anchored in local market realities – is key to contribute to sustainable and relevant positive peace and economic development effects.

Example: The negative experience of employment – rather than unemployment – often drives people to participate in political violence (owing to poor and exploitative working conditions, extremely low pay and a lack of formal mechanisms through which to express dissatisfaction, among others).¹⁰ In the case of employment-promotion programming, quality and distribution of employment therefore matter as much as the number of jobs created or the employability skills strengthened.

Further resource: see ILO, 2018, https://www.ilo.org/employment/areas/youth-employment/WCMS_627307/lang--en/index.htm

Good practice: Indicators need to be disaggregated along relevant identity lines, such as gender and age.

How does it help? Disaggregating data indicators allows for a more nuanced and granular understanding of what is happening on the ground, whether/how differently the intervention affects diverse segments of society and whether anyone is left behind. Disaggregation by age and gender is a minimum standard, and should, where best practice is possible, be complemented by other relevant identity markers, such as urban/rural, level of education, geographic background, to name a few. It is also good practice to ask women and men, young women and young men, and people with other gender identities, targeted by the programme to develop their own indicators of change, for instance, through the Everyday Peace Indicators methodology.¹¹

Example: If your objective is to strengthen young women's and men's confidence and agency in their communities through employment-promotion/creation:

- Economic indicator: *# of participants who hold a job for longer than x months due to the intervention, disaggregated by gender.*
- Peace indicator: *Change in % of participants who feel more confident to participate in decision-making in their communities, disaggregated by gender.*
- Gendered peace indicator: *Change in % of participants who feel young women's needs and aspirations are listened to by local authorities.*


Selecting monitoring methodologies for qualitative and quantitative measurement of peace-conducive economic development programming in FCAS

Why does it matter?

FCAS pose specific challenges to data collection, and therefore to monitoring and evaluation – such as access to data; ensuring safety and security of data collectors and participants; attrition bias; and sensitivity of certain issues (e.g. engagement with violent groups), among others. In the case of economic development for peace interventions, these challenges are further compounded by the complexity of multi-sectoral, or at least multi-objective, programmes based on limited evidence of what works.

What good practices can you use?

The following figure consolidates good practices from economic development programming in FCAS,¹² as well as from International Alert and the peacebuilding sector's experience. They can help donors and implementers mitigate some of the common challenges and **ensure information is gathered both on economic development and peace effect**.



Applying innovative peacebuilding monitoring methods to economic development programming in FCAS¹³

Peace is a difficult concept to measure and therefore presents challenges to those attempting their progress towards peace objectives. In responding to this challenge, peacebuilding has adopted different methodologies to monitor and identify intangible changes. For example, **Outcome Harvesting** is a monitoring methodology that collects evidence on what has changed, how significant it is and then, working backwards, determines whether and how an intervention has contributed to these changes. Project staff can ‘harvest’ outcomes (i.e. examples of other actors in the context doing things differently) through



For more on Outcome Harvesting, see Saferworld's Learning Paper **Doing things differently: Rethinking monitoring and evaluation to understand change**, <https://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/publications/1027-doing-things-differently-rethinking-monitoring-and-evaluation-to-understand-change>.

regular reflection. This methodology is well suited to identifying intangible changes in behaviours, practices, knowledge, policies and relationships, and can capture unintended outcomes. This could aid in identifying the 'job effect' on the conflict from an economic development intervention, especially where peace objectives have not been defined from the outset.

Using Outcome Harvesting approach to assess change in peace and economy programming

As part of a project on oil governance in Turkana county in northern Kenya,¹⁴ International Alert and its partners sought to build an enabling environment for communities affected by oil operations to engage in dialogue with duty bearers in the government as well as the oil operator. This was done through raising awareness and building capacities and trust among the different stakeholders. The project team used an Outcome Harvesting approach to frame reflection on the project's progress, to document changes in the context (both intended and unintended) and to analyse the contribution of the project to these changes. Using this approach, the team was able to collect multiple case studies of how people were using the training and platforms provided by the project to effect change in their engagement with the government and the oil operator over grievances. This allowed the project team to gain a much richer picture of their impacts in Turkana county.

Another methodology is **Everyday Peace Indicators (EPI)**. These are developed by the target groups themselves based on their own experiences of what 'peace means' in their context. The EPI approach is based on the rationale that those most impacted by conflict are the best placed to define what peace means in their specific environment. This approach can help bridge some of the gaps in defining and measuring peace, and can provide a useful tool for measuring local peace priorities in relation to economic development.

Using Everyday Peace Indicators in economic development

As part of the 'Living with Dignity' project implemented by International Alert and partners over a period of 15 months in Tajikistan, and promoting an integrated approach to economic and social empowerment, project participants developed their own everyday peace indicators.¹⁵ Indicators were disaggregated by gender and age, i.e. older men/younger men/older women/younger women. For instance, an indicator for improved economic conditions according to older women is 'money is available for eye and dental treatment' and an indicator for improved community relations in young men's view is 'neighbours support each other in difficult times'.

Monitoring conflict sensitivity of economic development programming in FCAS

Why does it matter?

Regardless of whether an economic development intervention explicitly aims to contribute to peace and stability, it needs to ensure that it integrates conflict sensitivity throughout the programming cycle. In countries prone to conflict, the nature of the economy is often part of the problem, because it is shaped by historical and contemporary factors that can undermine progress towards peace. If the programme does not recognise these realities and integrate conflict sensitivity, it could unintentionally exacerbate or perpetuate key conflict drivers such as inequalities.¹⁶ Monitoring conflict sensitivity is also critical to help 'make the case' for conflict sensitivity by measuring and evidencing how it contributes to promoting the success of economic development interventions in FCAS.


Integrating conflict sensitivity in economic development programming in FCAS

The **Sustainable Employment and Economic Development (SEED)** programme in Somalia developed a set of early-warning indicators of conflict to “help field staff recognise the early-warning signs of conflict, and take action to mitigate”. Specifically, 14 day-to-day management indicators for conflict sensitivity were developed as part of this employment-promotion and -creation project implemented in south central Somalia (completed) and informed by the project’s initial conflict analysis. While these indicators were not integrated within the project’s logframe, they were reported against internally on a regular basis as an early-warning mechanism. An assessment of this system seemed to highlight its effectiveness, even though the project’s summative evaluation stressed that efforts to mainstream conflict sensitivity were not systematically documented.¹⁷

How different is it from monitoring the project’s progress towards results?

Monitoring and evaluating conflict sensitivity focuses on monitoring the interaction between the intervention and the context. This means that monitoring the inclusivity and context sensitivity of an employment intervention, and how it is perceived across different groups, is as important as recording the intervention’s actual results, with quality and distribution of employment being as important as the number of jobs created for instance. It includes monitoring the context/conflict; monitoring/assessing whether risk-mitigation measures to minimise negative effects on the context have been effective; monitoring effects of the intervention on conflict; and monitoring effects of the conflict on the intervention.¹⁸

Monitoring conflict sensitivity: Things to keep in mind



Source: C. Gündüz and D. Klein, Conflict-sensitive approaches to value chain development (microReport #101), Washington, DC: USAID, 2008, <https://www.international-alert.org/publications/conflict-sensitive-approaches-value-chain-development>



How to evaluate economic development interventions in FCAS

Why does it matter?

Embedding the evaluation of an economic development intervention's peace impact into the intervention's evaluation is rarely done. When evaluations are done, they tend to focus on measuring outputs rather than outcomes, thereby not fully assessing the actual impact these interventions have on peace and stability.¹⁹ Yet, one cannot simply assume that every positive impact on economic development translates automatically into a positive impact on peace and stability. In fact, it is possible for a programme to be successful in its immediate economic development objectives, while having no impact (or even a negative impact) on peacebuilding.²⁰

Evaluation of economic development programming in FCAS, which assesses both progress towards economic results and peace results is therefore key to help identify what works to contribute to peace through economic development. The following table outlines consideration for defining the purpose and scope of an evaluation of peace-conducive economic development programming.

Assess the interaction between the project's economic results and the wider conflict context	This will help you to identify what works to contribute to peace through economic development.
Assess the peace and economic development impact beyond the direct target groups/project participants	This will help you to assess your impact on the wider conflict context and understand how the targeting of participants has affected conflict dynamics.
Consider investing into longer-term impact evaluations	This will help you to measure how sustainable your intervention was in its impact on multiple peace factors.
Measure both short-term and long-term impacts	This will help you to manage expectations and not raise frustrations or fuel grievances further, particularly as peace effects and economic development effects are often not based on the same timescales.

Sample of evaluation questions

Evaluation lines of enquiry should be directly related to the intervention's theory of change. Below is a sample of guiding questions related to common economic development for peace theories of change (for more details on theories of change, see **practice note 3**). These are indicative and need to be adapted, tailored and completed by further lines of enquiry.²¹


Theory of change	Examples of evaluation guiding questions
General/cross-cutting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has an analysis of peace and conflict dynamics and the linkages between conflict/peace and economic development informed the design, implementation and monitoring of the economic development intervention in FCAS? • How has the intervention been perceived by different groups including/specifically marginalised groups? Are all these groups engaged and interested? • How have the assumptions on how change happens as described in the intervention's theory of change been reflected in the intervention's design and implementation, in particular the internal coherence between economic development and peacebuilding objectives? For instance, has targeting been consistent with the assumptions of the theory of change and intended change on peace and economic development? • To what extent has the economic development intervention and its impacts been inclusive of diverse segments of society? • Assess the quality of economic development, for instance, in the case of employment programming, measuring short-term jobs created as well as the quality of jobs created (who gets what jobs and how);²² long-term job prospects; how the work is allocated among different groups, etc. • How conflict-sensitive was the intervention? • In the case of multi-sectoral integrated programming, is the interaction between economic development and peacebuilding activities creating significant positive changes in the conflict? If yes, what factors were involved?
The opportunity cost of conflict	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the intervention increased economic opportunities among marginalised segments of society? • How relevant were the economic opportunities to the target groups' aspirations? • Has increased availability of opportunities resulted in reduced participation of target groups in violence?
Economic activity creates social cohesion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the intervention improved intergroup relations or trust? • Have there been any changes in behaviours or relationships that will sustain the objectives beyond the intervention lifecycle?
Existence of grievance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To what extent has the intervention reduced grievances that were identified as conflict drivers?
Business for peace	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How relevant was the selection of businesses targeted by the intervention to address conflict drivers? • How effective was the business-focused intervention in promoting peace?
Addressing gender inequalities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How far has the intervention addressed gender inequalities for men/women/young men/young women/different gender identities? • Are there any changes in behaviours, practices or policies that will sustain the objectives beyond the intervention lifecycle?

Integrating gender into monitoring and evaluation

Why does it matter?

In addition to developing gendered indicators and disaggregating indicators along gender, age and other identity markers, any MEL plan needs to ensure that monitoring and evaluation data collection and data analysis factor in the specific and diverse experiences, opportunities and constraints of women and men, boys and girls, and people with other gender identities. This is critical to allow women and men, girls and boys, and people with other gender identities, to voice their respective perspectives and feedback on the intervention, and to identify how/if they have been differently impacted by it.

Good practices for integrating gender and conflict sensitivity in an MEL plan



To go further

Guidance for MEL for peacebuilding, economic development and integrated programming

- ILO, Handbook: How to design, monitor and evaluate peacebuilding results in Jobs for Peace and Resilience programmes, 2019, https://www.ilo.org/employment/Whatwedo/Instructionmaterials/WCMS_712211/lang--en/index.htm
- ILO, Guide on measuring decent jobs for youth: monitoring, evaluation and learning in labour market programmes, 2018, https://www.ilo.org/employment/areas/youth-employment/WCMS_627307/lang--en/index.htm
- S. Bayen with T. Vaux, Integrated development and peacebuilding programming, Practice product for the Conflict, Crime and Violence Results Okay Initiative, DFID, 2013, <https://www.cdacollaborative.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Integrated-Development-and-Peacebuilding-Programming.pdf>
- V. Corlazzoli and J. White, Back to basics: A compilation of best practices in design, monitoring & evaluation in fragile and conflict affected environments, Practice Product for the Conflict, Crime and Violence Results Initiative, DFID, 2013, www.smallarmssurvey.org/fileadmin/docs/M-files/CCRVI/CCVRI-DFID-Back-to-Basics.pdf
- V. Corlazzoli and J. White, Measuring the un-measurable: Solutions to measurement challenges in fragile and conflict-affected environments, Practice Product for the Conflict, Crime and Violence Results Initiative, DFID, 2013, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/304637/Measuring-the-unmeasurable.pdf
- R. Goldwyn and D. Chigas, Monitoring and evaluating conflict sensitivity: Methodological challenges and practical solutions, Practice Product for the Conflict, Crime and Violence Results Initiative, DFID, 2013, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/304611/Mon-eval-conflict-sensitivity-challenges-practical-solutions.pdf
- CARE and International Alert, Guidance for designing, monitoring and evaluating peacebuilding projects: Using theories of change, 2012, <https://insights.careinternational.org.uk/publications/guidance-for-designing-monitoring-and-evaluating-peacebuilding-projects-using-theories-of-change>

Guidance for MEL and gender in economic development programming

- ILO, , 2015, https://www.ilo.org/dyn/asist/docs/F1148634023/gender-responsive_EIIP.pdf
- FAO, Developing gender-sensitive value chains – Guidelines for practitioners, Rome: FAO, 2016, <http://www.fao.org/3/i9212en/I9212EN.pdf>
- Interagency Standing Committee, 2006, and updated in 2017/18, Gender and livelihoods in emergencies, in Gender Handbook for Humanitarian Action, <https://www.gihahandbook.org/>
- UK Gender Action for Peace and Security (GAPS) network et al, Beyond consultations: A tool for meaningfully engaging with women in fragile and conflict-affected states, Saferworld, 2019, <https://www.saferworld.org.uk/resources/publications/1205-beyond-consultations-a-tool-for-meaningfully-engaging-with-women-in-fragile-and-conflict-affected-states>

Acknowledgements

This practice note series was co-authored by Flavie Bertouille, George Grayson, Elizabeth Kariuki and Rabindra Gurung. The authors would like to thank colleagues at International Alert who reviewed the paper: Lucy Holdaway, Gabriel Nuckhir, Vesna Matovic, Lucy Williams, Gloriosa Bazigaga and Cindy Chungong.

About the Peace Research Partnership

Saferworld, Conciliation Resources and International Alert are collaborating on a research programme that generates evidence and lessons for policy-makers and practitioners on how to support peaceful, inclusive change in conflict-affected areas. Funded by UK aid from the UK government, the research focuses on economic development, peace processes, institutions and gender drivers of conflict. The views expressed do not necessarily reflect the UK government's official policies.

Endnotes

- 1 V. Izzi for INCLUDE Knowledge Platform, Promoting decent employment for African youth as a peacebuilding strategy, Evidence Synthesis Paper Series 4/2020, 2020, https://www.ilo.org/wcmsp5/groups/public/---ed_emp/documents/publication/wcms_744700.pdf
- 2 DFID, Results in fragile and conflict-affected states and situations, How to note, 2012, https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/67437/managing-results-conflict-affected-fragile-states.pdf
- 3 See practice notes 1, 2 and 3 for more details. Available at <https://www.international-alert.org/publications/economic-development-peacebuilding>
- 4 In consultations carried out as part of International Alert's Peace Research Partnership project with implementers in the Horn of Africa and EDP experts in September and November 2020.
- 5 G. Grayson and F. Bertouille, Can more jobs bring peace? Understanding peace impact in employment programme design in Kenya and Somalia, International Alert, February 2020, <https://www.international-alert.org/publications/can-more-jobs-bring-peace-kenya-somalia>
- 6 These are drawn from International Alert's and the broader peacebuilding sector's lessons learned, as well as from diverse economic development programmes in the Horn of Africa.
- 7 Of note, this section focuses on developing indicators for performance and outcome monitoring of economic development interventions in FCAS to track progress towards economic development and peace over the intervention timescale.
- 8 See practice notes 2 and 3 for more details on peace and conflict analysis and theories of change, respectively. Available at <https://www.international-alert.org/publications/economic-development-peacebuilding>
- 9 G. Grayson and F. Bertouille, 2020, Op. cit.
- 10 R. Mallett and R. Slater, Growth and livelihoods in fragile and conflict-affected situations, Working Paper 9, ODI, November 2012, <https://securelivelihoods.org/wp-content/uploads/SLRC-Growth-and-Livelihoods-in-Fragile-and-Conflict-Affected-Situations.pdf>
- 11 What is the Everyday Peace Indicators methodology?, <https://everydaypeaceindicators.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/06/EPI-handout-1.pdf>
- 12 G. Grayson and F. Bertouille, 2020, Op. cit.
- 13 You can find more details on more 'traditional' methods, such as FGDs/KIIs or KAP, in ILO, Handbook: How to design, monitor and evaluate peacebuilding results in Jobs for Peace and Resilience programmes, 2019, https://www.ilo.org/employment/Whatwedo/Instructionmaterials/WCMS_712211/lang-en/index.htm
- 14 Enabling good governance in Kenya's oil sector, International Alert, <https://www.international-alert.org/projects/enabling-good-governance-kenyas-oil-sector>
- 15 Zindagii Shoista: Living with dignity – Evaluation, International Alert, 2019, <https://www.international-alert.org/publications/zindagii-shoista-living-dignity-evaluation>
- 16 See practice note 1 for more details on conflict sensitivity considerations adapted to economic development programming and practice note 2 for further guidance on how to integrate conflict sensitivity in programming. Available at <https://www.international-alert.org/publications/economic-development-peacebuilding>
- 17 G. Grayson and F. Bertouille, 2020, Op. cit.
- 18 Ibid.
- 19 Ibid.
- 20 T. Brück, N. Ferguson, V. Izzi and W. Stojetz, Jobs aid peace: A review of the theory and practice of the impact of employment programmes on peace in fragile and conflict-affected countries, Berlin: International Security and Development Center, 2016, https://www.ilo.org/global/topics/employment-promotion/recovery-and-reconstruction/WCMS_633429/lang-en/index.htm
- 21 The ILO Handbook on DM&E for Employment for Peace programming provides a sample of evaluation questions per OECD-DAC criterion for employment programming and employment for peace programming (Annex III, p. 86).
- 22 V. Izzi, 2020, Op. cit.

Cover image: AMISOM Photo (CC0 1.0)

International Alert

346 Clapham Road, London, SW9 9AP, United Kingdom

Tel +44 (0)20 7627 6800 Fax +44 (0)20 7627 6900

Email info@international-alert.org

www.international-alert.org



/InternationalAlert



@intalert



/international-alert