



ADVANCING RESILIENCE MEASUREMENT CONSULTATION REPORT



Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
2. Objectives	1
3. Principles and Priorities by Theme	2
3.1.1 Demand Driven Resilience Measurement and Evidence	2
3.1.2 3.2 Psychosocial Resilience and Well-being	4
3.1.3 3.3 Systems Resilience	6
3.1.4 3.4 Resilience and Climate Adaptation	8
4. NEXT STEPS	11
Annex - Agenda, PreBrief Document, Participants List	12

Acknowledgements

We would like to acknowledge the tremendous contributions of the Advancing Resilience Measurement (ARM) consultation participants (see Annex). The highly interactive consultation brought together people from diverse backgrounds and institutions to ensure a range of perspectives were heard. The consultation's success and the outputs captured in this report are a reflection of everyone's willingness to engage in rich discussion and debate.

We would also like to acknowledge the many contributors who helped design, plan, and moderate the thematic sessions and breakout groups, as well as our notetakers who did an excellent job capturing dynamic and far-reaching discussions. This includes John Meyer, Shuchi Vora, Aditya Bahadur, Isabelle Bremaud, James Campbell, Mark Conostas, Daniel Deng, Elisabeth Farmer, Regardt Ferrei, Vidhya Sriram, Tim Frankenberger, Zack Guido, Tracey Mitchell, Nancy Mock, Conor Riggs, Fernanda Zermoglio, Katherine Braga, Bobby Hartwell, Hallie Heinzen, and Alison Simerly.

Finally, we would like to thank the facilitation team of Erin Martin (lead) and Katherine Casey (support), as well as the University of Arizona staff who supported the event, including Ryan Armendariz, Brew McKenna, Karla Nunez, Francine Songa, and Aaron Handel-Kutz.

Thank you all for your contributions to Advancing Resilience Measurement!

Greg Collins, Associate Vice President for Resilience and International Development and Research Professor, University of Arizona

Nathanial Matthews Chief Executive Officer, The Global Resilience Partnership

Christine Gottschalk, Director, Center for Resilience USAID

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the last decade, resilience has continued to be elevated as an analytic, programmatic, and organizing concept in development discourse and practice. In line with this, approaches to measuring resilience have proliferated, giving rise to a nascent evidence base on both the impact of resilience programming and the sources of resilience that explain why some households, communities, systems, and countries fare better in the face of shocks and stresses than others. Despite clear progress, significant challenges and gaps in resilience measurement and evidence remain. The demand for resilience evidence has also grown exponentially as conflict, Covid-19 and the accelerating impacts of climate change have reversed development gains on a massive scale and pushed hundreds of millions of people into crisis levels of poverty and hunger.

On May 17-18th, the University of Arizona, the Global Resilience Partnership, and the United States Agency for International Development convened a group of 50 experts and development practitioners at the University of Arizona, DC Center for Collaboration and Outreach in Washington, D.C. with the aim of advancing resilience measurement and setting a common agenda for addressing these challenges and gaps. The group of experts and development practitioners included representatives from USAID, the State Department's Special Envoy for Climate, UN agencies, the World Bank, private foundations, universities and research institutions, NGOs, and governments and regional institutions, including the Government of Kenya and the Sahelian West Africa Permanent Committee for Drought Control. The agenda, participants list, and briefing documents are provided in the annex of this report.

2. OBJECTIVES

The objectives of the consultation were to identify and affirm core principles and priorities for resilience measurement and evidence with a focus on four critical themes. The four themes were selected on the basis that they represent critical frontier issues in resilience measurement that also have significant unresolved challenges that must be addressed.

The first theme, demand-driven resilience measurement and evidence, was selected in recognition of both the growing demand for and diversity of evidence needs and the extent to which current measurement and evidence are not meeting all of those needs. The second theme, psychosocial resilience measurement, was selected due to the growing recognition that psychosocial resilience and well-being are foundational to resilience and development in ways we are just beginning to understand. The third theme, systems level resilience measurement, was selected because of the importance of systems in managing shocks and stresses that go beyond the capacity of households and communities to manage on their own. Finally, the fourth theme, climate adaptation, was selected because of the urgency and growing global momentum to support communities and countries to adapt to the accelerating impacts of climate change. The session on climate adaptation did not attempt to tackle the full spectrum of climate adaptation measurement, including measuring climate finance and climate action as part of the global stocktaking. Rather, the discussion focused more narrowly on lessons learned from resilience measurement that can inform climate adaptation measurement.

For the purposes of the consultation, resilience was defined as the ability of people, households, communities, countries and systems to mitigate, adapt to and recover from shocks and stresses in

a manner that reduces chronic vulnerability and facilitates inclusive growth (USAID, 2012). Principles were defined as shared beliefs about each measurement theme and how it should be approached or applied, both conceptually and operationally. Priorities were defined as the most pressing measurement issues to address within each measurement theme within the next 3 to 5 years.

3. PRINCIPLES AND PRIORITIES BY THEME

3.1 Demand Driven Resilience Measurement and Evidence

There is growing recognition of the diversity of resilience evidence needs and the extent to which current evidence and measurement approaches are not meeting all of these needs. A better understanding of who needs what type of evidence and when, is critical to ensuring that resilience measurement evolves to meet this demand more effectively.

3.1.1 Principles

- 1. Engaging evidence users - including communities - in the co-production of knowledge is critical for ensuring resilience measurement and evidence are demand driven and contribute to strengthening individual and collective agency.** This requires balancing the top-down evidence needs of government policy makers and donors with the more localized bottom-up needs of communities, local authorities, and project implementers in recognition that all of these stakeholders need resilience evidence for decision making. It also requires sustained processes for involving communities, local actors, and project implementers at all stages of research design, implementation, and analysis, including program design and the co-creation of resilience theories of change that inform measurement. Integrating indigenous knowledge systems and strengthening the capacity of communities to use evidence generated by other development actors are both critical in this regard. Finally, it requires feedback loops that provide evidence to users in a timely manner and form that meets their needs.
- 2. Different evidence users have different evidence needs that require different resilience measurement methods and approaches. A range of methods and approaches are required to meet the growing diversity of resilience evidence needs.** This includes qualitative and quantitative methods, objective and subjective measures, a range of novel data collection approaches such as phone surveys, remote sensing, earth observation, and various types of AI supported analyses. A common feature of resilience measurement across these methods and approaches is the use of longitudinal data, often panel data. These data are collected at relatively high frequency to assess the impact of shocks and stresses on well-being, as well as the extent to which households, communities, countries, and/or systems are resilient and able to mitigate, adapt to, and recover from shocks and stresses without compromising their future well-being.
- 3. Mixed methods and approaches help meet diverse evidence needs and reinforce trust and confidence in findings.** Different resilience evidence users have different levels of trust and confidence in findings generated through different methods and approaches. For some, Randomized Control Trials (RCT) constitute a gold standard against which other methods

are judged. For others, qualitative evidence they can see and hear themselves inspires more trust and confidence. Still others recognize that all methods and approaches have strengths and limitations. Identifying the appropriate mix of methods and approaches can help leverage these strengths, address limitations, and ensure the responsible use of data and evidence, including anecdotal evidence. It can also help balance the need for rigor and relevance in relation to the specific needs of different evidence users.

3.1.2 Priorities

- 1. Develop a map and typology of resilience evidence users, uses, and needs at different scales.** There is a need for both a generic map and typology to guide our collective approach to demand-driven resilience measurement and context specific maps that define evidence users and their needs in relation to a specific context and evidence-generating exercises. A process for developing the latter would provide a transparent means of assessing whose evidence needs are and aren't being met. These context specific mapping exercises should be done in consultation with a range of stakeholders, including communities, local authorities, and other local evidence users.
- 2. Connect data and evidence from multiple sources in a resilience information network that, collectively, meets a diversity of evidence needs.** Given that no single method or approach of even a single mixed-methods evidence-generating exercise can meet all evidence needs, it is useful to conceive of each exercise as contributing to a resilience information network. These networks can exist at a global scale to help curate global resilience evidence. However, they are also needed at a local scale to provide insights and evidence to inform local actors and action, and this should be prioritized. Regional institutions and governments at a national and local level have a critical role to play in this regard, as do local research institutions, universities, and other actors. Resources and support for developing these networks must align behind locally led efforts.
- 3. Operationalize learning from monitoring and evaluation in (closer to) real time.** Time lags between when evidence is needed and when evidence is generated continue to undermine the use of resilience evidence for decision-making. There is an opportunity to ensure evidence is both rigorous and relevant by reducing these time-lags and ensuring data collection and analysis are generated in (closer to) real time. The longitudinal, high-frequency data collection approaches that are commonly used in resilience measurement are tailor-made for interim analysis of this kind. However, a commitment by donors, governments, and other stakeholders to prioritizing time-bound relevance of the data being collected and analyzed is still required.
- 4. Improve visualization and translation of resilience evidence in consultation with evidence users to meet their evidence needs.** The form that evidence takes is as important as the evidence itself. Improved visualization and translation of evidence into actionable policy and programming recommendations is required. A process of consultation to ensure this is demand-driven is also required, both generally to guide our collective approach and in relation to a specific context, evidence use and users, and evidence-generating exercises.

5. **More fully leverage existing, longitudinal data to meet evidence needs.** There is a collective recognition that the amount of longitudinal data now available is far greater than it was 10 years ago when efforts to measure resilience in the context of international development began. However, there is also a collective recognition that the data is underutilized and constitute an important resource for meeting demand-driven evidence needs. As part of the process of mapping global and local evidence users and uses described above, existing longitudinal data should be prioritized as a cost (and time) effective means of meeting unmet evidence needs.
6. **Better demonstrate the effectiveness of resilience projects and programming.** Current approaches to resilience measurement prioritize expanding our understanding of the sources of resilience that explain why some households, communities, countries and systems fare better in the face of shocks and stresses than others. There is a demand to balance this with the related but distinct need to measure the effectiveness of resilience interventions. There is a similar demand to ensure evidence on effectiveness not only captures the collective impact of projects in a resilience portfolio, but the specific contribution of individual projects. Finally, there is an urgent need to prioritize generating additional evidence on the ‘value for money’ of investing in resilience projects and programming expressed in terms of averted humanitarian assistance needs and declines in well-being.

3.2 Psychosocial Resilience and Well-being

The rise of resilience as an analytic, programmatic, and organizing concept in the field of international development, as well as an increase in conflict, insecurity, and displacement, have led to a greater interest and focus on psychosocial factors in recent years. In turn, this resulted in a growing but still nascent evidence base on their importance for resilience and development.

3.2.1 Principles

1. **Psychosocial well-being is a critically important well-being outcome, an enabling condition that facilitates improvement in other well-being outcomes, and a source of resilience that protects other well-being outcomes in the face of shocks and stresses.** The importance of psychosocial well-being in each of these three respects has been undervalued and is only beginning to be recognized and understood. Improving and further incorporating measurement of psychosocial well-being is therefore critical to expanding our understanding and further substantiating its value as an outcome in its own right, as an enabler of other outcomes, and as a source of resilience.
2. **Culture and context shape people’s perceptions and understanding about psychosocial constructs and this must be reflected in how they are measured.** Many psychosocial concepts and constructs reflect a Western bias. Great care must be taken in measuring and translating these concepts and constructs in non-Western cultures and communities to reduce bias and avoid false equivalence. Even where cross-culturally validated tools are used (e.g. [CESD](#) and [PSS](#)), these must be complemented with qualitative inquiry to ground understanding in the local culture and context. Cultural and contextually specific evidence

and learning about psychosocial well-being and resilience should take precedence over cross-context and cross-culture comparison. In-depth exploratory and participatory qualitative inquiry with communities are critically important in this regard.

- 3. Measuring psychosocial resilience and well-being can be sensitive and requires (pre)caution and adherence to do no harm principles.** Improving and further incorporating the measurement of psychosocial well-being and resilience is critical for addressing profound gaps in our understanding about resilience and development. However, measuring psychosocial well-being and resilience can itself cause discomfort, distress, and trauma for respondents and participants. Therefore, care and precautions must be taken, including using skilled enumerators and making psychosocial support available, particularly where respondents have experienced trauma, conflict and violence. The use of in-depth exploratory and participatory qualitative inquiry with communities as suggested above can help establish trust and reduce the potential for discomfort, distress, and trauma.
- 4. Psychosocial resilience and well-being (like other forms of resilience and well-being) exist and can be measured at different scales.** Individual and community level psychosocial resilience and well-being are both important in the context of international development for reasons stated above. They are related, but distinct. Understanding the relationship between individual and community level psychosocial resilience and well-being is an important frontier issue for resilience measurement.

3.2.2 Priorities

- 1. Form a technical working group for advancing psychosocial resilience measurement -** The primary aims of this PR-TWG should be to continue to advance measurement practice, generate evidence to further validate the importance of psychosocial well-being for resilience and international development, and translate this evidence into actionable policy and programming recommendations. The PR-TWG should include both practitioners and academics - including psychologists, sociologists, and other social scientists working in academia and the field of international development - as well as practitioners that use resilience evidence to make sure efforts to advance psychosocial resilience measurement are demand driven and locally informed.
- 2. Conduct a systematic review of psychosocial resilience and well-being measurement tools, methods, and evidence.** A priority task for the proposed PR-TWG is to conduct a systematic review of tools, measurement methods, and evidence on psychosocial resilience and well-being in the context of international development. This should also include an assessment of the impact of different interventions on psychosocial wellbeing where possible, including but not limited to, graduation programming. Given the scope and scale of this review, external funding will be required.

3. **Further validate the use of existing psychological scales in contexts relevant to resilience and international development, including with communities themselves.** There are many scales currently available and in use. Most have been developed in Western contexts. Even for scales that have been validated in different cultural and country contexts, there is a need for further validation among individuals and communities relevant to resilience and international development, including in areas of recurrent crises and among refugees or IDPs. A secondary aim of this validation exercise is greater standardization by identifying a more limited set of scales appropriate for use in these contexts.
4. **Explore the potential for standardization of concepts, tools, and scales while also allowing for cultural and contextual tailoring.** A lack of common understanding of key psychosocial concepts and constructs and how to measure them has the potential to create a lack of coherence at the very moment further clarity is required. There is a need to identify 5-7 key psychosocial concepts and constructs and develop guidance on their meaning and measurement in the context of international development. Similarly, the wide range of scales and tools being used to measure psychosocial resilience and well-being is creating a lack of coherence and the very moment when more clarity is needed. The potential for further standardizing tools and scales must be explored.

3.3 Systems Resilience

Systems thinking has provided new insights into the complex ways in which components and actors within market, ecological, and social systems interact and interconnect, as well as the importance of systems to achieving development outcomes at an individual, household, and community scale. Drought, conflict, and Covid-19 have further demonstrated how shocks reverberate through systems – the latter on a global scale – and reaffirmed the importance of both understanding and strengthening the resilience of systems.

3.3.1 Principles

1. **Defining a system, its components and boundaries is a subjective exercise. As such, it is critical to engage a broad range of actors within the system in the process of doing so, including the most vulnerable.** It is a challenge to find the right balance between including a broad range of actors and keeping systems mapping exercises manageable. However, the inclusion of a variety of actors is needed to fully understand different perspectives on a system's components and boundaries and how actors in a system interact. Care must also be taken to limit the inherent biases introduced by those facilitating the systems mapping exercise. Incentivizing participation can also be a challenge, particularly among private sector actors that may not see inherent value in their participation.
2. **Defining the determinants or sources of a system's resilience is also subjective and difficult to validate in the absence of systems level well-being outcomes.** A key measurement principle in the foundational [2014 FSIN Resilience Measurement Principles](#), is that resilience is a capacity that should be indexed to a development (well-being) outcome. This presents an unresolved challenge for systems-level measurement where such outcomes

are either difficult to identify or measure, do not adequately represent a system's well-being, or have a high probability of masking unintended consequences and maladaptation¹.

3. **A primary objective for measuring systems level dynamics and resilience is to understand their impact on household, and community resilience and well-being.** Understanding the relationship between these scales and how structures and processes impact households and communities is critical for understanding household and community resilience, as well as the systems and institutions needed to manage shocks and stresses that go beyond the capacity of individuals, households, and communities to manage on their own. Resilience at one scale must not be conflated as conferring resilience at another scale unless analytically substantiated. Inter-scalar analysis to examine these relationships are currently at a nascent state and remain a frontier issue in resilience measurement.
4. **Systems level resilience measurement must be highly sensitive to and anticipate unintended consequences and maladaptation.** This holds true for resilience measurement at all scales as emphasized in the principles on measuring climate adaptation. However, the combination of an uncertain future being shaped by climate change and the complexity and connectedness of systems further exacerbates both the threat of unintended consequences and maladaptation and the potential for them to be masked in systems-level measurement.

3.3.2 Priorities

1. **Make systems and systems resilience measurement more accessible to a broader range of development stakeholders.** Many development stakeholders are uncomfortable with systems thinking and terminology or are skeptical about its utility. This is in part a reflection of the complex, dynamic systems themselves. However, it also signals a need to better translate systems thinking and systems level resilience measurement into terms that those not accustomed to or comfortable with the language and concepts associated with systems thinking can understand. Conceiving of a system as a network and using network mapping and social network analysis may provide one way forward in this regard.
2. **Develop a typology of systems and focus future consultations on specific systems to enable a deeper and context specific discussion.** Systems differ enough in their qualities that efforts to measure resilience in one type of system may have little in common with measuring resilience in another type of system. An agreed upon typology will be useful in guiding future discussions and work, particularly as interest in systems level resilience measurement extends beyond market systems, social systems and ecological systems to health systems, food systems and other systems.

¹ [The Normalized Difference Vegetation Index \(NDVI\)](#) provides an example of a systems level outcome (greenness) that may be appropriate for use in some circumstances, but may also not adequately represent a system's well-being or have a high probability of masking unintended consequences and maladaptation in other circumstances.

- 3. Develop a shared typology or categories for the determinants (or sources) of resilience used in relation to specific systems.** The most obvious starting point for this is market systems resilience measurement which has seen significant advances in recent years. Despite these advances, the proliferation of tools and approaches has resulted in different typologies or categories for conceptualizing determinants (or sources) of resilience. In turn, this reduces the ability to compare between methods and studies and aggregate evidence. It also has the potential to cause confusion among evidence users who are not steeped in the nuance of market systems resilience measurement. This shared typology must also be dynamic both in light of new evidence and because systems change over time.
- 4. Consolidate lessons learned on processes for systems mapping, including the incorporation of risks associated with shocks and stresses and determinants or sources of resilience within the system.** The process of mapping a system can be challenging given the complexities and feedback loops involved, as well as the range of actors needed to effectively map out a system's components and boundaries. A consolidated guide to best practices and lessons learned from different organizations engaged in systems-level resilience measurement would help manage these challenges and lower the barriers to entry for those seeking to incorporate systems-level resilience measurement into their work.
- 5. Demonstrate the value of systems-level resilience and systems-level resilience measurement to achieving development outcomes.** There is a growing appreciation in international development that systems thinking, and systems approaches, including in relation to resilience, provide a means of grappling with complexity of systems and achieving development outcomes at scale. However, that value has yet to be demonstrated to policy makers in relation to the centrality of systems-thinking and systems approaches for achieving development outcomes. Doing so is a priority for sustained interest and investment in systems thinking and systems approaches.

3.4 Resilience and Climate Adaptation

Advances in resilience measurement over the last decade provide valuable insights for measuring climate adaptation. However, to effectively inform and contribute to adaptation measurement and decision-making, resilience approaches to measuring climate adaptation must overcome several conceptual and practical measurement challenges.

3.4.1 Principles

- 1. Resilience measurement frameworks and approaches provide a means of measuring climate adaptation that complements other approaches and fills a critical gap,** particularly at the individual, household, and community scales. Other approaches to climate adaptation measurement, including measuring climate actions and climate finance, remain critical for gauging progress, including at national and international scales. Greater coordination and collaboration among communities of practice implementing these different approaches to climate adaptation measurement will improve coherence and ensure these complementarities are maximized.

2. **Resilience approaches to measuring climate adaptation measure capacities that enable people, households, communities, countries, and systems to adapt to and manage the impacts of climate change without compromising current and future well-being.** This focus on capacities mirrors current approaches to resilience measurement with additional emphasis on measuring how these capacities protect and enable *future* well-being. It also includes a more explicit recognition that actions taken to protect current well-being can be maladaptive and compromise future well-being, highlighting the need to account for this in the way climate adaptation is measured. Given the timescales involved and uncertainties about the future, resilience and adaptation capacities and their relationship to future well-being must be analyzed in relation to a range of potential adaptation futures.
3. **Climate shocks and stresses occur in complex risk environments in which a range of shocks and stresses are interacting and compounding one another.** Conflict, Covid-19 and the accelerating impacts of climate change have demonstrated in stark terms how shocks and stresses and a cascade of downstream effects interact at local and global scales. In turn, this makes isolating the impact of a particular shock or stress (climate or otherwise) increasingly difficult and detached from a complex reality. The compound nature of shocks and stresses that households and communities faced must be incorporated into resilience and climate adaptation measurement. Embracing this complexity also provides a natural bridge for linking climate adaptation action and measurement to efforts and issues at the nexus of these challenges, including the Humanitarian-Development-Peace (HDP) nexus.
4. **Flexibility to adapt to a range of potential adaptation futures is a source of resilience and form adaptation in the face of an uncertain future.** This is in line with the concept of [adaptation pathways](#), as well as the first and second principles highlighted above on measuring capacities and future well-being in relation to a range of potential adaptation futures in compound and complex risk environments. As such, measures of flexibility must be more effectively incorporated into resilience and climate adaptation measurement.
5. **Sustained processes for involving communities in the co-production of resilience and climate adaptation evidence is required.** Communities are already adapting, and local and indigenous knowledge and actors are central to the adaptation evidence enterprise. In line with demand driven resilience measurement and locally led adaptation principles, engaging communities in all stages of research design, implementation, and analysis is critical. This includes engaging communities in developing theories of change that inform measurement and program design. It also includes feedback loops that provide timely evidence to local actors and decision makers in a form that meets their evidence needs.

3.4.2 Priorities

1. **Develop measurement and analytic innovations to address unresolved challenges to measuring climate adaptation using a resilience measurement approach.** Foremost among these challenges is how to define adaptation success in terms of adaptation capacities and their relationship to future well-being, including whether well-being has been compromised (maladaptation), given the timescales of climate change and uncertainties

about the future. A technical working group made up of resilience measurement experts and climate adaptation measurement experts would help speed this much needed innovation. Predictive modeling under different climate scenarios will likely play a critical role and these models should not only consider extreme scenarios.

- 2. Refine and improve measures of resilience capacities to better reflect the uncertainty and future orientation of climate adaptation.** Resilience and resilience measurement have tended to focus on the ability to manage current shocks and stresses. The time horizon and uncertain future associated with a longer-term perspective on climate change demands measuring whether changes are occurring now to better equip people, households, communities, countries, and systems to future impacts under different climate scenarios. This includes measuring whether the transformational changes to systems, structures and institutions needed to manage future impacts are occurring now. It also includes measuring flexibility in the face of an uncertain future as a source of resilience and form of adaptation.
- 3. Greater collaboration and convergence between resilience and climate adaptation measurement communities of practice.** Efforts to measure resilience and climate adaptation have emerged in parallel from largely separate communities of practice. Different terminology, timescales, evidence priorities, and a lack of understanding of approaches developed by the ‘other’ impede opportunities for greater collaboration, coherence, and complementarity and must be overcome.
 - a. Distill the various approaches used in resilience measurement and climate adaptation for practitioners.** One specific recommendation to enhance is to develop a practitioner-oriented overview that explains various measurement approaches and how they differ and complement one another.
 - b. Conduct measurement exercises with joint resilience and climate adaptation measurement teams.** Another recommendation to accelerate collaboration is to create joint resilience and climate adaptation measurement teams to support measurement efforts in a specific country, either in the Horn of Africa and Sahelian West Africa.
- 4. Further elevate local and indigenous knowledge and actors in resilience and climate adaptation evidence enterprises.** Locally led adaptation principles, as well as several principles outlined in this report, provide strong statements on the need to do so. However, effectively and meaningfully doing so requires confronting long-standing patterns of power that shape how we perceive and value evidence. Greater intentionality in creating space for diverse perspectives on resilience and climate adaptation evidence is required.

5. NEXT STEPS

The University of Arizona, the Global Resilience Partnership and USAID are committed to working with participants and others to advance the principles and priorities identified during this consultation. This includes socializing the principles and priorities presented in the preceding sections of this report more broadly through a donor briefing and a webinar hosted by USAID's [ResilienceLinks](#). It also includes using the outputs of this consultation to inform and shape future Advancing Resilience Measurement (ARM) events being planned for COP27 and USAID's Resilience Evidence Forum in 2023. Ensuring these events build upon one another is critical for sustaining momentum and continuing to grow and support the resilience measurement community of practice. The more specific calls for Technical Working Groups, systematic reviews, follow-on consultations in the global south, and other priority actions identified under each theme will be pursued under the auspices of the GRP's [Resilience Knowledge Coalition](#). Readers interested in collaborating on these follow up actions are encouraged to join the coalition's listserv:

<https://www.globalresiliencepartnership.org/what-we-do/shared-learning/resilience-knowledge-coalition/>

ANNEX



ADVANCING RESILIENCE MEASUREMENT



Advancing Resilience Measurement

May 17-18, 2022

Washington, D.C.

Over the last decade, resilience has continued to be elevated as an analytic, programmatic, and organizing concept in development discourse and practice. In line with this, approaches to measuring resilience have proliferated, giving rise to a nascent evidence base on the sources of resilience that explain why some households, communities, systems, and countries fare better in the face of shocks and stresses than others. Despite clear progress, significant challenges and gaps in resilience measurement and evidence remain. The University of Arizona, the Global Resilience Partnership, and USAID are convening experts to help set a common agenda for addressing these challenges and gaps.

The objectives of the convening are to identify and affirm core principles and priorities for resilience measurement and evidence with a focus on four critical themes:

- Demand-driven resilience measurement and evidence
- Resilience of systems (market, ecological, and social)
- Psychosocial sources of resilience
- Resilience and climate adaptation

For the purposes of the convening, the following definitions are offered:

- Principles: shared beliefs about the measurement theme and how it should be approached or applied, both conceptually and/or operationally
- Priorities: the most pressing measurement issues to address within the next 3-5 years, aligned with each measurement theme and inclusive of required procedures and processes

Some 45-50 experts and practitioners representing NGOs, academia, USAID, and other USG agencies will attend. The agenda consists of plenary and breakout sessions with significant emphasis on participant contributions, discussion, and collaboration. Participants are encouraged to cross-fertilize ideas within and across themes, and to generate ideas for collaboration after the event.

AGENDA

Tuesday, May 17: Day 1

Time (EDT)	Session	Presenter/moderators
8:30-9:00	Coffee and registration	
WELCOME and INTRODUCTIONS		
<i>Session 1</i> 9:00-9:20	<p>Welcome and Introductions</p> <p>Consultation Framing and Objectives This session introduces the four themes of the consultation, provides context on convening objectives, and outlines the meeting process.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin Martin, facilitator • <u>Presenter 1</u>: Greg Collins, Associate Vice President for Resilience and International Development, University of Arizona • <u>Presenter 2</u>: Christine Gottschalk, Director, USAID's Center for Resilience • <u>Presenter 3</u>: Nathaniel Matthews, CEO, the Global Resilience Partnership
<i>Session 2</i> 9:20-10:00	<p>Participant Insights</p> <p>Drawing on the wealth of experience in the room, participants share a key lesson from their resilience work to inform discussions on advancing resilience measurement over the next two days.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin Martin
<i>Session 3a</i> 10:00-10:30	<p>Framing: Understanding the demand for resilience measurement</p> <p>To open discussion on how to effectively meet the demand for resilience measurement, this session explores a basic question: who needs what type of evidence when?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Kick-off</u>: John Meyer, Senior Strategy and Impact Advisor, USAID • <u>Presenter 1</u>: Elisabeth Farmer, Chief of Party, CARE, Livelihoods for Resilience Activity • <u>Presenter 2</u>: James Campbell, MEL Coordinator, Catholic Relief Services • <u>Presenter 3</u>: Mark Conostas, Associate Professor, Cornell University
10:30-11:00	Break	

THEME 1: Demand-driven Resilience Evidence and Measurement		
Session 3b 11:00-12:30	<p>Demand-driven Breakouts: Mini-group inventories</p> <p>Participants break into three small groups of 14-16 to elaborate on the opportunities and challenges associated with demand-driven resilience measurement. The process begins with mini-groups of 4-5 people (40 minutes) followed by a return to the main small group (45 minutes). At each stage, participants will share, refine, and combine their ideas, addressing gaps and building on commonalities. The aim is to emerge from each group with a collection of concrete ideas on principles and priorities.</p>	<p>Group 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Moderator</u> Fernanda Zermoglio • <u>Room</u>: Catalina South <p>Group 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Moderator</u>: Daniel Deng • <u>Room</u>: Catalina North <p>Group 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Moderator</u>: Greg Collins • <u>Room</u>: Lounge/Monsoon
12:30-13:30	Lunch	
Session 3c 13:30-13:45	Plenary review of breakout work	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Erin Martin
THEME 2: Measuring the Resilience of Systems THEME 3: Measuring Psychosocial Sources of Resilience		
Session 4a 13:45-14:00	<p>Framing: Key issues for systems-level resilience measurement</p> <p>This session introduces key issues related to applying systems-level thinking to resilience measurement, looking particularly at measuring the resilience of market, social, and ecological systems.</p> <p>Framing: Insights on psychosocial resilience</p> <p>This session offers an overview of the current considerations, challenges, and unresolved issues in measuring psychosocial resilience.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Kick-off</u>: Shuchi Vora, Programme Officer, Global Resilience Partnership • <u>Kick-off</u>: Greg Collins
Session 4b 14:00-15:45	<p>Breakouts: Improv fishbowl</p> <p>Participants break into small groups. Each begins with presentations highlighting practitioners' points of view. Then, participants share their experiences, drawing on guiding questions. Using an interactive discussion technique known as a fishbowl, participants will take turns speaking. The group eventually reunites as a whole to debrief and synthesize their ideas on principles and priorities.</p>	
	<p>Systems-level resilience breakout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Presenter 1</u>: Conor Riggs, Vice President of Global Initiatives, IDE • <u>Presenter 2</u>: Isabelle Bremaud, Global Resilience Advisor, GOAL • <u>Moderator Group 1</u>: Aditya Bahadur, Principal Researcher, IIED • <u>Moderator Group 2</u>: Nathaniel Matthews 	
	<p>Psychosocial resilience breakout</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Presenter 1</u>: Nancy Mock, Associate Professor, Tulane University • <u>Presenter 2</u>: Daniel Deng, Team Lead, One Project • <u>Moderator Group 1</u>: Reggie Ferrei, Associate Professor, Tulane University • <u>Moderator Group 2</u>: John Meyer 	

15:45-16:15	Break	
Session 4c 16:15-16:45	Systems and Psychosocial “roaming” report-back All participants reconvene, walking around the plenary space and connecting with one or more people from another group to share key takeaways from their respective discussions.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participants
Session 5 16:45-17:00	Check-in on progress and process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erin Martin, participants
17:00-19:00	Reception	Lounge area/roof deck

Wednesday, May 18: Day 2

Time (EDT)	Session	Presenter/moderators
8:30-9:00	Coffee and registration	
WELCOME, INTRODUCTIONS, AND CONTEXT		
Session 6 9:00-9:10	Opening and Objectives Review of Day 2 process and expected outcomes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Erin Martin
THEME 4:		
Session 7a 9:10-9:30	Framing: Climate Adaptation This introduction will offer perspectives on applying lessons learned from resilience measurement to the challenge of measuring climate adaptation, considering successes as well as challenges and gaps.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Kick-off</u>: Bradley Sagara, Director of Research & Learning-Resilience, Mercy Corps <u>Presenter 1</u>: Tim Frankenberger, President, TANGO International <u>Presenter 2</u>: Fernanda Zermoglio, Climate Adaptation and Resilience Specialist, USAID
Session 7b 9:30-10:30	Adaptation Breakouts: Poster preparation and discussion Participants break into groups to discuss guiding questions related to the interconnections of resilience and adaptation measurement, including opportunities to leverage existing measurement efforts and definition of the boundaries and limitations between the two. Discussions will be captured on multiple virtual “posters” that will be shared in Session 8c.	<p>Group 1:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Moderator</u>: Nancy Mock <u>Room</u>: Catalina South <p>Group 2:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Moderator</u>: Tracy Mitchell, Senior Research Specialist, RTI International <u>Room</u>: Catalina North <p>Group 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>Moderator</u>: Zack Guido, Director of International Programs, AIRES <u>Room</u>: Lounge/Monsoon

10:30-11:00	Break	
Session 7b 11:00-11:30	Adaptation Breakouts, continued	
Session 7c 11:30-12:15	Adaptation Gallery Walk Participants will travel around the room to review the posters produced by each group. The session concludes with the framing presenters offering feedback and insights on the posters.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants • Fernanda Zermoglio • Tim Frankenberger • <u>Moderator</u>: Brad Sagara
12:15-13:15	Lunch	
Building an Agenda for Resilience Measurement		
Session 8 13:15-14:30	Assessing Principles and Priorities Looking at summaries of the thematic sessions, participants will circulate to validate the principles and priorities identified in Days 1 and 2.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants
14:30-15:00	Break	
Session 9 15:00-16:15	Mapping Actions, Actors, and Collaborations To chart a path forward on principles and priorities, participants suggest potential activities, collaborations, partners, and new audiences.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All participants
WRAP-UP		
Session 10 16:15-17:00	Discussion and Closing Final summary remarks and take-home messages from conference organizers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Convening organizers • Erin Martin
17:00	ADJOURNMENT	



ADVANCING RESILIENCE MEASUREMENT



Advancing Resilience Measurement

May 17-18, 2022

Pre-Brief for Convening Participants

Overview

Over the last decade, resilience has been elevated as an analytic, programmatic, and organizing concept in development discourse and practice. Measurement approaches have also proliferated, giving rise to a nascent evidence base on the sources of resilience and insights on why some households, communities, systems, and countries fare better in the face of shocks and stresses than others. Despite clear progress, significant challenges and gaps in resilience measurement and evidence remain. The University of Arizona, the Global Resilience Partnership, and USAID are convening experts to help set a common agenda for addressing these challenges and gaps. The expert convening will focus on four critical themes:

- Demand-driven resilience measurement and evidence
- Resilience of systems (market, ecological, and social)
- Psychosocial sources of resilience
- Resilience and climate adaptation

For the purposes of the convening, the following definitions are offered:

- Principles: shared beliefs about the measurement theme and how it should be approached or applied, both conceptually and/or operationally
- Priorities: the most pressing measurement issues to address within the next 3-5 years, aligned with each measurement theme and inclusive of required procedures and processes

To prepare participants to engage effectively at the convening, this briefing document provides a snapshot of the four themes, along with recommended pre-event reading.

Theme 1: Demand-driven resilience measurement and evidence

There is growing recognition of the diversity of resilience evidence needs and the extent to which current evidence and measurement approaches are not meeting all these needs. A better understanding of *who* needs *what* type of evidence and *when*, is critical to ensuring that resilience measurement evolves to meet this demand more effectively. To answer these questions we must recognize:

- The various resilience evidence needs among different stakeholders, including local actors and communities
- The inability of a single method or approach to meet the diversity of evidence needs
- The persistent challenge of timing in meeting resilience evidence demands
- The tension between relevance and rigor, as well as complexity and usability

Priority reading:

[Advancing Resilience Measurement](#), January 2021

***Only two pages!

Theme 2: Resilience of systems (market, ecological, and social)

Systems thinking has provided new insights into the complex ways in which components and actors within market, ecological, and social systems interact and interconnect, as well as the importance of systems to achieving development outcomes at an individual and household level. Drought, conflict, and Covid-19 have further demonstrated how shocks reverberate through systems – the latter on a global scale – and reaffirmed the importance of both understanding and strengthening the resilience of systems. There have been significant advances in measuring the resilience of market, social, and ecological systems in recent years. However, many core challenges remain, including:

- How to define the system boundaries and components, both conceptually and operationally
- How to define and validate the determinants of a system's resilience (or its resilience capacities), including in the absence of easily identified, systems-level outcomes
- How to measure these determinants/capacities in data scarce environments, balancing contextual specificity with the desire for cross-context comparison
- How to analyze the relationship between systems level resilience and resilience and well-being at other scales (e.g. individuals, households, communities)

A lack of familiarity – and corresponding degree of discomfort – with systems thinking among many development stakeholders further exacerbates these challenges.

Priority reading

[Analysis of the Resilience of Communities to disasters, GOAL Global](#)

****If short on time, see section 3.1. Systems thinking in resilience programming*

[Market Systems Resilience Resources](#)

****Jump to the resources on [measurement](#)*

Other background:

[Wayfinder](#) Developing a framework for learning, monitoring and evaluation

Theme 3: Psychosocial sources of resilience

The rise of resilience as an analytic, programmatic, and organizing concept in the field of international development, as well as an increase in conflict, insecurity, and displacement, have resulted in a greater focus on psychosocial resilience. This includes both psychosocial resilience as an outcome of interest, as well as psychosocial factors as sources of resilience in relation to other well-being outcomes. Importantly, this has led to a greater recognition that both outcomes and sources of resilience *transcend* traditional development sectors.

However, unresolved challenges are constraining the ability of development stakeholders to fully leverage these new insights, including:

- A lack of clarity and consensus on what is meant by psychosocial resilience in the international development context
- A lack of practical approaches and instruments for effectively capturing psychosocial resilience and associated constructs

- Effectively taking account of cultural perceptions and sociocultural factors into measuring psychosocial resilience and associated constructs.
- The translation of evidence on psychosocial resilience into actionable policy and programming recommendations

Priority reading:

[‘Perception matters’: new insights into the subjective dimension of resilience](#)

***See the conceptual framework, page 191 and future research directions, page 206

Other background:

- Jones and Tanner (2017) [‘Subjective resilience’: using perceptions to quantify household resilience to climate extremes and disasters](#)
- <https://resiliencelinks.org/impact-areas/psychosocial-dynamics>
- <https://resiliencelinks.org/impact-areas/social-capital>

Theme 4: Resilience and climate adaptation

Efforts to advance resilience measurement over the last 10 years provide valuable insights for ongoing efforts to measure climate adaptation. Conceptually, a resilience approach to climate adaptation measurement focuses on measuring resilience capacities and how they mitigate the impact of climate change on wellbeing. This is in contrast to climate adaptation measures that focus on climate actions or finance. To effectively inform adaptation measurement and decision-making, a resilience approach to measuring climate adaptation must overcome a number of conceptual and practical measurement challenges.

- There is no commonly agreed upon metric or set of metrics for climate adaptation
- Defining adaptation “success” is elusive as climate change impacts continue to evolve
- Measuring exposure to longer-term climate stresses is challenging and isolating climate shocks and stresses belies the compound nature of risks to people’s wellbeing
- Adaptation (and therefore measurement) varies significantly by sector making it difficult to both aggregate results and meet the demand for measurement support

Priority reading:

[Interrogating ‘effectiveness’ in climate change adaptation: 11 guiding principles for adaptation research and practice](#)

***See table 2 for 11 principles for effective adaptation

[Is adaptation success a flawed concept?](#)

***Short paper

Other background:

- [The evolution of adaptation metrics under the UNFCCC and its Paris Agreement](#)

Participants

Last	First	Organization, Title
Alloush	Mo	Hamilton University, Assistant Professor of Economics
Andersen	Leigh	University of Washington, Professor for Humanitarian Action, International Development, and Global Citizenship
Ashley	Laurie	USAID Bureau for Resilience and Food Security, Climate Adaptation and Resilience Advisor
Bahadur	Aditya	International Institute for Environment and Development, Principal Researcher, Human Settlements Group
Braga	Katherine	USAID Bureau for Resilience and Food Security, Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Analyst
Brandon	Carter	World Resources Institute (WRI), Senior Advisor
Bremaud	Isabelle	GOAL, Global Resilience Advisor
Caldwell	Richard	Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, Senior Programme Officer MEL
Campbell	James	Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Regional Technical Advisor
Carter	Michael	UC Davis, Professor, Agricultural and Resource Economics and Director, Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Markets, Risk and Resilience
Choularton	Richard	TetraTech, Director, Agriculture and Economic Growth Sector
Collins	Greg	University of Arizona, Associate Vice President, Resilience and International Development
Constas	Mark	Cornell University, Professor
Deng	Daniel	One Project, Principal Global Practice Specialist
Engle	Nathan	World Bank, Senior Advisor, Climate Change
Farmer	Elisabeth	CARE Ethiopia, Chief of Party, Livelihoods for Resilience Activity
Field	Michael	Vikara Institute, Senior Systems Thinking Specialist
Frankenberger	Tim	TANGO International, President and Founder
Goldberg	Nathanael	Innovation for Poverty Action, Director of Sector Programs
Gottschalk	Christine	USAID Bureau for Resilience and Food Security, Director, Center for Resilience
Grange	Joe	USAID Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance, Data Scientist
Guido	Zack	University of Arizona, Assistant Research Profession and Director, Arizona Institute for Resilience, International Programs
Issoufou	Bauoa	The Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS), Food Security Analyst
Ives	Nathan	USAID Bureau for Resilience and Food Security, Resilience Measurement Advisor
Jones	Lindsey	World Bank, Senior Risk Analyst

Josephson	Anna	University of Arizona, Assistant Professor Applied Econometrics Development Economics
Kim	Jeeyon	Mercy Corp, Senior Researcher
Kinuthia	Monica	Govt of Kenya Ministry of Public Service, Ag. Director: Strategic Programmes Development
Lewis Young	Sera	Northwestern University, Associate Professor, Anthropology & Global Health
Li	Jia	World Bank, Senior Economist
Makipoyu	Laban	MSI
Matthews	Nate	Global Resilience Partnership (GRP), CEO
McClain	Shanna	NASA, Disasters Program Manager
Meyer	John	USAID Center for Resilience, Senior Strategy and Impact Advisor
Michalopoulos	Lynn	USAID Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance, M&E Advisor
Mitchell	Tracy	RTI International, Director of Resilience and Climate Adaptation
Mock	Nancy	Tulane University, Professor
Mude	Andrew	African Development Bank, Lead – Agri-SME Development and Innovative Finance
Narayan	Tulika	Mathematica, Vice President, Climate Change
Patwardhan	Anand	University of Maryland, Professor, Lead ARA
Rashid	Arif	USAID Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance, Division Chief, Design, M&E, and Applied Learning Division
Ferreira	Regardt	Tulane University, Disaster Resilience Leadership Academy, Director, Associate Professor
Riggs	Conor	iDE Global, Vice President of Global Initiatives
Russo	Luca	FAO, Team Leader in Office of Emergency
Sagara	Brad	Mercy Corp, Director, Research and Learning
Shih	Stephanie	USAID Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance
Simmons	William	University of Arizona, Director, Human Rights Practice Program
Spangler	Tom	Save The Children, Director, Resilience and Livelihoods
Taffesse	Alemayehu	IFPRI Ethiopia, Senior Research Fellow
Ulimwengu	John	IFPRI, Senior Research Fellow
Vora	Shuchi	Global Resilience Partnership (GRP), Programme Officer
Zermoglio	Fernanda	USAID Bureau for Resilience and Food Security, Senior Resilience and Adaptation Advisor