Cost savings somalia

Cost savings somalia

The .gov means it"s official. Federal government websites often end in .gov or .mil. Before sharing sensitive information, make sure you"re on a federal government site.

The site is secure. A lock () or https:// ensures that you are connecting to the official website and that any information you provide is encrypted and transmitted securely.

A recent study commissioned by USAID demonstrates that investing in a more proactive response to avert humanitarian crises could reduce the cost to international donors by 30%, whilst also protecting billions of dollars of income and assets for those most affected.

The aim of this study is to investigate the impact of an early humanitarian response and resilience building on humanitarian outcomes in Somalia, both in terms of cost savings, as well as the avoided losses that can result from a more proactive response. The study investigates existing data and empirical evidence, and uses this to model the relative costs of different response scenarios.

The impacts of drought on households are complex and interrelated, with spikes in need arising from a combination of physical changes to rainfall, fodder and vegetation, price changes in local markets, as well as other factors such as the quality of institutional response and conflict, for example. Further, high impacts of drought in one year can have strong effects on households" abilities to cope in subsequent years.

It is very hard to measure this complex web of interactions and outcomes empirically. Hence, this analysis combines empirical evidence with the Household Economy Approach (HEA) to model the potential impact of different response scenarios over 15 years, for a population of 3.4 million across Somalia. The model is dynamic, allowing impacts in one year to carry forward into subsequent years, and hence gives a nuanced prediction of how different interventions may affect humanitarian need over time.

A report comissioned by USAID to assess the cost savings that could result from anearlier and more proactive response to drought in Kenya, Ethiopia and Somalia.

Humanitarian aid is critical for saving lives, alleviating suffering, and maintaining human dignity. However, aid often arrives late, and there is increasing recognition that this type of response is costly and unsustainable. Responding earlier saves lives, livelihoods and money. Investing in people"s resilience - their ability to manage shocks and stresses without compromising their future well-being - is also critical for reducing these humanitarian costs.

These results are clear; investing in early response and resilience is significantly more cost effective than providing ongoing humanitarian aid. Investing in resilience is a win-win - it not only reduces human suffering,

but it also reduces the cost to donors, allowing humanitarian aid dollars to go further and help more people. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure.. This study evaluates the economic case for early response and resilience building in Kenya, Ethiopia and Somalia.

The HEA modelling that fundamentally underpins this work was conducted by Mark Lawrence at the Food Economy Group (FEG), without whom this work would not have been possible. Tanya Boudreau at FEG provided input throughout. HEA baseline data was generously provided by the Government of Ethiopia, Mercy Corps International, Save the Children US/UK, Adeso and ACTED (STREAM Consortium), FSNAU/FEWS NET. FEWSNET and USGS provide the monitoring data used in the study.