Delta 8.7 Policy Guide Introduction

Angharad Smith

Programme Officer, Delta 8.7
United Nations University Centre for Policy Research

Alice Eckstein

Project Director, Delta 8.7
United Nations University Centre for Policy Research

Journal of Modern Slavery Special Supplement: Delta 8.7 Policy Guide Introduction

Angharad Smith

Programme Officer, Delta 8.7
United Nations University Centre for Policy Research

Alice Eckstein

Project Director, Delta 8.7
United Nations University Centre for Policy Research

Introduction

In 2015, 193 Member States pledged their commitment to Target 8.7 of the SDGs. Target 8.7 commits Member States to: Take immediate and effective measures to eradicate forced labour, end modern slavery and human trafficking and secure the prohibition and elimination of the worst forms of child labour, including recruitment and use of child soldiers, and by 2025 end child labour in all its forms. Yet knowing exactly what constitutes 'effective' measures to end these practices remains ambiguous and presents itself as one of the critical challenges of responding to modern slavery. Although efforts to produce reliable data on antislavery interventions, as well as work to improve access to data, have increased in recent years, the need for a more robust understanding of the current evidence base on 'what works' remains. The 2016 Global Estimates of Modern Slavery reported that on any given day 40.3 million people lived in conditions of modern slavery; in September 2022 new estimates were released stating that on any given day in 2021, some 50 million people lived in modern slavery. This increase underlines the need for policymakers and other stakeholders to act quickly to address this crisis.

It is only on the basis of rigorous research and sound evidence that policymakers can formulate more targeted and effective public policies. Delta 8.7, the Knowledge Platform for the Alliance 8.7, seeks to address the knowledge gap through identifying "what works" to achieve SDG Target 8.7. Our work identifies effective measures through collaborative research: with academics, front-line responders and advocates in civil society, policy makers and implementors, and survivor experts and leaders. This supplemental edition for the Journal of Modern Slavery discusses one such collaborative research project: the creation of the Delta 8.7 Policy Guides.

Challenges in data collection

Limited access to data has historically been a challenge for the anti-slavery field. Globally monitoring and evaluation assessments remain limited, though recent evidence suggests marked improvement in their implementation.[1] For instance, the new iteration of the Walk Free's

---

[1] Walk Free Foundation. 2021. "What Works? Five Years of Lessons Learned from the Promising Practices Database." (The Minderoo Foundation: Melbourne).

Promising Practices Database which collates impact and program evaluations of anti-slavery and counter trafficking interventions highlighted an overall improvement in the specificity and reliability of evaluations assessed.[2] However, as Katharine Bryant and Todd Landman recently illustrated, challenges still remain in their execution. [3] These include limited resources, lack of resources, lack of training on data collection and analysis, short-term project timelines and the invisibility and complexity of human trafficking which can make it difficult to establish such baselines and limits their efficacy.

In addition to the challenges involved in monitoring and evaluation, challenges also arise on the issue of publicly available data; a topic of concern during the Markets Policy Working Group discussions. In their consultations they questioned whether there was indeed a scarcity of data: instead, they pointed out that this may not actually be the case within the business landscape. Business in fact often have a wealth of data and information that could be of valuable use to researchers and civil society operating in this space. It is, however, often difficult to obtain as it sits behind proprietary barriers, making it inaccessible to the public. For instance, as Eleanor Harry notes, there is a wealth of reports resulting from audits that companies undergo to meet compliance requirements that are only provided to the factory or the organization funding the audit. This results in a large amount of data that is rarely analyzed or used, preventing access to real-life and timely impact data.[4]

A wave of new mandatory human rights and due diligence (mHRDD) disclosures may offer a solution, as it brings with it not just an unprecedented level of scrutiny but also an opportunity for increased data collection and sharing. The increase of available corporate statements resulting from this legislation - whilst welcome - presents its own challenge for organizations wishing to analyze the available data. Reportedly one document can take up to one hour to properly assess. In response to this challenge, Project AIMS (AI against Modern Slavery) was created. The platform uses data science and Artificial Intelligence (AI) methods such as Natural Language Processing (NLP) to analyze all the available UK modern slavery statements. The platform seeks to "to provide a scalable, open-source tool for analyzing statements, boosting compliance and helping to eradicate modern slavery, while being aligned with the best practices in terms of ethics-by-design." With mHRDD taking shape across the globe, more of these reports will be produced and made publicly available, and Project AIMS software could be used by antislavery actors to understand the action taken by businesses and help them identify potential areas of alignment and collaboration.

---

[2] Walk Free Foundation. 2021. "What Works? Five Years of Lessons Learned from the Promising Practices Database." (The Minderoo Foundation: Melbourne).

[3] Bryant, Katherine & Landman, Todd. 2020. Combatting Human Trafficking since Palermo: What Do We Know about What Works?, *Journal of Human Trafficking*, 6:2, 119-140. https://doi.org/10.1080/23322705.2020.1690097.

[4] Harry, Eleanor. 2021. "Delta 8.7 Policy Guides and Data Patterns." *Delta 8.7,* April 30, 2021. Available at https://delta87.org/2021/04/delta87-policy-guides-and-data-patterns/.

Offering a possible solution: Delta 8.7 Policy Guides

Between April 2020 and March 2021, Delta 8.7 convened global expert Working Groups to produce three Policy Guides to address "what works" to achieve Target 8.7 in three broad domains: Justice, Crisis and Markets. The purpose of these Policy Guides is to provide a highly credible and current articulation of what we know about the global and national policies needed to accelerate progress towards Target 8.7 in a format that is useful for policy actors. They provide a snapshot of "what works" to achieve Target 8.7. The specific audience for these Guides is multilateral and national-level policymakers. The Guides do not seek to dictate to policymakers how they should organize to achieve Target 8.7 — because that requires an understanding of the specific challenges in each country, including available resources and other contextual factors. Instead, they aim to provide an evidence-based policy resource that is useful across contexts and to policy actors around the world, including those thinking about multilateral policy frameworks. The Policy Guides prioritize scientifically rigorous information regarding what works. As a result, the guidance offered is neither comprehensive nor definitive. It is thorough and deep in areas where evidence is comprehensive and robust, while in other cases it is patchier and more speculative. This will, however, help to highlight areas where evidence is strong and areas where it is lacking. The deliberative process by which the Policy Guides were formulated was designed to be replicable. The aim was to capture the current state of knowledge on what works and allow future editions of these Policy Guides to reflect changes in the underlying state of knowledge.

The policy guide process took inspiration from and drew on best practice in assessing evidence in policy domains. Our first level of enquiry took us to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPPC). The IPPC is the United Nations body for assessing the science related to climate change. It was established to create a scientific process to provide a review of the state of the evidence around climate change to inform the international policy making process. As defined by the IPPC its role is to:

> "Identify where there is agreement in the scientific community on topics related to climate change, and where further research is needed. The reports are drafted and reviewed in several stages, thus guaranteeing objectivity and transparency. The IPCC does not conduct its own research. IPCC reports are neutral, policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive. The assessment reports are a key input into the international negotiations to tackle climate change."

In designing the Policy Guide process, we hoped to replicate the key features of the IPPC assessments: 1) a focus on rigorous evidence; 2) an open transparent and objective process; and, 3) a collaborative multi-stakeholder initiative. Fundamentally however the Policy Guide process could not replicate the IPPC model. As previously discussed, access to limited data has historically been a challenge. As a relatively nascent field of academic investigation the same breadth of scientific and peer-review journals is not as available to the anti-slavery community as to the field of climate change science. Instead, significant research has been conducted by governments, multilateral organisations, and civil society. In their assessments, IPPC working group members are able to assess for and provide calibrated language for 'likelihood'- quantified

uncertainty, to express a probabilistic estimate of the occurrence of a single event or of an outcome (Figure One). This is an exercise we knew we would not be able to replicate in this field.

Recognising that the current state and nature of anti-slavery research and evidence differs greatly from the evidence available to the scientific community, we looked elsewhere for best practice in assessing evidence in policy domains. Our search took us to the United Kingdom's Department for International Development 'How to Note: Assessing the Strength of Evidence', a document that aims to help staff use evidence more judiciously for the benefit of designing and implementing effective policy and programmes. The document introduces a) the appraisal of the quality of individual studies, and b) the assessment of the strength of bodies of evidence. We referred closely to this document when designing our methodology, in particular its recommendations on how to assess the strength of evidence. The next section of this introductory article discusses this methodology in depth.

Policy Guide Methodology

Research Inputs

Assembling the evidence

Between July and September 2020, Delta 8.7 assembled a database of evidence on what works to achieve Target 8.7. This was achieved through two processes: a public submission of evidence, and a non-comprehensive evidence review carried out by Rights Lab, University of Nottingham. Both processes sought to identify sources and bodies of evidence that are based on rigorous scientific methods and/or have been tested through government implementation. For each piece of evidence entered through the public submission process or identified in the Rights Lab evidence reviews, information on over 20 different data points was collected, creating a database of evidence in each domain area. This database enabled the Working Group to map the contours of bodies of evidence relating to specific thematic areas and specific hypotheses about what works to achieve Target 8.7.

The three Rights Lab evidence reviews sought to examine what is known about effective policy to achieve SDG Target 8.7 in the context of Crisis, Markets and Justice, by 1) collecting and collating existing evidence on what works; 2) identifying the range of claims and hypotheses captured in academic and grey literature, and the evidentiary foundations of these hypotheses; and 3) conducting mixed methods analysis of strengths, weakness and trends in the evidence base. As such, the overarching research question for the studies was: "What is known about works at the State and multinational policy level to address modern slavery in the context of [markets, crisis or justice]."

Mapping the bodies of evidence

The database was mapped in two ways: qualitatively and quantitatively. Both approaches offered assessments of the strength of evidence associated with specific themes and, where

possible, specific hypotheses. The quantitative strength of evidence was broken into three components and scored as follows:

1. Diversity of evidence indicating the variety of type, methods and design of the evidence associated with different themes and hypotheses. This data allowed each Working Group to distinguish themes and hypotheses that have been explored through a variety of research and implementation approaches from those that are backed by less diverse evidence. For the quantitative analysis, we calculated the distribution of scores for each factor for any given theme or hypothesis pertaining to the body of evidence for the variables of type, method and design. Interpretation of this score is as follows: the greater the deviation, the greater the variety of research and implementation approaches supporting the hypothesis. (Figure Two).

2. Size of the body of evidence quantifying the size, scale and geographic reach of evidence associated with a theme or hypothesis. This helped the Working Group identify themes and hypotheses that have been more extensively tested. In order to calculate the scale, Delta 8.7 assigned an ordinal value to a given range. The higher the value, the greater the range. Delta 8.7, then calculated the average of each categorization of size, scale and geographic reach of evidence. The higher the average, the more extensively a hypothesis had been tested. (Figure three).

3. Technical quality of evidence deriving from data provided by submitters related to "Evidentiary Quality". In order to calculate the scale, Delta 8.7 assigned an ordinal value to a given variable perceived to be of greater quality[5], detailed in the Table One. We then calculated the average score for each variable. The higher the average, the greater quality of evidence to support a hypothesis. (Figure Four)

This Delta 8.7 quantitative assessment of the strength of evidence underlying each hypothesis formed another resource for the Working Groups.

The Working Groups

Members were selected following an open call for nominations, with members appointed to bring together a diverse group with reference to gender, region, age, sector, stakeholder group and discipline. The process included survivor and lived experience expertise in each Working Group consultation process, both through survivor membership in the Working Groups themselves, and through bespoke consultations on the draft Policy Guide documents. Working Group members were assigned to subgroups based on their expertise and asked to assess the two research inputs for the hypotheses linked to their respective "sub-theme". The Working Groups considered these background documents — Rights Lab's non-comprehensive evidence review, the underlying database and the Delta 8.7 quantitative assessment — and reworked them using a

---

[5] UK DfID, *Assessing the Strength of Evidence*, How to Note, March 2014.

shared template into a Policy Guide aimed at providing a snapshot of evidence on what may work to achieve Target 8.7. Some of their duties included:

1. Identifying evidentiary sources that were missing and needed to be incorporated.
2. Discussing the strength of evidence associated with each theme and/or hypothesis.
3. Identifying other interventions or hypotheses that were not reflected in evidence but may be promising.
4. Assigning a confidence score to each hypothesis.

Understanding and interpreting confidence scores

Delta 8.7's confidence ranking approach to these claims is based on the system pioneered by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and draws on guidance on evidence assessment from the UK Department for International Development. It aims to provide a systematic and transparent method to identify, select, and assess synthesized research evidence. Following the IPCC model, the Working Groups were asked to use a single scale of precisely defined, calibrated "uncertainty language" to express a level of confidence in findings based on 1) the strength of the scientific and technical evidence, 2) the level of agreement in the literature relevant to this domain, and 3) on the experience of Working Group members.

The Confidence Score created a metric for the Working Group to discuss, consider and validate the three primary research inputs into the Policy Guides: Rights Lab evidence review, the Delta 8.7 Quantitative Score and the database of evidence. The evaluation to obtain a confidence score acted as an additional quality check, allowing the Working Group to assess bodies of evidence that the research inputs may have struggled to recognize or map. For instance, there were interventions such as the Brazilian labour inspections system that governments have tried and tested but which are not well documented in scientific literature. Another example might be one effective study with little supporting evidence which would suggest a very strong lead for a promising practice or intervention: it would not rate highly on size or diversity, but would receive a high score for evidentiary quality, so the working group may assign it a higher confidence score than it would otherwise get. In the Policy Guide documents, the degree of certainty is expressed by the Working Groups as a qualitative level of confidence from "very low" to "very high".

In is original conception, the third component - the experience of working group members - was not included. Following Working Group discussions, however, it became clear that there were discrepancies between the classification of the strength of evidence and practitioners' own experiences of what they knew to be true.

As a result, the strategy of assigning a confidence score was refined for a more inclusive and shared collection of knowledge that was based on the available evidence examined but also — and very importantly — on a synthesis with the diverse personal, research and practical experience of the Working Group's members. The evidence base was therefore not used as the sole indicator of the strength of a hypothesis but a starting point in a multi-stage, "adaptive" process towards setting and refining policy parameters.

Limitations

It is important here to note the limitations of the Policy Guide Process. The evidence reviews considered records available in English published or completed in the period from 01 January 2010 to 01 July 2020. It excluded records not accessible online to the research team. This had the impact of excluding the majority of full-length monographs and edited volumes. Future iterations of the Policy Guide Process should therefore consider records published prior to 2010, and in other languages, and to capture records that were inaccessible to the research team at the time of the study. Additionally, although the NuSearch database, used by the Rights Lab, provided access to a range of databases hosting grey literature, the majority of results collected were academic sources. This was also supplemented by a complete manual review of all sources included in the Walk Free Foundation's 'Promising Practice Database', which captures 179 evaluations relevant to modern slavery. Future studies might therefore usefully undertake further manual searching of a wider range of non-governmental, governmental, and inter-governmental organizations, as well as broader web-based searches, to capture a wider range of grey literature – particularly the period from 2017 onwards to capture evaluations published since the Promising Practices Database was complied.

Time constraints and resources.

Additionally, a key limitation of the study was the resource and time constraints that precluded analysis of the full body of potentially relevant records. The evidence reviews conducted by the Rights Lab noted a prioritization process that excluded a significant number of potentially relevant studies in each domain: 152 studies each in the Justice and Crisis domains, and 135 in the domain area of Markets. Fuller analysis of these remaining studies is therefore needed to fully understand the existing evidence base on what works to address modern slavery. The time constraints also necessitated records being analyzed and coded by a single research team member, rather than the double-blind coding that would have provided the most solid foundation to support conclusions drawn from the evidence. Given the subjective nature of the process of constructing claims from records, as well as decisions on the relevant data extracted from these records, this creates risk of analysis and findings being skewed on the basis of differences between reviewers. To mitigate these issues, clear guidelines on coding for each metric were provided at the outset, random quality assurance was conducted by the project managers on 20% of entries, and further guidance was provided to team members as required throughout the process.

As noted in the Rights Lab report:

"Without in-depth consideration of the paradigms in which the different research outputs considered were produced, the underpinning assumptions about theory, legitimate objects of study, legitimate research questions, and what constitutes a finding remain largely unexplored. Greenhaigh (et al) highlight the challenges of synthesizing evidence from across a wide range of disciplines with a variety of study designs, noting that 'an

empirical discovery made using one set of concepts, theories, methods and instruments cannot be satisfactorily explained through a different paradigmatic lens.;' Given the constrains and parameters of this review, the interrogation of underlying paradigms and assumptions of the evidence base and development of 'meta-narratives' was not possible. Further research considering the different underpinning assumptions and biases of different disciplines and fields is therefore required to understand these nuances."

Implementation notes

Delta 8.7 assembled these Working Groups to include practitioners and policy actors precisely because it aims to bridge the research-to-policy divides. With this in mind, Working Groups were able to include an "implementation note" in cases where a hypothesis may seem to have contradicted their own experience of practice/ policy implementation, or if they felt it necessary to include a comment that provides additional nuance or shading to a conclusion. The decision to incorporate these notes proved critical in two ways. First, through their ability to plug data gaps; in writing these notes members were able to highlight where there were discrepancies between the evidence and their experience. Second, it reinforced the importance of collaboration; bringing together stakeholders from different disciplines created a space in which constructive disagreement and agreement could be reached. The implementation notes served as a useful space to air these discussions.

Definitions

In most cases, 'modern slavery' is conceived as an umbrella term capturing a range of specific practices within its remit. The International Labour Organisation and Walk Free, for instance, include forced labour and forced marriage in their global estimates of 'modern slavery.' The UK's Modern Slavery Act (2015) includes slavery, servitude, forced labour, and trafficking in persons. Australia's Modern Slavery Act encompasses slavery, servitude, forced labour deceptive recruitment for labour or services, forced marriage, trafficking in persons, debt bondage, and the worst forms of child labour. The US Department of State adopts a slightly different approach suggesting that trafficking in persons and modern slavery are interchangeable umbrella terms for the same basic practices (in this case presented as sex trafficking and compelled labour/labour trafficking) However, the US Office to Monitor and Combat Trafficking in persons also indicates that bonded labour, domestic servitude and unlawful recruitment and use of child soldiers fall within the remit of forced labour.

While use as an umbrella term is the most commonly adopted approach internationally some commentators understood 'modern slavery' to be a singular and holistic concept – a coherent conceptual category of experience rather than a set. This definition might still encompass a range of different practices; however, 'modern slavery' itself is determined by a set of benchmarks specific to the concept, rather than by a finding of another form of exploitation such as forced labour. Kevin Bales, for instance presents [modern] slavery as defined by a set of core attributes: 'the state of control exercised over the slave based on violence or its threat, a lack of any payment beyond subsistence, and the theft of the labor or other qualities of the slave for

economic gain. The definition of slavery is therefore presented as a 'state marked by the loss of free will in which a person is forced through violence to give up the ability to sell freely his or her own labour power'.

For the purpose of the policy guide process and for the research inputs, it was not necessary to establish a decisive definition of the concept of 'modern slavery.' Rather, parameters had to be set as to which evidence would be included as relevant to 'modern slavery', and which would be excluded. The research team adopted a broad approach, considering a range of practices associated with modern slavery, as well as sources speaking specifically of 'modern slavery' or 'contemporary slavery'.

Supplemental Edition: What actually works to end modern slavery?

As previously mentioned, the purpose of these Policy Guides is to provide a highly credible and current articulation of what we know about the global and national policies needed to accelerate progress towards Target 8.7 in a format that is useful for policy actors. They provide a snapshot of "what works" to achieve Target 8.7. The following articles contained within this supplemental edition explore this snapshot in detail, each discuss initial findings, key lessons learnt and recommendations for exploring this question further.

Ruth Juliet Nyambura Gachanja and Peter Williams, in their article: 'The Justice Policy Guide – Exploring What Works to End Modern Slavery: A Survivor-Centric Approach to Justice,' identify a pervasive theme running through Justice Guide - the importance of survivor[6] well-being in the application of justice policies and interventions. Their paper examines this theme within each of the five justice dimensions explored in the guide - criminal justice, civil justice, international justice, survivor engagement and support, and health policy and practice. They note the strong evidence base that supports the hypothesis that keeping survivors at the center of interventions leads to better outcomes. Whether addressing identification, the creation and application of laws, the training of officials, coordination and collaboration within and between governments, engagement with community groups and civil society, the application of trauma-informed practices or the provision of social services, survivor well-being is primary. Policies targeted towards flexible, survivor-centered and/or child-centric models of support will lead to better recovery and reintegration, more effective prosecutions and perpetrator accountability, and enhanced prevention efforts. Throughout their discussion the authors consider the potential uses of the Guide within justice responses to modern slavery and how emphasis on the survivor can be maintained as the best approaches and policies are put into practice. Their paper seeks to answer what works to end modern slavery through justice systems and aims to show that having survivor-centric mechanisms in justice interventions contributes effectively to combating modern slavery.

Hannah Thinayne, Leanne Melnyk and Michael Gallo take a novel approach to their exploration of the Markets Policy Guide. Situating their article and the guide within the context of the United Nations Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights (UNGPs), the authors

---

[6] The authors have chosen to use "survivor" to describe a person who has had a past experience of modern slavery, and "victim" to describe a person still experiencing modern slavery.

present a case study on using the Policy Guide's hypotheses alongside the UNGPs to evaluate the mechanisms that supported the International Transport Workers' Federation's (ITF) successful efforts to ensure decent work for seafarers.

Katharine Bryant and Katarina Schwarz in their article: 'What works to eradicate modern slavery in crisis settings? Lessons from the evidence' highlight the Guide's role in revealing important gaps that should be the subject of future systematic reviews. Three of these fissures are explored in depth: first, the gaps in understanding the links between modern slavery and crisis settings; second, gaps in the overall understanding of what works to eradicate modern slavery; and third, gaps in literature on effective interventions in crisis settings. They note that in order to plug these gaps, more investment is needed to evaluate the impact of modern slavery interventions in crisis settings, including tackling the exploitation of women and girls in crisis settings, addressing with the intersection of climate change and modern slavery, and examining the role of technology.

Future Policy Guides and next steps

The deliberative process by which the Policy Guides are formulated is designed to be replicable. The aim is to capture the current state of knowledge on what works and allow future editions of these Policy Guides to reflect changes in the underlying state of knowledge. As the COVID-19 pandemic deepens vulnerabilities to modern slavery and decreases the available resources to address it, targeted research is needed to prioritize effective anti-slavery investments. The Delta 8.7 Policy Guide method is one collaborative way in which research can be assessed, interventions identified and effective measures collated. In the future we hope to produce a Social Protection Policy Guide, covering a wide range of mechanisms including cash transfers, and access to healthcare, food assistance, education and other services, as a preventative measure or means to build resilience in vulnerable communities. In addition, we hope in the future to adapt the Policy Guide process to a national context and work with individual States so that they can understand ''what works' in their own context. We expect such research to have particular relevance as states and the international system "build back better" following the pandemic. Our intent, which is shared among all stakeholders, is that we learn from the challenges we now face in order to build a more effective and resilient anti-trafficking system.

Appendix

Figure One

Likelihood Scale	
Term*	Likelihood of the Outcome
Virtually Certain	99-100% probability
Very Likely	90-100% probability
Likely	66-100% probability
About as likely as not	33-66% probability
Unlikely	0-33% probability
Very Unlikely	0-10% probability
Exceptionally Unlikely	0-1% probability

Table One - Datapoints

Diversity of Evidence		Type of Evidence	Strength of Evidence
Type	A Project Evaluation	Scale	Is the study published?
	A Primary Study	Geography	Is the study grounded in a clear research framework (i.e it acknowledges existing research, constructs a conceptual framework, poses a clear research question, states a clear hypothesis)?
	A Secondary Study		Is the study transparent (i.e it shares underlying data, declares funding sources)?
	A Theoretical or Conceptual Study		Is the study context-appropriate (i.e it explains why a certain design or method were used, consider cultural or other factors that may influence the analysis, handles human subjects appropriately)?
Method	Experimental		Are the measurements valid (i.e indicators measure the concept in question, study is replicable, study accounts for endogeneity.)?
	Quasi-experimental		Is the analysis reliable (i.e consistency in how data is gathered; measurement methods likely to gather data needed for indicator; findings seem unlikely to be influenced by analytical techniques applied to data gathered)?
	Observational		Is the analysis cogent (i.e conclusions recognize limitations of design and methods; study considers alternative interpretations; conclusions map to study results)?
	Systematic review		
	Non-systematic review		
	Not applicable		
Scale	How many cases, instances or subjects are covered by the research		
Geography	Indicate all countries the research addressees and, if applicable, the region addressed		

Figure Two: diversity

Ordinal Value	Published	Clear Research Framework	Transparent	Context-Appropriate	Valid	Reliable	Cogent
3	Yes - in peer-reviewed journal	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
2	Yes - in non-peer reviewed setting	Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat	Somewhat
1	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
0	Don't Know	Don't Know	Don't Know	Don't Know	Don't Know	Don't Know	Don't Know

Figure Three: scale

Ordinal Value	Communities	Individuals	Organizations	Other	Geographic Reach of Evidence/ Countries
1	1	1	1	1	1 country
2	2 to 6	2 to 6	2 to 6	2 to 6	2 to 6 countries
3	7 to 20	7 to 20	7 to 20	7 to 20	7 to 20 countries
4	21 to 500	21 to 500	21 to 500	21 to 500	20 to 40 countries
5	>500	>500	>500	>500	Global

Figure Four – technical quality

Numerical Code	Type	Design	Method
1	Primary Study	Qualitative	Experimental
2	Project Evaluation	Quantitative	Quasi-experimental
3	Secondary Study	Mixed Methods	Observational
4	Theoretical or Conceptual Source	Non- empirical	Systematic Review
5	Mixed		