



This paper provides a detailed description of the country selection decision-making process for the Central Emergency Response Fund (CERF) Underfunded Emergencies (UFE) Window 2019 first round funding, risk and vulnerability analysis. Some aspects of this process may differ each round due to available information or timing; and therefore, the specific methodology paper is produced and is made publicly available. The CERF UFE general Overview of Technical Methodology is available on the CERF website¹ while additional details and technical guidance are further elaborated in CERF Underfunded Emergencies Window: Procedures and Criteria.²

Summary

Under the UFE window, the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC) allocates funding to the least funded humanitarian emergencies. Twice a year, the CERF secretariat identifies the most underfunded emergencies to support life-saving humanitarian action in these forgotten places. Both the analysis of quantitative data on funding, severity, risk and vulnerability and qualitative, contextual information underlie the identification of these crises. The information is collected during a consultation process and from established data sources. This document describes the methodology that underpins the funding, risk and vulnerability analysis. A separate CERF UFE Guidance Note, which is disseminated to key stakeholders and published on the CERF website³ at the beginning of each round, describes the consultation process in detail.

Introduction

Twice a year, the CERF identifies and allocates funding to the most underfunded humanitarian emergencies. The UFE window accounts for one third of CERF grants, i.e., on average, some \$150 million of the fund's annual target of \$450 million.⁴ Based on the current level of allocations, funding and projected income for 2019, the CERF secretariat has set an allocations budget of \$600 million for 2019. Thus, the secretariat recommends **\$125 million** for the 2019 first round to support critical humanitarian interventions. The selection of humanitarian emergencies for the UFE allocation rounds build on two components: (1) a quantitative analysis of data on humanitarian needs, funding levels, risk and vulnerability, and (2) qualitative, contextual information collected from consultations and documents.

Countries can qualify for UFE consideration either with or without a Humanitarian Response Plan (HRP) or equivalent appeal, henceforth known as “Financial Tracking Services⁵ (FTS)-tracked Appeals” and “Non-FTS tracked humanitarian programming”. While the term “FTS-tracked Appeals/Plans” refers to countries with (1) an HRP or comparable appeal in place which is (2) tracked on FTS in (3) sufficient detail, namely, funding to and outside the HRP/appeal as well as funding level per cluster/sector, countries not meeting the three criteria of FTS-tracked Appeals/Plans are considered “Non-FTS tracked humanitarian programming”.

The information for different parts of the analysis comes from various sources. The qualitative information, as well as some funding and programmatic information for Non-FTS tracked humanitarian programming is collected from UN agencies that participate in the Underfunded Emergencies Working Group (UFEWG)⁶ and different parts of OCHA, in particular the Operations and Advocacy Division, the Assessment Planning and Monitoring Branch (APMB), which supports the Humanitarian Programme Cycle, and the Country Based Pooled Fund Section (CBPFS), as well as from documents such as HRPs and Humanitarian Needs Overviews (HNO).

The quantitative data on funding for FTS-tracked Appeals/Plans, and on humanitarian needs for all countries, are collected from established, public sources for analysis.

Process

The process is described in detail in the CERF UFE Guidance Note. In summary: Eligible and excluded countries are listed. The UFEWG then identifies and recommends a specific number of Non-FTS tracked humanitarian programming. In parallel, the CERF secretariat identifies the most underfunded emergencies which have a FTS-

¹ http://www.unocha.org/cerf/sites/default/files/CERF/Underfunded%20Emergencies_Technical%20Methodology.pdf

² https://www.unocha.org/cerf/sites/default/files/CERF/UFE_Guidelines_March_2010_Review_June_2011.pdf

³ <https://cerf.un.org/apply-for-a-grant/underfunded-emergencies>

⁴ Per endorsement of the UN General Assembly in December 2016 (A/RES/71/127), the CERF annual funding target increased to \$1 billion by 2018.

⁵ <https://fts.unocha.org/>

⁶ In 2019, the UFEWG members were FAO, IOM, OCHA, UNFPA, UNHCR, UNICEF, WFP, and WHO.

tracked Appeal/Plan in place. The CERF secretariat then combines the identification process for FTS-tracked Appeals/Plans and Non-FTS tracked humanitarian programming to assess the level of underfunding and the level of severity, risk and vulnerability for each of the listed countries. The CERF secretariat shares the draft funding, risk and vulnerability analysis with the UFEWG and other parts of OCHA and consults each either in meetings or by email before finalizing the analysis. Based on the final analysis, the CERF secretariat makes a recommendation on the selection of countries and funding amount per country to the Emergency Relief Coordinator (ERC), who makes the final decision both on which countries will be included in the UFE round and the apportionment of funding among the selected countries.

Funding Analysis

The objective of the funding analysis is to identify emergencies with the highest levels of underfunding. This is the primary criterion for inclusion in a UFE round.

In the analysis, available funding for humanitarian programming is compared to funding requirements to calculate the funding level. The funding level of each eligible FTS-tracked Appeal/Plan and of the recommended Non-FTS tracked humanitarian programming is compared to the average funding level. The average funding level is calculated in a number of ways, including:

1. The average funding level of all eligible FTS-tracked Appeals/Plans, with all FTS-tracked Appeals/Plans weighted equally.
2. The average funding level of all eligible FTS-tracked Appeals/Plans and Non-FTS tracked humanitarian programming, with all emergencies weighted equally.
3. The global funding level, comparing global response plan/appeal funding against global response plan/appeal funding requirements.

Emergencies whose funding level is below all measures remain in the pool of eligible countries. The range between the lowest and the highest measures represents a grey zone, and emergencies whose funding level falls in the grey zone may remain in the pool of eligible countries. Emergencies with a funding level above all measures are typically not considered, unless there are other, extraordinary reasons.

The funding level of each response plan is calculated based on available funding as a share of funding requirements.

CERF will also analyze other humanitarian funding available reported for an emergency outside the appeal and funding reported as regionally earmarked to organizations for particular emergencies. Consideration is also given to any funding through the 18 CBPFs, where applicable.

Since the funding data for Non-FTS tracked humanitarian programming are provided by UN agencies and do not contain NGO funding, the funding level is calculated based on available funding as a share of funding requirements for UN agencies only.

The funding analysis includes tracking of past CERF allocations, allocations from CBPFs and, if available, projections on affected people, targeted people, funding requirements and funding from other sources.

Analysis of Risk, Vulnerability and Severity of Humanitarian Needs

For underfunded emergencies, as defined during the funding analysis, the level of risk, vulnerability and severity of humanitarian needs is assessed. Data on all aspects of risk, vulnerability and humanitarian needs are combined into a single index, the CERF Index for Risk and Vulnerability (CIRV).⁷ CIRV includes six measures that cover a comprehensive range of factors influencing the humanitarian situation, which are listed in the index. The six measures are standardized and then weighted according to the scope of information each covers before being included in the CIRV. The Index for Risk Management (INFORM) accounts for 50 per cent of CIRV since it already includes 54 different measures, and the five other components together account for the remaining 50 per cent.

⁷ First introduced for the 2016 first allocation round, see www.unocha.org/cerf/resources/how-apply/underfunded-emergencies-0

CERF Index for Risk and Vulnerability (CIRV)	
50% of CIRV	50% of CIRV
<p>Index for Risk Management (INFORM) Accounts for 1/2 of CIRV Includes about 50 indicators Based on quantitative data Forward-looking (3-5 years) Dimensions include conflict, natural disaster, displaced and other vulnerable people, coping capacity</p>	<p>Projected risk of increase in humanitarian needs From IASC Alert, Early Warning & Readiness Report Accounts for 1/10 of CIRV Based on qualitative assessments Forward-looking (6 months)</p>
	<p>Food Insecurity From FEWSNet Food Assistance Outlook Brief, FAO's Global Information and Early Warning System, and WFP's Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping Accounts for 1/10 of CIRV Based on quantitative data on food insecurity Forward-looking (6 months)</p>
	<p>Prevalence of conflict From Uppsala Conflict Data Program Accounts for 1/10 of CIRV Based on quantitative data on civil and int'l conflict</p>
	<p>Change in conflict intensity and conflict risk alert From International Crisis Group Accounts for 1/10 of CIRV Based on qualitative assessment of conflict Conflict risk alerts are forward-looking</p>
	<p>Human rights violations From Political Terror Scale Accounts for 1/10 of CIRV Based on US State Department, Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch reports</p>

The six measures included in the CIRV are:

1. The **Index for Risk Management (INFORM)**,⁸ a collaboration of the former IASC Task Team for Preparedness and Resilience and the European Commission, is a global, open-source risk assessment for humanitarian crises and disasters. It indicates risk three years into the future but cannot predict individual crises. INFORM has three dimensions: hazard and exposure, vulnerability, and lack of coping capacity. Each dimension encompasses different categories, which are user-driven concepts related to the needs of humanitarian and resilience actors. For each category, several indicators may be included. Categories cover natural hazards, conflict, socio-economic factors including aid dependency, vulnerable groups including due to health conditions or food insecurity, and measures about the quality of institutional capacity and infrastructure. INFORM includes 54 different indicators, which are listed in the annex, and ranges from 0 to 10, with higher values indicating a higher risk.
2. The **IASC Early Warning, Early Action and Readiness Report**⁹, from the IASC Reference Group on Early Warning and Preparedness, lists countries with serious risks of strategic operational concern or with a high probability of increasing humanitarian needs. These countries are identified by the IASC Emergency Directors Group and an analysis working group and are categorized as having one of five levels of seriousness: very low, low, moderate, high or very high. Each country is assigned one or several of three risk types: conflict, cyclone, drought, epidemic and flood. The IASC Early Warning Report assesses the risk half a year into the future. As it is based on qualitative assessments rather than a quantitative analysis, it complements INFORM and other measures. Level 3 emergencies are not included in the report because they are considered already to be at the highest level of seriousness. For the analysis, the seriousness levels are translated into an indicator, with moderate at 3.3, high at 6.7 and very high at 10. Level 3 emergencies are also assigned a score of 10.
3. A measure of **Food Insecurity** combines data from three sources: The FEWSNet Food Assistance Outlook Brief¹⁰ provides projections of emergency food assistance needs in FEWSNet coverage countries, six months

⁸ www.inform-index.org

⁹ <http://reliefweb.int/report/world/iasc-alert-early-warning-and-readiness-report-outlook-period-november-2015-april-2016>

¹⁰ <http://fews.net/global/food-assistance-outlook-brief/december-2018>

in the future. The Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNet) bases its projections on the methodology of the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) and ranges from 'minimal' ('generally food secure') and 'stressed' ('moderately food insecure') via 'crisis' ('acute food and livelihood crisis') to 'emergency' ('humanitarian emergency') and 'famine'. FAO's Global Information and Early Warning System (GIEWS) groups countries requiring external food assistance into four categories: those with current food insecurity, including an 'exceptional shortfall in aggregate food production/supplies,' 'widespread lack of access,' and 'severe localized food insecurity'; as well as 'countries with unfavourable prospects for current crops', i.e. countries with possible future food insecurity. WFP's Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping publishes a Global Food Security Update, which lists countries facing food insecurity. The FEWSNet indicator has a 6-point scale (from 0 to 5, famine). Countries with current food insecurity according to GIEWS are assigned a score of 2 and countries with 'unfavourable prospects' as score of 1. VAM's food insecurity hotspots are assigned a score of 2. These measures are combined into an additive index.

4. The **Uppsala Conflict Data Program** (UCDP)¹¹ provides datasets on different aspects and types of conflict.¹² INFORM already includes the most severe, high-intensity conflicts from the Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research's Conflict Barometer and the Global Conflict Risk Index. Thus, lower-level forms of violent conflict, defined by UCDP as causing at least 25 battle-related deaths in one calendar year, are separately included in the CIRV. These are the conflicts that often cause humanitarian needs even if not to the same extent as the most intense conflicts. The 'UCDP/PRIO Armed Conflict Dataset' provides historical data on violent conflict since 1946. The CIRV takes the latest available year into account, and codes countries with violent conflict at 1, countries without 0.
5. In contrast to the historical conflict data from UCDP, the **Crisis Group's** monthly CrisisWatch provides more current data on whether conflict situations improve, stay the same or deteriorate. In addition, CrisisWatch provides forward-looking data by issuing 'conflict risk alerts' when the situation is at risk of deteriorating (as well as 'peace opportunities'). As these data are not available in a database, they are collected as follows: A country is assigned a score of +1 for each month in which the situation deteriorates, a -1 for each month that the situation improves, and a +1 one for each month with a conflict risk alert. These scores are summed up for the current year or past 12 months, resulting in an index that can theoretically range from -12 (for a country that improved each month) to +24 (for a country that deteriorated each month and for which Crisis Group issued a conflict risk alert each month).
6. Since INFORM does not include a measure for human rights violations, data from the **Political Terror Scale**¹³ has been added to the CIRV. The PTS measures levels of human rights violations on a 5-point scale originally developed by Freedom House, with higher scores indicating worse violations. The data used in compiling this index comes from three different sources: the yearly country reports of Amnesty International, the US State Department Country Reports on Human Rights Practices, and Human Rights Watch's World Reports. The CIRV includes the average of the scores from the three sources for the most recent available year.

In sum, the CIRV includes indicators that:

- Are based on historical data (e.g., UCDP, PTS) and data that are forward-looking (INFORM, IASC Early Warning Report, FEWSNet);
- Cover humanitarian needs arising from conflict (INFORM, UCDP, Crisis Group) and natural disasters (INFORM, FEWSNet);
- Cover the need for material humanitarian assistance (INFORM, FEWSNet) and protection-related issues (PTS);
- Are based on quantitative analysis (INFORM, UCDP, etc.) and qualitative assessments (IASC Early Warning Report, Crisis Group);
- Take stock of the current situation (UCDP, PTS) and that indicate change (IASC Early Warning Report, FEWSNet, Crisis Group).

Before they can be combined into one index, the seven measures are normalized to 10, so that each range from 0, which is the theoretical minimum of each indicator and represents a low risk of humanitarian needs, to 100, the theoretical maximum representing a high risk.

¹¹ www.pcr.uu.se/research/UCDP

¹² www.pcr.uu.se/research/ucdp/datasets

¹³ www.politicalterroryscale.org

In addition to the CIRV, the CERF secretariat conducts robustness tests using different measures to ensure that the same underfunded emergencies are assessed as having high levels of vulnerability regardless of the exact calculation, i.e. that the risk and vulnerability analysis is robust. Overall, the analysis takes into account data quality. Some figures, especially for the funding analysis, may have to be estimated (e.g., prorated); estimates are clearly marked to distinguish them from more solid data points.

Funding Apportionment

Once the most underfunded emergencies with the highest levels of vulnerability have been identified, the available funding envelope is apportioned among the selected countries. The CERF secretariat makes a recommendation and the ERC makes the final decision about the funding allocated to each of the selected countries.

For the apportionment, 25 per cent of the available funding envelope is distributed evenly among the selected countries, to create a baseline. The remaining 75 per cent are allocated among the selected countries as a function of their funding gap, including both the relative gap (the share, in per cent, of UN requirements that has not been funded). Third, the calculated amounts are adjusted. In many cases they will be rounded to nearest million or half-million. However, in some cases, other factors may influence the apportioned amount, such the level of vulnerability (for example, a country with a higher score on the CIRV may receive more UFE funding than a country with a lower CIRV score even if they have the same funding level), past CERF funding, implementation capacity, and the focus of the UFE allocation.

Conclusion

The CERF secretariat has developed and refined the process and analysis for UFE rounds over years and continues to adjust it in response to feedback and lessons learned from previous allocation rounds, feedback from the UFE working group, NGOs and other parts of OCHA.

Annex: Indicators and Data Sources for CERF Index for Risk and Vulnerability

#	Indicator	INFORM Category	INFORM Dimension	Index	Source	Link
1-2	Exposure to earthquakes of MMI category 6¹⁴ Average annual number and percentage of people exposed	Natural, Earthquake	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	Global Seismic Hazard Assessment Program (GSHAP), LandScan ¹⁵ (ETH Zurich)	www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/GSHAP
3-4	Exposure to earthquakes of MMI category 8¹⁶ Average annual number and percentage of people exposed	Natural, Earthquake	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	Global Seismic Hazard Assessment Program (GSHAP), LandScan ¹⁷ (ETH Zurich)	www.seismo.ethz.ch/static/GSHAP
5-6	Exposure to tsunamis Average annual number and percentage of people exposed	Natural, Tsunami	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	PREVIEW Global Risk Data Platform (UNEP, UNISDR)	http://preview.grid.unep.ch
7-8	Exposure to flood Average annual number and percentage of people exposed	Natural, Flood	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	PREVIEW Global Risk Data Platform (UNEP, UNISDR)	http://preview.grid.unep.ch
9-10	Exposure to storm surges of Saffir-Simpson category 1¹⁸ Average annual number and percentage of people exposed	Natural, Tropical Cyclone	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	PREVIEW Global Risk Data Platform (UNEP, UNISDR)	http://preview.grid.unep.ch
11-12	Exposure to tropical cyclone of Saffir-Simpson category 1¹⁹	Natural, Tropical Cyclone	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	PREVIEW Global Risk Data Platform (UNEP, UNISDR)	http://preview.grid.unep.ch

¹⁴ Modified Mercalli Intensity scale. Category 6 is "strong": "felt by all [...] Damage slight," <http://earthquake.usgs.gov/learn/topics/mercalli.php>

¹⁵ This product was made utilizing the LandScan (insert dataset year)TM High Resolution global Population Data Set copyrighted by UT-Battelle, LLC, operator of Oak Ridge National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the United States Department of Energy. The United States Government has certain rights in this Data Set. Neither UT-BATTELLE, LLC NOR THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, NOR ANY OF THEIR EMPLOYEES, MAKES ANY WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, OR ASSUMES ANY LEGAL LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, OR USEFULNESS OF THE DATA SET.

¹⁶ Category VIII is "severe" with "considerable damage in ordinary substantial buildings".

¹⁷ This product was made utilizing the LandScan (insert dataset year)TM High Resolution global Population Data Set copyrighted by UT-Battelle, LLC, operator of Oak Ridge National Laboratory under Contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725 with the United States Department of Energy. The United States Government has certain rights in this Data Set. Neither UT-BATTELLE, LLC NOR THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY, NOR ANY OF THEIR EMPLOYEES, MAKES ANY WARRANTY, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, OR ASSUMES ANY LEGAL LIABILITY OR RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ACCURACY, COMPLETENESS, OR USEFULNESS OF THE DATA SET.

¹⁸ Category 1 is "very dangerous winds" of 119-153 km/h that "produce some damage," www.nhc.noaa.gov/aboutsshws.php

¹⁹ Category 1 is "very dangerous winds" of 119-153 km/h that "produce some damage," www.nhc.noaa.gov/aboutsshws.php

#	Indicator	INFORM Category	INFORM Dimension	Index	Source	Link
	Average annual number and percentage of people exposed					
13-14	Exposure to tropical cyclone of Saffir-Simpson category 3²⁰ Average annual number and percentage of people exposed	Natural, Tropical Cyclone	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	PREVIEW Global Risk Data Platform (UNEP, UNISDR)	http://preview.grid.unep.ch
15	Annual probability to have more than 30% of agriculture area affected by drought	Natural, Drought	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	FAO	
16-17	Drought-affected people Average annual number and percentage of people affected by drought	Natural, Drought	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	EM-DAT: The OFDA/CRED International Disaster Database	www.emdat.be
18	Drought frequency	Natural, Drought	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	EM-DAT: The OFDA/CRED International Disaster Database	www.emdat.be
19	National power conflicts	Human, Conflict Intensity	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	Conflict Barometer - HIIK (Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research)	www.hiik.de/en/konfliktbarometer/index.html
20	Subnational conflicts	Human, Conflict Intensity	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	Conflict Barometer - HIIK (Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research)	www.hiik.de/en/konfliktbarometer/index.html
21	Probability of violent internal conflict	Human, Projected Conflict Intensity	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	Global Conflict Risk Index (GCRI)	http://conflictrisk.jrc.ec.europa.eu
22	Probability of highly violent internal conflict	Human, Projected Conflict Intensity	Hazard and Exposure	INFORM	Global Conflict Risk Index (GCRI)	http://conflictrisk.jrc.ec.europa.eu

²⁰ Category 3 is winds of 178-208 km/h that cause “catastrophic damage”, www.nhc.noaa.gov/aboutsshws.php

#	Indicator	INFORM Category	INFORM Dimension	Index	Source	Link
23	Human Development Index	Socio-Economic Vulnerability, Development and Deprivation	Vulnerability	INFORM	UNDP Human Development Report	http://hdr.undp.org/en/data
24	Multidimensional Poverty Index	Socio-Economic Vulnerability, Development and Deprivation	Vulnerability	INFORM	UNDP Human Development Report	http://hdr.undp.org/en/data
25	Gender Inequality Index	Socio-Economic Vulnerability, Inequality	Vulnerability	INFORM	UNDP Human Development Report	http://hdr.undp.org/en/data
26	Inequality in income or consumption Income GINI coefficient	Socio-Economic Vulnerability, Inequality	Vulnerability	INFORM	World Bank	http://hdr.undp.org/en/data
27	Public aid per capita Development and humanitarian aid	Socio-Economic Vulnerability, Aid Dependency	Vulnerability	INFORM	FTS, OECD DAC	http://fts.unocha.org/page-loader.aspx http://stats.oecd.org/Index.aspx?DataSetCode=TABLE2A
28	Net Official Development Assistance (ODA) received as Percent of Gross National Income (GNI)	Socio-Economic Vulnerability, Aid Dependency	Vulnerability	INFORM	World Bank	http://data.worldbank.org
29	Refugees by country of asylum	Vulnerable Groups, Up-rooted People, Total people of concern	Vulnerability	INFORM	UNHCR Global Trends	www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c4d6.html
30	Internally Displaced People	Vulnerable Groups, Up-rooted People, Total people of concern	Vulnerability	INFORM	IDMC (NRC)	www.internal-displacement.org/8025708F004CE90B/(http-Pages)/22FB1D4E2B196DA802570BB005E787C?OpenDocument
31	Returned refugees	Vulnerable Groups, Up-rooted People, Total People of Concern	Vulnerability	INFORM	UNHCR Global Trends	www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646c4d6.html

#	Indicator	INFORM Category	INFORM Dimension	Index	Source	Link
32	Adult prevalence of HIV/AIDS Estimated number of adults (>15) living with HIV	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Health Conditions	Vulnerability	INFORM	WHO Global Health Observatory Data Repository	http://apps.who.int/ghodata
33	Malaria mortality rate Deaths due to malaria per 100,000 people	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Health Conditions	Vulnerability	INFORM	United Nations Millennium Development Goals indicators	http://mdgs.un.org/unsd/mdg/SeriesDetail.aspx?srid=663
34	Tuberculosis incidence Number of cases of all forms of tuberculosis per 100,000 people	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Health Conditions	Vulnerability	INFORM	WHO Global Health Observatory Data Repository	http://apps.who.int/ghodata
35	Child mortality Probability of dying by age 5 per 1,000 live births	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Children under 5	Vulnerability	INFORM	Inter-agency Group for Child Mortality Estimation (IGME)	www.childmortality.org
36	Children under weight Children under 5 years old	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Children under 5	Vulnerability	INFORM	WHO Global Health Observatory Data Repository UNICEF The State of the World's Children	http://apps.who.int/ghodata www.unicef.org/publications/index_pubs_statistics.html
37	Number of people affected by natural disasters in the last three years	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Recent Shocks	Vulnerability	INFORM	EM-DAT: The OFDA/CRED International Disaster Database	www.emdat.be
38	Average dietary supply adequacy Average dietary energy supply as a percentage of the average dietary energy requirement	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Food Insecurity	Vulnerability	INFORM	FAO	www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/ess-fadata/en
39	Prevalence of undernourishment	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Food Insecurity	Vulnerability	INFORM	World Bank	http://data.worldbank.org

#	Indicator	INFORM Category	INFORM Dimension	Index	Source	Link
	Percent of population below minimum level of dietary energy consumption					
40	Domestic Food Price Level Index A measure of the monthly change in international prices of a basket of food commodities	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Food Insecurity	Vulnerability	INFORM	FAO	www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/ess-fadata/en
41	Domestic Food Price Volatility Index Compares the variations of the Domestic Food Price Index across countries and time	Vulnerable Groups, Other Vulnerable Groups, Food Insecurity	Vulnerability	INFORM	FAO	www.fao.org/economic/ess/ess-fs/ess-fadata/en
42	Government Effectiveness Index	Institutional, Governance	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	World Bank	http://data.worldbank.org
43	Corruption Perception Index	Institutional, Governance	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	Transparency International	http://cpi.transparency.org
44	Hyogo Framework for Action Disaster Risk Reduction activities, measured on 5-point indicator	Institutional, DRR	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	UNISDR	http://preventionweb.net/applications/hfa/qbnhfa
45	Literacy rate Percent of people aged 15 years and older	Infrastructure, Communication	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	UNESCO Institute for Statistics	http://stats.uis.unesco.org/unesco/ReportFolders/reportFolders.aspx
46	Access to electricity Percent of population	Infrastructure, Communication	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	World Bank	http://data.worldbank.org
47	Internet use Internet users per 100 people	Infrastructure, Communication	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	World Bank	http://data.worldbank.org
48	Mobile cellular subscriptions	Infrastructure, Communication	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	World Bank	http://data.worldbank.org

#	Indicator	INFORM Category	INFORM Dimension	Index	Source	Link
	Per 100 people					
49	Improved sanitation facilities % of population with access	Infrastructure, Physical Infrastructure	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	WHO, UNICEF	www.wssinfo.org/data-estimates/table
50	Improved water source % of population with access	Infrastructure, Physical Infrastructure	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	WHO, UNICEF	www.wssinfo.org/data-estimates/table
51	Road density km of road per 100 km ² of land area	Infrastructure, Physical Infrastructure	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	International Road Federation	www.irfnet.ch
52	Health expenditure per capita In Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) international dollar	Infrastructure, Access to Health Care	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	WHO Global Health Observatory Data Repository	http://apps.who.int/ghodata
53	Measles (MCV) immunization coverage among 1-year-olds (%) Children under 1 who received at least one dose	Infrastructure, Access to Health Care	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	WHO Global Health Observatory Data Repository	http://apps.who.int/ghodata
54	Physicians density Number of medical doctors (generalist and specialist) per 10,000 people	Infrastructure, Access to Health Care	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	WHO Global Health Observatory Data Repository	http://apps.who.int/ghodata
55	Maternal mortality ration Ratio of maternal deaths per 100,000 live births	Infrastructure, Access to Health Care	Lack of Coping Capacity	INFORM	Maternal Mortality Estimation Group	http://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/monitoring/maternal-mortality-2015/en/
56	Projected risk of increase in humanitarian needs 6 months into the future 5-point scale of seriousness of risks of strategic operational con-	--	--	--	IASC Alert, Early Warning and Readiness Report	https://interagencystandingcommittee.org/reference-group-risk-early-warning-and-preparedness

#	Indicator	INFORM Category	INFORM Dimension	Index	Source	Link
	cern or that have a high probability to influence humanitarian needs					
57	Projected food assistance needs 6 months into the future Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (5 categories from minimal to famine)	--	--	Food Insecurity Index	Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWSNet): Food Assistance Outlook Brief	www.fews.net
58	Countries requiring external food assistance 4 categories, from “unfavourable prospects for current crops” to “exceptional shortfall in aggregate food production/supplies”	--	--	Food Insecurity Index	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), Global Information and Early Warning System (GIEWS) on food and agriculture	www.fao.org/giews/english/hotspots/index.htm
59	Food Insecurity Hotspots	--	--	Food Insecurity Index	World Food Programme (WFP), Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM): Global Food Security Update	http://vam.wfp.org/sites/global_update/
60	Prevalence of violent conflict At least 25 battle-related deaths per year	--	--	--	Uppsala Conflict Data Program (UCDP)	www.pcr.uu.se/research/UCDP
61	Change in conflict intensity and conflict risk alert Aggregated score of improvements and deteriorations in conflict intensity, and conflict risk alerts, over the past year	--	--	--	International Crisis Group: CrisisWatch	http://crisis-group.be/maps/crisiswatch/index.html
62	Human rights violations 5-point scale of the extent and intensity of human rights violations	--	--	--	Political Terror Scale Mark Gibney, Linda Cornett, Reed Wood, Peter Haschke, and Daniel Arnon. 2015. The Political Terror Scale 1976-2015	www.politicalterror scale.org