EUROPEAN COMMISSION
HUMANITARIAN AID OFFICE (ECHO)

General affairs and relations with European institutions, other donors and international organisations; disaster preparedness; support for major crisis; statistics and databases (ECHO 4)

Brussels,
ECHO 4/PB D(2004)

BACKGROUND NOTE

Subject: **ECHO Strategy 2005: *G*lobal humanitarian *N*eeds *A*ssessment (*GNA*) and *F*orgotten *C*risis *A*ssessment (*FCA*); Methodological notes**

1.   BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

ECHO's 2005 annual strategy retains the objective of focussing on areas of highest needs. One of the principles of this needs-based approach is to focus on humanitarian crises that receive low donor and media attention ("forgotten crises"). Striving for a systematic and consistent approach, ECHO has established basic principles and methodologies for assessing both, high-need areas and forgotten crises in 2001 and consolidated them since.

Within the inevitable constraints of a highly-aggregated data analysis, this approach has proven its relevance. Reactions from Member States, other donors and independent research institutions[1] have been positive. The overall approach will thus be continued in the 2005 strategic planning cycle.

A specific attempt has been made this year, however, to even better integrate the two assessments. Since the identification of forgotten crises to a large extent uses data and results of the GNA anyway, there is no reason to present two separate notes.

The present paper, therefore, presents the methodology of the global needs assessment (GNA) for 2005 and, in a second step, explains the process of establishing the forgotten crises index, which to a large extent builds on the results of GNA.

The analysis uses the latest available validated aggregate data from various international organisations and research institutions to bring the results as close as possible to the real-time situation. In some cases, ECHO has even funded efforts to

---

[1]   Humanitarian Policy Group (HPG): According to need? Needs assessment and decision-making in the humanitarian Sector. September 2003.

update datasets (HIIK data). ECHO geographical units have been asked to provide any relevant complementary data at sub-national level they may dispose of.

Despite its relative inertia caused by the long data collection cycles for some of the used datasets, the index nevertheless seems to portray adequately the evolution in the field since last year and to point towards the main areas at humanitarian risk or in actual crisis.

For the first time since adoption of the methodology in 2002, the GNA and forgotten crisis assessment has been undertaken by the Joint Research Centre (JRC) on the basis of an administrative arrangement between JRC and ECHO. This has significantly reduced the burden on ECHO, further enhanced the quality of the tool and allowed the utilization of state-of-the-art technology. JRC also provides ECHO with additional resources to undertake further in-depth analyses such as time-series, through which the evolution of needs over time and trends can be identified. This has not been feasible in previous years because of resource constraints.

2. METHODOLOGICAL NOTES FOR THE GLOBAL NEEDS ASSESSMENT (GNA)

The basic methodology of the global needs assessment has first been established in 2001 for the "ECHO Aid Strategy 2002". To the extent possible, comments and suggestions aiming at the improvement of the tool have been taken into consideration. More detailed explanations will be provided in each relevant section below.

The identification of priority areas of highest needs, in principle, relies on a parallel exercise: a) bottom-up assessments undertaken by ECHO's field experts to the HQ and the subsequent planning process within the geographical units; b) establishment of a global needs assessment (GNA) by ECHO 4, ranking more than 130 countries and territories in a list of relative need on the basis of nine aggregated indicators.

The GNA, focussing on the second element, is a planning tool offering a cross-country comparison to complement, not to replace in-depth analyses done by ECHO country desks and field experts. Results of both exercises will be discussed during the meetings of the geographical units with ECHO Management preparing the annual strategy. Possible incoherences (rarely the case so far) will be arbitrated by the Management.

In line with ECHO's strategic orientation to pay specific attention to the needs of **children**, the methodology has been better geared towards this objective in 2003. In concrete terms, the indicator "general undernourishment of population" was replaced by "children under weight for age". This facilitates the identification of areas where children are most in need and is maintained for the 2005 exercise.

A modification in this year's assessment is the removal of the sub-national data for western Guatemala. This sub-national data had been included on an experimental basis in last year's exercise to test how this would influence the country's rank or category. However, it has been found that the additional effort required (at least 10 times more data required if all countries were analysed at sub-national level) would not justify the little added value that could be achieved by identifying eventual "pockets of needs". For the majority of cases, the rank would be more or less the same. In the case of the Russian Federation, however, sub-national data for

Chechnya has been maintained as this is indeed a very specific case, characterised by a high-intensity conflict in a very small area of a very big country.

The following chapters explain the process of a needs analysis at macro-level and the way the global index for needs assessment (GNA) 2005 was established. The basic assumption of the GNA is that humanitarian aid is most likely to be needed in *the least developed and poorest societies* (measured by HDI and HPI), in those with the *highest number of severe natural disasters or conflicts* (measured by data from CRED and HIIK), with the *highest refugee and IDP caseload* (UNHCR, Global IDP), with *the highest prevalence of malnutrition and U5 mortality rates* (measured with UNICEF data). Aggregating this information and clustering the countries accordingly into groups with high, medium and low needs respectively, this cross-country comparison enables a transparent first prioritisation of the main areas of intervention. The method used for clustering is to separate the country sample into quartiles, with the 25% worst cases figuring as "high need", the 50% middle ranks as "medium need" and the 25% best cases as "low need". We chose this method because it is widely recognized in statistics as a simple but effective tool to group ordinal scale data. The gross needs situation is finally contrasted with data on donor contributions (OECD DAC data on overseas net development assistance, including emergency and food aid) to identify the net needs.

2.1. Selection of the countries

The selection of countries for GNA 2005 is essentially based on the country list established in August 2003 for the GNA. That list originally was taken over from ReliefWeb, assuming that any country or territory being listed in ReliefWeb would be in a situation of some humanitarian relevance. In a second step, highly industrialised countries (mainly OECD members and their dependent territories) as well as EU accession countries were deleted from the selection as they are not mentioned in ECHO's legal base as a priority for its operations. Wealthy developing countries that can be assumed to be able to cope with a humanitarian disaster themselves, such as Kuwait or Brunei, were also removed. 135 countries / territories have finally been maintained, two more than last year. Uruguay and Jordan have been added on request of ECHO geographical units.

2.2. Selection of indicators for needs

The assessment initially used eight selected indicators. They were grouped into the 4 broad categories of equal weight presented in the overview below. Since 2002 they were complemented by a ninth indicator, containing data on donor contributions from OECD/DAC. This indicator was given 20% of the total weight.

Overall Situation: Human Development, Human Poverty

Exposure to Major Disasters: Natural Disasters, Conflicts

Humanitarian effects of population movements: Refugees, Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs)

Situation of children: Malnutrition – undernourishment; Mortality

Donor contributions: Net Official Development Assistance recipients 2000 - 2002 per capita of population (including emergency and food aid).

The above variables include the following components and concepts:

2.2.1.   First category: Overall Situation

In order to gauge a country's general ability to react to sudden-onset and humanitarian crises on its own accord the first two indicators focus on the economic strength in terms of both human development and human poverty. For both categories we basically took over the ranking done by UNDP.

2.2.1.1.   Human Development

It is assumed that the higher the degree of development in a given country, the higher the capacity of a country's people to deal with humanitarian suffering from their own resources, either individual or national.

Reflecting the question of resources, the Human Development Index[2] (HDI) of the UN Development Program (UNDP) was chosen. Published in July 2004, the index measures the average achievements in a country in three basic dimensions:

- A decent standard of living, as measured by GDP per capita - purchasing power parity (PPP) - in USD.

- A long and healthy life, as measured by the life expectancy at birth.

- Education, as measured by the adult literacy rate (with two-thirds weight) and the combined primary, secondary and tertiary gross enrolment ratio (with one-third weight).

As UNDP has already established a ranking system similar to ours, we took over the ranks allocated by UNDP (in reverse order because "high" in UNDP terms means high level of development).

2.2.1.2.   Human Poverty

To complement the HDI, a measure of poverty was included in the form of the Human Poverty Index[3] for developing countries (HPI-1), which measures deprivations in the three basic dimensions of human development. The primary difference and added value lies in the fact that this index captures specific problems of *developing* countries, rather than the general development/vulnerability of a country indicated by the HDI, thus suggesting heightened vulnerability to humanitarian crises and suffering, namely

- Lack of access to economic provisioning, as measured by the percentage of the population not using improved water sources.

- Vulnerability to death at a relatively early age, as measured by the probability at birth of not surviving to age 40, measuring a long and healthy life.

---

[2]   United Nations Development Programme, *Human Development Report 2004*, released 15 July 2004; statistical annex: http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_HDI.pdf

[3]   Ibid., Human Poverty Indicators and Human Poverty Index for Developing Countries (HPI-1)

- Exclusion from the world of reading and communications, as measured by the adult illiteracy rate, measuring education.

The ranking follows the quartile method described in chapter 2 above.

2.2.2. *Exposure to major disasters*

The second category of indicators regards the historical and present exposure of countries to serious natural disasters as well as conflicts:

2.2.2.1. Natural Disasters

The raw data for this aggregated information has been taken from the International Disaster Database maintained by the Centre for Research of the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) at the Université Catholique de Louvain (UCL). The period of time being assessed covers the years 1992-2004. The fact that this period is shorter than in the previous exercise is due to difficulties experienced last year in the attribution of disasters before 1990 to the newly independent states.

Since ECHO's interest focuses on natural catastrophes in which people are being seriously affected beyond the coping capacities of their society or community, it was necessary to find a numerical indicator qualifying a natural catastrophe as a disaster. Thus, a natural phenomenon with at least 1000 deaths each was considered to classify as a disaster in every assessed country. In addition, every natural disaster which affected[4] at least five percent of the total population was qualified as a disaster as well. 2004 data has been included (until July 2004) in order to not just measure the historical "disaster-proneness" but to bring the analysis closer to the real-time situation.

Although CRED admits that the figures on affected people are not entirely reliable, we decided to keep affected people in the equation because there are many serious disasters in which very few people were killed but many affected. We also recognised that looking at the number of at least 1000 killed people only was not reflecting the differences of the ranges of disasters. It has been argued that such an incident has very different effects on small island states than on big states. In addition, the overall number of people killed by natural disasters has decreased over time, while there are more and more people affected.[5]

The scoring pattern for that category applies as follows: the disaster proneness was considered "**high**" if a specific country has suffered 5 or more serious natural disaster events with more than 1000 killed or 5% of the population affected in the period 1992-2003, or suffered one such serious event in 2004. The category "**medium**" was chosen for 2-4 events in the period above, "**low**" for one such event in the period and "**no relevance**" if there was no such event.

---

[4] Definition of "Affected" by CRED: People requiring immediate assistance during a period of emergency; it can also be displaced or evacuated people". http://www.cred.be/

[5] IFRC: World Disaster Report 2003.

With these figures the threshold to qualify for a disaster event was deliberately put relatively high. This was done to achieve a sufficient spread of countries across the three categories.

2.2.2.2. Conflicts

The impact of violent conflicts, no doubt, is the most complex indicator to express by means of quantitative data. Comparing various sources[6] and reviewing the ongoing debate[7] how to systematise conflict research, ECHO in 2001 decided to use the data provided by the Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research (HIIK). Based on their own thorough research their yearly "Conflict Barometer" provides an analysis of ongoing conflicts world-wide, classifying activities in five categories, appointing one classification per conflict corresponding to the highest intensity during the course of the year. Our analysis is based on the following classification:

(1)   Severe crisis, defined by HIIK as a conflict in which violent force is repeatedly used in an organized way.

(2)   War, defined as a type of violent conflicts in which violent force is used with a certain continuity in an organized and systematic way. The conflict parties apply extensive measures, according to the situation. The amount of destruction is vast and of long duration.

Wars and, to a somewhat lesser extent, severe crises are almost always associated with destruction of human life and infrastructure with a high likelihood of leading to some sort of humanitarian disaster of the civilian population (displacement, disruption of food chain, water distribution etc.) Within the terms of reference of an ECHO Grant Facility contract concluded with HIIK in December 2003[8], HIIK was required to provide an mid-year update of the global conflict situation. This update was provided in early August and was used as the source data for the assessment.

For the same reasons as for natural disasters, the threshold for classifying was put relatively high. Thus, a country was classified into the "**high**" category if there was an ongoing severe crisis or war in that country in 2004. The "**medium**" category was attributed to countries if there were more than one violent crisis or war on the territory of that country between 1994 and 2003. "**Low**" was attributed to countries with one such event in that period and "**no relevance**" there was no such event.

---

[6]   See, for example, Wallensteen, Peter & Margareta Sollenberg, "Armed Conflict, 1989–98", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 36, No. 5, 1999; also at URL: http://www.pcr.uu.se/

[7]   See the documentation of the June 2001 conference "Identifying Wars: Systematic Conflict Research and its Utility in Conflict Resolution and Prevention", June 2001, Department of Peace and Conflict Research, Uppsala University, URL: http://www.pcr.uu.se/conferenses/Euroconference/ident.html

[8]   Grant Facility for studies and training "Humanitarian Impact of conflict Dynamics – the Effects of Man Made Crises on Refugee Movements and Displacement"; Grant no. ECHO/210/QGE/2003/0100. It should be mentioned that HIIK moved from a system of four categories to five in 2003. As far as can be seen so far, however, this has no direct impact on the GNA results.

2.2.3. Population movements

Refugees and IDPs are among the most vulnerable groups of people particularly in terms of sudden humanitarian suffering during man-made or natural emergencies and their aftermath. As this is the very core mandate of ECHO's work it was seen to warrant an extra category to account for these needs. Within the aggregated country-based analysis in this paper, refugees and IDPs can be considered as an important element reflecting "pockets humanitarian needs" at a sub-national level.

2.2.3.1. Refugees

The number of refugees is derived from UNHCR's "2004 UNHCR Population Statistics (Provisional)"[9]. Refugees are defined as "persons recognised as refugees under the 1951 Convention, the 1969 OAU Convention, in accordance with the UNHCR Statute, persons granted a humanitarian status and those granted temporary protection". The approach follows a methodology suggested by UNHCR[10]. UNHCR attempts to measure the "burden" of refugees to a host population in terms of the GPD per capita of population[11]. The "burden" is assumed to be higher (and, consequently, the need for external assistance) if the GDP per capita is low.

The countries are ranked by a composite index correlating the number of refugees in a country with its GDP per capita. The 25% worst cases in the ranking are classified in the "**high"** needs category, the middle 50% in the "**medium"** needs and the 25% with the lowest refugee burden per GDP per capita as "**low**". Countries with no refugees were encoded as "**no relevance**".

2.2.3.2. IDPs

With regard to the number of IDPs, reliable data are difficult to obtain. Reliable estimates for displaced persons are unavailable in many countries, both for reasons of state censorship and lack of access by independent observers and because often IDPs can not be easily distinguished from the local population, especially if they find shelter with friends or relatives. Comparing the available data on the numbers of IDPs, it is also apparent that sources' estimates differ enormously without any discernible trend of one single source generally providing a more conservative or more radical estimate. In order to ensure as high a degree of reliability as possible we compared three sources of data on IDPs: UNHCR, U.S. Committee for Refugees and the Global IDP Project by the Norwegian Refugee Council[12]. We selected the

---

[9]   UNHCR: Refugee trends 1 January – 31 March 2004 – Refugee populations, new arrivals and durable solutions in 70, mostly developing countries, 31 March 2004, found at: http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=STATISTICS&id=40e3cafb4&page=statistics

[10]   UNHCR Geneva, Population Data Unit, *"Selected Indicators measuring Capacity and Contributions of Host Countries"*, April 2002

[11]   GDP figures taken from the online version of the CIA World Fact Book http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html.

[12]   UNHCR: http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home?page=statistics; for data from the U.S. Committee of Refugees see URL: http://www.refugees.org; and for the Global IDP Project, which provides detailed analyses and weekly updates for all relevant countries, see URL: http://www.idpproject.org.

highest estimates ("worst case scenario") for attributing scores to each country, where relevant.

It is thought important in order to gauge the IDP caseload to compare the total number of IDPs with the total population of each country. The 25% of countries hosting the highest ratio of IDPs were classified as "**high**" needs, the 50% in the middle as "**medium**" needs and 25% least affected as "**low**". Countries with no known IDPs were classified as "**no relevance**".

2.2.4. *Needs of children*

2.2.4.1. **Malnutrition**

The first indicator chosen under this category was "moderate and severe underweight of children under 5 years of age" from UNICEF´s State of the World´s Children Report 2004[13].

Different approaches with regard to this measure have so far been discarded. One idea was to take data on the Body Mass Index (BMI) but sources prove to be still insufficient concerning the necessary data. Another idea is to make use of the Food Insecurity and Vulnerability Information and Mapping Systems (FIVIMS)[14] website. This cannot provide useful information yet either.

For the ranking, we again formed quartiles with the 25% worst affected countries (highest level of undernourishment) classified as "**high**", the 50% middle as "**medium**" and 25% least affected as "**low**".

2.2.4.2. **Mortality rates**

The last measure completing the survey of humanitarian needs gives an indication of the situation of children in each country focusing on the under-five mortality. Under-five mortality is defined as the probability of dying between birth and exactly five years of age expressed per 1,000 live births. The data is derived from UNICEF's State of the World´s Children Report 2004[15]. Where the mortality rates are relevant, i.e. above those for developed countries, a classification into "**high**", "**medium**" and "**low**" was applied according to the quartile method used for other indicators above.

2.2.5. *Donor contributions*

Taking into consideration comments received on 2003's global needs assessments, a category was included on donor contributions into last year´s analysis, the rationale being that donor contributions can enhance coping capacities and mitigate the "gross" needs, particularly where the effects of high needs are controlled to some extent through high donor contributions. This was maintained for the 2005 GNA The inclusion of donor data therefore gives a more precise picture of the real

---

[13]   UNICEF: "*Table 2 Nutrition*" at http://www.unicef.org/sowc04/sowc04_tables.html.

[14]   See http://www.fivims.net/index.jspx?lang=en

[15]   UNICEF, *"Table 1 Basic Indicators"*, at http://www.unicef.org/sowc04/sowc04_tables.html

situation. The category donor contributions is given the same weight as the other categories (20%).

For pragmatic reasons it was decided to use the ODA data provided by OECD DAC. OECD DAC data are user-friendly, cover a period of three years (2000-2002), include all major donors and all aid categories. The comprehensive character, the reliability and easy accessibility of the data outweighs by far the disadvantage that they are published with a year's delay (i.e. with data representing the situation at the end of 2002) and the fact that GNA-results may be slightly distorted, particularly in the high-need category where some relatively wealthy countries with correspondingly low ODA appear (India, Nigeria, China).

The fact that the OECD ODA data incorporates not just humanitarian spending ("emergency assistance" in OECD terminology) but the *overall* aid flows to a country is not considered a disadvantage because the ODA includes food aid and reconstruction, both of which are closely linked with humanitarian situations. Besides, for the countries in humanitarian crisis the lion's share of ODA is emergency assistance anyway.

A classification into "**high**", "**medium**" and "**low**" was applied according to the quartile method used for other indicators above. In the case of negative net ODA (e.g. Trinidad and Tobago) a category of "**no relevance**" was applied.

For the time being, as long as the OCHA FTS does not reliably provide the overall humanitarian spending, OECD data remain the best source.

2.3. Presentation

Using the measures outlined above, the GNA tool offers different levels of information detail. The first and most aggregated level takes the form of a ***country ranking*** with one score attributing a high, medium or low need in each country in each of the areas of humanitarian concern. Ranking countries according to their ***accumulative humanitarian needs*** (average score of all indicators) may serve as a priority list for humanitarian assistance. For more information on these parameters (development, poverty, natural and man-made disasters, refugees/ IDPs, undernourishment and mortality) there is more information on each sheet, namely

a) a country ranking according to each specific indicator,

b) an alphabetic country list with the full range of data sets used, and

c) (in some cases) further back-up raw data

The final ranking across all five categories was achieved by adding the values attributed to each country within each individual indicator (3 for "high", 2 for "medium", 1 for "low", 0 for "no relevance"), dividing the sum by the number of indicators/categories for which there are values (missing values were not considered and marked as "x") and by ranking them by size. The 25% of countries ranking on top of the list were considered those with **highest** needs the 50% in the middle were considered "**medium**" need countries and the remaining 25% "**low**" need countries.

2.4.   Limitations of the GNA Methodology

The assessment needs to be interpreted with care because of the inevitable limitations of the data and the method.

- The ranking establishes **relative positions**. The fact that one country is on rank 4 and the other on rank 2 does not mean that the former is twice as badly off.

- The method is not designed to give guidance on absolute funding levels as these depend on supplementary factors like absorption capacity, access, presence of other donors, quality of partners etc.

- The final country ranking contains a host of data sets that have been **aggregated** to a high degree. Keeping this in mind, one should use this priority list as a crude cross-country comparison; detailed and substantial conclusions will need a closer look at the underlying data as well as targeted qualitative analyses.

- For some indicators, the compilation of data sets provides a comparatively **static** view of facts and figures.

- As the GNA relies on verified data from international organisations, the scope of figures available unfortunately is limited in most cases to the **national level** and to existing countries (at the time of data collection). This impedes the possibility to differentiate the situation of humanitarian needs of different regions within the borders of a nation-state. Especially salient in cases of one region fighting for independence from a central government, existing data does not permit varying (often special) needs of such regional **pockets of humanitarian needs** to be shown. In the current methodology, only the figures on IDPs and refugees provide an idea of the existence and size of such pockets.

- The same weight has been deliberately given to all need indicators since it is difficult to determine whether one indicator is more important than another. Any weighting might easily be criticised as an attempt to manipulate the results. We admit, however, that the chosen indicators are not fully independent from each other. There might be, for example, a slight bias towards conflict-related data (e.g. positive statistical correlation between conflict and refugees/IDP) which might "privilege" conflict-affected crises over crises caused by natural disasters. Given that ECHO´s main emphasis is on man-made crises however, this possible bias is not regarded as harmful.

- Net ODA per capita receives 20% of the weight. It is currently being studied to determine whether this weight has the capacity to cause distortion. It is true that net ODA may hide the capacity of a net recipient to provide aid itself. Another consideration is that ODA is often provided on political basis rather than on the basis of needs.

- Due to the indicators used in the methodology, the high needs category may contain countries in which ECHO funds little or no activities. The principal reason is that coping capacities can not be fully taken into consideration as there is no data available. A country such as China or India may thus score highly in terms of natural disasters and refugee caseload but is generally considered to be

able to cope without too much external assistance. ECHO is working with JRC and other institutions to develop the concept of coping capacity.

- Data on returnees are not included in the methodology. Returnees may pose considerable humanitarian needs in the countries of origin. A preliminary analysis has shown, however, that the impact of a large number of actual or potential returnees will be limited mainly on those countries which are in the "high need" category already.

3. METHODOLOGICAL NOTES FOR THE "FORGOTTEN CRISIS" ASSESSMENT (FCA)

Forgotten crises are defined as those situations of crisis where a high level of humanitarian needs persists but that receive little attention by way of donor contributions and media coverage. They tend to be long-term situations of acute human suffering caused by protracted violent conflicts where there is little international interest. Four indicators are used to determine whether a situation is considered a forgotten crisis or not: **needs**, **net ODA**[16] **per capita**, **media coverage**, **assessment by ECHO units**. To the extent possible, comments and suggestions from previous years aiming at the improvement of the tool have been taken into consideration. More detailed explanations will be provided below.

3.1. Selection of the countries

The selection of countries for the Forgotten Crises Assessment 2005 is essentially based on the country list provided by the HIIK[17] that consists of all countries in the world where a conflict in 2004 is regarded to be of intensity 3 or greater according to the definitions described in the table below:

State of Violence	Intensity Group	Level of Intensity	Name of Intensity	Definition
Non-violent	Low	1	Latent Conflict	A positional difference on definable values of national meaning is considered to be a latent conflict if respective demands are articulated by one of the parties and perceived by the other as such.
		2	Manifest Conflict	A manifest conflict includes the use of measures that are located in the forefield of violent force. This concerns for example verbal pressure, threatening publicly with violence, or the imposition of economic sanctions.
Violent	medium	3	Crisis	A crisis is a tense situation in which at least one of the parties uses violent force in single incidents.
	High	4	Severe Crisis	A conflict is considered to be a severe crisis if violent force is repeatedly used in an organized way.
		5	War	Wars are a type of violent conflicts in which violent force is used with a certain continuity in an organized and systematic way. The conflict parties apply extensive measures, according to the situation. The amount of destruction is vast and of long duration.

---

[16] Official Development Assistance

[17] Heidelberg Institute on International Conflict Research at the Department of Political Science, University of Heidelberg

This is a change in comparison to the previous year when the list was based on ReliefWeb. Comments on last year´s exercise pointed out that there were too many irrelevant cases on the ReliefWeb list. For the 2005 exercise we therefore included only conflicts regarded as violent in 2004 (intensity level 3 or more according to HIIK). The list includes only those countries that appear on the GNA list, i.e. those countries and territories where ECHO would be likely to intervene.

3.2. Selection of indicators for needs

The assessment uses four indicators in order to arrive at a consensual perception as to whether a crisis is forgotten or not.

- ➢ **Needs:** GNA score excluding ODA data

- ➢ **External assistance:** GNA score on Net ODA per capita

- ➢ **Media coverage:** Articles related to conflict situation in each country

- ➢ **Categorization by units:** qualitative assessment by ECHO geographical units

The logic driving the use of the first two indicators is that countries with high needs receiving low levels of assistance are likely to be forgotten by the donor community.

3.2.1. Needs

The starting point for the forgotten crises assessment is the GNA undertaken by ECHO. The countries and territories are ranked according to the needs only. ODA is therefore excluded in this first indicator. A quartile method is used whereby the 25% of countries hosting the highest needs are classified as "**high**" needs and receive a score of 3, the 50% in the middle as "**medium**" needs receiving a score of 2, and 25% least affected as "**low**" receiving a score of 1. For a full explanation of the GNA methodology refer to chapter 2 above.

3.2.2. External assistance

The net ODA per capita as used in the GNA is taken as the second indicator. A classification into "**high**", "**medium**" and "**low**" was applied according to the quartile method used for other indicators. A low Net ODA per capita results in a "high" classification and a score of 3, a medium classification results in a score of 2, while a high net ODA per capita results in a "low" classification and a score of 1.

3.2.3. Media coverage

A study conducted by the JRC[18] on the request of ECHO focused on countries that have been experiencing violent conflict, security or humanitarian concerns during 2004. A statistical analysis was carried out counting articles in which a selected

---

18   Joint Research Centre, see http://www.jrc.cec.eu.int/.

number of key themes relevant for humanitarian aid appeared with a reference to a given country. Three keyword clusters were used ("conflict", "security", "humanitarian crisis"), each cluster containing a series of relevant keywords. A detailed description of keywords used can be obtained from ECHO 4. Source data included 600 news sites in 20 different languages[19], thus expanding considerably the scope of the analysis compared to last year´s exercise. The screening covered the period 24th January and 26th May 2004.

JRC uses state-of-the-art technology encompassing a sophisticated method to identify keywords, thus reducing the number of irrelevant articles to the extent possible. The results coincide to a surprisingly large extent with the subjective assessments of ECHO units. A quartile method is used to score the countries according to the media coverage received, 3 for low coverage, 2 for medium coverage, and 1 for high coverage.

3.2.4. *Categorization by ECHO units*

In order to complement the assessment with an expert input, the geographical units in ECHO grade the countries and territories under their responsibility. Where a crisis is considered forgotten by the unit a score of 3 is attributed. Where there are considered to be important forgotten or uncovered needs a score of 2 is attributed. Where a crisis is considered not to be forgotten a score of 1 is attributed. A score of 0 is attributed to all countries and territories that are not considered relevant due to a lack of acute crisis.

3.3. Presentation

For each country/territory the scores of the four indicators were added and ranked. Countries and territories receiving a total score of 10 or more are considered forgotten crises. Countries considered of particular pertinence are those amongst the forgotten crises where the overall assessment matches the ECHO unit assessment.

Countries scoring 6 or more are considered to fall into the category forgotten needs / uncovered needs, while those below a score of 6 are considered not forgotten.

3.4. Limitations of the Forgotten Crisis Methodology

The assessment needs to be interpreted with care because of the inevitable limitations of the data and the method.

- Net ODA may hide the capacity of a net recipient to provide aid itself to other countries. Another consideration is that ODA is often provided on political basis rather than on the basis of needs.

- The identification of keywords to determine media coverage is not an obvious task, especially when searching in various languages.

---

[19]   Data used for the analysis were retrieved from the EMM News Brief. See http://emm.jrc.org

4. OUTLOOK

In view of further enhancing ECHO´s possibility to react to the evolution of the humanitarian environment and to better target most needy populations, the methodology presented in this paper is flexible enough to adapt to changing context. With the support of the EC Joint Research Centre (JRC), which already took over large parts of the data input this year, it will be feasible to further develop the instrument by, for example, introducing additional data layers reflecting, e.g. population density, HIV/AIDS prevalence, projections based on population dynamics etc. ECHO 4 will see with JRC what can be done for the 2006 exercise.

5. SOURCES

Global Needs Assessment

2.2. Global indicators

General Data: Population & GDP per capita:

Central Intelligence Agency (CIA)

CIA http://www.cia.gov/index.html

CIA - The World Factbook 2004►
http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/index.html

Population (WFB) ► http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/fields/2119.html

GDP per capita (WFB)► http://www.cia.gov/cia/publications/factbook/fields/2004.html

2.2.1. Human development Indicators

Human development data:

United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)

UNDP http://www.undp.org/

Human development report (HDR 2004)

HDR 2004 ► http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/

Human development index

HD Indicators ► http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_backmatter_1.pdf

 HDI ► http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_HDI.pdf

Human and Income poverty: developing countries

HPI ► http://hdr.undp.org/reports/global/2004/pdf/hdr04_HDI.pdf

HPI-1 rank ► http://hdr.undp.org/statistics/data/indic/indic_18_1_1.html

Human and income poverty: OECD, Central & Eastern Europe & CIS
HPI-2 rank ► http://hdr.undp.org/statistics/data/indic/indic_28_1_1.html

2.2.2. Natural Disasters and man-made Disaster Proneness

Natural Disaster data:

Center for Research of Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED)

CRED► http://www.cred.be/

NatDis ► http://www.em-dat.net/

NatDis 1992-2004 ► http://www.em-dat.net/disasters/statisti.htm

Man-made disaster data:

Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research (HIIK)

HIIK Conflicts ► http://www.hiik.de/en/index_e.htm

2.2.3. Refugees and Internal Displaced Person's

Population & GDP data: see above under General data

Refugee data:

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees

(UNHCR)► http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home

UNHCR Refugee data ► http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texi-s/vtx/statistics

Refugees data ► http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=STATISTICS&id=40e3cafb4&page=statistics

United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNWRA)► http://www.un.org/unrwa/

Refugees ►http://www.un.org/unrwa/publications/statis-01.html

Internal displaced person's (IDP's) data:

UNHCR http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home

IDP data ► http://www.unhcr.ch/cgi-bin/texis/vtx/home/opendoc.pdf?tbl=STATISTICS&id=40e3cafb4&page=statistics

U.S. Committee for Refugees (USCR) http://www.refugees.org/index.cfm

IDP data.pdf ► http://www.refugees.org/wrs04/pdf/idps.pdf

Global IDP Project► http://www.idpproject.org/index.htm

IDP database ► http://www.idpproject.org/about_the_database.htm

IDP World map ► http://www.idpproject.org/images/website_maps/IDP_worldmap.gif

http://www.idpproject.org/IDP_table.htm

2.2.4. Health & Mortality

United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)

The State of the World's Children 2004 http://www.unicef.org/sowc04/index.html

& UNICEF ► http://www.childinfo.org/

Children under weight of age data:

CU5WA ► http://www.unicef.org/files/Table2.pdf

Under five mortality data:

U5MR basic indicators ► http://www.unicef.org/files/Table1.pdf

U5MR mortality under five ranking ► http://www.unicef.org/files/Table1.pdf

2.2.5. Official Development Assistance (ODA)

Organisation of Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

OECD ► http://www.oecd.org/home/

ODA ► http://www.oecd.org/department/0,2688,en_2649_33721_1_1_1_1_1,00.html

FORGOTTEN CRISES

3.2.3. Media coverage

JRC ► http://www.jrc.cec.eu.int/

EMM News Brief. ► http://emm.jrc.org

Peter BILLING / Fausto PRIETO PEREZ