

EN

EN

EN



EUROPEAN COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE-GENERAL FOR HUMANITARIAN AID - ECHO

Policy affairs, relations with European institutions, partners and other donors; strategy and general coordination; evaluation, thematic funding

Brussels, 4 August 2006
DG ECHO/UNIT 0/1 ML

TECHNICAL NOTE

Assessment of humanitarian needs and identification of “forgotten crises”

CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| SUMMARY | 4 |
| 1. Introduction | 5 |
| 2. Tools previously used: GNA and FCA | 6 |
| 3. Changes in methodology | 7 |
| 3.1. Global Needs Assessment | 7 |
| 3.2. Forgotten Crises Assessment | 8 |
| 4. Changes in the indicators | 8 |
| 4.1. Vulnerability Index (VI) | 8 |
| 4.2. Crisis Index (CI)..... | 9 |
| 5. Conclusion..... | 10 |
| ANNEX 1: DETAILED METHODOLOGY | 11 |
| 1. Selection of countries for GNA..... | 11 |
| 2. Vulnerability Index | 11 |
| 2.1. Indicator 1: Human Development Index..... | 12 |
| 2.2. Indicator 2: Human Poverty Index | 12 |
| 2.3. Indicator 3: Uprooted people | 13 |
| 2.4. Indicator 4: Malnutrition in children under five | 14 |
| 2.5. Indicator 5: Mortality in children under five..... | 14 |
| 2.6. Indicator 6: Access to health care | 14 |
| 2.7. Indicator 7: Prevalence of HIV-AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria | 14 |
| 2.8. Indicator 8: Gender-specific Human Development Index | 15 |
| 2.9. Indicator 9: Gini Index | 15 |
| 3. Crisis Index | 15 |
| 4. FCA Index | 16 |
| 4.1. Indicator 1: Vulnerability Index (see above) | 16 |
| 4.2. Indicator 2: Media coverage..... | 16 |
| 4.3. Indicator 3: Public Aid per capita (Per capita public aid)..... | 16 |
| 4.4. Qualitative assessment of DG ECHO geographical units and experts | 17 |

| | |
|---|----|
| ANNEX 2: THRESHOLDS APPLIED TO INDICATORS | 18 |
| ANNEX 3: IMPACT ON RESULTS..... | 20 |
| Comments..... | 21 |
| ANNEX 4: FCA FORM..... | 22 |

SUMMARY

The European Commission bases its decisions on humanitarian aid solely on assessment of the needs of the people concerned, in accordance with the principles of impartiality, neutrality and independence. It identifies the neediest people in two ways: by assessing needs on the spot, and by making a global assessment by country using certain national indicators that reflect the degree of vulnerability of the population as a whole.

It has developed two tools to do this: the GNA or Global Needs Assessment, which classifies countries according to the relative importance of their needs, and the FCA or Forgotten Crises Assessment, which attempts to identify serious humanitarian crisis situations where the people are receiving not enough international aid or even none at all. The purpose of these tools is to establish some consistency in the allocation of resources to different countries according to their respective needs, regardless of political pressure of any kind, and to guarantee the credibility and transparency of Community humanitarian aid.

Although these tools are useful and relevant, it is felt that they could be improved.

For the GNA, the introduction of an additional filter makes it possible to differentiate between needs arising from a disaster, whether natural or man-made, and needs arising from a situation of extreme poverty, and thus to identify situations that meet the intervention criteria of the Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid (DG ECHO), whose mandate, as laid down by Council Regulation (EC) No 1257/96, does not cover situations of structural humanitarian need. The GNA is therefore done in two stages: the first stage identifies the most vulnerable countries, where humanitarian needs are likely to be greater in the event of a disaster, using a *vulnerability index*, and the second stage identifies countries that are effectively in a humanitarian crisis situation corresponding to the DG ECHO intervention criteria, by means of a *crisis index*; taken together the two indices define the priorities for intervention. The relevance of this approach is confirmed by the budget allocation for 2006.

For the FCA, the indicators used were found to be difficult to interpret, so it was decided to refine and systematise the qualitative assessment in order to make it more rigorous.

1. INTRODUCTION

Humanitarian aid is the concrete expression of the values of humanity and solidarity which are the backbone of European integration. The implementation of the Commission's humanitarian policy is also based on the fundamental principles of impartiality, neutrality and independence.

In practical terms, applying these principles means that European humanitarian action is dictated exclusively by the scale of the needs and the interest of the victims, without any ethnic, national or religious consideration and without discrimination of any kind, without bias towards any particular side in a conflict and without mixing humanitarian objectives and political, economic or military objectives. The decisions to grant aid are therefore based solely on the evaluation of the needs of the people receiving it. The principle of action based on needs also means that the Directorate-General for Humanitarian Aid (DG ECHO) pays particular attention to crises that generally occurred some time ago and are neglected or even forgotten by the media and donors.

To implement its policy of assisting people with the greatest humanitarian needs and to define its priorities according to the principles of impartiality, neutrality and independence, DG ECHO identifies such people using a twofold approach:

- a 'bottom-up' assessment of needs by DG ECHO's field experts in the countries concerned and by its country desks at headquarters, and
- a 'top-down' assessment in two parts, the global evaluation of the humanitarian needs of developing countries (*Global Needs Assessment - GNA*) and the identification of forgotten crises (*Forgotten Crisis Assessment - FCA*).

The former "GNA index" that classified countries according to the relative scale of their needs has now been replaced by two indices: the *vulnerability index* (VI), which identifies countries likely to suffer more than others from a humanitarian perspective in the event of a disaster, and the *crisis index* (CI), which identifies countries that are effectively in a humanitarian crisis situation corresponding to the DG ECHO intervention criteria.

The FCA index is from now on supplemented by a qualitative analysis.

These GNA and FCA tools do not seek to define in what form and on what scale the Commission should intervene in response to a humanitarian crisis. Their objectives are far more modest and are confined to the identification of priority countries where humanitarian needs are greatest or most neglected and where Commission aid is most necessary. They are intended to be a common alternative reference framework to ensure some consistency in the allocation of resources among the various geographical zones according to their respective needs.

These tools are also objective measuring instruments ensuring that the principle of independence is applied. In addition, they allow rapid *ex post* control of the allocation of resources to the most vulnerable people in countries where need is greatest. Finally, they ensure the credibility and transparency of the Commission's humanitarian aid vis-à-vis the European citizen.

2. THE TOOLS PREVIOUSLY USED: GNA AND FCA INDICES

GNA indexing was based on the premise that in time of crisis the need for humanitarian aid is greatest in the least developed and poorest countries, since they are less able to meet their own needs in the event of a humanitarian disaster, countries most exposed to the risk of a disaster happening and where sections of the population are particularly vulnerable (e.g. countries with large numbers of refugees or internally displaced persons and poor health among young children).

These weakness factors were measured using seven indicators:

GNA INDEX

Indicator 1: human development index

Indicator 2: human poverty index

Indicator 3: refugees received and displaced persons

Indicator 4: malnutrition in children under five

Indicator 5: mortality rate in children under five

Indicator 6: exposure to natural disasters

Indicator 7: exposure to conflicts

These indicators aggregated in the GNA index made it possible to divide countries into three groups using the quartile method:

Group 1: GNA index = 3 → country with high-level needs (first quartile)

Group 2: GNA index = 2 → country with medium-level needs (centre 50%)

Group 3: GNA index = 1 → country with low-level needs (last quartile).

The **FCA index** was based on a combination of the following factors: high humanitarian needs as reflected in the GNA index, little or no media coverage, little donor interest reflected in the level of public aid received and an on-the-spot assessment by the Commission's experts and geographical units.

FCA INDEX:

Indicator 1: GNA index, reflecting humanitarian needs

Indicator 2: media coverage

Indicator 3: level of aid received per capita, reflecting the degree of donor interest

Indicator 4: on-the-spot assessment by the experts and geographical units of

DG ECHO

The FCA index corresponded to the sum of the four indicators, and countries and territories with a high index (over nine) were considered to be forgotten crises and so priority areas for budgetary allocations.

3. CHANGES IN METHODOLOGY

3.1. Global Needs Assessment

The Commission did not, however, intervene systematically on the humanitarian front in all the countries classified by the GNA index as having high-level needs; in practice an additional filter was added according to whether a country was actually suffering an acute crisis or not, as DG ECHO's mandate does not extend to situations of underdevelopment.

In effect, the GNA index combined indications of the vulnerability of a population in the event of a crisis resulting from a natural disaster or conflict with indications of the risk for such a crisis to occur. Also, the indicators of exposure to disasters and conflicts were ambiguous as they attempted to identify the actual existence of a crisis and at the same time the risk that one might arise (exposure of the country to this type of risk). With regards to DG ECHO's mandate to intervene in the event of a crisis, the GNA index did not indicate whether the event that should trigger a humanitarian intervention had taken place or not.

An evaluation in two distinct stages/steps reflects better the method effectively followed:

First stage: *assessment of the vulnerability of countries*, identifying those likely to suffer more than others on the humanitarian front in the event of a disaster. This assessment helps drawing up a list of countries we may call “under surveillance”.

Vulnerability is measured by the *vulnerability index* (VI) which, like the GNA index, brings together different indicators reflecting the weakness of a country as well as the lack of internal resources and capacities to cope with adversity by itself.

Second stage: *identification of countries actually in a humanitarian crisis situation*, corresponding to the DG ECHO conditions for intervention.

If we assume that the humanitarian needs that DG ECHO is mandated to cover will decrease over time after the end of the crisis, the *crisis index* (CI) decreases over time, depending on whether the country is still in a humanitarian crisis or whether the situation occurred one or two years before.

By combining the two scores/by putting the two scores side by side,, CI and VI, it is thus possible to identify the priority countries for humanitarian aid.

| |
|---|
| Former GNA index → crisis index CI and vulnerability index VI |
|---|

The impact of the change in the method on the results is set out in Annex 3. Overall, the proposed method corresponds more closely to DG ECHO's actual budgetary allocation.

Two additional remarks:

- for countries with a crisis index of 2 or 1, reflecting a state of crisis that occurred some time ago, decisions should in principle be of a non-urgent nature only, except for decisions in the event of a crisis where the number of victims is below the thresholds for inclusion in the index;
- this crisis index must be updated if a new disaster occurs.

3.2. Forgotten Crises Assessment

“Forgotten crises” almost always concern minorities within a country, groups of people whose living conditions are below the average for the country as a whole. For cases such as Sahrawi refugees in Algeria, ethnic minorities in Myanmar or the Chechen people, it is clear that the national indicators used to form the vulnerability index or the level of public aid cannot reflect their specific situation.

Furthermore, both the indicator for public aid and the indicator for media coverage are difficult to interpret accurately. Thus the indicator for public aid is somewhat distorted for relatively rich countries such as Iran, Libya and Russia, which do not in principle receive very much public aid and therefore have a mathematical score of 3, which does not, however, reflect a neglected humanitarian situation. The problem with the media coverage indicator is that it fails to take account of whether there is a crisis or not; it is in fact quite natural for the media not to pay much attention to crises that are “old news”, but the indicator will nevertheless have a score of 3.

It is also necessary to ensure that assessments by the geographical units are consistent.

It was therefore decided to make a more detailed analysis, confined to countries actually in a conflict situation; the desk officers can always add to the list if they think fit other cases, for example arising from natural disasters.

The public aid and media coverage indicators are calculated by applying the quartile rule only to those countries covered by the detailed analysis.

The second stage of the assessment is a response to the realisation that there are no accurate indicators for forgotten crises, since it is clear that the more a crisis is neglected the less easy it is to find reliable data on the situation. For each of the situations under examination there must therefore be a qualitative analysis based on the work of the desk officers. To ensure that this analysis is methodical it is guided by a series of questions (see form, Annex 4).

These individual analyses are collated centrally to ensure consistency, and the results allow to identify very precarious humanitarian situations requiring the Commission’s special attention, where there is little or no humanitarian aid from other sources.

4. CHANGES TO THE INDICATORS

4.1. Vulnerability Index (VI)

The *vulnerability index* is calculated in much the same way as the GNA index, excluding the two indicators for natural disasters and conflicts. However, four other indicators have been added to the index, measuring the *health situation* in the country, as reflected in access to health care and the prevalence of certain diseases (HIV-AIDS, malaria and tuberculosis) and *inequalities within the population*, in particular gender inequalities, as measured by the gender-specific human development index computed by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and income-distribution inequalities, as measured by the Gini index, also calculated by the UNDP. It is thought that these different factors can strongly influence the vulnerability of a group and their capacity to cope with a disaster.

VULNERABILITY INDEX:Category 1: general situation in the country*Indicator 1: human development index**Indicator 2: human poverty index*Category 2: uprooted people*Indicator 3: refugees received, displaced persons and recent returnees*Category 3: health of children under five*Indicator 4: malnutrition**Indicator 5: mortality*Category 4: other vulnerability factors*Indicator 6: access to health care**Indicator 7: prevalence of HIV-AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria**Indicator 8: gender-specific human development index**Indicator 9: Gini Index**(for details see Annex 1)***4.2. Crisis Index (CI)**

It is thought that as a general rule the humanitarian needs DG ECHO is mandated to cover decrease over time after the end of a crisis.

It should also be remembered that one of DG ECHO's priorities is uprooted people and that there are large numbers of refugees or internally displaced people in countries that are relatively vulnerable and yet not in a crisis situation or which are not listed as countries in crisis due to the low intensity of violence. These uprooted people may nevertheless have serious humanitarian needs that the host country is not always able – or willing – to meet. Tanzania and Congo Brazzaville are examples.

With these two considerations in mind, the *crisis index* (IC) is calculated as follows:

- a score of 3 for countries that have suffered or are still suffering a natural disaster and/or a violent conflict in the current year, or are receiving a large number of uprooted people,
- a score of 2 for countries that suffered this type of situation the previous year,
- a score of 1 for countries that suffered this type of situation two years previously.

CRISIS INDEX:*Indicator 1: ongoing or recently resolved conflict**Indicator 2: recent natural disaster**Indicator 3: large number of uprooted people (refugees and/or internally displaced people)**(for details see Annex 1)*

5. CONCLUSION

The GNA and FCA tools are, inevitably, based on indicators that are subject to both historical and geographical constraints, given the length of time it takes to collect data and the fact that they are worked out on a national scale, without taking account of the specific situations of certain groups of people within a country. The results should therefore be seen in perspective, i.e. one should look only at the orders of magnitude they reflect, without attaching too much importance to where each country is ranked in each of the categories. Further, these tools give no indication of the scale of needs in absolute figures and cannot therefore be used to work out the budget allocation, since they do not take account of the number of people affected by the crisis, the capacity of the local community to take up the aid, access, other donors, the ability of partners to intervene effectively in the area, and so on.

It is therefore essential to balance this type of “top-down” approach with the “bottom-up” approach consisting of analysis by experts on the spot, who can identify humanitarian crisis pockets and back up their proposals for action with a needs assessment that is recent and as comprehensive as possible.

Despite these shortcomings, the GNA and FCA tools are invaluable for ensuring compliance with the principles of impartiality and independence and the corresponding commitment to channel humanitarian action solely on the basis of the needs of the people affected. They make it possible to identify priority countries; they ensure some consistency in the allocation of budget resources among the various geographical areas and facilitate *ex post* control of how those resources are used; they are objective measuring instruments; in short they guarantee the transparency of the Commission’s humanitarian action vis-à-vis both the European taxpayer and the aid recipients.

In conclusion, in its current form the vulnerability index is a better reflection of DG ECHO’s priority targets, i.e. the most vulnerable people, as it comprises indicators not only for children and uprooted people but also for the prevalence of AIDS and for gender and income inequalities.

ANNEX 1: DETAILED METHODOLOGY

1. SELECTION OF COUNTRIES FOR GNA

The list of countries included in the GNA is based on the World Bank list. From that list were removed:

- all the countries classified by the World Bank as high-income economies,
- all the Member States and candidate countries for accession to the European Union, as these are not covered by DG ECHO's legal mandate,
- some small islands with limited sovereignty (American Samoa, Marshall Islands, Northern Mariana Islands and Mayotte).

The list also includes Chechnya; although not independent, Chechnya is in a very particular situation within the Russian Federation, afflicted as it is by violent conflict and a very large number of displaced persons.

2. VULNERABILITY INDEX

The vulnerability index is based on nine indicators, divided into four categories all with equal weighting.

- **Category 1: general situation in the country**

Indicator 1: human development index

Indicator 2: human poverty index

- **Category 2: uprooted people**

Indicator 3: refugees, displaced persons and recent returnees

- **Category 3: health of children under five**

Indicator 4: malnutrition

Indicator 5: mortality

- **Category 4: other vulnerability factors**

Indicator 6: access to health care

Indicator 7: prevalence of HIV-AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria

Indicator 8: gender-specific human development index

Indicator 9: Gini Index

The nine indicators listed above are graded on a scale from 0 to 3, with 0 representing no needs and 3 representing high needs, except for indicator 3 which combines the data on refugees and IDPs, which is graded on a scale from 0 to 6. The thresholds for each indicator are given in Annex 2.

These indicators are then aggregated in the **vulnerability index (VI)** with each of the four categories carrying an equal weighting of 25% (missing indicators, marked with an “x”, are not taken into account), which means a weighting of 12.5% for indicators 1, 2, 4 and 5, a weighting of 25% for indicator 3 and a weighting of 6.75% for indicators 6 to 9. The 139

countries and territories on the list are then ranked in decreasing order of their scores and divided, according to the quartile rule, into three categories according to the scale of their needs.

Finally, a note may be added to the VI to indicate that several indicators are not available: one asterisk when three or four indicators are missing, two asterisks when five or six are missing and three asterisks when more than six are missing.

2.1. Indicator 1: Human Development Index

It is assumed that the more developed a country is the better its people will be able to respond to humanitarian needs using their own individual or national resources.

The human development index (HDI) calculated for each country by the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) was chosen to reflect the state of these resources. Updated annually,¹ this composite index adds together the arithmetic average score for three essential criteria essential for human development:

- longevity and health, as measured by life expectancy at birth,
- education and access to knowledge, 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),
- the possibility of enjoying a decent standard of living, as measured by GDP per capita in purchasing power parity (exchange rate intended to offset price differences between countries).

2.2. Indicator 2: Human Poverty Index

While the HDI measures the average achievement of a country in terms of development, the human poverty index (HPI), also calculated and updated annually by the UNDP, focuses on the section of the population below the threshold of the basic criteria for human development. It examines the deprivations that may be observed in the three fundamental dimensions already taken into account in the human development indicator:

- longevity and health: risk of relatively early death, as measured by the probability at birth of not surviving to age 40,
- education and access to knowledge: exclusion from the world of reading and communications, as measured by the adult literacy rate,
- possibility of having a decent standard of living: impossibility of access to the provisioning of the economy as a whole, as measured by the non-weighted average of two indicators: the percentage of the population with no regular access to water supply points and the percentage of children who are underweight for their age.

The HPI thus measures social exclusion and the size of the most vulnerable population and is therefore of particular interest to DG ECHO in defining its priorities.

¹ UNDP, *Human Development Report 2005*, September 2005, <http://hdr.undp.org/reports/>

For the 40 or so countries for which the UNDP gives no HPI, the indicator is estimated on the basis of the data available. For about a dozen cases, the data necessary to calculate the index can be found from other sources (UNICEF and UNDP), and so the formula for calculating the HPI can be applied. For 28 countries where the probability of surviving to 40 is unknown, the probability is estimated on the basis of life expectancy at birth, and in 11 cases the HPI is calculated on the basis of the three data available out of the four required. It is felt that, for the purposes of the GNA index, a slightly inaccurate HPI figure is better than none at all.

Finally, it should be noted that DG ECHO does not follow the approach of the UNDP, which (although lack of data prevents it from doing so in reality) provides for an HPI-2 index for the countries of eastern Europe and the CIS countries, the same as that used for the OECD countries, based on different parameters (probability of death before 60/illiteracy rate/percentage of people living below the poverty line/long-term unemployment rate). The same formula as that applied to other developing countries is used in order to allow comparison.

2.3. Indicator 3: Uprooted people

Refugees and internally displaced persons (IDPs) are among the most vulnerable people in a humanitarian crisis, the people at the heart of DG ECHO's mandate. Their importance must be taken into account when assessing global needs. Also, given that returnees initially increase the vulnerability of a country, those who returned the previous year are also taken into account.

The figures for refugees and returnees are drawn up by the United Nations High Commission for Refugees (HCR)² and by the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA)³. These are people recognised as refugees under the 1951 Geneva Convention and the 1969 OAU Convention, in accordance with the UNHCR Statute, and people who have been granted a humanitarian status or temporary protection.

It is difficult to find accurate data on the number of internally displaced persons (IDPs) in a country. In many countries estimates are not reliable, for reasons of state censorship and lack of access by independent observers and also because it is not always easy to distinguish IDPs from the local population, especially if they take shelter with relatives or friends. Comparing the various data on the numbers of IDPs, it is apparent that estimates differ widely depending on the source, without any discernible trend of one source providing a more conservative or more radical estimate. It was therefore decided to use three sources: the UNHCR, the US Committee for Refugees⁴ and the Global IDP Project of the Norwegian Refugees Council⁵ and to adopt the "worst case scenario" by selecting the highest estimate of the three.

Given that the humanitarian needs of these three categories of persons are similar, even though they have a different status, countries are classified on the basis of the combined number of refugees, IDPs and recent returnees living in their territory, expressed as a percentage of the total population.

² <http://www.unhcr.org/cgi-bin/tehis/vtx/statistics>

³ <http://www.un.org/unrwa/publications/pdf/uif-dec04.pdf>

⁴ <http://www.refugees.org/>

⁵ <http://www.idpproject.org/statistics.htm>

Grading the indicator on a scale of 1 to 6 instead of 1 to 3 makes it possible to refine the categorisation in view of the importance attached to it in the VI.

2.4. Indicator 4: Malnutrition in children under five

The choice of two indicators concerning children also reflects the concern to identify the most vulnerable groups, since children certainly fall into that category.

In order to measure the first indicator concerning children, DG ECHO refers to the underweight ratios, based on the ratio between weight and age of children under five, as calculated by UNICEF in its annual State of the World's Children Report⁶. Although the weight/height ratio indicating acute malnutrition (wasting) is a better indicator for emergency situations and the weight/age ratio does not distinguish between acute malnutrition (wasting) and chronic malnutrition (stunting), it was nevertheless decided to use the weight/age ratio in the VI for two reasons: the weight/height ratio figures are not collected systematically for all countries, and by their very nature they rapidly become obsolete.

2.5. Indicator 5: Mortality in children under five

This indicator shows the probability of death between birth and the end of the fifth year per 1000 live births. It is also based on UNICEF data.

2.6. Indicator 6: Access to health care

The indicator for health care is based on the non-weighted average of the following three figures:

- number of doctors per 100 000 population
- percentage of children vaccinated against measles
- per capita public and private expenditure on health care

These data are collated in the annual report of the UNDP and then translated onto a scale of 1 to 3 by applying the quartile method. The weighted average of the three indicators is then in turn translated onto a scale of 1 to 3 by applying the quartile rule.

2.7. Indicator 7: Prevalence of HIV-AIDS, tuberculosis and malaria

The indicator for the prevalence of AIDS is calculated on the basis of data provided by UNAIDS⁷, supplemented by data from the World Health Organisation⁸, and corresponds to prevalence expressed as a percentage for the age group 15-49 years.

The data on tuberculosis and malaria also come from the WHO; for tuberculosis the figures correspond to the prevalence rate per 100 000 population and for malaria the death rate per 100 000 population. A combined indicator was then calculated on the basis of the average of the three indicators, the one for HIV-AIDS being given double weighting in view of the impact of the epidemic not only on health but also on food security and economic and social infrastructure, giving rise to widespread vulnerability of which a drop in life expectancy is only one symptom. It should also be noted that the scale of this indicator (expressed in

⁶ http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_30398.html

⁷ http://www.unaids.org/bangkok2004/GAR2004_pdf_fr/GAR2004_table_countryestimates_fr.pdf

⁸ http://www.who.int/whr/2004/annex/topic/en/annex_7_fr.pdf

percent) is of an order of magnitude very different from the other two indicators (expressed in “per hundred thousand”).

2.8. Indicator 8: Gender-specific Human Development Index

The composite gender-specific human development index (GSHDI) calculated by the UNDP measures the average achievement of a country using the same essential variables as the human development indicator.

- longevity and health, as measured by life expectancy at birth,
- education and access to knowledge, 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),
- the possibility of enjoying a decent standard of living, as measured by estimated income from work (in PPP),

but the results are adjusted on the basis of the sociological inequalities observed between men and women.

2.9. Indicator 9: Gini Index

The Gini index calculated by the UNDP indicates how much the distribution of income (or consumption) among individuals or households in a country diverges from perfect equality. Hypothetical perfect equality is represented by zero, and complete inequality is represented by 100.

3. CRISIS INDEX

The *crisis index* is calculated as follows:

- a score of 3 for countries that have suffered or are still suffering a natural disaster and/or a violent conflict in the current year, and/or are receiving a number of uprooted people above x% of the host population, where x is equal to the threshold above which the score for the uprooted persons indicator passes from 4 to 5,
- a score of 2 for countries that suffered a natural disaster and/or a violent conflict in the previous year, and/or are receiving a number of uprooted people above y% of the host population and over 50 000, where y is equal to the threshold above which the indicator score the uprooted persons indicator passes from 2 to 3,
- and a score of 1 for countries that suffered a natural disaster and/or violent conflict two years previously.

For natural disasters the data are taken from the EM-DAT database⁹ kept by the Center for Research on the Epidemiology of Disasters (CRED) of the Catholic University of Leuven, which records all natural and technological disasters, a disaster being defined as “a situation or event which overwhelms local capacity, necessitating a request to the national or international level for external assistance, or is recognised as such by a multilateral agency or by at least two sources, such as national, regional or international assistance groups and the

⁹ <http://www.em-dat.net/>

media.” Only natural events affecting at least 50 000 people and half a percent of the population are taken into account for the current year, the threshold for an event that happened two years before being 100 000 people affected and a minimum of one percent of the population. People “affected” are those requiring immediate assistance during a period of emergency, including injured, homeless, evacuated and displaced people, corresponding to the CRED “Total Affected”.

Although CRED recognises that the figures for people affected are not entirely reliable, since the definition leaves room for interpretation, it is nevertheless better to use this figure rather than the number of people killed, because it is the survivors who require emergency aid.

The humanitarian impact of a conflict is difficult to measure using quantitative data. For the 2007 strategy, DG ECHO has decided to use data provided by the Conflict Barometer 2005 Report of the HIIK (Heidelberg Institute for International Conflict Research)¹⁰ and by the Uppsala Conflict Database - "Department of Peace and Conflict Research", University of Uppsala¹¹ updated in June 2006. It has been agreed to take into account only conflicts that have caused 1000 deaths or more and with relatively high intensity of violence

4. FCA INDEX

4.1. Indicator 1: Vulnerability Index (see above)

4.2. Indicator 2: Media coverage

At DG ECHO's request, the European Joint Research Centre carries out an annual statistical analysis to assess how the press, radio and television report humanitarian disasters, be they natural or man-made. To do this analysis, four key themes relevant for humanitarian aid have been selected (“conflict”, “security”, “humanitarian crisis” and “food security”), each theme containing a series of relevant keywords. Researchers count the number of articles in which one or other of these themes appeared with reference to a given country. To do this they screen 600 news sites in 20 different languages for all the countries assessed under the GNA, over a six-month period from January to June. Then for each country they calculate the ratio of the number of articles counted concerning it with respect to the average number of articles per country. A result lower than 1 indicates that the media coverage for that country is below the average, while a result of more than 1 indicates higher than average media coverage. Then the ratios are re-calculated taking into consideration only the countries assessed under the FCA.

Finally, the quartile method is used to score the countries, a score of 3 for the 25% that received low coverage, 1 for the 25% that received high coverage, and 2 for all the ones in between.

4.3. Indicator 3: Public aid per capita

This indicator is calculated by adding the public development aid and the humanitarian aid. Public development aid is calculated on the basis of data provided by the OECD Development

¹⁰ http://www.hiik.de/en/index_en.htm

¹¹ <http://www.pcr.uu.se/database/index.php>

Assistance Committee over the last two years¹² for which data are available. It includes all the major donors and all categories of aid (grants, loans, technical cooperation, emergency aid, public aid etc., minus repayments of principal and interest paid on loans). The humanitarian aid is calculated on the basis of data provided by the OCHA Financial Tracking System¹³ over the last two years plus the year in which the exercise is done.

A score of 1, 2 or 3 is then given by applying the quartile rule, the countries with least per capita public aid receiving a score of 3.

4.4. Qualitative assessment of DG ECHO geographical units and experts

DG ECHO desk officers assess whether a humanitarian crisis has been forgotten by completing a questionnaire (see Annex 4) which attempts to cover the various points that indicate lack of response.

The completed questionnaires are then collated by the unit responsible for strategy within DG ECHO, and forgotten crises are identified on the basis of the results together with the three indicators above.

¹² <http://www.oecd.org/home/>

¹³ <http://ocha.unog.ch/fts/index.aspx>

ANNEX 2: THRESHOLDS APPLIED TO INDICATORS

24.04.06

Seuils utilisés pour le GNA

HDI

| | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-------|
| 3 | high need | ≤ | 0,5 |
| 2 | medium need | < | < 0,7 |
| 1 | low need | < | 0,8 |
| 0 | no need | ≥ | 0,8 |
| x | no data | | |

HPI

méthode des quartiles

| | | | |
|---|-------------|---|------|
| 3 | high need | > | 38,8 |
| 2 | medium need | | |
| 1 | low need | < | 11,4 |
| x | no data | | |

Ref+IDP+Ret/pop

répartition par sextiles

| | | | |
|---|-------------|---|--------|
| 6 | high need | > | 5,05 % |
| 5 | | > | 1,8% |
| 4 | medium need | > | 0,4% |
| 3 | | > | 0,17% |
| 2 | low need | > | 0,06% |
| 1 | | ≥ | 0,005% |
| 0 | no need | < | 0,005% |

Children underweight

méthode des quartiles

| | | | |
|---|-------------|---|----|
| 3 | high need | > | 26 |
| 2 | medium need | | |
| 1 | low need | < | 7 |
| x | no data | | |

% Child Mortality

méthode des quartiles

| | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-----|
| 3 | high need | ≥ | 125 |
| 2 | medium need | | |
| 1 | low need | < | 24 |
| 0 | no need | | |
| x | no data | | |

% VIH-SIDA

méthode des quartiles corrigée

| | | | |
|---|-------------|---|-----|
| 3 | high need | ≥ | 4,2 |
| 2 | medium need | ≥ | 0,2 |
| 1 | low need | ≥ | 0,1 |
| 0 | no need | < | 0,1 |
| x | no data | | |

Malaria : tx mortalité/100 000 hab.

Tuberculose : prévalence pour 100 000 hab.

Nombre de médecins pour 100 000 habitants

Tx de vaccination des enfants de -1 an c/ la rougeole

Dépenses de santé (publ.+ privées)

Indice de Gini

ISDH

Seuils proposés pour l' IV

seuils 3 et 0 donnés par le PNUD

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|------|
| 3 | high vulnerab. | < | 0,5 |
| 2 | medium vulner. | ≥ | 0,5 |
| 1 | low vulnerab. | ≥ | 0,65 |
| 0 | no vulnerab. | ≥ | 0,8 |
| x | no data | | |

maintien de la méthode des quartiles

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|------|
| 3 | high vulnerab. | > | idem |
| 2 | medium vulner. | | |
| 1 | low vulnerab. | < | |
| x | no data | | |

seuils forfaitaires

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|--------|
| 6 | high vulnerab. | > | 10% |
| 5 | | > | 3% |
| 4 | medium vulner. | > | 1% |
| 3 | | > | 0,5% |
| 2 | low vulnerab. | > | 0,1 % |
| 1 | | ≥ | 0,005% |
| 0 | no vulnerab. | < | 0,005% |

seuils forfaitaires

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|----|
| 3 | high vulnerab. | > | 20 |
| 2 | medium vulner. | | |
| 1 | low vulnerab. | < | 10 |
| x | no data | | |

méthode des quartiles corrigée

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|------|
| 3 | high vulnerab. | > | idem |
| 2 | medium vulner. | | idem |
| 1 | low vulnerab. | < | idem |
| 0 | no vulnerab. | < | 10 |
| x | no data | | |

seuils forfaitaires

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|-----|
| 3 | high vulnerab. | > | 10 |
| 2 | medium vulner. | > | 5 |
| 1 | low vulnerab. | > | 0,1 |
| 0 | no vulnerab. | ≤ | 0,1 |
| x | no data | | |

seuils forfaitaires

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|-----|
| 3 | high vulnerab. | ≥ | 100 |
| 2 | medium vulner. | > | 50 |
| 1 | low vulnerab. | > | 0 |
| 0 | no vulnerab. | = | 0 |
| x | no data | | |

méthode des quartiles corrigée

| | | | |
|---|----------------|---|-----|
| 3 | high vulnerab. | > | 420 |
| 2 | medium vulner. | > | 65 |
| 1 | low vulnerab. | ≥ | 20 |
| 0 | no vulnerab. | < | 20 |
| x | no data | | |

application de la méthode
des quartiles

Catastrophes naturelles

1 événement (év.) = au moins 1000 décès ou 5% de la popul. touchée

| | | |
|---|-------------|--|
| 3 | high need | 1 év. au 1er sem. année en cours ou +4 év. les 12 années précédentes |
| 2 | medium need | 2 à 4 év. les 12 années précéd. |
| 1 | low need | 1 év. les 12 années précédentes |

Conflits

conflits d'intensité 4 et 5 selon HIIK

| | | |
|---|-------------|---|
| 3 | high need | 1 conflit en cours |
| 2 | medium need | 2 ou + conflits les 10 dernières années |
| 1 | low need | 1 conflit les 10 dernières années |
| 0 | no need | aucun conflit depuis + 10 ans |

Réfugiés

Seuils proposés pour l' IC

| | |
|---|--|
| 3 | 50 000 pers. et 0,5% de la popul. touchées l'année en cours |
| 2 | 100 000 pers. et 1% de la popul. touchées l'année précédente |
| 1 | 100 000 pers. et 1% de la popul. touchées 2 années avant |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | 1 conflit violent durant l'année en cours |
| 2 | 1 conflit violent durant l'année précédente |
| 1 | 1 conflit violent 2 années plutôt |
| 0 | aucun conflit ou conflit dénoué depuis 3 ans au moins |

| | |
|---|---|
| 3 | nombre de réfugiés > 3% de la population d'accueil |
| 2 | nombre de réfugiés > 0,5% de la population d'accueil et > 50000 |
| 0 | |

ANNEX 3: IMPACT ON RESULTS

| GVA 2006 | GNA (7 indicators) | | | | IV (9 indicat/ pv) | | | | | | | | | | | | IC | | | Budg. 2006 |
|------------------------|-----------------------|-------|------|-----|-----------------------|------|-----|-------|------|------|-----|-----|---------------|------|------|-------|----|----|---|---------------|
| | rank | score | aver | | score | aver | HDI | HPI-1 | R+I+ | U5UW | U5M | SMT | Soins méd. | ISDH | Gini | C/NDR | Co | ND | R | |
| Russian Fed. (Chech) | 17 | 3 | 2.25 | *** | 3 | 3.00 | x | x | 6 | x | x | x | x | x | x | 3 | 3 | x | 0 | 26 |
| Somalia | 4 | 3 | 2.57 | * | 3 | 2.50 | x | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | x | x | x | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 9 |
| Afghanistan | 1 | 3 | 2.71 | * | 3 | 2.42 | x | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 1 | x | x | x | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Congo, Democratic R | 2 | 3 | 2.63 | | 3 | 2.33 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | x | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Cote d'Ivoire | 5 | 3 | 2.50 | | 3 | 2.25 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| Iraq | 15 | 3 | 2.29 | * | 3 | 2.25 | x | 3 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 1 | x | x | x | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Burundi | 2 | 3 | 2.63 | | 3 | 2.20 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Djibouti | 17 | 3 | 2.25 | | 3 | 2.13 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | x | x | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | x |
| Sudan | 8 | 3 | 2.38 | | 3 | 1.94 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | x | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Uganda | 17 | 3 | 2.25 | | 3 | 1.90 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 15 |
| Zimbabwe | 23 | 3 | 2.13 | | 3 | 1.90 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 12 |
| Nigeria | 8 | 3 | 2.38 | | 3 | 1.90 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Myanmar, Union of | 23 | 3 | 2.13 | | 3 | 1.88 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | x | x | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Mali | 23 | 3 | 2.13 | | 3 | 1.80 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | x |
| Nepal | 23 | 3 | 2.13 | | 2 | 1.75 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Mozambique | 46 | 2 | 1.75 | | 2 | 1.75 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Occ. Palest.Terr. (We | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | * | 2 | 1.71 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | x | 2 | x | x | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 34 |
| Niger | 32 | 2 | 2.00 | | 2 | 1.70 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 2 |
| Yemen | 32 | 2 | 2.00 | | 2 | 1.60 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Pakistan | 39 | 2 | 1.88 | | 2 | 1.55 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 2 | x |
| Cambodia | 39 | 2 | 1.88 | | 2 | 1.50 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Algeria* | 46 | 2 | 1.75 | | 2 | 1.40 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 10 |
| Lebanon | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | | 2 | 1.39 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | x | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | x |
| Haiti | 46 | 2 | 1.75 | | 2 | 1.38 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | x | x | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Jordan | 75 | 2 | 1.38 | | 2 | 1.35 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | x |
| India | 23 | 3 | 2.13 | | 2 | 1.35 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| Indonesia | 23 | 3 | 2.13 | | 2 | 1.30 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Armenia | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | | 2 | 1.30 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Laos | 39 | 2 | 1.88 | | 2 | 1.30 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Korea Dem.People's R | 83 | 2 | 1.29 | * | 2 | 1.25 | x | 2 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | x | x | x | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 16 |
| Colombia | 39 | 2 | 1.88 | | 2 | 1.20 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 12 |
| Philippines | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | | 2 | 1.20 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Guyana | 84 | 2 | 1.25 | | 2 | 1.11 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | x | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| China (w/out HongKor | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | | 2 | 1.10 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Albania | 122 | 1 | 0.63 | | 1 | 0.75 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Angola | 8 | 3 | 2.38 | | 3 | 2.33 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | x | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Chad | 5 | 3 | 2.50 | | 3 | 2.22 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | x | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 13.5 |
| Zambia | 8 | 3 | 2.38 | | 3 | 2.20 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Guinea | 17 | 3 | 2.25 | | 3 | 2.17 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | x | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | x |
| Sierra Leone | 17 | 3 | 2.25 | | 3 | 2.15 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Tanzania | 23 | 3 | 2.13 | | 3 | 2.00 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 11.5 |
| Rwanda | 8 | 3 | 2.38 | | 3 | 2.00 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Kenya | 32 | 2 | 2.00 | | 3 | 1.90 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Ethiopia | 5 | 3 | 2.50 | | 3 | 1.85 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Congo, Rep. Of | 32 | 2 | 2.00 | | 3 | 1.83 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | x | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 |
| Swaziland | 46 | 2 | 1.75 | | 2 | 1.70 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Bangladesh | 23 | 3 | 2.13 | | 2 | 1.55 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Madagascar | 66 | 2 | 1.50 | | 2 | 1.55 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Serbia and Montenegro | 73 | 2 | 1.43 | * | 2 | 1.42 | x | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | x | x | x | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Iran, Islamic Republic | 46 | 2 | 1.75 | | 2 | 1.40 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | x |
| Sri Lanka | 39 | 2 | 1.88 | | 2 | 1.35 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 7 |
| Syrian Arab Republic | 75 | 2 | 1.38 | | 2 | 1.33 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | x | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | x |
| South Africa | 66 | 2 | 1.50 | | 2 | 1.30 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Thailand | 32 | 2 | 2.00 | | 2 | 1.25 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 7.5 |
| Bosnia and Herzegov | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | | 2 | 1.22 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | x | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Honduras | 84 | 2 | 1.25 | | 2 | 1.17 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | x | 3 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Peru | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | | 2 | 1.15 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Tajikistan | 73 | 2 | 1.43 | | 2 | 1.00 | 1 | 2 | 1 | x | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 |
| Jamaica | 122 | 1 | 0.63 | | 1 | 0.75 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Cuba | 111 | 1 | 0.75 | | 1 | 0.44 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | x | x | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 |
| Liberia | 15 | 3 | 2.29 | * | 3 | 2.75 | x | 3 | 6 | 3 | 3 | 3 | x | x | x | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | x |
| Central African Repub | 8 | 3 | 2.38 | | 3 | 2.39 | 3 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | x | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Eritrea | 8 | 3 | 2.38 | | 3 | 2.00 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | x | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 6 |
| Senegal | 23 | 3 | 2.13 | | 3 | 2.00 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mauritania | 39 | 2 | 1.88 | | 2 | 1.75 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | x |
| Namibia | 46 | 2 | 1.75 | | 2 | 1.70 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Guatemala | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | | 2 | 1.65 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Lesotho | 66 | 2 | 1.50 | | 2 | 1.50 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Benin | 46 | 2 | 1.75 | | 3 | 1.89 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | x | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Mongolia | 75 | 2 | 1.38 | | 2 | 0.95 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | x |
| East Timor | 75 | 2 | 1.38 | | 2 | 1.56 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | x | x | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Georgia | 46 | 2 | 1.75 | | 2 | 1.39 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | x | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Grenada | 120 | 1 | 0.71 | * | 1 | 0.71 | 1 | 2 | 0 | x | 1 | 1 | 1 | x | x | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | x |
| Cameroon | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | | 3 | 1.80 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Guinea Bissau | 17 | 3 | 2.25 | | 3 | 2.00 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Malawi | 46 | 2 | 1.75 | | 3 | 1.85 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Togo | 56 | 2 | 1.63 | | 3 | 1.83 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | x | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

... tous les autres pays ayant un IC nul et un IV de 2 ou 1

total * 350,5 350,5

* total auquel il faut ajouter 11 pour la sécheresse en Afrique et 6 pour ECHO-flight en DRC et en Somalie

Comments:

The strategic plan for 2006 does not provide for any intervention in 32% of the countries classified under the GNA as priority cases (10 out of 31 countries), but the proportion falls to 14%, i.e. 2 out of 14 countries, for priorities identified by the proposed method (CI and IV of 3). Also, it can be seen that almost 99% of the budget is allocated to countries with a positive crisis index, 72% of which have a VI of 3 and 28 a VI of 2.

ANNEX 4: FCA FORM

FCA 200 **Country Profile:.....** **Date: dd/mm/yy**

| |
|---|
| <p>TARGET POPULATION:</p> <p>NUMBER OF PEOPLE AFFECTED: of which IPDs of which refugees: (host country:)</p> |
| <p>DATE OF START OF HUMANITARIAN CRISIS:</p> |
| <p>AMOUNT OF AID PROVIDED TO TARGET POPULATION:</p> <p>Total amount 200./200. (according to FTS at dd/mm/yy) :</p> <p>ECHO share of total amount:</p> <p>Difficulties in finding other sources of funding: yes/no? If yes, why?</p> <p>Number of humanitarian actors present:</p> |
| <p>DIFFICULTIES OF ACCESS / PROBLEMS OF SECURITY:</p> |
| <p>ROLE OF THE STATE (with respect to the target population) :</p> <p>“Minority” problem?</p> |
| <p>HEALTH INDICATORS FOR THE TARGET POPULATION (if available):</p> |
| <p>OTHER INFORMATION:</p> |
| <p>DO YOU CONSIDER THAT THIS IS A “FORGOTTEN CRISIS”? yes / no</p> <p>If yes, why?</p> |

