About REACH:
REACH Initiative facilitates the development of information tools and products that enhance the capacity of aid actors to make evidence-based decisions in emergency, recovery and development contexts. The methodologies used by REACH include primary data collection and in-depth analysis, and all activities are conducted through inter-agency aid coordination mechanisms. REACH is a joint initiative of IMPACT Initiatives, ACTED and the United Nations Institute for Training and Research - Operational Satellite Applications Programme (UNITAR-UNOSAT).
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INTRODUCTION & CONTEXT

CONTEXT

After decades of conflict, the population of Afghanistan continues to suffer from the on-going crisis, with 2019 being the most violent year on record. In addition to the direct impact of Afghanistan’s conflict on civilians, it also often obstructs the required humanitarian response, with organisations facing a range of challenges to move staff and assets throughout the country. Outside of key transit routes, decades of fighting and a challenging geographic environment, cumulating in the Hindu Kush, have furthermore resulted in a limited infrastructure network and physical obstacles to reach many rural areas of Afghanistan.

While constraints on humanitarian access in Afghanistan are multi-layered and impact differently across districts, sectors, and individual organisations, there are common dimensions of inaccessibility that can help determine and distinguish Hard-to-Reach (HTR) areas across the country. In 2019, the Humanitarian Access Group (HAG) led a coordinated effort to identify a list of Afghanistan’s HTR districts and defined them across three factors of inaccessibility: (1) physical constraints, (2) conflict intensity, and (3) complexity of actors. Based on these dimensions, HTR districts are areas that humanitarian actors struggle to access and provide assistance to, due to (1) their remoteness and poor infrastructure, (2) on-going armed clashes, and / or (3) the presence of one or multiple armed actors that actively limits access to areas under their control.

From a humanitarian perspective, whether a district is hard-to-reach or not should not matter for an organisation’s aim or decision to provide assistance, as this must be based on an impartial and neutral assessment of the corresponding needs of the people. Unfortunately, conventional data collection techniques (face-to-face / telephone interviews), which facilitate an evidence-based humanitarian response, are equally limited and undermined by the access restrictions that implementing partners face. As a result, the humanitarian community in Afghanistan lacks reliable data and monitoring tools to assess and track needs and vulnerabilities of people in HTR areas.

ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORK

To address the limited insight into humanitarian needs of population leaving in HTR areas and in order to ensure an evidence-base for a humanitarian response in all areas of Afghanistan, irrespective of access, REACH, in collaboration with the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), the Inter-Cluster Coordination Team (ICCT), and HAG, conducted in January/ February 2020 a second round of needs assessment in 120 districts previously classified as hard-to-reach.

OBJECTIVES

The HTR assessment aims to identify and regularly monitor humanitarian needs and vulnerabilities of populations in HTR districts. The immediate objective of this assessment is to provide an evidence-base to inform the humanitarian response in Afghanistan towards the areas of greatest need, irrespective of access constraints, while keeping in mind that the response remains dependent on organisations actually being able to access these HTR areas.

While no humanitarian organisation in Afghanistan will agree on the same set of HTR districts, as each has its own access profile, the value of defining and assessing the proposed list of HTR districts is threefold. First, while individual organisations may have full or partial access in some of the included districts, the districts’ general inaccessibility means they are among the least well understood areas of Afghanistan and require more thorough and streamlined assessment. Second, as the districts are defined and measured according to the three dimensions of inaccessibility outlined above, the research can begin to understand whether and how vectors of inaccessibility may relate to humanitarian needs. A better understanding of the impact of particular inaccessibility factors would strengthen the humanitarian response strategy across the entire country, not just the included districts. Third, this project aims at monitoring the humanitarian needs in those HTR districts every four months, which will allow for an insight into the impact of shocks in these areas as well as a timely prioritisation of humanitarian assistance.

---

2 This assessment is the second round of needs assessment in hard to reach district. Findings from the first round conducted in July / August 2019 of 100 HTR districts can be found here.
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SCOPE AND COVERAGE

The HAG measured and ranked all of Afghanistan’s districts across the three dimensions discussed above and developed a list of the 103 districts with the highest inaccessibility/HTR score first in July 2019, followed by a second round in March 2020 (see Annex 1 for more information on the HAG inaccessibility ranking).

Based on the July 2019 list, REACH updated and extended its existing portfolio of 70 HTR districts, which were sampled, mapped, and assessed as part of the 2018 HTR assessment, and took the 50 highest ranked districts from the HAG HTR list (July 2019) to include 120 districts.1 This REACH portfolio of 120 HTR districts was the basis for the second HTR assessment round and the current factsheet booklet. The revised HAG HTR district list from March 2020 was not yet available, but will be used as the basis for the third HTR assessment round. As a result, the coverage of the REACH portfolio and revised HAG HTR district list is not of 100%.

Overall, the REACH portfolio of HTR districts includes 91 district that were also included in the 103 HAG HTR list of July 2019. The 29 REACH portfolio districts that are not part of the HAG list, were still included in the current assessment and booklet to allow for a more comprehensive monitoring and trend analysis.

As the HAG HTR list is released every 6 months, the table below shows the coverage of REACH need’s assessment compared to the HAG HTR list of both July 2019 and March 2020.

Coverage of HAG HTR list by REACH portfolio:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HAG HTR List</th>
<th># districts assessed from HAG HTR list</th>
<th>% of HAG HTR list assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>July 2019</td>
<td>91 / 103</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 2020</td>
<td>71 / 100</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The 2018 HTR assessment report can be found here.

2 The first round of needs assessment took place in July 2019 and included 100 districts. The second round of needs assessment presented in this factsheet expands the portfolio of HTR districts to include 20 more districts for a total of 120 districts assessed.
METHODOLOGY

SAMPLING

The sampling frame was designed to strengthen the insights users can draw from the HTR data. First, in order to ensure all area or population of a HTR district is adequately taken into account, each district was mapped and divided into Basic Service Units (BSUs). Together with community representatives, BSUs were identified and mapped as geographic areas that have common demographic/socio-economic features and in which communities rely on the same basic services and facilities, such as health facilities, markets, and schools. Following the mapping, key informants were identified through snowballing from existing networks from previous assessments and purposefully sampled, based on their knowledge of the community. Key informants commonly included community elders, teachers, nurses, or maliks (village chiefs).

Once the BSUs were identified, Key Informants Interviews (KII's) were conducted in all areas and for all communities that relied on the same set of basic services—allowing for an efficient, yet comprehensive, research design. Each KII was conducted in a separate settlement and at least 18% of each district's settlements were covered, resulting in an average of four KII's per BSU.

DATA COLLECTION

Using Open Data Kit (Kobo Toolbox), 135 REACH enumerators conducted 4,010 KII's across 4,010 settlements between 13 January and 6 February 2020. Of these 2,641 were conducted face-to-face, while 1,369 were conducted over the phone. The assessment's research design and questionnaire were developed in close coordination with the ICCT to include indicators required by each Cluster to determine sectoral and inter-sectoral humanitarian needs. Furthermore, the assessment indicators were closely aligned with the Whole of Afghanistan Assessment (WoAA) household survey to allow for a comparison across accessible and inaccessible areas of Afghanistan.

ANALYSIS

The unit of analysis that each key informant was asked to report upon was the settlement they resided in. Findings and data hence reflect the needs of settlements as a whole, and cannot be further broken down to specific population groups or the household level. However, findings can be aggregated to the district or national level and be compared across districts with different inaccessibility score for the three dimensions of hard to reach: (1) Physical Constraints, (2) Conflict Intensity, (3) Complexity of Actors.

Analysis of the HTR data was conducted using R's statistical packages. As there was no reliable information on the exact population within individual settlements, the analysis weighted the data by the number of settlements within a district, rather than the population within a district. To assess a district's humanitarian needs, a sectoral index of need was calculated for each sector (see Annex 2), based on consultations with each active Cluster in Afghanistan and aligned with the 2019 WoAA household survey index.

LIMITATIONS

- In all but 20 districts, the assessment was conducted within the district, by local enumerators. In 20 HTR districts, data collection was not possible in person or via the phone, due to security restrictions and/or a lack of a reliable phone network. In those districts, the assessment relied on an Area of Knowledge (AoK) approach, interviewing recent Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) that had recently left from different BSUs within the assessed district.

- Findings rely on the knowledge of key informants responding on their settlements. The findings are therefore indicative and may not always reflect fully the situation on the ground.

- Weighting of data by the number of settlements within a district, rather than the population, may result in an under- or over-representation of any particular settlement population.

- While the settlement functions well as a ‘unit of analysis’ for issues related to access to services, it is difficult to adequately assess aspects such as nutrition and food consumption for a settlement as a whole. Therefore, for certain indicators or needs, such as nutrition, high proportions of settlements with needs, may not automatically translate to high proportions of the population with needs.

- Composite indicators for sectoral severity were calculated differently across sectors, therefore we cannot compare severity of needs across sectors.

1 More information on Basic Services Units mapping can be found in the map collection: for North and North-East, for South, for Capital and South-East, for West and for East.

2 Data collection for the WoAA took place between July and September 2019. Therefore differences observes between accessible and innaccessible areas might be due to change overtime. More information on the WoAA available [here](#).

3 The AoK approach was used in Badakhshan (Raghestan), Badghis (Bala Murghab, Ghormach), Farah (Bakwa, Bala Buluk, Farah, Gulistan, Khak-e-Safed, Pur Chaman, Pushtrod, Shikoh), Ghor (Pasaband), Hilmand (Musa Qala), Hirat (Shindand), Kandahar (Shorabak), Nangarhar (Hesarak, Sherzad), Pakita (Wazzakhah, Wormamay), Takhar (Eakhkamish).
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**OVERVIEW**

% of assessed settlements reportedly impacted by the following events in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- Active conflict or violence: 56%
- Avalanche / heavy snow: 16%
- Drought: 28%
- Earthquake: 6%
- Flood: 18%
- None of the above: 17%
- Do not know / do not want to answer: 1%

In **51%** of assessed settlements, at least some households had reportedly **displaced** due to conflict and / or natural disaster.

% of assessed settlements in which at least one member from the following population groups had reportedly arrived in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- IDPs: 33%
- Returnees: 25%

% of assessed settlements reportedly impacted by the following events in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- Active conflict or violence: 56%
- Avalanche / heavy snow: 16%
- Drought: 28%
- Earthquake: 6%
- Flood: 18%
- None of the above: 17%
- Do not know / do not want to answer: 1%

In **51%** of assessed settlements, at least some households had reportedly **displaced** due to conflict and / or natural disaster.

% of assessed settlements in which at least one member from the following population groups had reportedly arrived in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- IDPs: 33%
- Returnees: 25%

% of assessed settlements reporting protection incidents in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- Adults:
  - Verbally threatened: 49%
  - Hindered to move freely: 38%
  - Assaulted without weapon: 30%
- Children:
  - Verbally threatened: 43%
  - Hindered to move freely: 35%
  - None of the above: 29%

In **37%** of settlements, **incidents of gender-based violence (GBV)** were reported.

In **37%** of assessed settlements the **presence of explosive hazards** in or around 5km of the settlement was reported in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Types of impact in those settlements reporting the presence of explosives:

- Extreme impact: 24%
- Severe impact: 34%
- Small impact: 48%

**PROTECTION**

Average severity score of protection sectoral need in 120 Hard to Reach districts: **2.7**

% of assessed settlements by perceived level of safety and security in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- Very poor: 19%
- Poor: 12%
- Okay: 47%
- Good: 12%
- Very good: 10%

In **45%** of assessed settlements, at least one member had reportedly **physically injured due to conflict (35%) or due to natural disaster (23%)** in the 3 months prior to data collection.

% of assessed settlements in which a majority of people reportedly did not have a tazkira in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- 20%

1. Composite indicators for sectoral severity were calculated differently across sectors, therefore we cannot compare severity of needs across sectors but can be compared across rounds.
2. Multiple options could be selected.
3. Settlements reportedly impacted by conflict and/or natural disaster in the 3 months prior to data collection, see displacement section.
4. Very good: completely stable situation and no criminality or conflict; good: stable situation and people are feeling safe; presence of only criminality but no conflict; okay: situation is good but unstable / can change at any time; poor: suicide attack, demonstration, explosion, but existence of some safer location, or people are in danger from one party; very poor: ongoing fighting, mines/explosions, and people are in danger from multiple parties.
5. An extreme impact is defined as having incidents such as death or disability or restricted access to basic services. A severe impact is defined as a negative impact on livelihood/income or an impact on psychological wellbeing (for example fear, stress, anxiety). A small impact is defined as a restricted access to playing and recreation (for children).
6. This proportion only includes settlements in which key informants voluntarily decided to report incidents of GBV; as a result, prevalence is highly likely to have been under-reported.
7. A tazkira is an Afghan legal identification document.
**Overall 120 Hard to Reach districts**

### Emergency Shelter & Non-Food Items (ESNFI)

- **Average severity score of ESNFI sectoral need in 120 Hard to Reach districts:** 2
- **% of assessed settlements per main shelter type reported:**
  - Makeshift: 4%
  - Tents: 2%
  - Mud/bricks: 93%
  - Do not know: 1%
- **In 20% of assessed settlements, at least one person reportedly lived in the open. In 0% of settlements more than half of the households reportedly lived in the open in the 3 months prior to data collection.**
- **% of assessed settlements in which at least one shelter had reportedly been destroyed or severely damaged due to conflict and/or natural disaster in the 3 months prior to data collection:**
  - Due to conflict: 19%
  - Due to natural disaster: 17%
  - Due to both: 20%
- **51% of assessed settlements, in which at least one person had reportedly been evicted from their shelter in the 3 months prior to data collection:**
- **% of assessed settlements in which a majority of people reportedly did not have access to a market with sufficient non-food items in the 3 months prior to data collection:**
  - Market too far / no transport: 63%
  - Roads too dangerous: 18%
  - Prices too high / cannot afford NFI: 9%
- **46% of assessed settlements in which most people reportedly did not have access to key items to cope with winter in the 3 months prior to data collection:**
- **% of assessed settlements in which most people did reportedly have access to medicine in the 3 months prior to data collection:**
  - Yes, most people have access: 20%
  - No, medicine too expensive: 36%
  - No, medicine not available in the area: 39%
  - Do not know / do not want to answer: 5%
  - 20% of assessed settlements reported an increase in mortality in the month before data collection.

### Health

- **Average severity score of health sectoral need in 120 Hard to Reach districts:** 1.8
- **% of assessed settlements in which no health facility within 2 hours of the settlement was reportedly accessible for most people in the 3 months prior to data collection:**
  - 44%
- **In 14% of assessed settlements, a health facility had been closed or severely damaged due to conflict and/or natural disaster in the 3 months prior to data collection.**
- **% of assessed settlements in which most pregnant women were reportedly not able to give birth in a clinic or a hospital in the 3 months prior to data collection:**
  - 64%
- **% of assessed settlements in which most children were not vaccinated against polio in the 3 months prior to data collection:**
  - 45%
- **% of assessed settlements, in which at least one shelter had reportedly been destroyed or severely damaged due to conflict and/or natural disaster in the 3 months prior to data collection:**
  - Due to conflict: 19%
  - Due to natural disaster: 17%
  - Due to both: 20%

---

1 Settlements reportedly impacted by conflict and/or natural disaster in the 3 months prior to data collection, see displacement section.
2 Key winter items are considered to be stove, blankets, mattress/mats and winter clothing.
3 If most people have access or do not know / do now want to answer were selected, reason for not access could not be selected.
4 Reason for increased mortality in the settlement was not specified.
**WATER, HYGIENE & SANITATION**

Average severity score of WASH sectoral need in 120 Hard to Reach districts: **1.9**

% of assessed settlements per water source type used by most people as their main drinking water source in the 3 months prior to data collection:

- Surface water: 20%
- Unimproved water source: 25%
- Improved water source: 55%

In 43% of assessed settlements, the main water source was reportedly destroyed, damaged or dried up due to conflict or natural disaster in the 3 months prior to data collection.²

In 18% of assessed settlements, soap was reported as commonly not available on the market in the 3 months prior to data collection.

**FOOD SECURITY & AGRICULTURE**

Average severity score of FSA sectoral need in 120 Hard to Reach districts: **1.7**

In 48% of assessed settlements, most people were reportedly not able to access enough food in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Reported level of hunger in those settlements reporting insufficient access:

- 3% The worst it can be
- 51% Bad
- 37% Small
- 9% Almost none
- 1% Do not know

In 9% and 15% of assessed settlements, almost half and more than half, respectively, of the households relied on help or borrowed food / money to spend on food or essential household needs in the month prior to data collection.

In 7% and 9% of assessed settlements almost half and more than half, respectively, of the households reduced adults’ food consumption when food or money to buy food is not available in the month prior to data collection.

1. Unimproved water source is defined as unprotected spring, well or kariz (Persian water channel system), water trucking or tankering (National WASH cluster guidance).
2. Settlements reportedly impacted by conflict and/or natural disaster in the 3 months prior to data collection, see displacement section.
3. If no issues or do not know / do not want to answer was selected, reason for not meeting needs could not be selected.
4. Unimproved latrine type is defined as no facility (open field, dearan, bush) or family pit latrine - without slab / open (National WASH cluster guidance).
5. Multiple options could be selected.
6. A severe impact on agriculture impact is the loss of half of the production and an extreme impact is the loss of more than half of the production to all the production.
7. A severe impact on livestock is livestock becoming ill or livestock producing less and an extreme impact is the livestock died or was left unattended because of displacement.
**EDUCATION IN EMERGENCIES**

Average severity score of EiE sectoral need in 120 Hard to Reach districts: **2.4**

Reported location of available government schools:

*Locations and number of services are indicative only.

In **30%** of assessed settlements, at least one child (aged 6-17) was reportedly removed from school due to conflict and/or natural disaster in the 3 months prior to data collection. **1,2**

**NUTRITION**

Average severity score of nutrition sectoral need in 120 Hard to Reach districts: **2.1**

In **81%** of assessed settlements, most people were reported to not have access to a nutrition treatment service in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Main reported reason for inaccessibility of nutrition treatment services in those assessed settlements were:

- Services are too far: 36%
- Services are too expensive: 23%
- Other reason services not accessible: 23%

**ACCOUNTABILITY TO AFFECTED POPULATION & HUMANITARIAN ACCESS**

**21%** of assessed settlements reportedly received assistance in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Reported type in those settlements receiving assistance: **3**

- Food: 84%
- Shelter or NFI: 22%
- Education: 18%

Top 3 priority needs reported in assessed settlements: **3**

- Healthcare: 58%
- Food: 52%
- Education for children under 18: 39%

**24%** of assessed settlements were reportedly not accessible by road in the 3 months prior to data collection.

Main reported reason in those assessed settlements inaccessible by road:

- No road to settlement: 56%
- Active conflict on road: 25%
- Blocked by armed actors: 9%

% of assessed settlements in which the mobile network has generally not been reliable in the 3 months prior to data collection: **41%**

**AFGHANISTAN**

**HTR - R2 | 2020**

**INTER-CLUSTER COORDINATION TEAM**

---

**1** Settlements reportedly impacted by conflict and/or natural disaster in the 3 months prior to data collection, see displacement section.

**2** Education facilities are defined as government schools of all level, private school of all level or community based education services for the purpose of this assessment.

**3** Multiple options could be selected.

**4** A network is defined as non-reliable if only connected a few days per week or not connected at all.
In 2019, the Humanitarian Access Group (HAG) led a coordinated effort to establish a comprehensive list of Afghanistan’s HTR districts, updated every 6 months. To this end, they rated each district according to three inaccessibility factors: (1) physical constraints, (2) conflict intensity and conflict spread, and (3) complexity of actors. Based on those dimensions, HTR districts are areas that humanitarian actors struggle to access and provide assistance to, due to (1) their remoteness and poor infrastructure, (2) on-going armed clashes, and/or (3) the presence of one or multiple armed actors that actively limits access to areas under their control. The weighted indicators used to determine the inaccessibility score of every district of Afghanistan are listed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicators</th>
<th>Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical Constraints:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average number of hours to reach district center</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone coverage</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to airport</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict Intensity and spread:</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict intensity</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Kinetic Incidents (by political actors)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Deaths</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict actors (0.25%)</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilian causality (0.75%)</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Airstrikes/IDF incidents</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># IED/UXO incidents (detonations and discoveries)</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active/Disputed Control</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict spread - Scope of populated areas affected by conflict</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder Complexity:</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presence of IS-K</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% NSAG Control</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Times DAC fell from GOA control</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access by female staff</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access by staff</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Methodology note

Analysis of HtR district needs was conducted using R’s statistical packages.

A sectoral index of need was calculated for each sector (see below), comprised of multiple indicators based on consultations with each active Cluster in Afghanistan and aligned with the 2019 WoAA household survey index\(^1\).

The composite sectoral indicators include three different categories of distinct indicators, aiming to measure: (1) humanitarian condition of the settlement, (2) access to basic services in the settlement, (3) event/shock impact on the settlement. Indicators took on different weights based on their estimated proportional contribution to the overall need and the proportion of settlements reporting a need for this indicator. For instance, indicators falling into the third category around the impact of event/shock were commonly weighted higher than indicators on access to services, given that the former were deemed to have a more immediate impact on the humanitarian need of a settlement. Indicators falling into category (1) on the humanitarian condition in general, were sub-divided into three different severity weights (stress, severe, and extreme).

Composite indicator

The composite considered both the magnitude and the intensity of all indicators. Each severity indicator was calculated based on the magnitude of the need (% of settlements), and the intensity of the indicator (weight). The total was then ranked on a severity scale: [1] minimal, [2] stress, [3] severe, [4] extreme.  

Severity of need: A total severity score was obtained for every district in each sector by aggregating the district’s score for weighted indicators within the sectoral index. Districts classified as having a “severe” or “extreme” severity score were classified as having a sectoral need.\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) Whole of Afghanistan Assessment province level factsheet
## ANNEX 2: COMPOSITE INDICATORS
**EiE**

### Education in Emergency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response if unmet need</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Threshold for sectoral need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which most children were reported not able to access at least one functioning formal education facility</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, were there ANY functional formal education facilities or Community Based Education services in the area accessible for MOST children of the settlement?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Minimal: &lt;175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stress: 175-349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Severe: 350-524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme &gt;525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which boys are not able to attend school</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, did MOST boys (aged 6 to 17) of the settlement able to attend school?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which girls are not able to attend school</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, did MOST girls (aged 6 to 17) of the settlement able to attend school?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which at least one child was reportedly removed from school due to shocks</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, were ANY children (6-17 years old) removed from school due to conflict or natural disaster in the settlement</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Response if unmet need</td>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>Threshold for sectoral need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which most people lived in tent or emergency shelter</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, what type of shelter did MOST people in the settlement live in?</td>
<td>Tents (emergency shelter) or makeshift shelter</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which at least one person reportedly lived</td>
<td>Are you aware of ANY people in the settlement living in the open without shelter in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements with shelter destroyed due to conflict or natural disaster</td>
<td>Have ANY shelters in the settlement been destroyed or severely damaged in the past 3 months due to conflict or natural disaster? If yes, how many households had shelter destroyed or severely damaged because of either conflict or natural disaster in the settlement in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes, due to both or yes, due to conflict yes, due to natural disaster and More than half of the shelters or Almost all/All shelters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minimal: &lt;275 Stress: 275-549 Severe: 550-824 Extreme &gt;825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements with evictions reported</td>
<td>Are you aware of ANY people in the settlement being evicted from their shelter in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements where no sufficient access to market with NFI have been reported</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, has there been a market open with sufficient access to Non-Food Items for MOST people in the settlement? (e.g. Sleeping mats/mattress, plastic tarpulin, blankets, etc.)</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which non-sustainable sources of heating is used</td>
<td>What is the MAIN source of heating for MOST households in your settlement in the winter?</td>
<td>Wood / Bushes or Dung or Waste or No source of heating</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 2: COMPOSITE INDICATORS
### FSA

### Food security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response if unmet need</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Threshold for sectoral need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements by severity of hunger shock</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, were MOST members of the settlement able to access enough food? If no, how would you BEST describe the level of hunger of MOST people in the settlement?</td>
<td>No and hunger is the worst it can be, all over the settlement, and causing many deaths or no and hunger is bad, limited options to cope with the reduced access to food</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minimal: &lt;325 Stress: 325-649 Severe: 650 - 974 Extreme &gt;974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements relying on coping strategy when food or money to buy food was not available per proportion of household in the month prior to data collection</td>
<td>In the past month, are you aware of ANY member of your settlement who borrowed/relied on help from friends or relatives for staple food or borrowed money to spend on food or essential household needs? If yes, what proportion of the settlement has to rely on such coping strategy to eat when food or money to buy food is not available?</td>
<td>Yes, and more than half</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements that had their livelihood affected due to conflict or natural disaster</td>
<td>Did conflict or natural disaster negatively impact the livelihood (eg. livestock, agriculture or employment) of the settlement in the past 3 months? If yes, how? If affected livestock, what have been the MAIN negative impacts noted on livestock for MOST members of the settlement in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes, negatively impacted livestock and one of the following: livestock have died, or livestock have become ill or livestock was left unattended in previous location because of necessary displacement due to conflict or natural disaster</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did conflict or natural disaster negatively impact the livelihood (eg. livestock, agriculture or employment) of the settlement in the past 3 months? If yes, how? If affected agriculture, how much production did MOST members of the settlement lose in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes, negatively impacted agriculture and more than half of the harvest lost</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Did conflict or natural disaster negatively impact the livelihood (eg. livestock, agriculture or employment) of the settlement in the past 3 months? If yes, how? If affected agriculture, how much production did MOST members of the settlement lose in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes, negatively impacted agriculture and more than half of the harvest lost</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 2: COMPOSITE INDICATORS
### HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response if unmet need</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Threshold for sectoral need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which no health facility was reportedly accessible within 2 hours</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, was there ANY functioning health facility in the area that MOST people in the settlement could access within 2 hours?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% settlements with increased mortality</td>
<td>In the last 3 months, have MORE people died than in the months BEFORE for any reason in [name of settlement]?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements with closed or severely damaged health facilities due to conflict or natural disaster</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, has ANY health facilities closed or been severely damaged due to conflict or natural disaster?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% assessed settlements where health is one of the top 3 priority needs</td>
<td>What are the 3 priority needs for MOST people in the settlement?</td>
<td>Healthcare as one of top three needs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which most pregnant women were reportedly able to give birth in a clinic or a hospital</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, were MOST pregnant women able to give birth in a clinic or a hospital?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Thresholds:
- Minimal: <200
- Stress: 200-399
- Severe: 400-599
- Extreme >599
### Nutrition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response if unmet need</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Threshold for sectoral need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which more than half of the children were reported malnourished and fell sick</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, what has been the severity of malnutrition for children under 5 in the settlement?</td>
<td>More than half the children are malnourished and fall sick</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minimal: &lt;100 Stress: 100 - 199 Severe: 200-299 Extreme &gt;299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Less than half the children are malnourished and only a few fall sick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlement without access to nutrition treatment services</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, did MOST people of the settlement have sufficient access to nutrition treatment services in the area?</td>
<td>No, services are too far or no, services are too expensive or no, services not accessible (for a reason besides too far or too expensive)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 2: COMPOSITE INDICATORS
### PROTECTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response if unmet need</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Threshold for sectoral need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which protection incidents were reported</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, are you aware of ANY adults (18 or older) subject to ANY of the following protection incidents? In the past 3 months, are you aware of ANY children (17 or younger) subject to ANY of the following protection incidents?</td>
<td>At least one of the following incidents reported: Assaulted (beaten, stabbed, attacked, shot) with a weapon, forced to work, forcibly detailed, or hindered to move freely within or outside your settlement</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% assessed settlement with reported GBV incidents</td>
<td>Are you aware of any other threats that household members in the settlement were worried about in the past 3 months that you would like to mention?</td>
<td>Yes, violence targeting women, girls or boys specifically</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Minimal: &lt;350  Stress: 350-699  Severe: 700-1049  Extreme &gt;1049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements with people reportedly injured by conflict or natural disaster</td>
<td>Are you aware of ANY members of your community that has been physically injured due to conflict in the past 3 months? Are you aware of ANY members of your community been physically injured due to natural disaster in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements with reportedly the majority of the male not having a Tazkira</td>
<td>What proportion of men in the settlement have a Tazkira?</td>
<td>Very few or none</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements were the safety is reported to be very poor</td>
<td>How would you rate the safety and security for MOST people in the settlement in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Very poor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% settlement per type of impact due to the presence of explosive</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, have you been aware of the presence of ANY explosive hazards (mines, ERWs, PPIEDs) in or within 5km of the settlement? If yes, have this presence impacted the population of the settlement in ANY of the following ways in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes, and one of the following: incident – death or disability of family member or constrained access to basic services (school, hospital, mosque)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes, and one of the following: negative impact on livelihood income, or impact on psychological wellbeing (fear, stress, anxiety)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes and: restricted to playing and recreation (for children)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ANNEX 2: COMPOSITE INDICATORS

### WASH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response if unmet need</th>
<th>Severity</th>
<th>Threshold for sectoral need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which most people reportedly relied on an improved water source as their main drinking water source</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, what was the MAIN source of drinking water (clean or unclean) for MOST people in the settlement?</td>
<td>Surface water (stream / river / irrigation)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water trucking / tankering or unprotected spring, well or kariz</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements were very few have access to water</td>
<td>In the past 3 month, what proportion of households had SUFFICIENT access to water to meet or satisfy their basic needs?</td>
<td>No households or Very few households or Less than half of the households</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlement per reason to not be able to meet water needs</td>
<td>What is the MAIN reason people in the settlement are not able to meet their water needs?</td>
<td>High risk to access water sources</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waterpoints are too far or Social restrictions on waterpoint access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements in which soap was reported as not commonly available on the market</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, was soap commonly available in the market for people in the settlement?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements reporting unimproved types of latrine</td>
<td>In the past 3 months, what was the MOST COMMON type of latrine used by people in your settlement?</td>
<td>No facility - open field, dearan, bush or Family pit latrine - without slab / open</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of assessed settlements with destroyed, damaged or dried up water source due to conflict or natural disaster</td>
<td>Have the MAIN water source in the settlement been destroyed, damaged, or dried up due to conflict or natural disaster in the past 3 months?</td>
<td>Yes, damaged or destroyed due to conflict Yes, damaged, destroyed or dried up due to natural disaster Yes, damaged or destroyed due to both</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Minimal:** <299  
**Stress:** 300 - 599  
**Severe:** 600 - 899  
**Extreme:** >824