Technical Note:

Emergency Risk Informed Situation Analysis

Purpose:
This document describes the analytical process that will allow a Country Office to develop an emergency risk-informed SitAn. Emergency risk-informed programming is a relatively new process to UNICEF – therefore it is still at its learning stages, especially around the analysis and interactions between conflict dynamics and natural disaster risks. We encourage all users of this draft guidance to feed back to us, and to provide examples of alternative methodologies that have been applied in different contexts. All feedback can be sent to Michel Le Pechoux and James Rogan in EMOPS.

Situation Analyses:
UNICEF Situation analyses (SitAns) are generally developed for 3 main purposes: advocacy for children, informing programming at strategic level, and influencing government and partners’ priorities for children. In regards to the second purpose (programming), as an evidence-based organisation, UNICEF programmes need to be developed on the basis of a sound child-centred analysis of disaster (including climate change) and conflict risks. These risks will significantly impact the realization of child rights and attainment of Millennium Development Goals, and may result in emergencies requiring a UNICEF response.

The development of a risk-informed SitAn is a fundamental undertaking to ensure that UNICEF Country Programmes proactively reduce emergency risks for children. The conclusions of the analysis also provide an opportunity for advocacy and fund-raising around Disaster Risk Reduction, Climate Change Adaptation, Peacebuilding and conflict sensitivity of programmes.

It is highly recommended that this analysis is carried out with partners and fully integrated in the UN Common Country Assessment (CCA).

Analysis of All Risks (disasters and conflicts):
Presently, when developing Situation Analyses UNICEF Country Offices analyse development data to identify programming priorities, but pay limited attention to the analysis of emergency risks.

Robust analysis of these risks is critical: it will enable to develop stronger programming to strengthen the resilience of governments and communities to address these risks through disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, conflict sensitivity of programmes, and peace building. In fact UNICEF programmes must be sensitive to existing power dynamics and drivers of conflict within the communities targeted by the Country Programme. An emergency risk informed SitAn will identify priority sub-national

---

1 UNICEF applies the UNISDR definition of risk = hazard (exposure and impact)*(vulnerability/capacity): R= H*V /C. Emergency risk for UNICEF is therefore a function of how much the population is vulnerable by the likelihood that the country will face hardships (be they natural hazards of complex emergencies), and how much capacity exists in the hands of national and local actors to cope by themselves.

2 Cf Guidance note for UNCT: Integrating DRR into the CCA and UNDAF

3 In this technical note emergency risk refers to the risk of emergencies resulting from natural hazards, conflict and epidemics.
geographic areas where risks of different nature are high and where programmes need to factor in child vulnerability to natural disasters and conflict dynamics.

Although disaster risk analysis and conflict risk analysis require different methodologies (for specific guidance on conflict analysis, please refer to the technical note on conflict sensitivity and peace-building) there is often an interaction between these two risks in many humanitarian situations. UNICEF SitAns should therefore look into both conflict and disaster risk and adopt a holistic approach integrating these two types of risk in a coherent analytical framework to guide the formulation of country programmes.

**MORES:**

This guidance is designed to be used as a companion to the Guidance on Conducting a Situation Analysis of Children and Women’s Rights, following the exact same structure and process, with advice and recommendations on how to integrate emergency risks into the analysis, it is also coherent with the recommended steps for MORES level 1 analysis\(^4\), although not as detailed as the determinants analysis recommended for MORES.

I. **PLANNING (TIMING, SEQUENCING, SOURCING)**

Before starting the analysis it is important for the country office (CO) to review the results of the Global Emergency Exposure Classification developed yearly by EMOPS (cf. annex 1)\(^5\) to determine the level of risk (high, medium or low) which guides the required depth of analysis. The CO could complement this information by doing additional research from the web or from staff on natural hazards trends, climate change vulnerability (future projections), and conflict dynamics (snapshot of the present political context and the localized conflict drivers). This is recommended to contact the RO emergency team and the RO planning team during this process for additional support and advice.

The Global Emergency Exposure Classification should be adapted to each country context, especially in regards to conflict risks. Once the level of emergency risk has been reviewed, it is necessary to define the terms of reference (ToR) for the analysis to take place. While the ToR for the SitAn will cover various fields of activity, this guidance only focuses on elements deemed necessary for the emergency risk analysis portion of the SitAn.

This is important also to note that for conflict analysis, inter-agency approaches are the first point of entry to UNICEF’s own conflict analysis. A discussion with the UNCT to pursue some form of conflict analysis, especially in latent situations where we don’t see the factors, is most important. In these cases, a simplified “level of emergency risk” is difficult but the level of depth for conflict analysis will be determined by the focus of the UNCT on these issues.

II. **ASSESSMENTS OF MANIFESTATIONS OF SHORTFALLS IN CHILD RIGHTS**

---

\(^4\) Concept note: Monitoring results for equity systems (MORES) p 2

\(^5\) The global emergency exposure classification produced by EMOPS every year is an adaptation of OCHA’s Global Focus Model to UNICEF.
It is necessary to start analysis by finding relevant sources of data. All COs should collect existing secondary data (sources: *annex 1* + partners in annex 2); however, medium and high risk countries are encouraged to also identify primary data (sources: *annex 1* + partners in annex 2 + government and others as relevant in country context).

The objective of the review is to carry out a **quantitative analysis and mapping of emergency risks** in order to be able to reply to 2 key questions:

- **Which** emergency risks pose the biggest risk to children and women?
- **Where** do these risks manifest themselves?

The **following table summarizes the steps for the SitAn process by level of emergency risk.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Low risk</th>
<th>Medium risk (steps required for low risk plus)</th>
<th>High risk (steps required for medium risk plus)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data collection/analysis</td>
<td>Review secondary data (list of possible secondary reviews available in <em>annex 1</em>)</td>
<td>Perform qualitative review to improve analysis through partner consultations</td>
<td>Based on data gaps, consider collection of primary data during SitAn or as a research activity in the next CPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk identification and definition</td>
<td>Based on available secondary analysis⁶, determine which types of emergency risk are the most acute and where they tend to happen. Conflict risks are less easily spatially defined: the main socio-political factors should be identified.</td>
<td>Use available data and products to determine which emergency risks are the most critical in the country. This will be based on trends analysis of available data for disaster risks, and on historical, political, economic and socio-cultural factors for conflict risk. (cf technical note on conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding in UNICEF). Conflict analysis shall not stop at analysis, but it shall include theories of change for designing peacebuilding programmes.</td>
<td>Process quantitative data available at local/district level. Refined conflict analysis with detailed theory of change to be used for programming.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mapping and Geo-localization</td>
<td>A simple country map can be drawn.</td>
<td>Use quantitative geo-localised data on child vulnerabilities (stunting, drop-out rates, child poverty, etc) to overlay with single and multi-hazard data losses (death to disasters, affected persons, cost), and allow more detailed sub-national prioritisation (<em>annex 4</em>). Conventional development planning is usually done based on a snap-shot of vulnerability indicators. In order to incorporate emergency risk it is necessary to assign weight to past hazard trends, current conflict risk and/or future climate change projections. Based on such spatial analysis, geographical targeting can be reconsidered. If needed request RO/HQ support on how to select indicators, combine the various types of data at local, regional and national levels, and draw conclusions from the analysis.</td>
<td>Conduct data analysis and mapping down to sub-national level. Schools and closed institutions for children should be represented on the maps. This geo-localisation and assessment of the risks of schools and institutions will in the future be a good basis for informing DRR, peacebuilding, or emergency response activities. Monitoring and evaluation of these programmes should also be facilitated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data gaps identification, data gathering</td>
<td>Identify data gaps. Depending on the desired level of detail, data gaps can be acknowledged in the SitAn as a limitation, or the CO can fill data gaps.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct consultations with vulnerable populations (VCA)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁶ Look at annex 1 for global usual resources, national level sources shall be researched by the CO, with support from RO / EMOPS.
The expected results at the end of this stage will be:

1. A quantitative data analysis (review of secondary and primary data)
2. A map overlaying the levels of emergency risks and child vulnerability in the country (cf annex 4 for example from Nepal).

## III. CAUSALITY ANALYSIS

The causality analysis is an important qualitative analysis of an Emergency Risk Informed SitAn. It answers the questions:

- **Who** is the most vulnerable and therefore the most affected?
- **Why** are these emergency risks affecting the most vulnerable with such force?

The causal relationship can be represented:

- as a problem tree identifying different levels of causality to emergencies (manifestations, immediate causes, underlying causes, structural causes): cf. *Guidance on Conducting a Situation Analysis of Children and Women’s Rights*, fig 1, p 12,
- or as a causality pathway showing how children are affected at the end of a causality chain (cf annex 5, *Climate Change causal pathway analysis from Madagascar*).

The causality analysis seeks to establish relationships between underlying/structural factors, disaster/conflict risk, and the consequences of these events on children. This analysis also helps to identify which groups of children are most at risk and the nature of that risk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Low risk</th>
<th>Medium and High Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition of causes</td>
<td>Conduct a desk review of potential reasons for emergencies</td>
<td>Discuss with relevant partners in high risk areas to gain more understanding by identifying immediate causes (eg: unsafe conditions, poor building structures), underlying causes (eg: rapid population growth, deforestation, poorly trained local institutions), and structural causes (political systems, social attitudes and behaviour) leading to emergencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem tree</td>
<td>A problem tree should be developed, and related to the other problem trees in the SitAn. (cf. Guidance on Conducting a Situation Analysis of Children and Women’s Rights, fig 1, p 12).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Causal pathway</td>
<td>A causal pathway analysis will also be developed for the most important risks identified in the previous steps of the SitAn (cf example from Madagascar in annex 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflict risk countries/area</td>
<td>For conflict situations, causality analysis is an important element of the analysis and it differs from natural disaster causal analysis. Guidance on the conflict causality analysis is provided on page 11, and in annex 2 to the technical note on conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding Conduct a Stakeholder analysis and an analysis of conflict dynamics.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected result at the end of the causality analysis stage will be:

1. To reach an understanding of the causality patterns of how and why children and women are affected by conflict, climate and disasters,
2. To recognize which causal factors can be leveraged to contribute to proactive risk management and risk reduction.

---

7 ISDR definition: The systematic process of using administrative directives, organizations, and operational skills and capacities to implement strategies, policies and improved coping capacities in order to lessen the adverse impacts of hazards and the possibility of disaster.

8 Risk Reduction is a combination of Disaster Risk Reduction, Climate Change Adaptation, and Conflict Sensitivity.
IV. ROLE-PATTERN ANALYSIS and CAPACITY-GAPS ANALYSIS

An emergency risk informed SitAn should be consistent with the human rights based approach. Therefore, in order to produce a qualitative analysis of emergency risks, a detailed analysis of duty bearers and rights holders should be developed. The following three questions are helpful to frame the understanding:

- **Who** or which individuals and/or institutions have the duty to reduce these risks?
- **What capacities** are needed to address the most critical emergency risks, both for those who are being denied their rights, and to those who have the duty to address these problems?

For conflict settings, it will be important to conduct a specific exercise to identify key stakeholders, duty bearers and different sets of capacities. (hyperlink to TN)

The process to answer these questions, as well as the level of detail required, will vary with the risk level. The recommended steps under this stage are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Low risk</th>
<th>Medium risk</th>
<th>High risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders mapping</td>
<td>Conduct a desk review to gain general understanding of the potential role of UNICEF and partners in disaster and conflict risk reduction</td>
<td>Organise consultations to identify key local, national, regional and international stakeholders (duty bearers) and the most vulnerable groups (right holders). It is especially important for conflict analysis to determine their perspectives and their relationships (with one another, with other entities), and venues to engage with them (technical note on conflict analysis and peace building, p 11, and annex 2)</td>
<td>Perform a detailed vulnerability and capacity analysis (VCA) through focus group discussions with rights holders in the most vulnerable communities (sub-national VCA or equivalent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity mapping</td>
<td>Organise interviews with key stakeholders to determine the most relevant institutions responsible for risk reduction in general, and in UNICEF sectors, and their capacities. Compile capacity mapping of the duty-bearers and rights holders identified through desk review.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Undertake a capacity mapping in partnership with regional organizations, National Disaster Management Organisations, NGOs, specialised UN agency. If agreed with the UNCT a request could be made to CADRI to support a detailed capacity mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaps analysis</td>
<td>Based on the above capacity mapping/stake-holder profile, identify priority gaps in key sectors by triangulation of the causality analysis, the role-pattern analysis, and the capacity analysis (DRR capacity assessment)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected result at the end of the role-pattern and capacity gaps analysis stage will be:

1. For low emergency risk countries: to gain basic understanding of the rights holders and duty bearers in disaster risk management.
2. For medium and high emergency countries: to gain detailed understanding of the landscape of duty bearers and rights holders in general and in key sectors for risk reduction (conflicts and disasters), with vulnerabilities and capacities clearly mapped.

V. VALIDATION OF ANALYSIS AND DISSEMINATION

9 Capacity Development for Disaster Reduction Initiative which is a joint initiative of UNDP, OCHA and ISDR.
After the analysis is complete, a process of validation of the findings must be conducted through consultations in order to acquire support from main partners, and to get a commitment to make an effort to reduce identified risks.

This process allows actors working on the improvement of child well-being to prioritise issues and articulate shared responsibilities by positioning the SitAn for use:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Steps</th>
<th>Low risk</th>
<th>Medium risk</th>
<th>High risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share Analysis</td>
<td>Share the analysis with relevant partners for comments and finalisation</td>
<td>Share the analysis with partners and sister agencies for comments and finalisation</td>
<td>Share the analysis with a wide group of stakeholders for comments and finalisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finalise focus on risks in UNICEF SitAn</td>
<td>Include focus on risks throughout the SitAn, linking clearly to sector-specific analysis. Emergency risks shall be reflected with at least a paragraph in the introduction and/or in the cross-sector section, and also with paragraphs where relevant in the programme sector sections</td>
<td>Include specific section of the SitAn focused on risks, with clear inclusion of the emergency risks dimension in all sections, linking with sector-specific analysis. Emergency risks shall be devoted a paragraph in the introduction and a full chapter in the cross-sector section, as well as with detailed paragraphs where relevant in the programme sector sections</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Position risks in inter-agency processes</td>
<td>Where relevant, discuss inclusion in CCA</td>
<td><strong>Conflicts</strong>: if conflict comes out as a major emergency risk, UNICEF should advocate for inter-agency conflict analysis and use it for UNICEF’s conflict analysis exercise. <strong>Disasters</strong>: UNICEF should discuss with sister agencies on positioning UNICEF SitAn within the UN system’s Common Country Assessment (CCA).</td>
<td>Advocate with UNCT to have a conflict analysis as part of CCA, and use inter-agency conflict analysis for UNICEF’s conflict analysis. Position UNICEF SitAn within the UN CCA for disasters.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The objective for action is prioritisation of interventions in the next CPD both as an independent Programme Component Result (PCR) focused on emergency risks as well as with Intermediate Results in a dedicated PCR, and if relevant in other PCRs, as appropriate in the country context.

**Conclusion: The Use of the SitAn for CPD Formulation**

The risk-informed SitAn is an analytical tool that can potentially be used by actors working to realize child rights in a given country. It can ensure that all actions taken are well-informed, and in particular, it can ensure that UNICEF’s programmes reduce emergency risks for children. The specific objectives for action will differ based on the level of risk:
| The objective for action is to understand how emergency risks could potentially impact on other more significant factors. The inclusion of emergency risks consideration into CPD will remain at advocacy level, unless the CO decides that the analysis requires them to prioritise the issue further. | The objective for action is to enable informed prioritisation of interventions in key sectors for the next CPD. The CPD should have specific Intermediate Results focused on emergency risks in relevant Programme Components Results. | The objective for action is to enable a prioritisation of interventions in the next CPD both as an independent Programme Component Result focused on emergency risks as well as with Intermediate Results in the dedicated PCR and if relevant in other PCRs, as appropriate in the country context. |
## MAIN STEPS FROM THE FROM UNICEF SITAN GUIDANCE

### TIMING, SEQUENCING, and PLANNING

1. **Assess emergency exposure level**
   - Develop ToR for SiTAn
   - List sources

2. **Which hazards pose the biggest risk? Where is the highest risk?**
   - ASSESSMENTS OF MANIFESTATIONS AND SHORTFALLS (=EMERGENCY RISKS TRENDS ANALYSIS)

3. **Why emergencies happen?**
   - CAUSALITY ANALYSIS

4. **Who are duty-bearers / right holders? What capacities they have?**
   - ROLE-PATTERN and CAPACITY-GAPS ANALYSIS

5. **Include in SiTAn/CCA Emergency risk in CPD**
   - VALIDATION OF ANALYSIS

## ACTIONS TO BE TAKEN IN THE SITAN PROCESS FLOW

### REVIEW EMERGENCY RISK OF THE COUNTRY: light, medium, or high? (In medium column, additions are marked in blue and in high column additions are marked in red)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOW</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ToR: secondary data review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List of secondary reviews</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Secondary analysis review: which hazards are most frequent and where they happen | 1. Trends analysis of emergency risks
2. Data gaps analysis
3. Sub-national country map of emergency risks in the country
4. Overlaid map of emergency risks with child vulnerability map | 1. Trends analysis of emergency risks, identification of baselines
2. Data gaps analysis
3. Data collection plan
4. Subnational country maps down to district level of emergency risks in the country
5. Overlaid maps down to district level of emergency risks with child vulnerability maps
6. Additional focus on schools and closed institutions |
| Desk-review of reasons of high vulnerability of at-risk-children and potential role for UNICEF and key players in risk reduction. | 1. Qualitative analysis with partners
2. Causality problem tree (focus on underlying and structural causes of emergencies) | 1. Qualitative analysis with partners
2. Causality problem tree (focus on underlying and structural causes of emergencies) |
| 1. Identify duty bearers and rights holders
2. Consult and prioritise duty bearers
3. Capacity mapping through desk review
4. Prioritise capacity gaps in key sectors | 1. Identify duty bearers and rights holders
2. Consult and prioritise duty bearers
3. Vulnerability and capacity analysis in consultation with rights holders at sub-national level
3. Capacity mapping in partnership with key players
4. Prioritise capacity gaps in UNICEF sectors |
| **CPD: routine CO preparedness and advocacy** | 1. Share analysis with partners, include in CCA
2. Visible mentions: paragraphs in the intro, cross-sector section, sector-specific sections | 1. Share analysis with large group of stakeholders, include in CCA
2. Dedicated chapter in SiTAn as cross-sector + paragraphs in the intro, cross-sector section, sector-specific sections
**CPD: Dedicated PCR + relevant IRRs** |
ANNEX 1: sources of information for emergency risk review and prioritisation

General risk overview:
- ACAPS secondary data reviews: country-specific multi-risk reviews of emergency-prone countries (not all countries covered), presenting key issues with statistical and analytical overviews.
- Maplecroft risks database: very comprehensive database to which UNICEF is a subscriber. It allows comparative reviews with other countries and detailed indices reviews.

Regarding Natural Hazards and health crises:
- EMOPS classification by emergency exposure provides a ranking of countries where UNICEF has operations according to the likelihood and potential impact of hazards, the vulnerabilities of population, and the capacities of the Government to respond.
- The Emdat database: this is the most comprehensive public domain database on natural hazards and their consequences on the population. This is possible to generate country profiles with the fatalities, number of affected persons, and economic damages caused by disasters in all countries.
- The Desinventar database: this is a more detailed database, but available in only in a few countries (in the Americas mainly)
- UNDP GRIP Project: the objective of this programme is to provide a detailed global repository of disaster risk information and analysis, with methodological support to risk analysis.
- ADPC country profiles: these are hazards profiles compiled by ADPC for certain Asian countries
- PreventionWeb contains a wealth of primary data on disaster losses: http://www.preventionweb.net/english/professional/statistics/
- UNU World Risk Report: this provides a different methodology to assessing risk as a function of exposure, susceptibility, coping capacities and adaptive capacities

Regarding conflict risk:
- Nisat small arms database: comprehensive database on trade of small arms throughout the world
- Uppsala/Prio armed conflict dataset: historical database of internal and external conflicts throughout the world from 1946 to present with indication of intensity and types of conflicts.
- Heidelberg conflict barometer: this describes all recent trends in conflict development, escalations, settlements, sorted by countries.
- References in annex 5 of the technical note on conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding in UNICEF

COs can request RO/EMOPS support to read through and process these sources.

Capacities available to collect primary data:
- UNDAC teams can be deployed after emergencies notably to run assessments and collect data
- MICS processes when they are planned in a country are very complete data collection mechanisms that can be mobilised
- UNDP/GRIP project has been collecting primary data in selected countries that can potentially relevant for risk analyses

ANNEX 2: potential partners in-country with whom to engage in the process

- UNDP / UNDP-BCPR: UNDP is very often a key actor in country-level support to DRR and Peacebuilding and through the GRIP and CADRI programmes often performs risk assessments and capacity assessments respectively. UNDP also hosts the informal UN Inter-Agency Framework Team for Preventive Action (Framework Team), which emphases inter-agency early prevention through UNCTs. Under the joint auspices of UNDP, DPA and the Framework Team, Peace and Development Advisors (PDAs), which are conflict prevention and peacebuilding specialists, are placed either in select Resident Co-ordinator Offices or within a UNDP Country Office. UNDP also manages the Conflict Prevention Community of Practice, which can be a valuable resource for interested UNICEF staff. To request access and membership, contact Alex Shoebridge at alex.shoebridge@undp.org or the UNICEF Peacebuilding and Recovery Section in EMOPS NYHQ.
- **IFRC / ICRC**: The Red Cross movement is also a global player in the field of risk reduction, IFRC mainly focused on natural hazards while ICRC’s focus is on conflictual settings. The Red Cross agencies very often perform Vulnerability and Capacity Assessments that can be usefully used by UNICEF as secondary analysis. The national red cross offices also provide powerful linkages with communities.

- **Plan International**: Plan international’s mandate allies very closely to UNICEF’s in terms of promotion of the CRC, and very pro-active work on DRR. The strong focus of the organisation on child participation and the strong linkages undertaken with communities make Plan a source of localised analysis as well as a logical partner in data collection and programme implementation.

- **The World Bank GFDRR and World Bank Global Centre for Conflict, Security, and Development**: In some 35 countries the World Bank has established specialised structures on DRR, piloted from Washington and a Global Centre for conflict, security, and development has also been established by the World Bank in Nairobi to work on improving the situation of fragile and conflict-affected countries. Useful connection to the work of UNICEF can be made and very often high quality analysis is done by the Bank.

- **The Peacebuilding Commission (PBC)**: The PBC is an intergovernmental subsidiary organ of the General Assembly and the Security Council. There are currently five countries on the Commission’s agenda – Burundi, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and Sierra Leone.

- **Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO)**: The PBSO works to sustain peace in conflict-affected countries by garnering international support for nationally owned and led peacebuilding efforts.

- **Peacebuilding Fund (PBF)**: The PBF relies upon voluntary contributions from Member States, organizations and individuals. It is managed by the PBSO and administered by the UNDP Multi-Donor Trust Fund Office (MDTF Office).

- **Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO)**: Important actors in many conflict-affected countries are Security-Council mandated peacekeeping missions. These missions also lead Integrated Strategic Frameworks, UN joint strategic plans for peace consolidation.

- **Department of Political Affairs (DPA)**: DPA manages Special Political Missions, including integrated Peacebuilding Offices, the majority of which are Security Council-mandated, and which lead joint peacebuilding strategies. These missions include countries currently on the PBC’s agenda – Guinea-Bissau, the Central African Republic, Burundi and Sierra Leone. DPA maintains a global Joint Programme on Conflict Prevention with UNDP.

- **European Commission (EC)**: The EC is a major funding partner both for DRR and for Peacebuilding.

- **UN-World Bank-EC Partnership Framework for Crisis and Post-Crisis Situations**: A tripartite Partnership Framework Agreement (PFA) for Crisis and Post-Crisis Situations was signed by the UN, World Bank, and the EC in 2008. The PFA reflects the renewed effort to engage sooner and more systematically after crises, and includes a Fiduciary Principles Accord to streamline financial collaboration, and an Operational Annex that identifies the Post-Conflict Needs Assessment (PCNA) and Post-Disaster Needs Assessment (PDNA) as the agreed, multilateral recovery assessment and planning tool. The documents can be found at: [http://www.intranet.unicef.org/PFO/PFOInfoV3.nsf/Site%20Pages/Page0304](http://www.intranet.unicef.org/PFO/PFOInfoV3.nsf/Site%20Pages/Page0304).

- **World Food Programme (WFP):** WFP is active in identifying and articulating the links between food insecurity and conflict. WFP’s principal contribution to peacebuilding is through support to food security via the delivery of humanitarian assistance (and the early recovery approach).

- **UN Women:** UN Women is a key actor in promoting the role of women in peacemaking, peacekeeping and peacebuilding, and advocates for the active participation of women at all levels of decision-making.

- **Save the Children**
- **International Alert**
- **Search for Common Ground**
- **World Vision**
- **PACT**
- **Catholic Relief Services**
- **CARE**
- **International Rescue Committee**
- **Counterpart International**
- **The US Institute of Peace offers** a list of NGOs specializing in conflict resolution.
ANNEX 3: ROSTER OF DRR AND PIECEBUILDING SPECIALISTS

Several rosters of specialists in DRR, Peace-building and risk reduction work in general have been put together by organisations such as the Norwegian Refugee Council, or MSB. More details can be obtained on these rosters by contacting

- EMOPS Geneva: Inter-Agency and Humanitarian Partnerships Section, Stand-by partnerships
- EMOPS New-York: Peacebuilding and Recovery Section

ANNEX 4: EXAMPLE OF DISASTER RISK MAPPING: NEPAL

This guidance proposes below a methodology with examples of indicators that can be selected for performing the geo-localised quantitative analysis of risks, based on the successful example of Nepal CO. However this methodology is only indicative and can be changed and adapted to the country context.

It is based on the risk formula:

\[
\text{Risk} = \text{Hazard} \times \text{Vulnerability} \times \text{Exposure} \times \text{Capacity}
\]

The above risk formula is interpreted as follows in the tables below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>The probability and intensity of a future disaster</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Hazards               | The probability and intensity of hazards. Examples of indicators\(^{11}\) for Natural hazards would be:
                        | - Nb earthquake hazard emergencies with 250 years’ return period,           |
                        | - Nb volcanic eruption emergencies with 50 years’ return period,           |
                        | - Nb significant flood emergencies with 10 years’ return period,           |
                        | - Nb rainfall triggered landslides emergencies with 10 years’ return period,|
                        | - Nb drought emergencies with 10 years’ return period,                     |
                        | - Nb extreme temperature spells with 10 year’s return period,              |
                        | - Nb disease outbreaks with 10 years’ return period                        |
| Climate Change\(^{12}\) | An index of climate change vulnerability can also be in-built in the model considering the country context and the availability of data at subnational level. |
| Child Vulnerability   | Child vulnerability was measured based on five child vulnerability indicators:  |
                        | - food security,                                                          |
                        | - primary school drop-out rate,                                           |
                        | - measles vaccination coverage,                                            |
                        | - ratio of girls to boys in secondary education, and                      |
                        | - sanitation coverage\(^{13}\)                                            |
| Exposure              | Number of children exposed to the hazard in a particular district          |
| Capacity              | This is the most difficult variable to assess as no ready-made indicator is. In the case of Nepal, the CO used an inverse ratio for the number of UNICEF sections working in a particular district. |

\(^{11}\) In these indicators, the element of probability is more prominent than the intensity element, however COs can also include an element of intensity by using indices based on the number of persons affected/killed by these hazards. EM-DAT/CRED is a good source of data for this purpose.

\(^{12}\) Climate change is incorporated in the scenarios below.

\(^{13}\) To build this composite index, these five child vulnerability indicators can be replaced other more significant child vulnerability indicators for the country, as relevant in the specific country context.
Different scenarios were then developed, using different weights for the different variables:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Relative Weight</th>
<th>Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| No. 1    | 30% multi-hazards  
            20% climate change  
            30% child vulnerability  
            10% child exposure  
            10% UNICEF capacity | Most relevant for weather-related hazards and rural settings, without disregarding seismic hazards |
| No. 2    | 40% multi-hazards  
            10% climate change  
            30% child vulnerability  
            10% child exposure  
            10% UNICEF capacity | Most relevant for multiple hazards and urban settings, without disregarding climate change |
| No. 3    | 50% multi-hazards  
            30% child vulnerability  
            10% child exposure  
            10% capacity | Multi-hazard risk assessment without considering climate change |
| No. 4    | 50% climate change  
            30% child vulnerability  
            10% child exposure  
            10% capacity | Climate change vulnerability assessment without considering seismic/volcanic risks |

Conventional development planning is usually done based on a snap-shot of current vulnerability indicators only. The following map in Nepal is the type of map conventionally used for development planning:

‘BLIND’ DEVELOPMENT PLANNING  
based on child deprivation indicators only

In order to incorporate emergency risk it is necessary to assign weight to past hazard trends, current conflict risk and/or future climate change projections. This map considers the past hazard trends:
Based on such spatial analysis of current vulnerability indicators overlaid with past hazard trends, current conflict risk and/or future climate change projections, geographical targeting can be reconsidered more precisely. The following map is considering past hazard trends and child vulnerabilities:

**DISASTER RISK-INFORMED PLANNING**

based on child deprivation AND multi-hazard indicators

This map is developed based on the above child deprivation index combined with a disaster risk assessment $R = (H \times V) / C$

**Relative weight of components:**
- 50% multi-hazard
- 30% vulnerability (child deprivation)
- 10% exposure
- 10% capacity

*Risk:*
- Risk Ranking 2 (1 district)
- Risk Ranking 3-4 (45 districts)
- Risk Ranking 5-8 (26 districts)
- Risk Ranking 9 (5 districts)
- Risk Ranking 10 (1 district)
ANNEX 5: CAUSALITY ANALYSIS PROBLEM TREE

Climate Change causal pathways analysis and impacts on child rights in Madagascar (general and detailed):

- Climate change
  - Extreme weather events
  - Gradual climate variability

Pathways

- Damage to livelihood systems
- Degradation of natural resources and ecosystem services
- Behavior change to adapt/cope

Impacts on children

- Deteriorated child health from increasing disease
- Increased child malnutrition
- Reduced access and quality of education
- Reduced child protection
Climate Change and Variability

Temperature Change

Precipitation Change

Intensification of Natural Hazards

Increased incidence of extreme events (cyclones, droughts)

Ecosystem change (erosion, desertification, sea level rise)

Decreased agricultural yields

Decline in household income / livelihood options

Increased child mortality and morbidity

Increased child malnutrition

Increased child poverty

Increased school drop-out

Water stress

Flooding

Reduced water quality

Deterioration of WASH

Decline in food security

Children

Communities / Households

Environment