

Addendum HNO + HRP Guidance

Analysing risks and determining the most likely evolution of the humanitarian situation

6 October 2020, Needs and Response Analysis Section, APMB¹

INTRODUCTION

This guidance outlines key steps for analysing risks and determining the most likely evolution of the humanitarian situation when developing an HNO. The analytical outputs should help to plan for the most likely scenario in the foreseeable future and inform the response analysis and targeting steps in the HRP. This note complements the HPC step-by-step guidance and HNO annotated template (Chapter II) and is based on a review of existing practice and policy.²

The three main outputs of the analysis include:

1. **Risk analysis** identifies the main drivers in a given humanitarian context, both positive (opportunities) and negative (shocks and stresses), their likelihood and potential severity. The risk analysis clarifies which and why changes are expected to occur, where, when and who will benefit or be affected.
2. **Scenarios:** From the drivers identified in the risk analysis, the *most likely and those with severe impact* are identified. Humanitarian Country Teams/ Inter-cluster coordination groups should use this information to agree on a *scenario* for the planning period. It will also inform potential changes in operational access, which influence the choice of response options.
3. **Most likely evolution** focusing on the humanitarian consequences for most vulnerable groups and **projection** of number of people in need during the planning period. This projected figure includes the number of persons in need already identified in the previous steps of the HNO and the number of people who are not resilient to the anticipated shocks and stresses and are expected to present needs in future (during the planning period of the HRP).

The underlying logic of this guidance is:

Risks Analysis (informs) -> scenario (informs) -> evolution + projections (informs) -> response analysis and targeting in HRP

Structure of guidance:

- I. Determining risks and the most likely impacts (main steps)
- II. Use of risk analysis and projections for prioritization, response options analysis and targeting in the HRP

¹ This guidance has been consulted with and approved by the Global Cluster Coordination Group and the Global HPC Planning group for the HPC season 2020. It is the intention to update it with lessons learned and emerging practice. Elements related to the JIAF Guidance, such as the guidance on forecasting PiN (see step 7 of this guidance) will require further consultations ahead of the HPC cycle 2021.

² FEWSNET: https://fews.net/sites/default/files/documents/reports/Guidance_Document_Scenario_Development_2018.pdf

ACAPS: https://acaps.org/sites/acaps/files/resources/files/acaps_technical_brief_scenario_building_august_2016.pdf

ERP ([IASC Emergency Readiness and Preparedness Guidance 2015](#)): see section III of this note for further detail on linkages to the ERP

- III. Linkages between risk analysis and preparedness planning, contingency planning and anticipatory action
- IV. Risk analysis in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic: What to focus on
 - Direct impact and humanitarian consequences on people's (women and men of different age and disability) physical and mental wellbeing: (spread/curve, mortality rate) and secondary impacts and consequences (health systems, other pathologies, safety / protection).
 - Impact and humanitarian consequences on people's (women and men of different age and disability) living standards (livelihoods, access to basic needs) due to government and international measures etc.
- V. Annex: How to forecast PiN Estimates

I. DETERMINING RISKS, MOST LIKELY IMPACT AND HUMANITARIAN CONSEQUENCES

Main steps:

1. Define scope of forward-looking analysis: timeframe, geographic coverage, vulnerable groups
2. Review relevant information
3. Determine what will drive changes (positive and negative) of humanitarian needs
4. Estimate likelihood and impact
5. Agree on most likely scenario
6. Describe the most likely evolution of the humanitarian situation and needs
7. Forecasting PiN estimates

1. Define scope of forward-looking analysis: Timeframe, geographic coverage, vulnerable groups

Usually the time horizon for which the forward-looking analysis should be conducted spans until the end of the planning cycle (end of following calendar year). For multi-year HRP's it is recommended to look at the entire planning cycle but differentiate between each year.

- Limit the analysis to specific geographic areas. This usually includes the most affected areas as identified in the HNO and may also include areas that are frequently affected by natural hazards or conflict.
- Agree on the vulnerable groups of focus. This should include the most vulnerable groups identified and analyzed already in the HNO and may include additional groups likely to fall from stressed into crisis situations.

Overarching research question: How will the situation in country/region X develop over the next x months and whose needs will change?

2. Review relevant information

Use relevant data available: past HNOs, [INFORM](#), Emergency Response Preparedness (ERPs), contingency plans, Common Country Assessment (CCAs), historical data, food security projections, weather forecasts, human rights including UN Human Rights Mechanisms' reports, emergent political,

economic, environmental and social issues etc. This data should help identify the type of shocks, stresses, and opportunities that can be expected to occur.

Refer to lessons learned (past responses, response capacities) or available trend analysis to help inform on the most recurrent shocks and stresses, whose lives and livelihoods were affected and how, and possibly, who recovered and how fast. This information gives a sense of the nature (type, frequency and intensity) of shocks and stresses typically occurring, the vulnerability characteristics of people who were harmed (including gender/age/disability), and the capacities that were mobilized to withstand and recover (resilience). As such, trend analysis also helps identify population groups and sub-groups who are usually resilient to specific shocks and stresses, and why.

3. Determine what will drive changes (positive and negative) of humanitarian needs

Shocks, stresses and opportunities have a determining influence over the direction the future will take. These drivers may have a positive (opportunity) or a negative impact on people’s lives and livelihoods, depending on the pre-existing context, people’s vulnerabilities and capacities (resilience, coping), and government/community response capacities.

The analysis can be structured according to the below categories:

Questions to help facilitate joint analysis:

What are the main political, social, security, economic, financial, environment and technological shocks (acute) or stresses (when they persist over long periods)?

- What are the main potential hazards
- What is their likelihood?
- What is their expected impact on people’s lives and livelihoods?

Categories	Examples
Current crisis context	Identified in the HNO, such as: severe under-development and poverty, fragile state institutions, lack of essential services and access to justice, economic and social deprivation of marginalized groups, insecurity, armed conflict, patterns of human rights violations, war crimes, inequalities, injustice, lack of democratic space, social tensions and violence, excessive population growth, overuse of local resources, food production deficits, recurrent lean seasons, etc. Positive drivers may include ongoing or anticipated peace or reconciliation processes, positive political changes including at regional level, remittances, etc
Potential future hazards ³	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Natural hazards, either hydro-meteorological (floods, landslides, storms, droughts) or geophysical (earthquake, volcanic eruption, tsunami). ▪ Armed conflict and civil unrest. ▪ Epidemics and pandemics. ▪ Drastic changes in the socio-economic environment, such as a surge in prices of essential goods, restrictive government legislation such as export and import bans and serious human rights violations and

³ ERP ([IASC Emergency Readiness and Preparedness Guidance 2015](#)):

	international humanitarian law violations, including attacks against protected persons and objects.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental hazards (industrial accidents, severe pollution).
People and communities' vulnerabilities and capacities (resilience)	<p>Vulnerabilities are people's conditions determined by physical, social, economic and environmental factors or processes that make them susceptible to the impacts of hazards⁴ and stresses (e.g. disabilities, medical conditions, denied access to basic services, displaced, people living in active conflict zones, marginalized groups, etc)</p> <p>Coping capacities are communities and people's ability, using available skills and resources, to manage adverse conditions, risk or disasters⁵ (e.g. ability to move, savings, remittances, flexibility of livelihoods, access to community support, knowledge and skills)</p>
Local/National/International Response Capacity	Government capacity and intentions, availability/lack of affordable and accessible basic services; , presence of aid actors, humanitarian space and access, humanitarian funding, level of preparedness, contingency stocks

For each shock and stress (or opportunity)⁶, make an assumption on their most likely evolution or direction (increase, decrease or stable). The more detailed the assumptions are the more helpful will it be to develop a meaningful scenario (see examples below⁷)

Weak assumption
Prices will decline during the March–May period.
Strong assumption
Based on last year's poor maize production, current government crop forecasts, and recent field assessments, maize grain prices in the Greater Mudzi Communal (GMC) livelihood zone are projected to increase to an average of \$0.46/kg in March/April, 5–15 percent above last year's prices and 20–40 percent above the 5-year average. Following the May harvest, prices are expected to drop to \$0.40/kg by June, a smaller decline than usual, and then rise again between July and September, reaching \$0.46-0.51/kg. The level of post-harvest price increases will largely depend on imports by government, the private sector, and other stakeholders.

Weak assumption
Rains are expected to be below-average during the upcoming season.
Strong assumption
Based on the national meteorological agency forecast and international forecasts, the April through June long rains are likely to be 20–40 percent below normal in the northeastern pastoral livelihood zone. As a result, seasonal totals of only 110–150 mm of precipitation are expected. Rains in this area are also expected to be erratic and poorly distributed, and to end after six weeks instead of three months.

⁴ UNISDR: https://www.unisdr.org/files/52828_nationaldisasterriskassessmentwiagu.pdf (see p28)

⁵ UNISDR: https://www.unisdr.org/files/52828_nationaldisasterriskassessmentwiagu.pdf (see p29)

⁶ In theory, the risk analysis should not only consider shocks and stresses (negative) but also opportunities (positive) that may positively affect people's lives and livelihoods. In practice, unless such opportunities are clearly predictable and significant (e.g. a bumper harvest in a situation of high food insecurity, a peace truce in a conflict etc., the risk analysis is limited to shocks and stresses.

⁷ FEWSNET: https://fews.net/sites/default/files/documents/reports/Guidance_Document_Scenario_Development_2018.pdf

4. Estimate likelihood and impact

Once the shocks and stresses (and opportunities) have been identified, their likelihood and impact should be determined. The likelihood estimation can be based on available trend analysis and modelisations.⁸ Some shocks or stresses may however be relatively new (e.g. those due to climate change) or difficult to predict (e.g. outbreaks of violence), which limits the reliability or reliance on past shocks/stresses analysis.

The intensity of the impact depends on the crisis context (the external conditions that mitigate or aggravate the intensity and frequency of shocks and stresses), people's vulnerabilities and coping capacities ([see also resilience guidance](#)) and the response capacities of affected communities, local and national authorities, and aid organisations. While the same shocks and stresses impact on all members of the community, some groups (e.g. women, children, persons with disabilities) may experience them differently due to barriers they face and intersecting structural inequalities.

The outcome of the likelihood and impact analysis can be represented by ranking the likelihood and impact e.g. on a scale of 1 to 5 (as featured in the table⁹ below). Multiplying these two variables results in a score that may help indicate the gravity — low, medium or high — of a given risk, as shown below.¹⁰¹¹ The scoring should be accompanied by transparent disclosure of the limitations and uncertainties.

IMPACT	LIKELIHOOD
Negligible (1) Minor additional humanitarian impact. Government capacity is sufficient to deal with the situation.	Very unlikely (1) A remote chance of an event occurring in the current year (0-5%). E.g. seasonal hazards that have happened once in the last 20 years.
Minor (2) Minor additional humanitarian impact. Current country level inter-agency resources sufficient to cover needs beyond government capability.	Unlikely (2) The event has a low chance of arising in the current year (5 to 15%). E.g. seasonal hazards that have happened one to three times in the last twenty years.
Moderate (3) Moderate additional humanitarian impact. New resources up to 30% of current operations needed to cover needs beyond government capacity. Regional support not required.	Moderately likely (3) The event has a viable chance of arising in the current year (15-30%). E.g. Seasonal hazards that have happened two or three times in the last ten years, or once or twice in the last five years.
Severe (4) Substantive additional humanitarian impact. New resources up to 50% of current operations needed to cover needs beyond government capacity. Regional support required.	Likely (4) The event has a significant chance of arising in the current year (30-50%). E.g. Seasonal hazards that happen every second or third year, e.g. two times in the last five years.
Critical (5) Massive additional humanitarian impact. New resources over 80% of current operations needed to cover needs beyond government capacity. L3- scale emergency.	Very Likely (5) The event has a positive chance of arising (>50%) E.g. seasonal hazards that have happened three or more times in the last five years, or five or more times in the last ten years.

⁸ e.g. UNISDR: https://www.unisdr.org/files/52828_nationaldisasterriskassessmentwiagu.pdf (see 18p64)

⁹ Excerpt ERP ([IASC Emergency Readiness and Preparedness Guidance 2015](#))

¹⁰ For an illustrative example of a scoring exercise pls see Myanmar ERP Plan June 2019: http://themimu.info/sites/themimu.info/files/documents/Core_Doc_Emergency_Response_Preparedness_Plan_Jun2019_ENG.zip

¹¹ Check if a protection risk matrix has been done or is planned to help inform the risk discussion. At a minimum ensure that a protection expert is engaged in the discussion: <https://emergency.unhcr.org/entry/35340/risk-analysis-and-monitoring-refugee-emergencies>

5. Agree on probable scenario¹²

At its core, scenario development is little more than a sophisticated “if-then” statement. That is, given current conditions, if the assumptions underlying the scenario are accurate, then it is likely that the projected outcomes will occur.¹³

The aim of this exercise is to arrive at a likely scenario that helps inform the HRP. Only the shocks and stresses that scored relatively high and are relevant should be retained for the scenario to avoid an overly complex exercise.

The scenario should also be coherent with ERPs and contingency plans that have been developed for potential high-impact / worst-case scenarios that would overwhelm current response capacities. If such exercises have not taken place or are outdated, the scenario should ideally be defined in cooperation with stakeholders involved in them usually (they may not be the ones involved in the HNO and HRP).

6. Most likely evolution of the situation

Once a scenario is agreed upon, it is applied to forecast changes in a) who will present humanitarian needs, b) where, and c) how many. Forecasts may reflect an increase or decrease in the estimated number of people in need (PiN), which should be what is then considered in the HRP for the prioritisation and response analysis.

The analysis of the most likely evolution of the humanitarian situation should focus on the humanitarian consequences as described in the Joint Inter-sectoral Analysis Framework (JIAF)¹⁴:

- Physical and Mental Wellbeing consequences
- Living Standards consequences
- The anticipated coping strategies of the most vulnerable populations

The shocks and stresses identified above and the anticipated humanitarian consequences of the most vulnerable should form the bases for the forecast of people in need, complemented by available trend analysis and lessons learned (which help understand which changes occurred in the past). As estimating the future number of people in need is complex, ranges may be provided instead of single figures (see step 7). Forecasts might also have to take into account seasonality of shocks and stresses. When available, models that are built on extensive and robust datasets (and ideally ground-truthed), can be used to help with estimations and ranges.

A [resilience analysis](#) can be used to complement this step, by filling in the corresponding vulnerability, capacities and context information in a matrix, organized by specific population groups and sub-groups, or first by geographic areas and then population groups and sub-groups in these areas. This will help provide a summary overview of the various elements and how they combine. When conducting such an analysis it is important to recognize that the resilience of certain groups (children, women, persons with disabilities, older persons etc.) may differ from those of the rest of the affected population.

Guiding question to help facilitate a joint discussion

What is the most probably impact on people, services and access and subsequent humanitarian consequences and coping mechanisms of the most vulnerable groups and sub-groups?

¹² The help determine the main elements of the most likely scenario you might wish to use this template: [link](#)

¹³ Guidance Fewsnets: https://fewsnets.net/sites/default/files/documents/reports/Guidance_Document_Scenario_Development_2018.pdf

¹⁴ The exact wording of these pillars might change pending the finalization of JIAF guidance

While it will be difficult to accurately estimate the change in number of people in need it is important to do so for the stage of prioritization and response analysis in the HRP (see Section II below).

7. Forecasting People in Need (PiN) Estimates

This final step outlines optional, additional guidance on how to forecast PiN estimates. Please consult the corresponding annex.

II. USE RESULTS FOR PRIORITIZATION, RESPONSE OPTIONS ANALYSIS AND TARGETING IN THE HRP¹⁵

The forward-looking analysis in the HNO should help inform the planning of the most likely scenario for the upcoming planning cycle. Specifically, it should contribute to determining in the HRP a) the prioritisation of geographic areas and groups, b) the most appropriate response options and c) the number of people targeted.

- The prioritisation of geographic areas and people in need in the HRP should be based on the severity of humanitarian consequences, magnitude (estimated numbers of people in need), causes of the needs, people's own priorities and the analysis of the most likely evolution of the situation. A deteriorating trend of humanitarian consequences is an alert that possibly less urgent problems related to physical and well-being needs, living standards needs or resilience deficits will eventually result in acute humanitarian needs. Prioritization should also consider urgent, mid-term and long-term needs which then may be addressed through layered and/or sequenced interventions
- Response analysis in the HRP consists of reviewing the range of proposed interventions and modalities to meet the prioritized humanitarian needs and to achieve the desired change in people's lives, as well as on national humanitarian, resilience and recovery systems and services. This requires a structured approach looking at appropriateness, relevance and feasibility of the interventions and providing clear explanations for the chosen modalities. The analysis of risks and most likely evolution of the situation should be considered when exploring these response options.
- Targeting is an iterative process that starts at the prioritisation stage, is refined at the response analysis stage and completed by the quantification of the number of people who will benefit from given responses. The number of people targeted is a subset of people in need and represents the number of people humanitarian actors aim or plan to assist.¹⁶ The targeting approach should be decided early in the planning process and should be used when formulating strategic and specific objectives. The analysis of the most likely evolution of the situation and corresponding projection of the current PiN should help inform the determination of the number of people targeted. The projected PiN may apply to certain periods of the planning timeframe taking into consideration seasonality (e.g. lean seasons) and responses that might be triggered at a later stage.

¹⁵ see also Prioritization, Response Analysis and Targeting Guidance Note ([link](#))

¹⁶ According to the logic of the population onion as defined in the [Humanitarian Profile Support Guidance 2016](#) the number of people targeted is typically smaller than the number of People in Need, given that needs are also being addressed by actors not participating in the joint plan, including national Governments, ICRC or development actors, and people in need are not always accessible.

III. LINKAGES BETWEEN RISK ANALYSIS AND PREPAREDNESS PLANNING, CONTINGENCY PLANNING AND ANTICIPATORY ACTION

While the risk analysis undertaken in the HNO is intended to help with the planning of the most likely scenario in the HRP it can also complement risk analysis undertaken to prepare for, anticipate and mitigate the impact of hazards outside of the scope of the ongoing response be that in the context of preparedness plans, contingency plans and anticipatory action plans or a combination of all three.

The IASC Emergency Response and Preparedness (ERP) approach offers a simple methodology to identify and rank hazards (see above 1.4 above) and to help Humanitarian Country Team to prepare for potential high-impact events outside the scope of the HRP that would overwhelm current response capacities. Depending on the severity of the scenario and operational context the Humanitarian Country Team is advised to either:

- a. Include costed preparedness actions and proposed response actions **in the HRP**;
- b. Develop a separate costed **contingency plan** which includes preparedness and response actions based on the country context and risk profile;
- c. Where appropriate levels of quality risk monitoring, response capacity and available financing are in place, field teams can identify humanitarian actions which can **mitigate** the humanitarian impact of a predicted out-of-the-ordinary hazard and can be implemented before this impact has fully materialized can be implemented in anticipation of a potential crisis to mitigate its potential impact (**anticipatory action**). Depending on the context prevention programming and anticipatory humanitarian actions can be i) included in the HRP, ii) included within a Contingency Plan and referenced in the HRP, or iii) as a separate anticipatory action plan/framework that is referenced in the HRP.

Preparedness. The ERP provides an agreed framework that allows Humanitarian Country Teams to identify high-impact risks, take actions to enhance preparedness, and flag gaps in capacity so the right support can be mobilized. The ERP approach is designed to ensure that the humanitarian community in a given country has a shared and updated understanding of risks and a joint plan for enhancing preparedness. The approach has three main components: 1) risk analysis and monitoring; 2) Minimum Preparedness Actions (MPAs), which are a set of activities that every Humanitarian Country Team should review and implement where needed to establish a minimum level of emergency preparedness within the country; and 3) Advanced Preparedness Actions (APAs), which are designed to take a Humanitarian Country Team from 'preparedness' to 'readiness', and contingency planning when required. While risk analysis, monitoring and minimum preparedness measures are relevant in all contexts, advanced preparedness and **contingency planning** only becomes necessary once a specific moderate or high risk has been identified.

Contingency Planning in its simplest terms is a snapshot of humanitarian partners' capacities and approaches to meeting the immediate needs of affected communities as the result of a likely shock. A good inter-agency contingency plan should:

- Foster a common understanding of all partners involved in the anticipated scope of the emergency, the possible humanitarian needs and the nature and scope of the planned operational response.

- Clearly identify the sector/cluster response capacities and response modalities to address the imminent needs of the affected population with the first weeks of an emergency in support of Government and other response partners.
- Reflect specific challenges/gaps in the potential response;
- Agreement on flexible humanitarian coordination arrangements requirements.
- Support for the implementation of **Anticipatory Action** should a out-of-the-ordinary event taking place be forecasted and trigger the provision of assistance before humanitarian needs have fully manifested.

Anticipatory Action. There is a growing consensus that given the unprecedented availability of risk and forecasting information and ever-increasing interconnectedness of the humanitarian system we can act before hazards impact communities. Key parameters of what we mean when we talk about early or anticipatory action:

- Time factor: the action happens in anticipation of a hazard impact
- Objective: Actions to prevent or mitigate the impact
- Trigger: Predicated on a forecast and/or collaborative analysis of a specific future event

Anticipatory action targets events that have a moderate likelihood, but whose impact would be severe or critical. A collective analysis of risk is key to understanding the impact of such an event, that is how humanitarian needs develop following the event and who is most at risk. This analysis will determine the selection of actions that have the biggest chance to reduce the shock impact and the identification of thresholds to trigger the actions.

With forecasting and communication of early warnings improving over the years, financing solutions to ensure translation of early warning into action have also advanced. Beyond agency-internal funds, there are pooled funding instruments accessible to UN agencies, NGOs and Red Cross/Red Crescent societies that provide resources for anticipatory action in line with the above parameters.

IV. RISK ANALYSIS IN THE CONTEXT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC: WHAT TO LOOK AT

Determining the probable evolution of the humanitarian situation in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic should follow the same logic as described above. However, the risk analysis should also consider other pre-existing shocks and stresses or those likely to happen (as per Part I).

With regards to risks more directly linked to the pandemic, the following factors should be considered inasmuch as they are expected to aggravate humanitarian needs:

- Risks to physical and mental wellbeing due to the direct health impact related to COVID-19 spread/curve and mortality rate, and secondary health impacts (e.g. due to inaccessible, costly or overwhelmed health-care system preventing the treatment of other pathologies and provision of essential services including to persons with disabilities, elderly, people living in institutions, detainees to survivors of gender-based violence and mental health and psychosocial care).
- Indirect humanitarian effects due to government and international preventive and response measures:

- Risks to living standards, through loss of access to basic goods including physical access to markets, market supplies (availability), and prices (economic access).
- Risks to coping capacity / resilience, through loss of livelihoods, e.g. decreased access to productive assets, employment, wages etc.
- Risks to education, e.g. future development and earning capacities of children, children protection risks etc.
- Risks to physical and mental wellbeing through erosion of social cohesion, discrimination against marginalised groups, increased violence or conflict.
- Protection risks, which are linked to the pandemic itself as well as the containment measures that have been applied. E.g. movement restrictions increasing the risk or incidence of gender-based violence, violence against children, loss of caregiver(s) and the demand for care for unaccompanied children and MHPSS for children, refugees, IDPs and migrants etc.

The most likely scenario should be based on the likelihood of the above risks, including those stemming from other shocks and stresses than COVID-19, and their expected humanitarian consequences, including for the most vulnerable groups identified in the HNO, as well as others who may be severely affected by the pandemic. The outcome of the risk analysis should be a description of the critical problems related to mental and physical well-being, living conditions, coping mechanisms and evolution of the total number of people in need.

For further guidance to help with the analysis the impact of the pandemic (both health and socio-economic) please consult the footnote.¹⁷

Specific COVID-19 Questions to facilitate joint discussion

Situation and needs risk analysis related to COVID-19

- *What are likely to be the humanitarian impacts of the pandemic and its response to it and what locations of the country will be impacted?*
- *What is the capacity of the healthcare system to respond?*
- *What is the likely impact on systems and services (such as WASH)? How is the Pandemic impacting people's access to these?*
- *Which population groups and how many people are likely to be affected? What are the gender., age, disability and other vulnerability considerations?*
- *Are they geo-spatial risk areas such as camps/camp-like settings, migrant detention centers or very populated urban slums?*
- *How are population movements affected, including for normal livelihood activities, IDPs, refugees and migrants? Is there likely to be new or more displacement?*
- *What are the capacities of people to withstand the shock of the pandemic, according to their vulnerability and other diversity characteristics?*
- *How long are emergency conditions likely to last?*

¹⁷ For further guidance pls consult also:

- A UN framework for the immediate socio-economic response to COVID-19: <https://reliefweb.int/report/world/un-framework-immediate-socio-economic-response-covid-19-april-2020>
- Examples of country analysis of socio-economic impact of COVID-19: <https://www.undp.org/content/undp/en/home/coronavirus/socio-economic-impact-of-covid-19.html>
- Interim ERP Guidance to the Covid -19 Pandemic: <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/chad/document/iasc-emergency-response-preparedness-erp-covid-19-pandemic-interim>
- Targeting and prioritization of impoverished and food-insecure populations affected by COVID-19: <https://docs.wfp.org/api/documents/WFP-0000116098/download/>

Implications of risk analysis for preparedness for COVID-19:¹⁸

- *What logistical and operational requirements should be in place to deliver prioritized interventions? Have these logistical requirements been adapted to the COVID-19 pandemic context?*
- *Have response modalities been reviewed to allow implementation of interventions in the context of COVID-19?*
- *What are the available stocks and what is the pipeline status? Is a pipeline break expected in the next three months?*
- *What procurement processes (including importation and customs) are in place for essential supplies?*
- *Are markets functional? Can they meet the demand for essential supplies? Can vulnerable population access markets?*
- *What staff capacity and technical expertise are required and are they available? Are there adequate numbers of female staff in all sectors?*
- *Has consideration been given to sharing staff capacity and technical expertise? How do you address gender gaps in staff?*
- *Has consideration been given to joint procurement and logistics – both local and international? Or front loading of supplies?*
- *Has consideration been given to using the same implementing partners and carrying out joint distributions?*
- *How can we work with local organisations such as women’s, youth and religious groups? What are the administrative and financial barriers to work with them and how to overcome them.*

Implications of the risk analysis for the response in relation to COVID-19

- *How are mobility restriction and social distancing measures affecting the capacity of independent humanitarian organizations to have free and unrestricted access to all affected areas and/or populations?*
- *Are local NGOs and community-based organisations able to access geographic areas and people in need? Do they have adequate numbers of female staff to reach out to women? Are there women’s or youth organizations that can access to geographic areas women and children in need.*
- *Are there particular access constraints for female staff and/or local women’s organizations?*
- *What are the options for reaching individuals and groups who do not have access to technology such as mobile networks/internet?*
- *What are likely to be the major constraints on the emergency response, e.g. in terms of physical access, supply chains, and capacities to deliver?*
- *What are the measures to address specific barriers and risks of vulnerable populations to access/use humanitarian services? E.g. women or children who live with abusers may not be able to access hotline to seek support.*
- *What will be the likely response of the national authorities?*
- *Are there other responses outside of the HRP?*

¹⁸ see also <https://www.humanitarianresponse.info/en/operations/chad/document/iasc-emergency-response-preparedness-erp-covid-19-pandemic-interim>

Annex: Forecasting People in Need (PiN) Estimates

I. General approach to identify the “Forecasted HNO PiN”

To forecast how much the current HNO PiN estimate is likely to change, it is recommended to look at the “most likely scenario” for the upcoming planning cycle, as determined in [steps 1-6](#) of this addendum and to conduct a joint analysis exercise to arrive at an agreed percentage change to the current PiN estimate.

Please note that following terminology is used when referring to the various steps in developing a PiN estimate:

Type of PiN	Description	Methodology
Current JIAF PiN	PiN estimates calculated based on JIAF indicators and methodology	see JIAF Guidance Annexes 1 & 2
Forecasted JIAF PiN	based on updated Current JIAF PIN estimates	see Optional Step in this addendum
Sector PiNs	PiN estimates based on sectoral indicators and methodology	Sectoral PIN forecasting is optional and under the responsibility of clusters ¹⁹
Current HNO PiN	overall PIN estimate derived through a final joint analysis step, considering both JIAF PIN and sector PINs	see JIAF Guidance sections 4.4.2&.3
Forecasted HNO PIN	based on estimated % in- or decrease in Current HNO PIN -> this is the figure that should help inform the planning cycle covered by the HRP - <i>pls see Section II Use results for prioritization, response options analysis and targeting in the HRP</i>	outlined in this addendum.

Following assumptions of the scenario agreed in step 5 are recommended to discuss in more detail when trying to determine the percentage change in overall HNO PiN:²⁰

- The likelihood and impact of the shocks, stresses, opportunities determined in steps 3&4 (what will drive needs?)
- Temporal scope determined in step 2 (when, for how long?)
- Seasonality (how does weather and seasons affect risks, livelihoods, migration patterns etc)
- Geographical scope determined in step 2 (what are the regions that will be affected by change)?
 - Which regions already included in the Current HNO PIN will likely be affected?
 - *The Forecasted JIAF PIN can help inform how much PIN is likely to change in these areas already included in the Current PIN (see optional step below).*
 - Which additional regions, not included in the current PIN will likely be affected?
- Vulnerable groups and communities determined in step 2 (who will be affected by change)?
 - Will needs expand in population groups already included in the Current HNO PIN?

¹⁹ As per JIAF guidance, UNHCR is responsible for providing refugee population data including the PIN and projected PIN. In situations relating to refugee outflow or returns, UNHCR’s planning figures will be used to ensure that double-counting across countries is avoided.

²⁰ Refer to the [template](#), if used, to help determine the most likely scenario

- *The Forecasted JIAF PIN can help inform how much the PIN is likely to change amongst these population groups already included in the Current PIN (see optional step below).*
 - Will additional population groups and communities, not included in the current PIN, develop humanitarian needs?
 - Demographic change in the population (sex & age)
- Local/national/ international response capacities identified in step 3 (to what extent can emerging needs be addressed with existing capacities?)
- Sectoral PiN forecasts (are there any sectoral forecasts that can help inform the discussion?)

Considering these points in a facilitated discussion should help determine the potential percentage change in HNO PiN. Given that this is a **largely qualitative exercise** in nature, it is recommended to use rounded percentages and resulting figures (disaggregated by sex and age). Overly precise figures might convey a false accuracy in this type of exercise. It is also important that the **agreed assumptions are well documented** and their influence on the percentage change of overall HNO PiN is clearly explained.

Optional step to calculate estimates to help inform the joint analysis discussion: A useful source of information that can help inform the estimation of a percentage change in areas and groups already covered by the Current PIN, is the Forecasted JIAF PIN. The Forecasted JIAF PIN can be obtained by determining which of the indicators used to develop the current JIAF PiN might change for the most likely scenario (see section II below).

II. Optional Step: Produce a forecasted JIAF PIN estimate, based on the JIAF indicators, areas and groups already included in the Current JIAF PIN estimate

This section outlines how to obtain the Forecasted JIAF PIN estimates for data scenarios A & B as described in the [JIAF Guidance Annexes 1&2](#). The same rules apply as for aggregation and severity classification for the current PiN. This implies that critical indicators should be respected, and the JIAF forecasted severity and PIN numbers should not be any lower than the forecasted severity and PiN of critical indicators.

In order to follow below suggested steps, a JIAF aggregation dataset must first be created.²¹ The steps outlined below are focusing on forecasting changes in JIAF PIN amongst “existing” groups and areas that are already identified for the Current JIAF PIN.

A. With the advice of sectoral experts, identify indicators, areas and groups in the JIAF aggregation dataset¹ that are likely to see a change, given the most likely scenario:

- Identify which specific indicators in the JIAF aggregation dataset where the % breakdown of population by severity class is likely to change in the given the scenario.
- Identify which specific areas and groups in the JIAF aggregation dataset are likely to experience a change in indicators in the given the scenario.

²¹ See [JIAF Guidance Annexes 1 & 2](#) for how to build the aggregation dataset for data scenarios A and B.

- Estimate how the indicator values for each of the “forecasting indicators” will likely change, as follows²²:

If using data scenario A: Estimate change in severity class - e.g. everyone likely to move into a more severe class (i.e. 1 → 2; 2 → 3 etc):

Add a new column for each “forecasting indicator” in the JIAF aggregation dataset and populate these with the estimated changed severity class taking into account historical data, seasonality and the volatility of each indicator.²³

Table 1: Data scenario A dataset - example including forecasting indicators and estimated change in indicator

JIAF Guidance: Annex 1				Current	Forecasted	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current
uid	KEY	Area	Population group	Food Consumption Score	Food Consumption Score	Household Dietary Diversity Score	Household Hunger Scale <i>Critical indicator</i>	% of HHs having access to water sources of sufficient quality and availability	% of HHs having access to a functional and improved sanitation facility	% of HHs with access to functioning handwashing facilities, with water and soap available or % of HHs with access to soap	% of the population identified as having disabilities (in line with the Washington Group Questions)	Minimum Acceptable Diet in children 6 to 23 months	Exclusive breastfeeding for infants 0-5 months
01657e	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
053be2	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
05e93d	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
061c53f	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
084d67	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
08965a	District A-/idp	District A	idps	5	5	3	3	1	4	2	1	1	2
08eb5f	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	5	2	2	1	3	1	2	1	2
0f139e	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	4	1	1	1	1	4	1	2
1574d0	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2

If using data scenario B: Estimate change in % breakdown of population by severity class:

Add a new row for each “forecasting indicator” in the JIAF aggregation dataset and populate these with the estimated % breakdown

(see next page for illustration)

²² For countries with an updated IPC/CH analysis, projected IPC/CH classification should be used to contribute to the “forecasting”, considering the validity period of both the current and the projected analysis. The analysis team should utilize the change in area classification to identify specific areas that are more prone to shocks. As in the JIAF current PiN analysis, indicators from well-established assessment methodologies, such as the IPC, whose severity indices relate to ‘imminent death’ in the highest categories should be treated as critical indicators.

²³ Example: some indicators that look at behavior change such as coping strategies, depending on the shock, might not be impacted immediately and change in severity cannot always be forecasted between the two analysis periods. When considering shifting severity scale for an indicator, ensure that the most likely scenario will in fact have a major impact on deteriorating or improving results of a specific indicator, taking into account when available indicator thresholds (refer to JIAF list of indicators)

Table 2: Data scenario B dataset - example including forecasting indicators and estimated % breakdowns by severity

JIAF Guidance: Annex 2										none/Minima	Stress	Severe	Extreme	Catastrophic
Step 2. For each indicator, geographical area/affected group, calculate the percentage of people per severity class. ***If breakdown is possible by severity class (e.g. HH and Area level interpretation is possible), use the breakdown***										1	2	3	4	5
Area	Population group	Forecast indicator?	Type of data source	Example data source	Interpretation level(s)	Pillar	Sub pillar	Indicator (examples from JIAG list)						
District A	IDP	yes	HH survey / school KI	MSNA / EMIS or school database / EIE assessment	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% children not attending school by sex and school-level (as a result of the crisis)	45%	0%	55%	0%	0%	
District A	IDP	forecasted	HH survey / school KI	MSNA / EMIS or school database / EIE assessment	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% children not attending school by sex and school-level (as a result of the crisis)	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	
District A	IDP	no	HH survey	Food security assessment / MSNA	HH	Humanitarian Conditions	Physical and mental well-being	Food Consumption Score (FCS)	20%	25%	30%	25%	0%	
District A	IDP	no	HH survey	Food security assessment / MSNA	HH	Humanitarian Conditions	Physical and mental well-being	Household Dietary Diversity Score	38%	15%	1%	27%	15%	
District A	IDP	no	HH survey	Food security assessment / MSNA	HH	Humanitarian Conditions	Physical and mental well-being	Household Hunger Scale (HHS)	25%	30%	24%	21%	0%	
District A	IDP	yes	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian Conditions	Living Standards	% of HHs having access to water sources of sufficient quality and availability	18%	18%	52%	14%	0%	
District A	IDP	forecasted	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian Conditions	Living Standards	% of HHs having access to water sources of sufficient quality and availability	0%	10%	70%	30%	0%	
District A	IDP	no	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% of HHs having access to a functional and improved sanitation facility	12%	32%	13%	8%	20%	
District A	IDP	no	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% of HHs with access to functioning handwashing facilities, with water and soap available or % of HHs with access to soap	30%	30%	7%	0%	23%	

- Also identify any population group figures that are likely to change due to the scenario (e.g. additional displacement leading to an increase in IDPs in a specific area), and estimate by how much they are likely to change → this will be added to the final output table (see section XX below).

B. Prepare the output table → the basis for discussion by the joint analysis group

The objective of the output table is to gather all PIN estimates in one place (whether inter-sectoral / sectoral, current or forecasted) to ensure they are considered in the final discussion where the current and forecasted HNO PINs are agreed.

When implementing the JIAF Aggregation method (Annex 1 & 2, JIAF Guidance) to produce the output table for joint analysis, run the aggregation twice to generate -->

- “Current JIAF PIN” --> use the “current” JIAF aggregation indicator % breakdowns for all indicators, to obtain the “current” PIN estimates (as per JIAF Guidance)

Table 3: Data scenario B dataset - disregard all “forecasted” indicator values.

JIAF Guidance: Annex 2										none/Minima	Stress	Severe	Extreme	Catastrophic
Step 2. For each indicator, geographical area/affected group, calculate the percentage of people per severity class. ***If breakdown is possible by severity class (e.g. HH and Area level interpretation is possible), use the breakdown***										1	2	3	4	5
Area	Population group	Forecast indicator?	Type of data source	Example data source	Interpretation level(s)	Pillar	Sub pillar	Indicator (examples from JIAG list)						
District A	IDP	yes	HH survey / school KI	MSNA / EMIS or school database / EIE assessment	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% children not attending school by sex and school-level (as a result of the crisis)	45%	0%	55%	0%	0%	
District A	IDP	forecasted	HH survey / school KI	MSNA / EMIS or school database / EIE assessment	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% children not attending school by sex and school-level (as a result of the crisis)	25%	0%	75%	0%	0%	
District A	IDP	no	HH survey	Food security assessment / MSNA	HH	Humanitarian Conditions	Physical and mental well-being	Food Consumption Score (FCS)	20%	25%	30%	25%	0%	
District A	IDP	no	HH survey	Food security assessment / MSNA	HH	Humanitarian Conditions	Physical and mental well-being	Household Dietary Diversity Score	38%	15%	1%	27%	15%	
District A	IDP	no	HH survey	Food security assessment / MSNA	HH	Humanitarian Conditions	Physical and mental well-being	Household Hunger Scale (HHS)	25%	30%	24%	21%	0%	
District A	IDP	yes	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian Conditions	Living Standards	% of HHs having access to water sources of sufficient quality and availability	18%	18%	52%	14%	0%	
District A	IDP	forecasted	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian Conditions	Living Standards	% of HHs having access to water sources of sufficient quality and availability	0%	10%	70%	30%	0%	
District A	IDP	no	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% of HHs having access to a functional and improved sanitation facility	12%	32%	13%	8%	20%	

Table 4: Data scenario A dataset - disregard all "forecasted" indicator values

JIAF Guidance: Annex 1				Current	Forecasted	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current
uid	KEY	Area	Population group	Food Consumption Score	Food Consumption Score	Household Dietary Diversity Score	Household Hunger Scale <i>Critical indicator</i>	% of HHs having access to water sources of sufficient quality and availability	% of HHs having access to a functional and improved sanitation facility	% of HHs with access to functioning handwashing facilities, with water and soap available or % of HHs with access to soap	% of the population identified as having disabilities (in line with the Washington Group Questions)	Minimum Acceptable Diet in children 6 to 23 months	Exclusive breastfeeding for infants 0-5 months
01657e	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
053be2	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
05e93d	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
061c53l	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
084d67	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
08965a	District A-/idp	District A	idps	5	5	3	3	1	4	2	1	1	2
08eb5f	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	5	2	2	1	3	1	2	1	2
0f139e	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	4	1	1	1	1	4	1	2
1574d0	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
1674dc	District A-/idp	District A	idps	2	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	2
172cef	District A-/idp	District A	idps	5	5	3	3	1	5	1	3	1	2
192765	District A-/idp	District A	idps	1	2	4	2	1	5	2	1	1	2

2. "Forecasted JIAF PIN" --> use the "forecasted" JIAF aggregation indicator % breakdowns, for any indicator where these have been identified (see section A above); and the "current" JIAF aggregation indicator breakdowns for all remaining indicators.⁴

Table 5: Data scenario B dataset - disregard all "current" indicator values where a forecasted alternative exists

JIAF Guidance: Annex 2										None/Minimal	Stress	Severe	Extreme	Catastrophic
Step 2. For each indicator, geographical area/affected group, calculate the percentage of people per severity class. ***If breakdown is possible by severity class (e.g. HH and Area level interpretation is possible), use the breakdown***										1	2	3	4	5
Area	Population group	Forecast indicator?	Type of data source	Example data source	Interpretation level(s)	Pillar	Sub pillar	Indicator (examples from JIAG list)						
District A	IDP	yes	HH survey / school KI	MSNA / EMIS or school database / EIE assessment	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% children not attending school by sex and school level (as a result of the crisis)		45%	0%	55%	0%	0%
District A	IDP	forecasted	HH survey / school KI	MSNA / EMIS or school database / EIE assessment	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% children not attending school by sex and school level (as a result of the crisis)		25%	0%	75%	0%	0%
District A	IDP	no	HH survey	Food security assessment / MSNA	HH	Humanitarian Conditions	Physical and mental well-being	Food Consumption Score (FCS)		20%	25%	30%	25%	0%
District A	IDP	no	HH survey	Food security assessment / MSNA	HH	Humanitarian Conditions	Physical and mental well-being	Household Dietary Diversity Score		38%	15%	1%	27%	15%
District A	IDP	no	HH survey	Food security assessment / MSNA	HH	Humanitarian Conditions	Physical and mental well-being	Household Hunger Scale (HHS)		25%	30%	24%	21%	0%
District A	IDP	yes	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian Conditions	Living Standards	% of HHs having access to water sources of sufficient quality and availability		18%	18%	52%	14%	0%
District A	IDP	forecasted	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian Conditions	Living Standards	% of HHs having access to water sources of sufficient quality and availability		0%	10%	70%	30%	0%
District A	IDP	no	HH survey / KI	WASH assessment / MSNA	HH Area	Humanitarian conditions	Living standards	% of HHs having access to a functional and improved sanitation facility		12%	32%	13%	8%	20%

Note that in certain cases some current indicators may not be valid for the projected period

Table 6: Data scenario A dataset - disregard all "current" indicator values where a forecasted alternative exists

JIAF Guidance: Annex 1				Current	Forecasted	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current	Current
uuid	KEY	Area	Population group	Food Consumption Score	Food Consumption Score	Household Dietary Diversity Score	Household Hunger Scale <i>Critical indicator</i>	% of HHs having access to water sources of sufficient quality and availability	% of HHs having access to a functional and improved sanitation facility	% of HHs with access to functioning handwashing facilities, with water and soap available or % of HHs with access to soap	% of the population identified as having disabilities (in line with the Washington Group Questions)	Minimum Acceptable Diet in children 6 to 23 months	Exclusive breastfeeding for infants 0-5 months
01657e	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	2
053be2	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
05e93d	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
061c53l	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
084d67	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
08965a	District A-/idp	District A	idps	5	5	3	3	1	4	2	1	1	2
08eb5f	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	5	2	2	1	3	1	2	1	2
0f139e	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	2	4	1	1	1	1	4	1	2
1574d0	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	2
1674dc	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	3	2	2	1	3	2	2	1	2
172cef	District A-/idp	District A	idps	5	5	3	3	1	5	1	3	1	2
192765	District A-/idp	District A	idps	4	2	4	2	1	5	2	1	1	2

For both data scenarios, when generating the final output table:

- Add a column populated with any updated population figures due to the scenario
- Add columns populated with the resulting "forecasted" JIAF PIN estimates to the overall JIAF aggregation output table

NB: these forecasted estimates are highlighted in yellow in the example below, all other columns are generated through the "current" PIN aggregation (see JIAF Guidance annexes 1 & 2). The final columns in both output tables below, show the estimated % increase in JIAF PIN that can help estimate how much the HNO PIN overall is likely to increase.

Table 7: Final output table for joint analysis - Data Scenario A

Area	Population group	Total population	Severity Class					Estimated JIAF PIN (Severity classes 3,4&5)	Forecasted total population	Severity Class					Estimated Forecasted JIAF PIN (Severity classes 3, 4 & 5)	Estimated % increase in JIAF PIN
			1	2	3	4	5			1	2	3	4	5		
District A	idps	54,561	-	19,411	30,953	4,197	-	35,150	100,000	-	-	35,577	56,731	7,692	100,000	184%
District A	non displaced	45,238	-	5,601	27,143	12,494	-	39,637	45,238	-	-	5,601	27,143	12,494	45,238	14%
District A	returnees	22,369	-	379	13,270	8,720	-	21,990	22,369	-	-	379	13,270	8,720	22,369	2%
District B	idps	3,651,651	-	-	1,654,167	1,997,484	-	3,651,651	3,651,651	-	-	1,654,167	1,997,484	-	3,651,651	0%
District B	non displaced	5,646,416	-	-	1,792,513	3,764,277	89,626	5,646,416	5,646,416	-	-	1,792,513	3,764,277	89,626	5,646,416	0%
District B	returnees	63,216	-	-	8,466	54,185	564	63,216	63,216	-	-	8,466	54,185	564	63,216	0%
District C	idps	4,545	-	38	2,444	2,062	-	4,507	20,000	-	168	10,756	9,076	-	19,832	340%
District C	non displaced	16,416	1,539	3,762	9,063	2,052	-	11,115	16,416	1,539	3,762	9,063	2,052	-	11,115	0%
District C	returnees	161,561	-	-	43,919	114,504	3,137	161,561	161,561	-	-	43,919	114,504	3,137	161,561	0%
etc.	returnees	161,561	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Table 8: Final output table for joint analysis - Data Scenario B

Pop. Group	Population size	Current Humanitarian Condition Score	Min. # of pop. in this severity class (or	Current JIAF PIN estimate is:	Population by severity class on any Critical indicators			Current Critical indicator or PIN	Current WASH PIN	Current Food Sec PIN	Current Health PIN	Etc	Forecasted population size	Forecasted Humanitarian Condition Score	Forecasted Min. # of pop. in this severity class (or higher)	Forecasted JIAF PIN	Estimated % increase in JIAF PIN
					HHS Severity class 3	HHS Severity class 4	HHS Severity class 5										
IDPs	10000	4	2,500	>2,500[1]	24%	21%	0%	4,500	6,000	4,500	8,000		20000	4	5,000	>5,000	100%
Residents	50000	3	12,500	>=12,500[2]	12%	0%	0%	6,000	7,000	6,000	9,000		50000	4	12,500	>12,500	>0%
Returns	30000	1	30,000	<7,500[3]	0%	0%	0%	0	0	0	3,500		30000	3	7,500	>=7,500	>0%
Residents	60000	2	15,000	<15,000[4]	0%	0%	0%	0	0	0	5,000		60000	2	15,000	<15,000	0%
...

Endnote: Guidance on how to identify and consider populations already receiving assistance in the PiN calculation and forecasting will be consulted and developed in the coming months with the aim to update the current JIAF aggregation guidance for the 2021 cycle.