|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR 1a: IDPs and returnees as percentage of host community population** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| No IDPs/ Returnees | IDPs/Returnees are between 1% - 3% of the host community | IDPs/Returnees are between 4% - 7% of the host community | IDPs/Returnees are between 8% - 11% of the host community | IDPs/Returnees are between 12% - 15% of the host community | IDPs/Returnees are between 16% - 19% of the host community | IDPs/Returnees are 20% or more of the host community |
| **Data Source(s):** TFPM Area Assessment  |
| **INDICATOR 1b: Proportion of IDP and returnee communities in district accessing an improved water source** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 90%-100% have access  | 75%-89% have access | 60%-74% have access | 45%-59% have access | 30%-44% have access | 15%-29% have access | 0%-14% have access |
| **Data Source(s):** TFPM Location Assessment |
| **INDICATOR 1c: Proportion of IDP and returnee communities in district accessing a functioning latrine** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 90%-100% have access  | 75%-89% have access | 60%-74% have access | 45%-59% have access | 30%-44% have access | 15%-29% have access | 0%-14% have access |
| **Data Source(s):** TFPM Location Assessment |
| **INDICATOR 1d: Proportion of IDP and returnee communities in district having and using soap** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 90%-100% have access  | 75%-89% have access | 60%-74% have access | 45%-59% have access | 30%-44% have access | 15%-29% have access | 0%-14% have access |
| **Data Source(s):** TFPM Location Assessment |
| **INDICATOR 1e: Proportion of IDP and returnee communities facing severe environmental hygiene problems (solid waste and waste water)** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 90%-100% have access  | 75%-89% have access | 60%-74% have access | 45%-59% have access | 30%-44% have access | 15%-29% have access | 0%-14% have access |
| **Data Source(s):** TFPM Location Assessment |
| **INDICATOR 1f: Proportion of IDPs living in CC/SS out of the total IDP population** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| No IDPs in CC/SS | IDPs in CC/SS are between 1% - 9% of the total IDPs population | IDPs in CC/SS are between 10% - 19% of the total IDPs population | IDPs in CC/SS are between 20% - 29% of the total IDPs population | IDPs in CC/SS are between 30% - 39% of the total IDPs population | IDPs in CC/SS are between 40% - 49% of the total IDPs population | IDPs in CC/SS are equal or more than 50% of the total IDPs population |
| **Data Source(s):**  TFPM Location Assessment; IDP Hosting Site Assessment Baseline 2017  |
| **INDICATOR 1g: Population of IDPs in CC/SS in need of support to access water**  |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 0% of CC/SS population require support orno CC/SS in district | 0 – 5%CC/SS population require support  | 6 – 15 %CC/SS population require support  | 16 – 25 %CC/SS population require support  | 26 – 40 %CC/SS population require support | 41 – 50 %CC/SS population require support | More than 50% CC/SS population require support |
| **Data Source(s):** IDP Hosting Site Assessment Baseline 2017  |
| **INDICATOR 1h: Population of IDPs in CC/SS in need of support to sanitation & waste removal services** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 0% of CC/SS population require support orno CC/SS in district | 0 – 5%CC/SS population require support  | 6 – 15 %CC/SS population require support  | 16 – 25 %CC/SS population require support  | 26 – 40 %CC/SS population require support | 41 – 50 %CC/SS population require support | More than 50% CC/SS population require support |
| **Data Source(s):** IDP Hosting Site Assessment Baseline 2017 |

|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR 2a: Attack rate of suspected cholera / acute watery diarrhoea (AWD) (/10,000 population)** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 0 | >0 - <1 | 1 - <10 | 10 - <100 | 100 - <200 | 200 - <500 | >500 |
| **Data Source(s):** Health cluster / eDEWS |
| **INDICATOR 2b: Attack rate of dengue (/10,000 population)**  |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 0 | >0 - <2 | 2 -<6 | 6 - <10 | 10 - <20 | 20 - 30 | > 30 |
| **Data Source(s):** Health cluster / eDEWS  |
| **INDICATOR 2c: Attack rate of malaria (/1,000 population)**  |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 0 | >0 - <2 | 2 -<6 | 6 - <10 | 10 - <20 | 20 - 30 | > 30 |
| **Data Source(s):** Health cluster / eDEWS |

|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR 3: Rate of Global Acute Malnutrition (wasting in children)** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| **<0-4.99%>** | **<5-9.99%>** | **<10-14.99%>** | **< >=15% >. *Besides, GAM prevalence between******10-14% with aggravating factors related -Health, WASH and Food security*** |
| **Data Source(s):** <SMART nutrition surveys >, EFSNA, CFSS (Nutrition Cluster) |

|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR 4: Proportion of communities accessing an improved water source** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 90%-100% have access  | 75%-89% have access | 60%-74% have access | 45%-59% have access | 30%-44% have access | 15%-29% have access | 0%-14% have access |
| **Data Source(s):**  SMART, SDR (governorate level data only – district level will be triangulated through Delphi method) |

|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR 5: Proportion of communities accessing an improved latrine** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 90%-100% have access  | 75%-89% have access | 60%-74% have access | 45%-59% have access | 30%-44% have access | 15%-29% have access | 0%-14% have access |
| **Data Source(s):** SMART, SDR (governorate level data only) |

|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR 6: Proportion of households / communities washing hands at 2 critical times with soap or substitute** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| 90%-100% washing hands | 75%-89% washing hands | 60%-74% washing hands | 45%-59% washing hands | 30%-44% washing hands | 15%-29% washing hands | 0%-14% washing hands |
| **Data Source(s):** SMART, SDR (governorate level data only) |

|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR 7: Occurrence of flooding in the district**  |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| Never | Almost never | Flooding occurs sometimes (1-2 times in last 5 years) but no damage is observed | Flooding occurs sometimes (1-2 times in last 5 years) and damage is observed | Flooding occurs frequently (3-5 times in last 5 years) and some damage is observed  | Flooding occurs frequently (3-5 times in last 5 years) and significant damage is observed | Flooding occurs very frequently (at least once a year) and damage is always observed |
| **Data Source(s):** Secondary data (flood reports and assessments last 5 years; will be triangulated through Delphi method |

**DELPHI QUESTIONS**

|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR Delphi 1: Proportion of people in district accessing an adequate/sufficient quantity of water** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| Everyone has enough water for their needs | Nearly everyone has enough water for their needs | Majority has enough water for their needs | Around half has enough water for their needs | Some have enough water for their needs | A few have enough water for their needs | Very few or none have enough water for their needs |
| 90%-100% have access  | 75%-89% have access | 60%-74% have access | 45%-59% have access | 30%-44% have access | 15%-29% have access | 0%-14% have access |
| **Data Source(s):** Delphi workshops |
| **Question:** What proportion of people in the district is accessing an adequate / sufficient quantity of water? |

|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR Delphi 2: Proportion of communities facing severe environmental hygiene problems (solid waste and waste water)** |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| All communities are clean | Most communities are clean (without garbage or sewage issues) | Few communities have piles of garbage and / or sewage issues  | Some communities have piles of garbage and / or sewage issues | Around half communities have piles of garbage and / or sewage issues | Majority communities have piles of garbage and / or sewage issues | All communities have piles of garbage and / or sewage issues  |
| 0% has problems | 1 – 10 % has problems | 11 – 25% has problems | 26 – 40% has problems | 41 – 60% has problems | 61 – 90% has problems | 91 – 100% has problems |
| **Data Source(s):** Delphi workshops |
| **Question:** What proportion of communities in the district is facing problems with garbage and / or sewage? |

|  |
| --- |
| **INDICATOR Delphi 3: Occurrence of flooding in the district**  |
| **0** | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** |
| Never | Almost never | Flooding occurs sometimes (1-2 times in last 5 years) but no damage is observed | Flooding occurs sometimes (1-2 times in last 5 years) and damage is observed | Flooding occurs frequently (3-5 times in last 5 years) and some damage is observed  | Flooding occurs frequently (3-5 times in last 5 years) and significant damage is observed | Flooding occurs very frequently (at least once a year) and damage is always observed |
| **Data Source(s):** REACH (If no hard data available, this will be included in Delphi method) |
| **Question:** How often did flooding occur in the district and what was the extent of damage caused by the flooding?  |