

Assessing the severity of displacement: Concept note

Last updated: 01/05/2024

Introduction

In 2023, IDMC developed a new methodology to assess the severity of displacement conditions, call attention to situations of particular concern, highlight key threats to IDPs' safety and wellbeing, and identify what remains to be achieved for IDPs to reach durable solutions. This new approach builds on [previous assessments](#) published since 2019, shifting from a qualitative to a quantitative methodology. Complementing the figures published in the Global Report on Internal Displacement, the severity assessment provides information to support governments, humanitarian and development actors, donors and other key stakeholders in prioritising their response to situations of displacement. Broadly aligned with the [IASC framework for durable solutions](#), it also provides a snapshot of a country's progress towards addressing displacement-specific vulnerabilities that can prevent IDPs from accessing durable solutions.

Lessons Learned

IDMC previously conducted two assessments of displacement severity, providing insight into the conditions experienced by IDPs at the end of [2019](#) and [2020](#). These assessments mainly relied upon qualitative analysis and the expertise of IDMC's monitoring experts and their partners, which resulted in several challenges with the comparability and reliability of the assessments. In 2022, IDMC undertook a stocktake of the severity assessment approach and methodology, publishing a [report](#) on the challenges and ways forward. Drawing upon these lessons learned and to improve the reliability, comparability and validity of the severity assessment, IDMC developed an updated methodology that draws upon quantitative data from Multi-Sector Needs Assessments (MSNAs) and similar exercises to provide a snapshot of displacement conditions in the countries assessed. The first severity assessment using the revised methodology was published in December 2023, with the next annual update published in May 2024.

Assessing severity

The absence of globally available data on standardised indicators remains a main challenge to conducting these assessments on a global scale. However, the MSNAs produced by [REACH Initiative](#) provide a comprehensive set of indicators that correspond to the majority of the severity assessment indicators (see Table 1 below) and were therefore selected as the primary data source for this assessment. At the beginning of 2024, there were datasets available for 11 countries where a multi-sectoral needs assessment or similar exercise was conducted and published by REACH that included IDPs among the population groups sampled. While the opportunity to use other types of needs assessments was explored, the lack of completeness and comparability of other datasets determined that this was not a viable option.

Assessment components

As a result of the shift to a quantitative approach for the severity assessments, the questions for each category were reformulated as indicators (see Table 1). The revised assessment includes 22 severity indicators grouped into four categories: safety and security; standards of

living; livelihoods and housing; and civic and social rights. Results for each question are calculated for each population group: internally displaced households, non-displaced households and returnee households.¹

The ‘Safety and Security’ question focuses on the proportion of IDPs in the given context who report being in fear of different safety and security-related issues, with indicators selected that best correspond with these risk factors. For the ‘Standards of Living’ and ‘Livelihoods and Housing’ categories, the indicators selected focus on the proportion of IDPs experiencing difficulties in accessing certain basic needs and services relating to their well-being and development. Finally, the ‘Civic and Social Rights’ category looks at the proportion of IDPs facing barriers to exercising these rights.

Specific questions within the MSNA survey have been identified that best correspond to the severity assessment indicators, which are detailed in Table 2. In most country datasets, the same or similar questions were asked, with some variations in wording or time period covered by the question. The response options and time periods are detailed in Table 2 below.

Table 1: Severity assessment dimensions and indicators

Safety and Security
1. Fear of exposure to conflict or violence
2. Fear of exposure to explosive hazards
3. Experience of natural hazards
4. Fear of harassment, intimidation or persecution
5. Fear of sexual and gender-based violence
Standards of Living
6a. Poor or borderline food consumption (FCS)
6b. High level of reduced coping strategies (rCSI)
7a. Lack of access to improved drinking water sources
7b. Lack of sufficient water to meet basic needs
8. Unmet healthcare needs
9. Unenrolled school-aged children
10. Lack of access to improved sanitation facilities
Livelihoods and Housing
11. Lack of stable income source
12. Lack of access to humanitarian assistance
13. Lack of access to adequate housing
14. Risk of eviction
15. Lack of housing, land and property rights
Civic and Social Rights
16. Lack of civil documentation
17. Children separated from family
18. Lack of access to voting rights

¹ Not all population groups (IDP, returnee, non-displaced) are available in all datasets.

19. Lack of participation in public affairs
20. Lack of freedom of movement

Presentation of results

The severity assessment results are displayed in an interactive Power BI dashboard, providing an overview of the results for the populations surveyed in each country across each relevant population group (where available, this included the returnee population surveyed). Users can easily navigate between countries and assessment dimensions to explore detailed insights. Within each dimension page, users can filter results by sub-national locations. Additionally, users can delve deeper into the data by exploring further analysis through the 'Explore further analysis' button, which offers options such as examining the influence of displacement factors and household characteristics on the severity of conditions. However, not all options may be available for every country.

The dashboard's design features clear tabs and menus for navigation, ensuring easy access to analysis for each country and dimension. Furthermore, the accompanying expert analysis highlights key findings within each assessment category, facilitating a nuanced understanding of the results and empowering users to extract insights relevant to their specific interests.

Table 2: Severity assessment indicators, survey questions and definitions

Dimension	Severity indicator	MSNA survey question	Response options	Definitions
Safety and security	1. Fear of exposure to conflict or violence	In the last 30 days/ 3 months/ 12 months, was anyone in your household concerned about/ exposed to any of the following? [timeframe varies by country] Can also be worded as “What are the main safety and security concerns for men/women/children/your household, if any?”	Response options vary by country and include: Maiming or killing; Assassination; Serious injuries; Physical violence/attacks by a member of our community (non-sexual); Physical violence/attacks by a member of other communities (non-sexual); Physical violence/attacks by armed groups (non-sexual); Murder, Incident caused by transhumance; Presence or threat of an armed actor; Armed clashes or presence of armed actors; Communal violence; Inter-community conflicts; Forced recruitment by armed groups; Kidnapping, forced recruitment, detention	<i>Conflict and violence can include international armed conflict, non-international armed conflict and other situations of violence, as detailed in IDMC's Violence typology. (Source: IDMC)</i> Specific wording and relevant response options for this indicator vary in some countries
	2. Fear of exposure to explosive hazards	In the last 30 days/ 3 months/ 12 months, was anyone in your household concerned about/ exposed to any of the following? [timeframe varies by country] Can also be worded as “What are the main safety and security concerns for men/women/children/your household, if any?”	Being injured/killed by an explosive hazard (including mine / UXO); Explosive hazards (mines, ERW, PPIEDs)	<i>In this context, explosive hazards are understood to include landmines, explosive remnants of war (ERWs) and improvised explosive devices (IEDs). For more information on these different types of explosive hazards, see here: https://unmas.org/sites/default/files/handbook_english.pdf</i> Some variations in the wording of this indicator for different countries
	3. Experience of natural hazards²	Has your household experienced any of the following major events/ shocks in the past three/six months? [timeframe varies by country]	Earthquake; Flood; Avalanche/heavy snowfall; Drought/irregular rains, prolonged dry spell	<i>Specific hazard types vary depending on country context. See limitations associated with this indicator in the Methodological note below.</i>
	4. Fear of harassment, intimidation or persecution	In the last 30 days/ 3 months/ 12 months, was anyone in your household concerned about/ exposed to any of the following? [timeframe varies by country] Can also be worded as “What are the main safety and security concerns for men/women/children/your household, if any?”	Threats; Verbal or psychological harassment; Discrimination due to nationality, ethnicity, religion or association with any other social group; Attacks or harassment; Trafficking in persons and/or exploitation (being engaged in harmful forms of labour for economic gain of the exploiter, including sexual exploitation)	<i>Harassment should be understood as any behaviour that causes deliberate mental or emotional suffering. Intimidation is the action of threatening or frightening someone, usually in order to force someone to do something. Persecution is unfair or cruel treatment over an extended period because of race, religion, political beliefs or membership of a specific social group. (Source: Cambridge)</i> <i>Note that this should not include SGBV since this is covered by the following question.</i>

	5. Fear of sexual and gender-based violence	In the last 30 days/ 3 months/ 12 months, was anyone in your household concerned about/ exposed to any of the following? [timeframe varies by country] Can also be worded as “What are the main safety and security concerns for men/women/children/your household, if any?”	Sexual and gender-based violence, including physical and verbal abuse; mistreatment, female genital mutilation	<i>Gender-Based Violence (GBV), sometimes also referred to as Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), is any harmful act of sexual, physical, psychological, mental, and emotional abuse that is perpetrated against a person’s will and that is based on socially ascribed (i.e., gender) differences between males and females. (Source: UN OCHA)</i> <i>Given the challenges associated with collecting data on the incidence of SGBV in MSNAs, and in general, the proxy indicator of perception of safety for women and girls is used as a means of understanding the potential exposure.</i>
Standards of living	6a. Poor or borderline food consumption (FCS)	% Of households by Household Food Consumption Score (FCS) - Poor, borderline or acceptable	FCS score: Poor and borderline (see methodology for list of questions asked to compute score)	<i>An explanation of the Food Consumption Score methodology and further guidance can be found at: https://www.indikit.net/indicator/20-food-consumption-score-fcs</i> <i>The rCSI is an experience-based indicator measuring the behaviour of households over the past seven days when they did not have enough food or money to purchase food. (Source: Food Security Cluster). Information on the calculation of the score can be found in the FSC handbook: https://fscluster.org/handbook/</i>
	6b. High level of reduced coping strategies (rCSI)	% households with high rating for the reduced Coping Strategies Index	rCSI score: >18 (see methodology for list of questions used to compute score)	
	7a. Lack of access to improved drinking water sources	What is the main source of water used by your household for drinking?	Types of water sources considered unsafe/ unimproved: Spring, well or kariz - unprotected; Surface water (Stream/river/irrigation); Rainwater; Traditional or unprotected well; Puddle or stagnant water; Other unprotected source.	<i>Improved water sources include the following: piped water into dwelling, yard or plot; public taps or standpipes; boreholes or tube wells; protected dug wells; protected springs; packaged water; delivered water and rainwater. (Source: JIPS)</i>
	7b. Lack of sufficient water to meet basic needs	Does your household currently have enough water to meet the following needs?	If household answered no to one or more of the following: Drinking; cooking; personal hygiene; other domestic uses (e.g. cleaning house, washing dishes)	<i>Sufficient water to meet basic needs refers to the availability and quality of the main source used by households for drinking, cooking, personal hygiene and other domestic uses. (See: https://washdata.org/monitoring/drinking-water)</i>
	8. Unmet healthcare needs	How many people in your household in the last 3 months were NOT able to obtain health care when they felt they needed it?	At least one member of the household	<i>Essential health services include reproductive, maternal, newborn and child health, infectious diseases, non-communicable diseases and service capacity and access. (Source: JIPS)</i>
	9. Unenrolled school-aged children	How many household members between the ages of 6 and 17 were formally enrolled in school during 2021-2022?	At least one child between the ages of 6 and 17 in the household who was not formally enrolled in school in the past 6 months.	<i>Lack of attendance as a result of school closures due to Covid-19 restrictions are not included in this measurement.</i>
	10. Lack of access to improved sanitation facilities	What kind of sanitation facility (latrine/toilet) does your household usually use?	Households that reported using open defecation or unimproved sanitation facilities, such as pit latrine without a slab or platform; hanging toilet/ latrine; pitless latrine; buckets or containers; open hole; toilet that discharges directly to water sources; unconnected toilet	<i>An improved sanitation facility is one that likely hygienically separates human excreta from human contact. Improved sanitation facilities include: Flush or pour-flush to piped sewer system, septic tank or pit latrine, ventilated improved pit latrine, Pit latrine with slab and Composting toilet. However, sanitation facilities are not considered improved when shared with other households, or open to public use. (Source: WHO: Population using improved sanitation facilities)</i>
Livelihoods and shelter	11. Lack of stable income source	What was your household's primary and secondary sources of income during the last 30 days/ 3 months/ 12 months? [timeframe varies by country]	Humanitarian aid; Support from community, friends, family (not including remittances); begging, loans or debt; sale of household assets, or no source of income.	<i>For the purposes of this indicator, and to align with existing REACH cross-crisis analysis, both unstable and ‘emergency’ sources of income are included in the analysis. “...stable sources are those considered to normally provide regular income, while unstable sources would not. ‘Emergency’ sources of income include unsustainable sources of income or those considered to indicate high dependency, such as humanitarian assistance, begging, selling household assets, etc.” (Source: REACH cross-crisis analysis)</i>

	12. Lack of access to humanitarian assistance	Has your household received humanitarian aid in the past 30 days/ 6 months/ 12 months? [timeframe varies by country]	Households that answered no; did not receive humanitarian assistance	Most datasets ask specifically about humanitarian assistance, with some variations in the wording of indicators. The exception is Colombia, which asks whether the household received help, subsidy or support from any person or institution?
	13. Lack of access to adequate housing	What type of shelter does your household currently live in?	Makeshift shelters; Emergency shelters; Constructions not intended for housing (hangars, warehouses, auxiliary constructions of farms, etc.); Community buildings; Unfinished building; No shelter.	Housing is considered adequate if it is safe, secure, weather-appropriate and meets international minimum standards. Shelters provided in camps may constitute adequate housing if this criterion is met.
	14. Risk of eviction	Have you experienced eviction or the threat of eviction within the past 6 months? Can also be asked as: Was anyone in your household concerned about the following in the last 30 days? Eviction from home	Households that responded yes to experience or risk of eviction	
	15. Lack of housing, land and property rights	Do you currently have any of the following problems related to housing, land and property? Can also be asked as: Does your household own valid documentation indicating land tenure or rental agreement for the property you are currently living in, or own elsewhere?	Dispute over property rights or ownership; Property unlawfully occupied by others (secondary occupation); Disputes about rent (including payment) between landlord and tenant; Rules and processes on housing and land not clear; Inheritance issues; Lack or loss of housing land tenancy or ownership documents; Looting of private property; Disputes with host family.	“Drawn from international humanitarian and human rights law, HLP rights entitle displaced people to having a safe home, free from the fear of forced eviction, a place that offers safety, and the ability to seek livelihood opportunities. Access to HLP rights is foundational to socio-economic inclusion and an essential steppingstone for displaced people to rebuild their lives... HLP rights also protect people’s relationship or ‘tenure’ over a plot of land, a home or property, and entitle people to claim their land, home or property or get compensation for the loss of it (right to restitution or compensation).” Source: NRC, Housing, land and property (HLP) rights
Civic and social rights	16. Lack of civil documentation	Does every person in your household possess a valid ID document (birth certificate, national ID and/or passport)? Can also be asked as: Is any person in your household missing at least one key identity document?	Any households that responded no/ someone in the household is without a valid identity document.	This should be understood to include all essential civil documentation required in each context. Questions on documentation are often disaggregated by sex, asking separately if all male and/or all female household members have civil documentation, in which case the results of both questions should be used.
	17. Children separated from family	Does your household have any child, son or daughter (<18 years) not currently living in the household in the last 3 months/ at the time of data collection? [timeframe varies by country]	Households that responded yes, there is a family member under 18 that is not living in the household	This should be understood to include only family members formerly living in the same household, rather than extended family members. Due to a lack of data on the separation of adult family members, the question relates specifically to the separation of children aged under 18 from their family.
	18. Lack of access to voting rights	Are the adult members in your household (age 18 and over) eligible and able to vote in local or national political elections?	Not all, because of legal reasons (not locally registered, missing documentation)	This question should be answered only if elections do indeed take place in the country of origin. Barriers associated with displacement could include for example a requirement to vote in areas of origin, lack of necessary documentation, harassment or discrimination.
	19. Lack of participation in public affairs	Do you feel that you are currently able to play a role in local decision-making? (e.g. inclusive consultation processes, ability to shape public life, participate in local community organisations)	Households that answered no	IDPs who have achieved a durable solution are able to exercise the right to participate in public affairs at all levels on the same basis as the resident population and without discrimination owing to their displacement. This includes the right to associate freely and participate equally in community affairs, to vote and to stand for election, as well as the right to work in all sectors of public service. (Source: IASC Framework on Durable Solutions for IDPs)
	20. Lack of freedom of movement	In the past 1 month/3 months/ 12 months, has anyone in your household experienced any [security] restrictions in their ability to move freely in your area? [timeframe varies by country]	Households that answered yes to experiencing movement restrictions, excluding those related to Covid-19 restrictions.	This should not include Covid-19 related restrictions, or any restrictions experienced equally by both displaced and non-displaced communities.

Assessing the severity of displacement: Methodological note

Last updated: 01/05/2024

Objective of the analysis

The objective of the severity assessment analysis is to provide a snapshot of the needs and challenges encountered by internally displaced households. Structured as a quantitative exercise, the assessment was designed with a standardised set of indicators informed by the IASC framework on durable solutions, ensuring consistency and comparability across diverse situations. This standardised approach ensures a robust foundation for analysing and interpreting the severity of displacement, allowing for meaningful comparisons between internally displaced, non-displaced and returnee households.³

Coverage

The analysis was conducted using REACH's Multi-Sector Needs Assessments (MSNA) and comparable initiatives across 13 countries in 2022 and 11 in 2023. Table 2 summarises the geographical coverage and the representativeness of the results in each of these countries for both the 2022 and 2023 assessments.

Data analysis

The data analysis employs statistical techniques to determine household-level weighted proportions corresponding to each indicator within distinct population groups (internally displaced, non-displaced and returnees). Tailored sampling designs were considered for each country to capture the representativeness of each dataset.

Available indicators were mapped across all datasets, ensuring consistency and comparability across different contexts. Subsequently, these indicators were recoded into R to ensure their comparability across countries. Throughout this process, REACH country teams were actively engaged and consulted, providing valuable feedback that was integrated into both the mapping of indicators and analysis.⁴

A critical consideration in the interpretation of results pertains to undisclosed proportions, which could impact the comparability of findings. While the proportion of missing data, encompassing households that either refused to respond, were uncertain, or provided blank answers, was systematically considered, this information is not explicitly displayed in the results. Furthermore, alternative responses to indicators, such as access to improved water sources, have been omitted.

Finally, differences in data collection methodologies, including how questions and responses were phrased, may affect the comparability of the results. Such differences must be considered when interpreting the findings.

³ Host community refers to non-displaced households living in the same locality or country. Please refer to the limitations section for additional information on the contextual differences.

⁴ R scripts are available upon request.

Indicators availability

Table 2 displays the 22 indicators included in the cross-country analysis, along with their availability across all countries assessed.

All indicators were mapped out and recoded to ensure their comparability across countries. A substantial number of indicators demonstrated direct comparability, primarily attributable to the increasing standardisation of indicators through REACH's MSNA indicator bank. For remaining indicators requiring attention, deliberate efforts were made to uphold broad comparability across countries through collaborative consultations with REACH country teams.

Several indicators were consistently available across all countries, predominantly within the Standards of Living dimension. This includes standardised indicators on "Unmet healthcare needs" and "Lack of access to improved sanitation facilities."

In contrast, the Civic and Social Rights dimension exhibited the lowest indicator availability in both the 2022 and 2023 assessments. Specifically, indicators pertaining to "Lack of access to voting rights" and "Lack of participation in public affairs" were exclusively observed in Iraq. However, these indicators were retained for the analysis to underscore a significant data gap.

Limitations

Several limitations have to be taken into account when interpreting the findings and using the data.

Contextual differences in the definitions of IDPs, non-displaced and returnee households:

The primary limitation stems from the inherent variability in defining and identifying internally displaced, non-displaced and returnee households across different countries. The criteria and methods used to identify and classify these population groups may vary, making direct comparisons challenging. The findings and severity assessments are context-specific and may not be universally applicable or comparable across diverse humanitarian and socio-political contexts.

Experience of natural hazards: This indicator captures whether households have experienced natural hazards, but falls short of assessing exposure, vulnerability and overall risk. Furthermore, this indicator does not assess when households experienced the reported natural hazards, which limits comparisons across households within the same country. Last, cross-country comparisons are limited due to varying reference periods (from the last 30 days to the past year) and the initial focus of the survey question on shocks impacting income and livelihoods.

Limited generalisation beyond research design: The scope of this study is explicitly confined to countries included in the research design. Consequently, the results are not intended to offer a comprehensive global assessment of displacement severity. Countries not covered by the research design, particularly those experiencing significant displacement without a widescale humanitarian response, are excluded from the analysis. Caution is warranted when attempting to extrapolate these findings to countries or regions outside the specified geographical coverage of the research.

Varying representativeness: The representativeness of the findings varies among the included countries. In several countries, the results are solely representative of the assessed

populations and cannot be generalised to the entire national population. Geographical coverage may also be incomplete in certain instances, influenced by factors such as access constraints. Furthermore, the findings may not represent all population groups, requiring careful consideration when making cross-contextual comparisons. Please refer to Table 2 for detailed information on geographical and population group coverage. It is important to note that all analyses disaggregated by displacement or household-level characteristics should be considered indicative. To mitigate the risk of biased results, only results based on sample sizes greater than 50 households are included.

MSNA-data-specific limitations: Additionally, overarching limitations associated with the MSNA data itself are outlined in the "[Methodological Note: Multi-Sector Needs Assessments \(MSNA\) – Global Indicator-Level Key Findings](#)". These include potential biases from varying humanitarian assistance levels, seasonal variations impacting how the severity of needs is perceived during data collection, and general challenges such as limited access to certain areas and complexities in assessing multi-sectoral needs.

Table 2: Geographical coverage and representativeness

ISO3	Country	Data collection period	Number of households surveyed	Geographical coverage	Representativeness
AFG	Afghanistan	30/07/2022 - 04/09/2022	IDP: 2,943 Non-displaced: 12,388	Countrywide coverage: all 34 provinces in Afghanistan, with the exception of Kandahar capital.	Results are representative of each population group at a 95% confidence level and with a 5% margin of error.
BFA	Burkina Faso	06/06/2022 - 14/07/2022	IDP: 2,631 Non-displaced: 2,998	Countrywide coverage: all 13 regions were sampled, but not all provinces could be accessed.	Results are representative of non-displaced households in accessible areas (at the region or province level) at a 90% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error. Results for IDP households, as well as non-displaced households in inaccessible areas, are indicative only and may not be generalised.
BFA	Burkina Faso	05/06/2023 - 19/07/2023	IDP: 3,282 Non-displaced: 3,308	Countrywide coverage: all 13 regions were sampled, but not all provinces were sampled.	Results are representative of displaced households in sampled areas (at the region or province level) at a 90% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error. Results for non-displaced households are indicative only and may not be generalised.
CAF	Central African Republic	18/07/2022 - 16/09/2022	IDP: 3,277 Non-displaced: 5,332	66 sub-prefectures out of the 71 sub-prefectures in the country (except Ouanda-Djallé, Ouadda, Yalinga, Bambouti, Zangba, and Ngaoundaye for logistical and/or security reasons).	For the assessed sub-prefectures, results are representative of each population group at a 92% confidence level and with a margin of error of 10%.

CAF	Central African Republic	21/07/2023 - 27/09/2023	IDP: 3,282 Non-displaced: 5,928 Returnee: 3,122	Countrywide coverage: 72 sub-prefectures, 16 prefectures, Bangui (8 districts).	For the assessed sub-prefectures, results are representative of each population group at a 92% confidence level and with a margin of error of 10%.
COL	Colombia	16/05/2022 - 27/08/2022	IDP: 793 Non-displaced: 1,225	27 municipalities across eight departments (Cauca, Chocó, Putumayo, Valle del Cauca, Arauca, Norte de Santander, La Guajira, and Nariño).	Results are indicative for both population groups and may not be generalised to the whole population or lower administrative levels.
COD	Democratic Republic of the Congo	06/06/2022 - 25/08/2022	IDP: 2,186 Non-displaced: 5,726	Accessible areas in Tanganyika and Sud Kivu provinces.	Results are representative of each population group at the territory level at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error for accessible areas in the two provinces.
COD	Democratic Republic of the Congo	31/05/2023 - 20/07/2023	IDP: 1,155 Non-displaced: 42,365 Returnee: 943	Countrywide coverage: 25 provinces (the province of Kinshasa is not included in this assessment). All areas were covered, except for Rutshuru in North Kivu province for security reasons.	Results are representative of each population group at the territory level at a 95% confidence level and with a 3-9% margin of error depending on the area.
ETH	Ethiopia	19/05/2023 - 27/05/2023	IDP: 17 Non-displaced: 1,383	7 accessible woredas (Berbere, Delo Mena, Gasera, Goba, Goro, Harena Buluk, and Sinana) across the Bale zone of Oromia region.	Results are representative at the Woreda level for the Bale zone population with a 92% confidence level and a 7% margin of error.
HTI	Haiti	12/06/2022 - 13/09/2022	IDP: 68 Non-displaced: 3,728	Countrywide: All 10 departments.	Results are representative of each population group at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error for Non-displaced community households and with a 95% confidence interval and a 5% margin of error for IDPs.

IRQ	Iraq	05/06/2022 - 16/08/2022	IDP: 8,236 Non-displaced: 916	64 districts out of a total of 120 districts in the country.	Results for the out-of-camp IDP population are representative with a 90% confidence level and a 10% margin of error. Results for the in-camp IDP population are representative with a 95% confidence level and a 10% margin of error. Non-displaced community households were surveyed exclusively in ten high-vulnerability districts. These findings are representative of the assessed districts with a 90% confidence level and a 10% margin of error.
IRQ	Iraq	16/07/2023 - 01/09/2023	IDP camp: 6,811 Returnee: 3,144	61 districts in 15 governorates were sampled out of a total of 120 districts in the country.	Results for the out-of-camp IDP and Returnee populations are representative with a 90% confidence level and a 10% margin of error. Results for the in-camp IDP population are representative with a 95% confidence level and a 10% margin of error.
KEN	Kenya	27/11/2022 - 08/11/2022	IDP: 114 Non-displaced: 2,006	Marsabit and Turkana counties.	Results are representative of the assessed population in both counties with a 95% confidence level and a 7% margin of error per subcounty.
KEN	Kenya	22/05/2023 - 04/06/2023	IDP: 238 Non-displaced: 4,605	Turkana, Marsabit, Mandera and Garissa counties.	Results are representative of the assessed population in all counties with a 95% confidence level and a 7% margin of error per subcounty.
LBY	Libya	04/07/2022 - 04/10/2022	IDP: 1,100 Non-displaced: 1,874	15 baladiyas (Abusliem, Albayda, Alghrayfa, Aljufra, Azzahra, Bani Waleed, Benghazi, Derna, Ghat, Jalu, Murzuq, Rigdaleen, Sebha, Tazirbu, Ubari).	Results are only representative per population group for the 15 baladiyas sampled and cannot be extrapolated to the rest of the country. Findings for Internally displaced households in Azzahra are indicative only.
MLI	Mali	05/09/2022 - 16/10/2022	IDP: 939 Non-displaced: 6,701	Countrywide: All 10 regions and 50 cercles out of 53 (except Nara, Inékar and Anderamboukane).	Results are representative for both groups in accessible locations at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error. For all cercles in Mopti region, results are indicative only.

MLI	Mali	10/07/2023 - 04/09/2023	IDP: 2,935 Non-displaced: 6,236	All cercles from 9 regions (Kayes, Koulikouro, Sikasso, Ségou, Mopti, Tombouctou, Gao et Bamako) except Nara (Koulikoro), Inékar (Ménaka), Andéramboukane (Ménaka), et Tidermène (Ménaka) due to inaccessibility.	Results are representative for both population groups at a 95% confidence level and with a 10% margin of error at the cercle level.
MMR	Myanmar	13/07/2023 – 14/08/2023	IDP: 1,915 Non-displaced: 229 Returnee: 1,762	18 states, regions and union territory of Myanmar.	At national level, results are representative for non-displaced households and indicative for the other population groups. In-person surveys are representative of all population groups at at 95% confidence level and 7% margin of error.
NER	Niger	20/06/2022 - 10/08/2022	IDP: 2,091 Non-displaced: 5,107	All departments in the regions of Niamey, Tillabéri, Diffa, Maradi and Tahoua with the exception of Bankilaré department. All communes could not be accessed.	Results are indicative for both groups for sampled regions as not all communes could always be accessed.
NER	Niger	12/06/2023 - 14/09/2023	IDP: 3,487 Non-displaced: 9,848 Returnee: 237	Countrywide: All departments in the regions of Agadez, Diffa, Dosso, Maradi, Niamey, Tahoua, Tillabéri and Zinder. All communes could not be accessed.	Results are representative at the national, regional and departmental levels for all population groups with a confidence level of 95% and a margin of error of 10%.
SOM	Somalia	19/07/2022 - 20/08/2022	IDP: 4,922 Non-displaced: 8,798	54 districts out of 74 were sampled.	Results are indicative as the sampling frame and coverage were designed based on accessibility and the location of population groups from previous assessments and may thus be biased towards (1) urban and peri-urban areas, as well as (2) areas with relatively less active conflict / armed actors.

SOM	Somalia	11/06/2023 - 04/08/2023	IDP: 4,384 Non-displaced: 4,588 Returnee: 1,364	59 districts out of 74 were sampled.	Results are indicative at the national level and representative for all population groups in some districts at a 90% confidence level and 10% margin of error.
UKR	Ukraine	10/10/2022 - 21/12/2022	IDP: 1,080 Non-displaced: 11,023	Government-controlled areas in all oblasts across Ukraine.	Results are representative of the population in newly accessible areas, as well as in government-controlled conflict-affected areas, at the raion-level at a 95% confidence level and with a 5% margin of error. Results disaggregated by population groups are indicative only.
UKR	Ukraine	21/06/2023 - 01/08/2023	IDP: 763 Non-displaced: 11,305 Returnee: 1,254	Government-controlled areas in all 24 oblasts across Ukraine.	Results are representative for all population groups at a 95% confidence level and 7% margin of error.
UKR	Ukraine IDP Sites	04/07/2023 - 02/08/2023	IDP: 2,038	774 collective sites across 5 macro regions (West, Centre, East, North, South)	Results are representative at the national and macro region levels at a 95% confidence level and 7% margin of error.

Table 3: Availability of indicators across countries

	Total countries by indicator in 2022 (out of 13)	Total countries by indicator in 2023 (out of 11)
Safety and security		
Fear of exposure to conflict or violence	11	9
Fear of explosive hazards	11	10
Experience of natural hazards	9	7
Fear of harassment, intimidation or persecution	10	9
Fear of sexual and gender-based violence	11	9
Standards of living		
Poor or borderline food consumption (FCS)	12	10
High level of reduced coping strategies (rCSI)	11	10
Lack of access to improved drinking water sources	12	11
Lack of sufficient water to meet basic needs	13	11
Unmet healthcare needs	13	11
Unenrolled school-aged children	13	11
Lack of access to improved sanitation facilities	13	11
Livelihood and housing		
Lack of stable income source	12	11
Lack of access to humanitarian assistance	13	10
Lack of access to adequate housing	12	11
Risk of eviction	9	7
Lack of housing, land and property rights	6	10
Civic and social rights		
Lack of civil documentation	11	8
Children separated from family	13	10
Lack of access to voting rights	1	1
Lack of participation in public affairs	1	1
Lack of freedom of movement	11	8