



## INDICATOR DEFINITION MATRIX

Criteria	Sub-criteria	Indicator	Indicator No.	Definition	Data source	Ideal disaggregate(s)	Proxy indicator(s)
<b>PHYSICAL SAFETY</b>	<b>Protection</b>	% of target population who were subjected to physical, psychological or sexual violence in the previous 12 months	1	This indicator measures people's exposure to different forms of violence. Measuring it in the solutions analysis will most likely be reliant on survey data, although it could possibly be calculated based on reported incidents. This is a SDG indicator.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: household/individual surveys; assessments by protection actors.</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location and population group.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of reported cases of physical, psychological or sexual violence that are reported to relevant authorities or community-based groups (compared over time)</li> <li>% of target population who report reduced incidence of violence</li> <li>% of target population feeling unsafe in their place of residence</li> </ul>
		% of target population facing restrictions on their freedom of movement	2	This indicator measures the extent to which people can move freely. People should be able to move freely to and from the place that they live. The IASC Framework states that "While certain movement restrictions to protect essential interests or the freedoms of others may be imposed on a temporary basis (e.g. curfews in tense security conditions), they must not be discriminatory or arbitrary".	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: assessments/surveys/analysis by protection actors; protection monitoring data</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location and population group.	Existence of laws, policies or informal measures which restrict the freedom of movement of the target group
	<b>Safety and security</b>	Level of confidence in police and informal/formal justice mechanisms among target population	3	<p>This indicators measures people's perceptions of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Informal justice mechanisms</li> <li>2. Formal justice mechanism</li> <li>3. The police</li> </ol> <p>Ideally, it should be measured separately for each of the above. In some contexts the formal justice system may have very limited presence- in such circumstances the analysis team may chose to focus on informal justice mechanisms.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: assessments/surveys/analysis by protection actors; protection monitoring data.</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location and population group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of police per XX of population</li> <li># of functioning formal/informal courts per XX of population</li> </ul>
		% of target population feeling unsafe in their place of residence	4	This indicators measures people's perceptions on how safe they feel within the displacement affected community.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: assessments/surveys/analysis by protection actors; protection monitoring data</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location and population group	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li># of police per XX of population</li> <li># of functioning formal/informal courts per XX of population</li> </ul>
	<b>Social cohesion</b>	% of stigmatization due to displacement status	5	This indicators measures people's perceptions on whether they feel stigmatised or dicriminated within the community or local institutions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FGDs, KII with relevant actors</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location and population group	
		% of acceptance by host community	6	This indicators measures people's perceptions on how accepted they feel in the community	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>FGDs, KII with relevant actors</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location and population group	

MATERIAL SAFETY	Adequate standard of living	Food consumption score	7	<p>“Food consumption score” is an indicator developed and used by WFP (as well as other food security actors) in a food security analysis. It is a composite score based on dietary diversity, food frequency, and relative nutritional importance of different food groups. More information on how food consumption score is calculated can be found here: <a href="http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp197216.pd">http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/manual_guide_proced/wfp197216.pd</a></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: assessments, analysis and surveys by food security actor</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location and population group	See nutrition indicators below
		Prevalence of global acute malnutrition among target population	8	<p>This indicator measures the prevalence of malnutrition within the target group.</p> <p>According to the WHO, severe acute malnutrition is defined by a very low weight for height (below -3z scores of the median WHO growth standards), by visible severe wasting, or by the presence of nutritional oedema.</p> <p>According to the World Food Programme, global acute malnutrition (GAM) “represents the proportion of children 6-59 months in the population classified with moderate acute malnutrition + severe acute malnutrition according to their weight-for-height (WFH) (Z-score), and/or nutritional oedema”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: surveys/data of food security/nutrition actors- government, WFP, UNICEF, WHO.</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location and population group	Prevalence of moderate acute malnutrition (cluster)
							Prevalence of under nutrition
							% of target population who experienced undernourishment in the past year/over the past XX months
		% of households in target population living in adequate housing conditions	9	<p>This indicator measures the adequacy of shelter conditions. Shelter actors should have already defined and agreed at country level on what is an adequate shelter in the particular context. Further guidance on what constitutes “adequate housing conditions” can be found in the “Shelter, settlement and non-food items” chapter of the Sphere Handbook.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: assessments, analysis and surveys by shelter actors</li> </ul>	Sex and age of head of household; household tenure situation (owner/owner-occupier; renter; no tenure); type of settlement (urban/rural; formal/informal) or displacement site/situation (self-settled/planned camp; collective centre; host family)	% of households having received shelter assistance (out of those assessed to be in need of shelter assistance)
							% of households who feel that they have an adequate standard of shelter
		% of target population with daily access to safely managed and sufficient drinking water	10	<p>This indicator is taken directly from the SDGs. It is defined as follows:</p> <p>“This indicator measures the percentage of the urban and rural population using safely managed drinking water services, as defined by the WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme. This ambitious indicator goes beyond the previous “basic drinking water” indicator as it has been designed to incorporate an assessment of the quality and safety of the water people use. Households are considered to have access to safely managed drinking water service when they use water from a basic source on premises. The term ‘safely managed’ is proposed to describe a higher threshold of service; for water, this includes measures for protecting supplies and ensuring water is safe to drink...A basic drinking water source is a source or delivery point that by nature of its construction or through active intervention is protected from outside contamination with fecal matter. Basic drinking water sources can include: piped drinking water supply on premises; public taps/stand posts; tube well/borehole; protected dug well; protected spring; rainwater; and bottled water (when another basic source is used for hand washing, cooking, or other basic personal hygiene purposes)”.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: assessment, analysis and survey data of WASH actors</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location, population group, type of water source	# of functioning water sources per XXX of population in displacement affected community, compare to national average
							% of population who live with XXkm of a functioning water source

		% of target population with secure tenure over land	20	<p>This indicator measures security of tenure. In the case of refugees or IDPs still in displacement, this indicator applies to the property and land they are currently occupying. Tenure is the way in which the rights, restrictions and responsibilities that people have with respect to the land (and property) are held. According to IFRC's Rapid Tenure assessment highlights that security of tenure "can be defined in various ways:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The degree to which land users can be confident that they will not be arbitrarily deprived of the rights they enjoy over land and the economic benefits that flow from it;</li> <li>• The certainty that an individual's rights to land will be recognized by others and protected in case of challenges;</li> <li>• More specifically, the right of all individuals and groups to effective government protection from forced evictions".</li> </ul> <p>One does not necessarily need to have documents to have security of tenure.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment/analysis/-surveys by HLP actors; records of HLP actors</li> </ul>	Sex, age, tenure situation (owner/owner-occupier; renter; no tenure); type of settlement (urban /rural; formal/informal) or displacement site/situation (self-settled/planned camp; collective centre; host family)	Existence of legal and administrative barriers to accessing secure tenure rights over land
	<b>Access to personal and other documentation</b>	Existence of accessible mechanisms for obtaining/replacing documents	21	<p>This indicator measures the availability of mechanisms to obtain/replace documents. This indicator should always interrogate mechanisms for obtaining/replacing birth certificates. Other documents to be interrogated should be determined in each individual context, but may include refugee status documents, passports, personal identification documents, birth certificates, marriage certificates and voter identification cards. The indicator should be broken down individual documents (e.g. Existence of accessible mechanisms for obtaining/replacing birth certificates etc.)</p> <p>To be accessible, the mechanisms must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided without discrimination;</li> <li>• Within safe and easy reach;</li> <li>• Affordable;</li> <li>• Known of by beneficiaries; and</li> <li>• Culturally appropriate and sensitive to gender and age.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary data: Assessments/analysis by protection actors, legal documentation experts.</li> <li>• KIs: protection actors, legal documentation experts</li> </ul>	Type of mechanism	Existence of legal and administrative obstacles to obtaining/replacing documents
		% of target population currently in possession of birth certificates, national ID cards or other personal documents relevant to the context	22	<p>This indicator measures the proportion of the target population (IDPs/refugees/returnees/host community) who are in possession of documents. Birth certificates should be a mandatory part of this indicator. Other documents should be prioritized in each particular context.</p> <p>This indicator will be broken down into a number of indicators, one for each document (e.g. % of target population currently in possession of a birth certificate etc).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary data: Assessments/analysis by protection actors, legal documentation experts; civil registration data.</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location, type of document and population group	<p>% of target population under age 5 whose births are reported registered by the authorities if relevant to the context</p> <p>% of target group who believe it is important to have personal documents</p>
	<b>Family reunification</b>	Existence of accessible mechanisms to reunite separated family members	23	<p>This indicator measures the availability of mechanisms to reunite separated family members. As per the IASC Framework, the focus here is on "children, older persons or other vulnerable persons". To be accessible, the mechanisms must be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provided without discrimination;</li> <li>• Within safe and easy reach;</li> <li>• Affordable;</li> <li>• Known of by beneficiaries; and</li> <li>• Culturally appropriate and sensitive to gender and age</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary data</li> <li>• KIs with child protection and FTR experts</li> </ul>	Type of mechanism	% of target population with household members missing with access to services for separated families and family reunification

LEGAL SAFETY		% of UASC and other separated vulnerable persons who have been reunified with their families	24	<p>This indicator measures the proportion of identified and registered UASC and other separated vulnerable persons who have been reunified with their families through the mechanisms identified under indicator FR1.</p> <p>This indicator should be broken down as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• % of UASC</li> <li>• % of other vulnerable persons</li> </ul> <p>In reality, data will most likely be available for UASC, but may not be for “other vulnerable persons”.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary data: data/reports of child protection actors, protection cluster, UNHCR, UNICEF, ICRCetch</li> </ul>	Age, sex, location, population group	<p>% of target unaccompanied and separated children who are waiting for family reunification</p> <p>% of vulnerable persons separated from their families who have been reunified</p>
	Participation in public affairs	Existence of legal or administrative obstacles that prevent people from 1) voting or 2) being elected	25	<p>This indicator identifies legal or administrative obstacles to voting and being elected. This indicator should not be applied to refugees (still in displacement)- as they are not citizens of the country that hosts them they will not have been afforded the right to vote. Legal obstacles would be presented if national or local laws discriminate against certain types of individual and present them with greater challenges in voting. Administrative obstacles might be presented by a failure to register voters, or a lack of convenient locations in which to vote.</p> <p>This indicator should be broken down into obstacles for 1) voting and 2) being elected</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary data: National and local laws; existing analysis of voting and elections.</li> <li>• Key informant interviews</li> <li>• Focus group discussions</li> </ul>	None	% of target population registered to vote.
		% of target population who believe decision-making is inclusive and responsive	26	<p>This indicator explores public perceptions of decision-making processes. This is a SDG indicator (#16.7.2).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary data: SDG data.</li> </ul>	Sex, age, location and population group	% of target population registered to vote
	Access to effective remedies and justice	% of target population who accessed mechanisms to provide remedies for violations suffered (out of those who needed them)	27	<p>This indicator measures the extent to which people have been able to access remedies for violations of international human rights law and international humanitarian law.</p> <p>“Violations” can be those that caused displacement (including arbitrary displacement itself), or may have occurred during displacement. As per the IASC Framework, “effective remedies” include “equal and effective access to justice; adequate, effective and prompt reparation for harm suffered and access to relevant information concerning violations and reparations mechanisms”. Reparation may include restitution and compensation (further detail on what reparation may include are contained with IASC Framework). This indicator includes violations that have been perpetrated by non-state actors. “Mechanisms” must have the legal mandate and actual capacity to provide remedies for rights violations</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary data: Relevant assessments/analysis/surveys; records/reports of mechanism providing remedies</li> </ul>	Type of mechanism, age, sex, location and population group	Existence of accessible mechanisms that provide effective remedies for violations suffered
		% of target population who consider that they have been effectively remedied for violations suffered (out of those who accessed mechanisms to provide remedies)	28	<p>This indicator interrogates people’s satisfaction with the remedies they have been provided by the mechanisms mentioned under indicator #25. As per the IASC Framework, “effective remedies” include “equal and effective access to justice; adequate, effective and prompt reparation for harm suffered and access to relevant information concerning violations and reparations mechanisms”</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Secondary data: relevant surveys, including satisfaction surveys of relevant mechanisms</li> </ul>	Type of mechanism, age, sex, location and population group	<p>% of reported violations (to above mentioned mechanisms) that have been remedied</p> <p>Level of confidence in mechanisms that provide remedies for violation suffered.</p>

		Unemployment rate (% of total labor force)	16	The following definition of the unemployment rate is provided by ILO :“The unemployment rate is defined mathematically as the ratio resulting from dividing the total number of unemployed (for a country or a specific group of workers) by the corresponding labor force, which itself is the sum of the total persons employed and unemployed in the group. It should be emphasized that it is the labor force (formerly known as the economically active population) that serves as the base for this statistic, not the total population”. In contexts where formal employment is uncommon, and informal economic activities are the norm, the analysis team may chose to remove this indicator..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: national/local unemployment statistics; surveys conducted by livelihoods actors</li> </ul>	Age, sex, location, population group.	Labor force participation rate	
		% of target population living below the national poverty line	17	The corresponding indicator in the SDGs defines the “national poverty line” as follows:“This modified MDG Indicator is defined as the percentage of the population living below the national poverty line, where the average daily consumption (or income) is less than a certain amount per person per day. These poverty thresholds are defined at the country level below which a person is deemed to be poor. The national poverty line should be differentiated for urban versus rural settings within the country to account for differences in cost of living”	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: Household surveys, for example household budget surveys or other surveys covering income and expenditure</li> </ul>	Age, sex, location, population group	% of population receiving food assistance or cash transfers  % of target population who in the last XX months was not able to pay: housing, education, food, healthcare, transport	
		<b>Effective and accessible mechanisms to restore housing, land and property</b>	Existence of accessible mechanisms to ensure access to housing, land and property rights for target group	18	This indicator measures 1) the existence of mechanisms and 2) their accessibility. Mechanisms can be formal or informal. "Ensuring access to HLP rights" might, according to the IASC Framework, include restitution or compensation for those "who have lost ownership, tenancy rights or other access entitlements". It will also include supporting individuals to assert their rights to ownership/tenancy in place of displacement.  <b>To be accessible, the mechanisms must be:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provided without discrimination;</li> <li>Within safe and easy reach;</li> <li>Affordable;</li> <li>Known of by beneficiaries; and</li> <li>Culturally appropriate and sensitive to gender and age.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: assessments/analysis conducted by HLP actors</li> <li>KIIs with HLP actors</li> <li>FGDs in displacement affected communities</li> </ul>	Type of mechanism (formal/informal)	Existence of and legal/administrative barriers for target group to access mechanisms to ensure access to housing, land and property rights  Level of confidence in mechanisms to ensure access to housing, land and property rights
			% of target population with lost HLP who have had their claims resolved	19	This indicator measures the extent to which cases of lost HLP have been resolved through formal or informal mechanisms. As per the IASC Framework, this indicator applies regardless of whether an individual choses to return, locally integrate or settle in a third location. The HLP in question may be that which they left behind in their place of origin, or that which they have obtained (and subsequently lost) in place of displacement. Resolution of claims will entail either compensation, restitution or the provision of alternative HLP with secure tenure.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Assessment/analysis by HLP actors; records of HLP actors</li> </ul>	Sex, age, tenure situation (owner/owner-occupier; renter; no tenure); type of settlement (urban /rural; formal/informal) or displacement site/situation (self-settled/planned camp; collective centre; host family)	% of reported cases of lost HLP which are resolved

		% of target population with access to safe toilet facilities	11	This indicator is aligned with the SDGs, which state:  “Safely managed sanitation services are those that effectively separate excreta from human contact, and ensure that excreta do not re-enter the immediate environment. This means that household excreta are contained, extracted, and transported to designated disposal or treatment site, or, as locally appropriate, are safely re-used at the household or community level. Each of the following types of facilities are considered adequate if the facility is not shared with other households: a pit latrine with a superstructure, and a platform or squatting slab constructed of durable material (composting latrines, pour-flush latrines, etc.); a toilet connected to a septic tank; or a toilet connected to a sewer network (small bore or conventional)”..	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: assessment, analysis and survey data of WASH actors</li> </ul>	Sex, age, population group, location.	<p># of functioning latrines per XXX of population in displacement affected community compared to national average</p> <p>Average number of users per functioning toilet (cluster)</p>	
		% of target population who used health care services (including mental health care) the last time they needed it in the past 12 months	12	This indicator measure people’s ability to access primary health care services the last time they needed them in the last year. WHO defines primary health services as including “preventative, curative, and palliative care of communicable and non-communicable diseases, sexual and reproductive health services, family planning, routine immunizations, and mental health”.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: assessment, analysis and surveys by health sector actors</li> </ul>	Age, sex, location, population group	<p># of functional basic health units/10 000 population</p> <p># of functional health centres/50 000 population</p> <p># of functional district-rural hospitals/250 000 population</p>	
		Primary/secondary school net attendance ratio	13	This indicator measures primary and secondary school attendance rates. In reality this indicator would be split into two-one for primary school and one for secondary school.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data: government statistics, assessments/survey data/statistics of education actors, including UNICEF and Save the Children.</li> </ul>	Age, sex, location, population group	Net primary school enrolment ratio	
		Existence of legal, administrative or discriminatory barriers to accessing national social protection programs	14	This indicator interrogates legal and administrative barriers to accessing social security schemes. Social security schemes can cover the following areas: medical care; sickness benefits; protection for disability, old age and survivorship, maternity, children, unemployment, and employment injury; and general protection against poverty and social exclusion . Social protection programs will include labor market interventions to promote employment and protect workers, social insurance such as health or unemployment insurance and social assistance to support vulnerable individuals or households. In some contexts, national social protection programs may not exist, or may have very limited penetration- in such cases the analysis team may consider removing this indicator.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Secondary data sources: analysis of social protection programs</li> <li>KIIs with relevant experts</li> </ul>	Type of national social protection program	% of target population covered under social security schemes (public or private)	
		<b>Access to job creation/economic opportunities</b>	Existence of legal/administrative obstacles to employment or economic activity	15	This indicator interrogates obstacles to employment and economic activity. “Legal or administrative obstacles” might apply across the board (e.g. refugees not being afforded the right to work), or they might apply to a certain type of role (for example, working in public service). “Legal obstacles” will include specific laws or policies that prevent or inhibit people from employment or economic activity. “Administrative obstacles” may include complex, cumbersome or slow-moving bureaucratic processes (e.g. long delays in issuing work permits or difficulties in obtaining credit). Access to credit through banks and loans associations, as well as access to skills development and vocational training should be considered as factors enabling or inhibiting employment and/or economic activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Review of secondary data: assessments, analysis and surveys by livelihood actors.</li> <li>KIIs with livelihoods actors</li> <li>FGDs</li> </ul>	Age, sex, location, population group.	None