

Methodology for Country Prioritisation

Eligibility for the Multi-Year Resilience Window will be determined by a robust analysis of key indicators by country which will be reviewed and updated on a regular basis to ensure that any new protracted crises are included as appropriate.

Table 2 below provides a list of countries ECW has supported to date (either as an Initial Investment or through the First Emergency Response Window) and which have already been identified as eligible for support under the Multi-Year Resilience Window (highlighted in bold), alongside new countries to benefit from the Multi-Year Resilience Window during 2018-2021 (those not in bold). This strategy targets at total of 25 countries for multi-year programming during this four-year period.

Table 2: ECW Priority Countries

1	Afghanistan	14	Mali
2	Bangladesh	15	Myanmar
3	Burundi	16	Niger
4	Cameroon	17	Nigeria
5	Central African Republic	18	Pakistan
6	Chad	19	Palestine/West Bank and Gaza
7	Democratic Republic of Congo	20	Somalia
8	Ethiopia	21	South Sudan
9	Haiti	22	Sudan
10	Iraq	23	Syrian Arab Republic
11	Jordan	24	Uganda
12	Lebanon	25	Yemen
13	Libya		

The methodology to identify these 25 worst protracted crises is as follows:

Protracted crisis: A protracted crisis has been defined as a crisis that has had an emergency for the past 3 years in a row at least, based on OCHA appeals data, UNHCR RRP information, and UNICEF HAC appeal information. A handful of new crises come up on a regular basis, and when it is expected that they will become protracted, they can be added to the list (this was done for Bangladesh and Venezuela).

Ranking criteria: The ranking is based on 3 composite scores: the severity of the crisis and risks (this score is not specific to education), education funding gaps, and the situation of education in the country.

Severity of the crisis and risks:

This score is a composite of three scores: i) general level of severity of the crisis and risks ii) current refugee/IDP burden iii) latest evolution and future risks (with an emphasis on conflict-related risks). Development stakeholders have greater difficulty intervening in acute conflicts or refugee situations, while they are generally well involved in fragile countries affected by ongoing chronic vulnerability, hence the emphasis on conflict/refugee/IDP situations and on rapidly changing crises.

The first score is based on the INFORM risk score for 2018, which reflects general risk levels. INFORM is a collaboration between the IASC reference group on risk, early warning and preparedness and the European commission (<http://www.inform-index.org/>). The second score integrates the absolute number of refugees/IDPs in the country and their relative burden as compared to the country population. The third score includes the INFORM sub-score related to projected conflict risk, recent variations in numbers of refugees/IDPs in the country, and recent variations in the number of refugees from the country as a proxy for increased volatility.

Education funding gaps:

This index reflects two elements: the severity of the education financing gap, and the country's ability to cope. The education financing gap is assessed through two measures: i) the percentage of education funding requested through existing appeals that has been financed, ii) the ratio between education in emergencies funding and total humanitarian funding. The second measure helps account for variations in education amounts requested for a given appeal (some appeals ask for very small education amounts or do not ask for any education funding at all: in this context, while education may appear well funded at first sight, the actual education financing gaps may still be large).

It is important to assess a country's capacity to cope as some countries may have relatively large needs but high financial means. Further, an underfinanced crisis of a relatively small scale as compared to the size of the country (a few tens of thousands of refugees) is easier to managed than a similarly underfinanced crisis that touches the entire country. The "capacity to cope" is therefore measured in two ways: i) the ratio of the education financing gap to the national education budget ii) the ratio of the humanitarian funding gap to national GDP. While the second measure is not specific to education, it is argued that if the total humanitarian funding gap is extremely large as compared to national GDP, this will likely affect a country's capacity/willingness to contribute to education in emergencies needs.

Situation of education in the country

This is measured through two scores. The first two scores reflect the level of access and continuity in education in the corresponding countries, and the level of equity in education. These rely on available administrative and household survey data, and include data on pre-primary, primary and secondary education. Equity is measured through data on gender disparities, but also disparities based on location (urban/rural) or wealth (poorest/wealthiest quintiles) when these are available.

Limitations

- Lack of data specifically on education funding available per country as part of refugee response plans means proxies were used.
- The current classification does not include appeal amounts beyond the OCHA or UNHCR websites.
- Countries are the unit of analysis, but analysis based on sub-national regions may be more relevant, particularly where there is de facto separation between regions. Doing so would however require an agreed methodology and stronger data.
- Education data is based on multiple data sources to increase its reliability, but education data in protracted crisis is too often partial and/or outdated.

Footnote

Note that there is one discrepancy between the list below of 25 countries and the list of 25 countries targeted by this strategy outlined in table 2: Mauritania (number 22) was replaced by Cameroon (number 32). The rationale is that, though all other countries in the 25 top have a level of 5 or above for “severity of the crisis”, Mauritania’s score is only 4.9: the country ranks high on the list mostly because of low educational outcomes – which may be best dealt with in a development setting. It would therefore appear reasonable to look into countries with higher crisis severity levels. While Cameroon is not the next country in the list, it stands out for its high crisis severity and is also flagged as a country with a rapidly worsening situation. It is therefore suggested to put Cameroon within the list instead of Mauritania.

The ranking:

Based on the above, we arrive at the following ranking:

Country	Score 1: crisis severity and risks	Score 2: severity of education funding gaps	Score 3: education situation / needs	Composite score	Rank
Somalia	10.0	2.9	6.1	6.3	1
South Sudan	12.6	0.8	4.1	5.8	2
Syrian Arab Republic	12.7	1.7	2.5	5.6	3
Yemen	9.2	2.5	3.4	5.0	4
Central African Republic	7.3	3.6	4.1	5.0	5
Afghanistan	8.2	2.3	4.2	4.9	6
Chad	7.7	2.1	4.0	4.6	7
Iraq	9.5	1.7	2.5	4.6	8
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8.3	2.3	2.8	4.5	9
Sudan	6.9	2.2	3.4	4.2	10
Niger	6.6	2.0	3.7	4.1	11
Nigeria	7.3	2.1	2.7	4.0	12
Libya	7.4	1.9	2.8	4.0	13
Pakistan	6.8	2.1	3.0	3.9	14
Ethiopia	6.2	2.3	3.0	3.8	15
Uganda	6.7	1.9	2.8	3.8	16
Palestine	8.8	0.9	1.7	3.8	17
Burundi	6.5	2.0	2.8	3.7	18
Haiti	6.3	1.6	3.0	3.6	19
Bangladesh	6.7	2.1	2.0	3.6	20
Myanmar	6.4	2.1	2.3	3.6	21
Mauritania	4.9	1.9	3.5	3.6	22
Lebanon	6.5	1.8	2.2	3.5	23
Mali	5.2	1.9	3.4	3.5	24
Jordan	6.5	1.9	1.8	3.4	25
Burkina Faso	4.9	1.8	3.1	3.4	26
United Republic of Tanzania	5.4	1.9	2.8	3.4	27
Congo	5.1	2.3	2.5	3.3	28
Djibouti	4.7	2.2	3.0	3.3	29
Rwanda	4.9	2.0	2.7	3.2	30
Senegal	4.1	2.1	3.4	3.2	31
Cameroon	6.5	1.6	1.4	3.2	32
Ukraine	6.3	2.0	1.2	3.2	33
Turkey	6.4	0.6	1.9	3.0	34
Kenya	5.6	1.5	1.6	2.9	35
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	4.2	2.3	1.5	2.7	36
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	4.4	Insufficient information - proxy score = 2	1.6	2.7	37
Egypt	4.5	1.0	1.7	2.4	38