Watchlist 2020 Technical Notes

November 2019

The 2019 Watchlist was developed by building on methodologies implemented in previous years to identify countries at risk of humanitarian crisis in the coming year. The methods used for the 2020 Watchlist are described here to ensure transparency and reproducibility.

The main steps for developing and ranking this year's Watchlist were:

1. Source selection
2. Indicator selection
3. Identification of long-list countries
4. Defining and selecting dimensions
5. Score card development
6. Calculating dimensional scores
7. Combining dimensional scores
8. Qualitative review of countries
9. Ranking the top 10 countries

1. Source selection

The following sources were identified as producing relevant indicators, either in the form of quantitative indices or qualitative data (for example, lists of "countries of concern") that were expected to be relevant to the formulation of the Watchlist. The sources were selected on the basis of relevance, availability, minimal missing data and credibility. Most had also been used in previous Watchlists. A description of each source and notes on the type of data are included below:

INFORM (Quantitative)[1]

INFORM is a tool that was developed as a collaboration effort by the Inter-Agency Standing Committee Task Team for Preparedness and Resilience and the European Commission. The tool brings together data from various, reputable sources and produces indicators related to the conditions that lead to conflict and natural disasters. The data used for this year's Watchlist included a combination of quantitative indices, and indicators such as the INFORM's Natural Hazards Index and INFORM's Governance indicator.

Responsibility to Protect (Qualitative)[2]

The establishment of the Global Centre for the Responsibility to Protect Populations at Risk was backed by various governments, human rights campaigners, the International Crisis Group, Human Rights Watch, Oxfam International, Refugees International, and World Federalist Movement (WFM)-Institute for Global Policy. The center identifies situations where populations are experiencing, or are at risk of, genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing and/or crimes against humanity. These are also events that warrant monitoring by IRC as they could potentially cause humanitarian needs that would trigger an IRC response. Responsibility

---

[1] http://www.inform-index.org/
[2] http://www.globalr2p.org/regions/

to Protect provides a qualitative overview of the situation in the country, classifying countries as "Current Crisis", "Imminent Risk", and "Serious Concern". The majority of countries receive no classification.

International Crisis Group (Qualitative)[3]

The International Crisis Group (ICG) is an independent organization that engages directly with various conflict actors to gather information and to provide analysis and advice on how to prevent, resolve, or better manage conflict. ICG produces a global conflict tracker tool known as Crisis Watch which provides a qualitative overview of how the context in a country is evolving, classifying them as "Unchanged Situation", "Improved Situation", or "Deteriorated Situation." The majority of countries did not receive a classification.

Social Progress Index (Quantitative)[4]

The Social Progress Index was created to define success in societies. It is a composite measure that assesses basic human needs, foundations of wellbeing, and opportunity to understand quality of life, independent of economic indicators. This measure was designed to complement rather than replace economic measures.

IRC Pre-Crisis Vulnerability Score (Quantitative)[5]

The IRC Pre-Crisis Vulnerability Score (PCV) is a measure developed by the IRC that takes into account 25 indicators that would make a country susceptible to an emergency. The 25 indicators in the index were selected in collaboration with IRC technical units and broadly represent meeting the IRC's core outcomes. The PCV is also integrated into the Emergency Classification System, which is utilized by the Emergency Unit to decide whether or not to respond to an emergency.

Council on Foreign Relations (Qualitative)[6]

Information from the Council on Foreign Relations' Global Conflict Tracker, which was developed by the Center for Preventative Action (CPA), highlights the relationship between risk and current crises. The conflicts featured on the Global Conflict Tracker - Conflict Status are identified through a Preventative Priorities Survey (PPS) which asks government officials, foreign policy experts and academics to assess ongoing and potential conflicts based on their likelihood to occur in a given year. The status of each conflict is concluded by monitoring developments in the conflict and reviewing watch lists, conflict assessments and government reports. The robust qualitative nature of the assessment of the conflict and the types of sources and experts that CPA has access to provide strong justification for including it as a source for IRC's Watchlist. Countries are classified as either "Unchanging", "Worsening", or "Improving", or are not listed at all if they are not of high concern.

ACAPS (Qualitative)[7]

The ACAPS annual Crisis Overview: Humanitarian Trends and Risks outlines countries where humanitarian needs are greatest and growing. ACAPS bases its assessment on their weekly Global Emergency Overview (GEO) and four years of data on humanitarian needs across 150 countries. ACAPS generates reports and assessments based on their analysis of secondary and tertiary sources. This aids in summarizing risks in a

---

[3] https://www.crisisgroup.org/crisiswatch
[4] https://www.socialprogress.org/
[5] https://rescue.box.com/s/556n0tpdwfl33jojlp8ze2egcg692rjx Column AD "Factor" was used
[6] https://www.cfr.org/interactives/global-conflict-tracker#!/
[7] http://humanitarianaccess.acaps.org/

qualitative manner providing a humanitarian lens with specific attention to the underlying risk that would trigger a humanitarian crisis, such as gang violence and/or political tensions between opposition groups and the ruling party within a fragile state. It is extremely relevant to the assessment of risk within a country for the purpose of the IRC Watchlist. ACAPS Access is an ordinal ranking of the ease of humanitarian access in a country. No constraints is rated as 0 and Inaccessible rated as 5. The ACAPS ranking is qualitative in nature and categorizes countries as "Severe Humanitarian Crisis", "Humanitarian Crisis", and "Situation of Concern".[8] Not all countries were classified by ACAPS.

IASC (Qualitative)[9]

The Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Early Warning, Early Action and Readiness (EWEAR) Report is produced biannually by the IASC Reference Group on Risk, Early Warning and Preparedness (RG REAP) to highlight where the IASC early warning analysts project a significant increase in the humanitarian caseload during the next six months. The analysis provides a qualitative categorization of countries as "Very High Concern", "High Concern", or "Moderate Concern", or does not mention them at all.[10]

ACLED (Quantitative)[11]

The Armed Conflict Location & Event Data Project (ACLED) is a project to collect, analyze and map conflict and political incidents in a large range of countries (but not all) globally. ACLED collects the dates, actors, types of violence, locations, and number of fatalities in all reported instances of political violence and protest events across Africa, South Asia, South East Asia, the Middle East, Europe, and Latin America. Political violence and protest includes events that occur within civil wars and periods of instability, public protest and government breakdown. ACLED's aim is to capture the forms, actors, dates and locations of political violence and protest as it occurs across states. [12]

Verisk Maplecroft (Quantitative)[13]

Providing global risk analytics, Verisk Maplecroft is a source that includes numerous quantitative indicators and indices that range from political risk, human rights, economic and environmental issues, sustainable sourcing, and the investment landscape.[14] The specificity of the dataset as well as the lack of missing data for certain countries, enabled the analysis team to develop dimensions that were specifically relevant to the needs of the IRC.

2. Indicator selection

After identifying a range of potential data sources for the Watchlist, the IRC identified which of their data sets were credible and highlighted "at risk" countries. *Table 1* includes the sources and the indicators utilized for this year's process. Some indicators were used to identify a long-list of countries of concern; some were used to create the Watchlist score cards; some were used for both steps of the process. Both steps are discussed in more detail in later sections. This table summarizes which part or parts of the quantitative analysis each indicator informed:

---

[8] The 2018 ACAPS ranking was not available at the time the long-list was put together. The 2017 ranking was used instead.
[9] https://rescue.box.com/s/jr0f2o0qwa1krkz8267mk74u9fj2eovz
[10] The IRC used the analysis for May to October 2018, as the most recent available at the time of doing the analysis.
[11] https://www.acleddata.com/data/
[12] https://www.acleddata.com/about-acled/
[13] https://www.maplecroft.com/
[14] https://www.maplecroft.com/about/introducing-maplecroft/

Table 1

	Source	Indicator	Data used in long-list	Data used for score card	Data used in both
1.	INFORM	Natural Hazard			X
2.	INFORM	Human			X
3.	INFORM	DRR		X	
4.	INFORM	Governance		X	
5.	INFORM	Institutional		X	
6.	INFORM	Communication		X	
7.	INFORM	Physical infrastructure		X	
8.	INFORM	Access to health care		X	
9.	INFORM	Infrastructure		X	
10.	INFORM	Vulnerability		X	
11.	INFORM	Coping Risk	X		
12.	INFORM	Overall risk	X		
13.	INFORM	3 year overall risk trend	X		
14.	Responsibility to Protect	Population at risk	X		
15.	International Crisis Group	Crisis watchlist	x		
16.	Social Progress Index	Social Progress			X
17.	Social Progress Index	Change in rating 2019-2018			X
18.	Social Progress Index	Change in rating 2019-2017			X
19.	Social Progress Index	Change in rating 2019-2016			X
20.	IRC Pre-crisis Vulnerability Score	Factor			X
21.	Council on Foreign Relations	Global Conflict Tracker-conflict status	X		
22.	ACAPS	Access	X		
23.	ACAPS	2017 ranking	X		
24.	IASC	IASC level of concern	X		
25.	ACLED	Cases of violence against civilians	X		
26.	ACLED	Proportion (cases/population) of violence against civilians	X		
27.	ACLED	Fatalities	X		

28.	ACLED	Proportion (cases/population) of fatalities	X		
29.	ACLED	Final incidents			X
30.	ACLED	Proportion (cases/population of final incidents	X		
31.	ACLED	Final fatalities			X
32.	ACLED	Final fatalities Proportion			X
33.	Verisk Maplecroft	Sexual minorities			X
34.	Verisk Maplecroft	Security force and human rights			X
35.	Verisk Maplecroft	Modern slavery			X
36.	Verisk Maplecroft	Minority rights			X
37.	Verisk Maplecroft	Kidnapping			X
38.	Verisk Maplecroft	Government effectiveness			X
39.	Verisk Maplecroft	Criminality			X
40.	Verisk Maplecroft	Corruption			X
41.	Verisk Maplecroft	Banking sector fragility			X
42.	Verisk Maplecroft	Forced labor			X
43.	Verisk Maplecroft	Women's and girls rights			X
44.	Verisk Maplecroft	Torture and other ill-treatment			X
45.	Verisk Maplecroft	Arbitrary arrest and detention			X
46.	Verisk Maplecroft	Human capital			X
47.	Verisk Maplecroft	Financial development			X
48.	Verisk Maplecroft	Pandemic susceptibility			X
49.	Verisk Maplecroft	Public sector indebtedness			X
50.	Verisk Maplecroft	Fiscal resilience			X
51.	Verisk Maplecroft	Exposure to regional conflict			X
52.	Verisk Maplecroft	Exchange rate pressure			X
53.	Verisk Maplecroft	Volcanic hazard			X
54.	Verisk Maplecroft	Tsunami hazard			X
55.	Verisk Maplecroft	Severe storm hazard			X
56.	Verisk Maplecroft	Landslide hazard index			X
57.	Verisk Maplecroft	Flood hazard			X
58.	Verisk Maplecroft	Extra-tropical cyclone hazard			X
59.	Verisk Maplecroft	Costal flood hazard			X
60.	Verisk Maplecroft	Healthcare capacity			X
61.	Verisk Maplecroft	Natural hazards – vulnerability			X

62.	Verisk Maplecroft	Natural hazards – transport infrastructure exposure (relative)	X		
63.	Verisk Maplecroft	Natural hazards - population exposure (relative)	X		
64.	Verisk Maplecroft	Natural hazards - population exposure (absolute)	X		
65.	Verisk Maplecroft	Natural hazards – impacts	X		
66.	Verisk Maplecroft	Pandemic transmission	X		
67.	Verisk Maplecroft	Interstate conflict			X
68.	Verisk Maplecroft	Government stability index			X
69.	Verisk Maplecroft	Conflict intensity index			X
70.	Verisk Maplecroft	Civil unrest			X
71.	Verisk Maplecroft	Tropical storm and cyclone hazard			X
72.	Verisk Maplecroft	Seismic hazard			X
73.	Verisk Maplecroft	Drought hazard			X
74.	Verisk Maplecroft	Environmental risk	X		
75.	Verisk Maplecroft	Political risk	X		
76.	Verisk Maplecroft	Wildfire hazard			X
77.	Verisk Maplecroft	Wave hazard			X
78.	Verisk Maplecroft	Terrorism threat			X
79.	Verisk Maplecroft	Terrorism intensity			X
80.	Verisk Maplecroft	Trade sanctions			X
81.	ACAPS	Ethnic Fractionalisation			X
82.	ACAPS	Size of excluded ethnic group			X
83.	ACAPS	BTI Democracy Status			X
84.	ACAPS	Conflict Intensity (HIIK)			X
85.	ACAPS	Rule of Law (WGI)			X
86.	ACAPS	Rule of Law (BTI)			X
87.	ACAPS	CPI			X
88.	ACAPS	Gender Inequality			X
89.	ACAPS	Income Gini Coefficient			X
90.	ACAPS	Freedom in the World			X

3. Identification of long-list countries

High risk counties were initially identified by combining 76 numeric indicators based on face validity (i.e. the expertise of IRC analysts) followed by a series of robustness tests to explore challenges and evidence of the validity of the model. This began by importing the most recent data on the indicators marked above as

either "used in long-list" or "for both". Indicators that were not on a 1-10 scale were transformed utilizing min-max scaling.

Each quantitative indicator was then sorted from high to low and the top 25 values were highlighted for the column. A country was not included in the analysis if there was missing data on the country for that indicator (complete case analysis). If the 25th and following values were the same, then all values equal to the 25th value were highlighted. The six qualitative sources provided analysis of only high risk counties, not all countries. For qualitative sources, therefore, countries were highlighted if the source indicated a negative or unchanging trend, or if it was otherwise identified as being somehow "of concern."

Next, robustness tests were conducted. These involved combining the indicators in various ways, by including or excluding different indicators. Each model (combination of indicators) was tested by counting how many times a country had been highlighted. The count of highlighted cells was then sorted from high to low and the top 40 countries were identified. This step identified which countries appeared most frequently on the top 25 for the indicators that were included in each model. 11 more models were developed and the top 25 countries from each model of the 12models were documented. Finally, a sum was calculated for the number of times a country appeared on the 12models. 40 countries that appeared most frequently across the 12 model combinations were selected for the long-list. The rational for this was that countries most at risk were expected to trend across various data sets and be robust to various methods of data reduction.

The Watchlist team also compared the preliminary long list with crises the IRC had been monitoring throughout 2019 while the IRC's program teams around the world also provided inputs on countries to be considered. This enabled further countries to be flagged for inclusion in the long list, particularly those with deterioration late in 2019.

4. Defining and selecting dimensions

After coming up with the long-list, the team proceeded to the next stage of the quantitative analysis: developing a set of four scores for each country, to illustrate key dimensions of a country's vulnerability to experiencing a humanitarian crisis. The four dimensions used for this stage of the Watchlist analysis were Natural Risk, Human Risk, Vulnerability, and Lack of coping capacity – each is defined below.

Two dimensions were developed for the "risk" of a country experiencing events that could trigger a humanitarian crisis:
1.   Human risk –the risk of the country experiencing human-driven events such as political instability, armed conflict and/or economic collapse.
2.   Natural risk – the risk of the country experiencing natural events such as a flood, earthquake or typhoon/hurricane.

An additional two dimensions were developed to help illustrate the likelihood that an event – whether human or natural – would cause a humanitarian crisis to which the IRC would be likely to respond:
3.   Vulnerability – the existing vulnerability of the population in that country.
4.   Lack of coping capacity – whether a country has the governance structures and physical/communications infrastructure to respond effectively to a crisis.

5. Score card development

The next step in the process was to develop a scorecard based on 70 selected indicators mapped to the 4 specified dimensions. Through consultation, decisions were made about which dimension each indicator would map to and how certain indicators would be prioritized and thus receive a higher weighting. *Tables 2, 3, 4,* and *5* show which indicators were used, where they were mapped to, as well as which indicators were prioritized based on conceptual importance. The indicators in green received the highest weighting, followed by yellow, and then red. Please note that the sources for Human Risk are also highlighted, not just the data sets, because an additional weighting step was completed for the Human Risk Dimension since the ACLED data source was considered less reliable than the INFORM and Verisk Maplecroft sources.

Table 2

Human Risk	Source	Data Used
1.	INFORM	Human
2.	ACLED	Final Fatalities proportion
3.	ACLED	Final Fatalities
4.	ACLED	Final incidents
5.	Verisk Maplecroft	Terrorism Threat
6.	Verisk Maplecroft	Terrorism Intensity
7.	Verisk Maplecroft	Sexual Minorities
8.	Verisk Maplecroft	Security Forces and Human Rights
9.	Verisk Maplecroft	Public Sector Indebtedness
10.	Verisk Maplecroft	Modern Slavery
11.	Verisk Maplecroft	Minority Rights
12.	Verisk Maplecroft	Kidnappings
13.	Verisk Maplecroft	Interstate Conflict
14.	Verisk Maplecroft	History of Terrorism
15.	Verisk Maplecroft	Government Stability Index
16.	Verisk Maplecroft	Government Effectiveness
17.	Verisk Maplecroft	Fiscal Resilience
18.	Verisk Maplecroft	Exposure to Regional Conflict
19.	Verisk Maplecroft	Criminality
20.	Verisk Maplecroft	Corruption
21.	Verisk Maplecroft	Conflict Intensity Index
22.	Verisk Maplecroft	Civil Unrest
23.	Verisk Maplecroft	Banking Sector Fragility
24.	Verisk Maplecroft	Forced Labor
25.	Verisk Maplecroft	Women's and Girls' Rights
26.	Verisk Maplecroft	Torture and Other Ill-treatment
27.	Verisk Maplecroft	Trade Sanctions
28.	Verisk Maplecroft	Exchange Rate Pressure
29.	Verisk Maplecroft	Arbitrary Arrest and Detention
30.	ACAPS	Ethnic Fractionalisation
31.	ACAPS	Size of excluded ethnic group
32.	ACAPS	BTI Democracy Status

33.	ACAPS	Conflict Intensity (HIIK)
34.	ACAPS	Rule of Law (WGI)
35.	ACAPS	Rule of Law (BTI)
36.	ACAPS	CPI

Table 3

Natural Risk	Source	Data Used
1.	INFORM	Natural Hazard
2.	Verisk Maplecroft	Tropical Storm and Cyclone Hazard
3.	Verisk Maplecroft	Seismic Hazard
4.	Verisk Maplecroft	Drought Hazard
5.	Verisk Maplecroft	Volcanic Hazard
6.	Verisk Maplecroft	Tsunami Hazard
7.	Verisk Maplecroft	Severe storm hazard
8.	Verisk Maplecroft	Landslide Hazard Index
9.	Verisk Maplecroft	Flood Hazard
10.	Verisk Maplecroft	Extra-tropical cyclone hazard
11.	Verisk Maplecroft	Costal flood hazard
12.	Verisk Maplecroft	Wildfire hazard
13.	Verisk Maplecroft	Wave hazard

Table 4

Vulnerability	Source	Data Used
1.	INFORM	Vulnerability
2.	IRC Pre-crisis Vulnerability Score	Factor
3.	Social Progress Index	2019 Social Progress
4.	Social Progress Index	Change in Rating 2019-2018
5.	Social Progress Index	Change in Rating 2019-2017
6.	Social Progress Index	Change in Rating 2019-2016
7.	Verisk Maplecroft	Healthcare Capacity
8.	Verisk Maplecroft	Human Capital
9.	Verisk Maplecroft	Financial Development
10.	Verisk Maplecroft	Pandemic Susceptibility
11.	Verisk Maplecroft	Natural Hazards - Vulnerability
12.	ACAPS	Gender Inequality

13.	ACAPS	Income Gini Coefficient
14.	ACAPS	Freedom in the World

Table 5

Lack of Coping Capacity	Source	Data Used
1.	INFORM	DRR
2.	INFORM	Governance
3.	INFORM	Institutional
4.	INFORM	Communication
5.	INFORM	Physical infrastructure
6.	INFORM	Access to health care
7.	INFORM	Infrastructure

6. Calculating dimensional scores

The process used to calculate the scores for each dimension was as follows:
1. Ensure all indicators are normalized using min-max normalization[15]
2. Multiply the normalized values by 10
3. Group indicators based on source [16]
4. Calculate arithmetic mean for each of the groups in step 2 using a 3-2-1 weight (3 for indicators highlighted in green, 2 for indicators highlighted in yellow, and 1 for indicators highlighted in red)
5. Calculate arithmetic mean using the values from step 3[17] (Average of averages)
6. Round mean to nearest whole number
7. Repeat steps 1-6 for each dimension

7. Combining dimensional scores

These scores are included in the final version of the Watchlist to help illuminate the situation in each country. However, the team also used the scores to inform where each country was placed on the Watchlist. Models were generated by combining the scores for the four dimensions using four weighting and averaging techniques. *Table 6* presents the averaging technique used, as well as the weight each dimension received when being averaged.

Table 2

	Method	Natural Risk	Human Risk	Vulnerability	Lack of Coping Capacity
1.	Geometric Mean	2	3	2	2
2.	Geometric Mean	1	3	2	2
3.	Arithmetic Mean	2	3	2	2
4.	Arithmetic Mean	1	3	2	2

---

[15] $Z = ((x-min)/(max-min))$. Where X is the observed value for the indicator, min is the minimum observed value for the indicator, and max is the maximum observed value for the indicator. This step will scale the values from 0 to 1

[16] Grouping of indicators based on source was necessary due to weights placed on sources for the Human Risk dimension

[17] The Human Risk Dimension is the only dimension on the score card where a data source received a reduced weighting. As such, when step 4 was conducted for the dimension, the average of the Verisk Maplecroft indicators and INFORM indicator received a weight of 3 while the average of the ACLED indicators received a weight of 1.

The averages[18] were sorted and each model produced a numeric ranking of the countries based on the combined scores.

8. Qualitative review of countries

The long-list of countries were reviewed by the analysis team to highlight which countries should definitely belong on the Watchlist, which countries should be a point of discussion, and which countries should not appear on the Watchlist. This conversation was informed by an understanding of the context, including from the history of classifications by the IRC's Emergency Classification System as well as qualitative insights from the rest of the analysis team. In addition, the dimensional scores and averages from step 7 above, were considered. Following this rational,18 countries were selected for definite inclusion, 5 countries were marked to be a point of discussion, and the remaining 17 were countries the team believed should not appear on the Watchlist. The list was presented to and discussed with the Vice President of Emergencies and Senior Vice President of International Programs to confirm the countries that were selected for inclusion and to make a decision on the remaining 2 countries that should be on the Watchlist, given the analysis team had reasons for and against including the countries marked as a point of discussion.

9. Ranking top 10 countries

The decision was made that the top 10 countries on the Watchlist would be ranked while the remaining countries would be listed in alphabetical order. The Crisis Analyst compiled the results and produced a ranking based on several factors:

1. The combined mathematical models: where a country appeared on the ranking and how often it appeared in that position in different models served as the foundation for its ranking.
2. Review of data sources: indicators with missing data or outdated data may bias the data in either direction. As such, a review was done to determine how missing data could influence the observed results and affected countries ranks were adjusted accordingly.
3. Qualitative review by the IRC's Crisis Analyst: by integrating ongoing trend analysis conducted throughout 2019, the Crisis Analyst was able to make reasoned judgments about the relative risk of further deterioration in the humanitarian situation in countries on the top 10.
4. Qualitative inputs from senior IRC leaders, regional focal points and other IRC colleagues familiar with the countries in question.
5. Previously classified emergencies: the analysis team reviewed the scale and severity of emergencies that had previously been measured by the IRC's Emergency Classification System in relevant countries.
6. Scenarios from Strategy Action Plans in countries where a formal IRC presence exists: the scenarios outlined in the Strategy Action Plans were reviewed to ensure that the local teams' knowledge of the context was included.

The final result was a ranking of 10 countries as follows:

---

[18] The following table provides an example of the calculated averages for Afghanistan and Syria using the scores found on *Table 6*.

Country	Method 1	Method 2	Method 3	Method 4
Yemen	7.96894	8.447037	8.222222	8.625
Democratic Republic of the Congo	7.263297	7.610344	7.444444	7.75

Table 3

Ranking	Country	Natural Risk	Human Risk	Vulnerability	Lack of Coping Capability
1.	Yemen	5	10	9	8
2.	Democratic Republic of the Congo	5	7	9	9
3.	Syria	6	10	7	6
4.	Nigeria	4	8	8	7
5.	Venezuela	7	6	6	5
6.	Afghanistan	7	10	9	8
7.	South Sudan	4	7	10	10
8.	Burkina Faso	4	5	8	7
9.	Somalia	7	9	10	9
10.	Central African Republic	3	8	10	9

The remaining 10 countries (sorted alphabetically) were those that we do not believe face as high a risk of experiencing the large-scale humanitarian emergencies as the top ten:

Table 4

Country	Natural Risk	Human Risk	Vulnerability	Lack of Coping Capability
Burundi	4	6	8	7
Cameroon	4	6	8	7
Chad	5	7	10	10
Ethiopia	5	7	8	7
Iraq	6	8	7	7
Libya	4	9	5	6
Mali	4	6	8	7
Myanmar	9	7	8	7
Niger	4	6	10	9
Sudan	5	8	8	7

The final data and analysis spreadsheet can be found here for reference.
For any questions or further information please contact George.Readings@rescue.org or Tom.Joseph@rescue.org.