

Resilience dimensions	Indicators that may align with the community’s description of local risks and its own resilience
<b>Community knows and manages its risk</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The number of individuals in the community who are trained in first aid and have sound knowledge.</li> <li>■ The number of individuals with a sound understanding of appropriate options for reducing threats, their limitations, longer-term impacts, and the feasibility of actions in response.</li> <li>■ The number of individuals with a sound understanding of what drives exposure to threats, their increase, and management options.</li> <li>■ The number of individuals who have an accurate perception of the location of hazard sites.</li> <li>■ The level of awareness and accurate knowledge of evacuation and safety in the context of rapid-onset threats.</li> <li>■ The level of accurate knowledge on appropriate options to minimise threat-related damage to housing and livelihood assets.</li> <li>■ The level of perception of trends in risk drivers (land use, building types, environmental degradation and regeneration, climate change) and an accurate understanding of how those drivers affect risk.</li> <li>■ The number of individuals who understand the long-term impacts of using various coping strategies, and who would like to use non-erosive strategies.</li> <li>■ The level of understanding of the impacts of waste management on health (including outside the community), particularly during floods.</li> <li>■ The existence and degree of community engagement with external services that run early warning systems (including credible seasonal forecasts) and the reliability of those relationships.</li> <li>■ The number of threat-related simulations conducted in coordination with relevant external services in the last five years.</li> <li>■ The number of campaigns to raise awareness of threats organised in the last 24 months.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report that they accessed understandable, timely and actionable information on flooding in the last 24 months.</li> <li>■ The level of influence, and knowledge of risk, of community leaders.</li> <li>■ The percentage of educational personnel trained in disaster risk reduction, psychosocial support, emergency life skills, etc.</li> <li>■ The percentage of children (3-18 years) who access education programmes that feature disaster risk reduction, emergency life skills, health, hygiene and nutrition, psychosocial care, peacebuilding and conflict resolution, etc.</li> <li>■ The presence/number of community-based organisation leaders trained in disaster risk reduction and planning.</li> <li>■ The scale and capacity of local government-led response plans, and their ability to meet the needs of the whole community in its diversity.</li> <li>■ The visible efforts of local government across sectors to use knowledge, innovation and education to build a culture of preparedness, safety and resilience.</li> <li>■ The percentage of surveyed community members who are able to articulate strategies to prevent physical violence and other harmful practices.</li> <li>■ The percentage of surveyed community members who are aware of the dangers and consequences of the worst forms of child labour.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who can describe at least one action to prevent or report on child soldier recruitment.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Community is healthy</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The number of community health workers.</li> <li>■ The number of functional health facilities providing selected relevant services.</li> <li>■ The number of non-functional health facilities.</li> <li>■ The number of outpatient consultations per person per year (attendance rate or consultation rate).</li> <li>■ The number of consultations per clinician per day.</li> <li>■ The coverage of measles vaccinations (%).</li> <li>■ The coverage of diphtheria tetanus toxoid and pertussis (DTP3) in &lt; 1-year-olds (%).</li> <li>■ The percentage of births assisted by a skilled attendant.</li> <li>■ The percentage of deliveries by caesarean section.</li> <li>■ The incidence of selected diseases relevant in the local context, including malnutrition (Global Acute Malnutrition / Severe Acute Malnutrition).</li> <li>■ The case fatality ratio (CFR) for the most common diseases, including malnutrition.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households possessing one or more effective insecticide-treated mosquito nets.</li> <li>■ The percentage of pregnant women, children under 5 years and other vulnerable people sleeping under effective insecticide-treated mosquito nets.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community can meet its basic water and sanitation needs</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The percentage of community members that are aware of actions that should be taken during disasters to ensure that drinking water is clean.</li> <li>■ The presence of a functioning a community waste management plan.</li> <li>■ The community has access to water, sanitation and waste disposal facilities from several reliable sources; during disasters water is potable and facilities are not damaged or contaminated.</li> <li>■ The quantity of water consumed per person per day for drinking, cooking, hygiene and laundry.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households in which only safe water is used for drinking and cooking.</li> <li>■ The average time required (in minutes) to make one water collection journey, including travel in each direction and queuing.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households with access to a source of safe drinking water.</li> <li>■ The availability (daily) of sufficient suitable water and fodder for livestock.</li> <li>■ Access to an appropriate amount of safe water.</li> <li>■ The percentage of schools/learning spaces that have adequate safe water for drinking and personal hygiene.</li> <li>■ The percentage of schools/learning spaces that possess adequate hand-washing and functioning solid waste management facilities.</li> <li>■ The percentage of schools/learning spaces that have adequate male and female WASH facilities.</li> <li>■ The presence of faecal-oral diseases.</li> <li>■ The extent of acute malnutrition and food insecurity.</li> <li>■ The density of settlement (m2 of total site area per person).</li> <li>■ The percentage of households possessing soap.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households that store, prepare and consume food safely.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households that possess at least one clean and appropriate water container for drinking water.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households that have appropriate water treatment supplies and equipment.</li> <li>■ The presence of human faeces or solid waste on the ground.</li> <li>■ The percentage of men, women, boys and girls (disaggregated) who used a toilet when they last defecated (or whose faeces were disposed of safely).</li> <li>■ The percentage of men, women, boys and girls (disaggregated) who wash their hands with water and soap after contact with faeces.</li> <li>■ The likelihood of a critical drop in the quantity of water available per day within the next month.</li> <li>■ Access to appropriate bathing and laundry facilities.</li> <li>■ The average number of users per functioning toilet; the percentage of households with access to a functioning toilet.</li> <li>■ The percentage of toilets that are clean.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Community can meet its basic shelter needs</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ <i>The number of inhabitants per square metre of dwelling.</i></li> <li>■ <i>The existence and enforcement of appropriate land use and urban planning legislation (flood zoning, urban proximity and density, location of settlements away from coastal areas where tidal surges occur, etc.).</i></li> <li>■ <i>The existence and enforcement of building codes. (Are buildings designed to enable a rapid exit from all rooms? Are doorways strongly built?, etc.)</i></li> <li>■ <i>The existence of appropriate communal evacuation shelters, which are accessible and adequately stocked with supplies.</i></li> <li>■ <i>The percentage of households who are aware that they need to reinforce the walls of their houses in earthquake zones, and have the capacity to do so.</i></li> <li>■ <i>The availability of sandbags at the household level to protect houses from flooding due to cyclones, etc.</i></li> <li>■ <i>The presence of trained firefighters, a fire alarm warning system at the community level, strategic water points, and firefighting equipment.</i></li> <li>■ <i>The frequency of evacuation exercises in settlements, apartments and public buildings.</i></li> <li>■ <i>The percentage of households who know how to remove or secure loose materials that may be carried away by strong winds and cause damage.</i></li> <li>■ <i>The percentage of households who know how to respond to storm warnings, and are familiar with evacuation procedures.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Community can meet its basic food needs</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The community continues to have access to food after disasters: neither its supply or quality (nourishment, calorie intake) are diminished.</li> <li>■ Food consumption patterns: meals per day, dietary diversity, intra-household food distribution.</li> <li>■ The availability of key commodities in markets.</li> <li>■ The extent of staple food reserves (the number of days that stocks will be sufficient to feed the population).</li> <li>■ Production compared to the previous year's harvest, by commodity.</li> <li>■ The ability to plant for the next season (seeds, tools, etc.).</li> <li>■ Herd sizes.</li> <li>■ The incidence of animal disease outbreaks.</li> <li>■ The availability of a sufficient suitable daily water supply and fodder for livestock.</li> <li>■ The capacity to prepare food safely.</li> <li>■ Food sources.</li> <li>■ Key food and non-food commodity prices.</li> <li>■ Coping strategies.</li> <li>■ The main sources of income.</li> <li>■ Expenditure patterns.</li> <li>■ Ownership of productive assets.</li> <li>■ Access to functioning markets.</li> <li>■ The number of people trained in (for example) best nutrition practices, land conservation, etc.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Community has diverse economic opportunities</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The percentage of households who possess a financial buffer that is expressly for recovery and is adequate to cover expected losses.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households that are able to cover their health, education and nutrition needs on a daily basis.</li> <li>■ The existence of local (or regional, etc.) flood emergency funds, with known distribution channels and a disbursement record that is considered equitable.</li> <li>■ The percentage of local businesses that have access to credit or can fully maintain their operations without laying off employees or cutting production.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households or businesses that have access to risk insurance.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households that have one or more strategies that enable them to maintain their livelihood or income stream.</li> <li>■ The existence of statutory and budgeted social safety nets that households can access efficiently, that are solvent, and that have a dedicated source of funding (such as payroll taxes, etc.).</li> <li>■ The existence of statutory and budgeted mitigation project, conservation or infrastructure funds that households can access efficiently.</li> <li>■ The availability of funding or investment vehicles for economic development projects that the community can access with minimal bureaucracy.</li> <li>■ The number of households that have access to formal or informal financial services.</li> <li>■ The number of households that include owners of micro-enterprises who have received skills training.</li> <li>■ The number of households without livelihood assets.</li> <li>■ The percentage of the economically active workforce that is employed on (a) a short-term or temporary basis and (b) a long-term and permanent basis.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community has well-maintained and accessible infrastructure and services</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ Healthcare, education, etc., facilities are built robustly, located away from flood zones, and can be accessed safely in protected ways even during floods, etc.</li> <li>■ The existence of appropriate infrastructure (including emergency equipment) that is designed to protect lives during emergencies and is open to all groups.</li> <li>■ The existence of a responsive, timely, credible and accessible early warning system, with a comprehensive management plan, that provides clear instructions linked to an enabling environment (good forecasting by the hydro-meteorological services).</li> <li>■ The existence of formal, local emergency services; and the number of threat-relevant trainings delivered to personnel in the last 24 months.</li> <li>■ The percentage of local emergency services personnel trained in flood response in the last 24 months.</li> <li>■ The existence of response and recovery mechanisms coordinated with external response services (e.g., by written agreements).</li> <li>■ The degree to which threat-related external services consult and involve the community.</li> <li>■ The existence of an (appropriate) feedback-and-complaints mechanism in relation to external disaster services.</li> <li>■ The existence of appropriate local early warning systems and adequate links to national early warning systems.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report that they have confidence in (threat-related) information provided by local authorities.</li> <li>■ The existence of local, up-to-date, certified or peer-reviewed standard operating procedures for threat-related interventions and contingency plans.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report that they have confidence in the local health, education, food, water, waste and energy systems.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report that the local health, education, food, water, waste and energy systems are equitable.</li> <li>■ The existence of structural or non-structural measures to protect against floods: levees, riverbank stabilization, adequate vegetation, population location, physical protection of most community physical structures and the communal infrastructure, etc.</li> </ul>

**Community manages its natural assets in a sustainable manner**

- The percentage of community members who can accurately describe the relationship between environmental resource use and threats such as flooding in their community (upstream and downstream).
- The existence and implementation of an up-to-date, certified or peer-reviewed village or district flood management plan, watershed management plan, forest management plan, integrated coastal resource management plan or other natural resource management plan.
- The percentage of community groups who report that they are involved in and satisfied by the design of the plan.
- The existence of risk-informed national environment legislation and policy.
- The degree to which local authorities and community members are aware of and accept threat-relevant environmental regulations..
- The existence of a community-driven, certified or peer-reviewed plan for the sustainable management of local natural resources; the degree to which it takes account of threats.
- Forests, agricultural lands, wetlands, drylands, grasslands, coastal and urban ecosystems are protected, maintained or restored as recognised components of the landscape.
- Natural habitats are well represented from the top to the bottom of the river basin, and ecosystem services operate across the entire basin, coastal area, mountain area, dryland or other ecosystem.
- Production practices that depend on natural resources (farming, livestock, forestry, fisheries, aquaculture, gravel extraction) respect natural resource carrying capacities and demonstrate best practice.
- A biodiversity, climate change or disaster risk management plan or strategy recognizes the contribution of natural habitats.

<p><b>Community is inclusive</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report being part of an informal or formal social network that organises mutual assistance.</li> <li>■ The existence of formal or informal networks/channels through which community members autonomously exchange information on a regular basis.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who feel extremely safe in the community at all times.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report willingness to volunteer for activities related to threat management.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who feel personally responsible for preparing for, responding to, and recovering from threats.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report that they belong to a structure relevant to threat management; or the number of formal or informal community structures in which community members participate in threat-related activities.</li> <li>■ The number of community members who regularly participate actively in threat-related initiatives or who have volunteered in the last 24 months through formal or informal structures; or the percentage of community members who volunteer or are willing to do so.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who have confidence in external services responsible for disaster response and recovery.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who collect information during emergencies.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who feel safe when they are at home, walk alone in the street, or take public transport after dark.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report that they feel most people can be trusted.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who have confidence in the police force.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who think lost assets would be returned to them if found by someone else.</li> <li>■ The existence of a representative community structure dedicated to risk management and decision-making.</li> <li>■ The number of meetings hosted by a representative risk management body in the last 12 months.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report they are satisfied with the set-up and operation of their risk management body.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members from vulnerable or marginal groups who sit on, or participate in, risk management or decision-making bodies.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who lack personal identity or other civil documents.</li> <li>■ Observed or reported changes in women's and/or girls' mobility patterns.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households headed by women.</li> <li>■ The percentage of children who live alone, separated from their caregivers; the percentage of households headed by children.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community is socially cohesive</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The percentage of persons with a physical or mental disability.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households that indicate they are deliberately excluded from access to certain services because they belong to a specific minority.</li> <li>■ The number of persons who are reported missing, abducted, arbitrarily detained, or forcibly recruited into armed groups or other forces.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households that report they are subject to or at risk of violence, gender-based violence, torture, or cruel and degrading treatment or punishment.</li> <li>■ The percentage of communities that have functioning safe spaces for children and/or for youth.</li> <li>■ The percentage of communities that indicate that children are involved in the worst forms of child labour.</li> <li>■ The number and percentage of persons or communities that report the occurrence of forced evictions.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Community is connected</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The percentage of community members who fully understand their rights and responsibilities, and those of government and other institutions, in relation to risk management.</li> <li>■ The percentage of communities represented in established watershed/basin flood structures.</li> <li>■ The number of flood-relevant, multi-sectoral partnerships at the level of the water basin.</li> <li>■ The existence of a national policy and plan to develop and enhance the production of relevant climate information.</li> <li>■ The number of national policies that explicitly refer to the risk management of floods or other specific threats.</li> <li>■ The existence of threat-specific legislation.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community leaders who are aware of the existence of threat-specific legislation.</li> <li>■ The presence of housing developments in high-risk areas.</li> <li>■ The percentage of community members who report that corruption is a barrier to equitable and effective local enforcement of threat-related regulation.</li> <li>■ The community has communication tools that continue to operate in disaster conditions.</li> <li>■ Legislation requires and resultant practice ensures that all forms of habitat conversion for the purpose of promoting livelihoods or development trigger compensatory (offsetting) activities of comparable scale in the watershed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Community can meet other household needs (education, electricity, gas, phone)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>■ The percentage of households that value both girls' and boys' education highly.</li> <li>■ The percentage of households whose members attend or have completed primary school.</li> <li>■ The community has access to energy from several reliable sources, which are portable, are not damaged, and remain free from contamination during disasters.</li> <li>■ The number and proportion of school-age children attending school.</li> <li>■ The number of functional schools/learning spaces.</li> <li>■ The number of teachers, and facilitators, volunteers or peer educators.</li> <li>■ The number of children receiving an education in schools considered safe for boys and girls of different ages.</li> <li>■ The percentage of schools/learning spaces that meet minimum safe construction standards.</li> <li>■ The percentage of schools/learning spaces accessible to children who have physical or learning disabilities.</li> <li>■ The percentage of schools/learning spaces with active recreational and sports education programmes for boys and girls.</li> <li>■ The average cost of shelter-related energy/fuel.</li> <li>■ The number and percentage of affected households able to cover their energy needs.</li> <li>■ The number of persons/households/communities who have received training in energy/fuel use.</li> <li>■ The number of households with access to basic community infrastructure not covered by other sectors or clusters: police stations, town halls, administrative buildings, schools (if not in education), playgrounds, parks, etc.</li> </ul>