



GIMAC
GLOBAL INFORMATION MANAGEMENT,
ASSESSMENT & ANALYSIS CELL ON COVID-19

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK BACKGROUND AND ESTRUCTURE

OCTOBER 2020

1. BACKGROUND

In response to the onset of the global COVID-19 Pandemic in March 2020 the Global Information and Analysis Cell (GIMAC) developed an analytical framework for the review and analysis of secondary data to: (1) improve situational awareness; (2) support the understanding of the global and country-specific COVID impact from a holistic and inter-sectoral perspective; (3) inform humanitarian programming and response; (4) provide evidence for decision-making at global and country-level.

As the COVID-19 pandemic presents an additional challenge to countries already struggling with ongoing humanitarian or protracted crises, it was important for the framework to maintain the ability to distinguish the situation before the onset of COVID and the additional burden on systems, populations and resources caused by the pandemic.

Understanding COVID-19 and its impact calls for an approach, that at least attempts to capture second and third-order effects, such as constraints on public services and the economic structures that are needed for us to contain and rapidly respond to this crisis.

The interplay between different factors, such as, in the case of COVID-19, health, economy and society, all have the ability to impact negatively each other, compounding existing needs and vulnerabilities as well as creating new ones. The effects of that interplay drive

exponential “stochastic” or unpredictable risk. Such risk is not measurable, and dynamics today can produce unpredictable results making it difficult to even perceive causal relationships¹, but we can try and begin to organise available information, viewing it through a lens that considers future risk so it may be useful further down the road.

In order to understand and respond to the impact of the pandemic, it is likewise key to understand factors that are specific to different country contexts, that could either exacerbate or alleviate the effects of COVID-19 – for example, Governments that had established epidemiological early warning information systems are likely to have had an advantage in responding to the crisis, including the establishment of timely containment measures.

The intended analytical outputs of the GIMAC framework are:

- Enabling the identification of direct and indirect effects of the crisis
- Identifying changes in humanitarian conditions
- Supporting the identification of populations at risk and in need of preventive measures
- Singling out potential areas of concern
- Mapping out stated priorities and field recommendations
- Identifying information Gaps

¹ <https://rmi.org/covid-19-and-climate-risk-mitigation-and-resilience/>

2. STRUCTURE AND KEY QUESTIONS

The framework follows a chain of causality approach (from left to right) to identify the impact of a shock, in this case more specifically COVID. It does so by looking at seven main elements:

The framework can be applied disaggregating the information by:

- Humanitarian Sectors
- Geographic Area
- Population Groups within the Humanitarian Profile (including Migrants, Camp and Non-Camp Displaced Populations)
- Other vulnerable groups (e.g. Persons with disabilities, female or child headed households, marginalized groups etc)
- Age and Gender



Baseline	What was the situation at the time of the shock? Was there a humanitarian situation and, if yes, what did it look like?
Shock	What type of shock is it, what are its characteristics and what elements from the context can aggravate or mitigate its impact?
Effects	Based on the context, existing humanitarian structures (where applicable), the shock itself and elements that could alleviate or compound the situation – what primary and secondary (or immediate and long-term) effects can we expect?
Operational environment	What is the operational environment where these effects are taking in place? What are the capacities of national and international humanitarian responders to intervene? And if there is an ongoing response, how can we best describe it?
Coping capacity	Between the effects of the crisis and the existing capacities to respond, is there a gap? And if yes, what strategies are being deployed at the individual level to fill that gap?
Humanitarian conditions	From the pre-existing elements, the effects of the shock on that pre-existing situation, the capacities to respond of the humanitarian community, national actors and individuals – do we see humanitarian needs emerge or worsen? Has there been a change that requires a humanitarian response or an adaptation of the current response? Do we see risks that require immediate preventive action to avoid irreversible harm or increased disease burden?
Priorities and recommendations	What are the priorities and recommendations to intervene/respond do the changes in humanitarian needs identified?