NDPBA

NEPAL DISTRICT RISK PROFILES

SUBNATIONAL ASSESSMENT RESULTS
NEPAL
ACHHAM
Area: 1,680 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very High
Score: 0.650 • Rank: 5/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low
Score: 0.305 • Rank: 70/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate
Score: 0.562 • Rank: 37/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very High
Score: 0.715 • Rank: 6/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very Low
Score: 0.326 • Rank: 65/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
229,816

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
37.8

Population below Poverty Line
47.2%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
60.2%

Adult Literacy
45.1%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 37 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.562

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
251,594
$451.88 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
100%
250,708
$451.88 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Extreme Heat
13%
33,198
$57.59 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 13%

Wildfire
42%
106,002
$275.89 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 61%

Fluvial Flood
1%
1,398
- 
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Pluvial Flood
2%
5,484
$25.71 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 6%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Achham is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

Score: 0.620  RANK: 26/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Adult Literacy: 45.1%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 2.52
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 97.3%
- Student Teacher Ratio: 33.56

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

Score: 0.557  RANK: 19/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 60.2%
- Households without Toilet: 52.4%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 37.8%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 135.1
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 32.5

Economic Constraints

Score: 0.860  RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $536
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 47.2%
- Poverty Gap: 12.7%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 111.9

Food Insecurity

Score: 0.816  RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 58.7%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 39.6%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 87.5%

Gender Inequality

Score: 0.802  RANK: 3/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.58
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.16
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 97.2%
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.715

Vulnerability in Achham is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

SCORE: 0.635  RANK: 9/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 65.0 Life Expectancy
- 3.3% Disabled Population

Child Health  

SCORE: 0.823  RANK: 2/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 59.2% Child Malnutrition Rate
- 37.8 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- 1981.3 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- 122.6 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- 150.5 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

RANK: 65 / 77  
DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.326

Achham exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity

- **SCORE: 0.064**  
  RANK: 75/77  
  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **GDP (Million Rs.):** 5,514  
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 48,178

Governance

- **SCORE: 0.621**  
  RANK: 15/77  
  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.1  
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 6.89  
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 8):** 5.57  
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 6.43  
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 9.64  
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 8.89  
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 4.86  
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 6.25

Environmental Capacity

- **SCORE: 0.269**  
  RANK: 34/77  
  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **Protected Area:** 7.2%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 65 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.326

Achham exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

SCORE: 0.250  RANK: 71/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity

SCORE: 0.117  RANK: 75/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 0.7% Households with Landline
- 0.1% Households with Internet
- 2.3% Households with Television
- 41.3% Households with Radio
- 33.7% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity

SCORE: 0.503  RANK: 54/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 9 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 48.6% Improved Roadway
- 11.9 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 316.3 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 11.9 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 15.1 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 14.0 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.09 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity

SCORE: 0.131  RANK: 71/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 18.5% Households with Electricity
- 0.4% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

Achham's score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Food Insecurity
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- Earthquake: RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.499
- Extreme Heat: RANK: 42 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.130
- Fluvial Flood: RANK: 26 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.201
- Pluvial Flood: RANK: 35 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.178
- Landslide: RANK: 3 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.549
- Wildfire: RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.395
Achham’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.562
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.715
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.326
  - Country Score: 0.436
RANK WITHIN DISTRICTS
Score: 0.650
NEPAL
ARGHAKHANCHI
Area: 1,193 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate
Score: 0.539 • Rank: 37/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.442 • Rank: 53/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low
Score: 0.501 • Rank: 45/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate
Score: 0.452 • Rank: 37/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very Low
Score: 0.335 • Rank: 63/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) 177,200
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) 30.0
Population below Poverty Line 28.8%
Population with Safe Drinking Water 80.4%
Adult Literacy 65.6%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 45 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.501

NOTICE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  RANK: 37 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.452

Vulnerability in Arghakhanchi is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**  
SCORE: 0.421  RANK: 56/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Adult Literacy: 65.6%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 4.01
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 96.3
- Student Teacher Ratio: 17.16

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**  
SCORE: 0.395  RANK: 43/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 80.4%
- Households without Toilet: 28.4%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 31.4%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 191.6
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 19.8

**Economic Constraints**  
SCORE: 0.583  RANK: 22/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Income per Capita (PPP $): $909
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 28.8%
- Poverty Gap: 6.9%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 92.6

**Food Insecurity**  
SCORE: 0.509  RANK: 29/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Food Poverty Prevalence: 22.1%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 29.7%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 80.1%

**Gender Inequality**  
SCORE: 0.482  RANK: 24/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.26
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.20
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 81.8%
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 37 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.452

Vulnerability in Arghakhanchi is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

RANK: 56/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.324

69.4  
Life Expectancy  

2.6%  
Disabled Population  

Child Health  

RANK: 56/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.318

31.0%  
Child Malnutrition Rate  

30.0  
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)  

771.2  
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)  

32.2  
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)  

54.6  
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

RANK: 63 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.335  

Arghakhanchi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

Score: 0.157  RANK: 61/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
7,198  70,768  
Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)  Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**

Score: 0.316  RANK: 67/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
0.1  4.88  3.88  5.88  7.33  7.08  4.88  4.25  
Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)  Government Management (Score out of 9)  Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)  Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)  Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)  Service Flow (Score out of 16)  Judicial Work (Score out of 7)  Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

3.08  2.08  0.58  
Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)  Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)  Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

**Environmental Capacity**

Score: 0.000  RANK: 49/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
0.0%  
Protected Area
Arghakhanchi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 28 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.405
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 40 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.141
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 42 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.157
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 52 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.132
- **Landslide**: RANK: 20 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.426
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 28 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.240
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Arghakhanchi’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

RANK WITHIN DISTRICTS
Score: 0.539

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.501
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.452
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.335
  - Country Score: 0.436
Safer world.
NEPAL

BAGLUNG

Area: 1,784 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY

COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Very Low
Score: 0.475 • Rank: 62/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Moderate
Score: 0.487 • Rank: 40/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Low
Score: 0.398 • Rank: 61/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Moderate
Score: 0.432 • Rank: 43/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Moderate
Score: 0.406 • Rank: 41/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
250,554

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
32.0

Population below Poverty Line
22.9%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
89.3%

Adult Literacy
65.5%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.398

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**: 100%
  - Population: 249,582
  - Value: $444.33 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**: 99%
  - Population: 248,229
  - Value: $444.33 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Extreme Heat**: 1%
  - Population: 3,434
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Wildfire**: 0%
  - Population: 0
  - Value: $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Fluvial Flood**: 1%
  - Population: 3,168
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Pluvial Flood**: 7%
  - Population: 17,024
  - Value: $5.58 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Baglung is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- 65.5% Adult Literacy
- 3.91 Mean Years of Schooling
- 96.8 Primary School Net Enrollment
- 14.67 Student Teacher Ratio

Score: 0.394  RANK: 59/77

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- 89.3% Access to Safe Drinking Water
- 19.8% Households without Toilet
- 38.9% Water Schemes in Disrepair
- 283.7 Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- 20.0 Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

Score: 0.429  RANK: 36/77

Economic Constraints

- $868 Income per Capita (PPP $)
- 22.9% Poverty Headcount Ratio
- 5.3% Poverty Gap
- 86.0 Age Dependency Ratio

Score: 0.514  RANK: 34/77

Food Insecurity

- 25.1% Food Poverty Prevalence
- 35.1% Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- 80.3% Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

Score: 0.579  RANK: 21/77

Gender Inequality

- 0.25 Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 0.06 Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 85.0% No Female Home nor Land Ownership

Score: 0.319  RANK: 49/77
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Baglung is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>42/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>45/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>901.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>45/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>39/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### COPING CAPACITY (CC)

**RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.406**

Baglung exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

#### Economic Capacity

- **SCORE: 0.227**  
  **RANK: 48/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>9,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>84,903</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Governance

- **SCORE: 0.368**  
  **RANK: 63/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>2.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Environmental Capacity

- **SCORE: 0.423**  
  **RANK: 25/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT PROFILE

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.406

Baglung exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.519  
RANK: 36/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Communications Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.499  
RANK: 27/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

3.8% Households with Landline  
1.2% Households with Internet  
19.1% Households with Television  
58.3% Households with Radio  
68.1% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.418  
RANK: 71/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

13 Road Density (km per sq. km)  
38.2% Improved Roadway  
44.2 Average Distance to Airport (km)  
103.0 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)  
44.2 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)  
26.1 Average Distance to Police Station (km)  
21.4 Average Distance to Hospital (km)  
1.52 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.641  
RANK: 19 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

81.7% Households with Electricity  
10.5% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 40 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.487

Baglung's score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Food Insecurity**
- **Economic Constraints**
- **Logistics Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

### KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Food Insecurity**
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Logistics Capacity**
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 41 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.376

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Score: 0.023

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 44 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.155

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 66 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.107

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 24 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.405

- **Wildfire**
  - Score: 0.000
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Baglung’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL

BAITADI

NDPBA SUBNATIONAL PROFILE

©2023 Pacific Disaster Center
RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -**
Very High
Score: 0.623 • Rank: 9/77

**RESILIENCE (R) -** Very Low
Score: 0.329 • Rank: 68/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) -** Moderate
Score: 0.527 • Rank: 41/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) -** Very High
Score: 0.603 • Rank: 14/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) -** Very Low
Score: 0.260 • Rank: 74/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)

- **244,400**
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
  - **34.9**
- Population below Poverty Line
  - **45.7%**
- Population with Safe Drinking Water
  - **73.5%**
- Adult Literacy
  - **54.8%**
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.527

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake

100%

477,760

$411.05 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide

100%

476,415

$411.05 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Extreme Heat

16%

74,636

$110.38 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 27%

Wildfire

17%

83,448

$62.04 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 15%

Fluvial Flood

1%

6,524

$2.35 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

Pluvial Flood

5%

24,037

$31.55 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 8%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
Vulnerability in Baitadi is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 14 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.603

Vulnerability in Baitadi is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.579 RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **64.2** Life Expectancy
- **3.1%** Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.653 RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **59.2%** Child Malnutrition Rate
- **34.9** Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- **1422.0** Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- **67.9** Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- **100.1** Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

RANK: 74 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.260

Baitadi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>5,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>54,980</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE:** 0.090  
**RANK:** 72/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

### Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)</td>
<td>3.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>7.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>4.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE:** 0.404  
**RANK:** 57/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

### Environmental Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>&lt;0.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SCORE:** 0.015  
**RANK:** 46/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED
Baitadi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.299
- **Rank:** 67/77

**Communications Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.256
- **Rank:** 64/77
  - 1.7% Households with Landline
  - 0.1% Households with Internet
  - 6.6% Households with Television
  - 56.6% Households with Radio
  - 37.9% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.451
- **Rank:** 65/77
  - 16 Road Density (km per sq. km)
  - 73.2% Improved Roadway
  - 10.7 Average Distance to Airport (km)
  - 415.3 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
  - 10.7 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
  - 34.0 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
  - 13.8 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
  - 1.02 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.191
- **Rank:** 64/77
  - 24.9% Households with Electricity
  - 0.9% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 68 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.329

Baitadi’s score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Food Insecurity
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Economic Constraints**

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Food Insecurity**

The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Energy Capacity**

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 7 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.502
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 37 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.157
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 48 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.147
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.161
- **Landslide**: RANK: 2 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.563
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.292
Baitadi’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
BAJHANG
Area: 3,422 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -
Very High
Score: 0.655 • Rank: 4/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low
Score: 0.236 • Rank: 76/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE
(MHE) - Low
Score: 0.437 • Rank: 56/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very
High
Score: 0.793 • Rank: 2/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very
Low
Score: 0.266 • Rank: 73/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
189,097

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
70.7

Population below Poverty Line
56.8%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
68.9%

Adult Literacy
45.0%
**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)**

**RANK: 56 / 77 DISTRICTS**

**SCORE: 0.437**

---

**ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:**

- **Earthquake**
  - **100%**
  - **313,129**
  - **$270.65 Million**
  - **Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%**

- **Landslide**
  - **100%**
  - **313,116**
  - **$270.62 Million**
  - **Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%**

- **Extreme Heat**
  - **0%**
  - **0**
  - **$0**
  - **Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%**

- **Wildfire**
  - **7%**
  - **22,537**
  - **$16.71 Million**
  - **Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 6%**

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - **3%**
  - **8,108**
  - **$2.47 Million**
  - **Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%**

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - **8%**
  - **24,297**
  - **$17.13 Million**
  - **Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 6%**

---

**NOTE:** Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
DISTRICT PROFILE

VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 2 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.793

Vulnerability in Bajhang is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Gender Inequality. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>45.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>26.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK: 17/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>69.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>55.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>236.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK: 2/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Economic Constraints**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$487</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>56.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK: 2/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Food Insecurity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>70.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>84.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK: 5/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Gender Inequality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
VULNERABILITY (V)  RANK: 2 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.793  

Vulnerability in Bajhang is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Gender Inequality. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
SCORE: 0.635  RANK: 8/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

60.4  Life Expectancy  2.5%  Disabled Population  

Child Health  
SCORE: 0.729  RANK: 5/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

63.2%  Child Malnutrition Rate  70.7  Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)  1168.4  Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)  82.1  Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)  75.8  Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 73 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.266

Bajhang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity
RANK: 77/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.031

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>3,817</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>43,624</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance
RANK: 50/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.431

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Capacity
RANK: 36/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.209

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

**RANK: 73 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.266**

Bajhang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Infrastructure Capacity

**SCORE: 0.274**

**RANK: 69/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

### Communications Capacity

**SCORE: 0.255**

**RANK: 65/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 2.8% Households with Landline
- 0.2% Households with Internet
- 4.1% Households with Television
- 57.8% Households with Radio
- 25.4% Households with Mobile Phone

### Logistics Capacity

**SCORE: 0.444**

**RANK: 67/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 3 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 78.2% Improved Roadway
- 9.9 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 375.7 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 9.9 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 21.0 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 11.7 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.85 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

### Energy Capacity

**SCORE: 0.122**

**RANK: 73 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 17.5% Households with Electricity
- 0.4% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 76 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.236

Bajhang’s score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Gender Inequality
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Economic Constraints**

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Gender Inequality**

Marginalized populations are less likely to have their needs met under pre-disaster conditions, and therefore become even more susceptible to harm during times of disaster. Increase gender-based inclusion in all phases of DM, ensuring the implementation at subnational and local levels. Courses of action must recognize the role of women in society and support changes to policies and programs to promote gender-equal access.

**Energy Capacity**

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.542
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.000
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 20 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.224
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 15 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.269
- **Landslide**: RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.585
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 36 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.198
Bajhang’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:
DISTRICT PROFILE

National Disaster Preparedness Baseline Assessment: Nepal
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NEPAL
Bajura
Area: 2,188 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very High
Score: 0.605 • Rank: 15/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low
Score: 0.267 • Rank: 73/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low
Score: 0.349 • Rank: 71/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very High
Score: 0.773 • Rank: 3/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very Low
Score: 0.306 • Rank: 67/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
138,998

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
72.8

Population below Poverty Line
64.1%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
68.7%

Adult Literacy
44.5%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 71 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.349

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**: 100%
  - 137,810 people
  - $186.82 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**: 100%
  - 137,781 people
  - $186.82 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Extreme Heat**: 0%
  - 0 people
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Wildfire**: 0%
  - 0 people
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Fluvial Flood**: 1%
  - 1,354 people
  - $3.29 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

- **Pluvial Flood**: 5%
  - 6,696 people
  - $12.14 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 7%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
## Vulnerability (V)

Vulnerability in Bajura is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>15/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>29.89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>68.7%</td>
<td>11/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>47.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>295.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$523</td>
<td>1/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>64.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>19.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>74.5%</td>
<td>2/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>42.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>12/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>97.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 3 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.773

Vulnerability in Bajura is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.852  RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

59.5  Life Expectancy

4.4%  Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.892  RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

50.8%  Child Malnutrition Rate

72.8  Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

1689.9  Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

96.9  Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

176.5  Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
Bajura exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.036
- **Rank:** 76/77 Districts Assessed

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 2,852
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 48,085

**Governance**

- **Score:** 0.637
- **Rank:** 10/77 Districts Assessed

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.2
- **Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9):** 7.63
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 5.09
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 7.16
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 11.28
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 5.31
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 6.22
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 5.16
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 3.63
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 2.88

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.119
- **Rank:** 39/77 Districts Assessed

- **Protected Area (%):** 1.4%
COPING CAPACITY (CC) 

**RANK: 67 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.306**

Bajura exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

**SCORE: 0.240**

**RANK: 74/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**Communications Capacity**

**SCORE: 0.154**

**RANK: 73/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 1.4% Households with Landline
- 0.2% Households with Internet
- 1.8% Households with Television
- 42.7% Households with Radio
- 25.4% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

**SCORE: 0.468**

**RANK: 63/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 2 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 30.6% Improved Roadway
- 7.2 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 333.1 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 7.2 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 13.4 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 15.7 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.08 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

**SCORE: 0.100**

**RANK: 75 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 22.8% Households with Electricity
- 0.02% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

RANK: 73 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.267

Bajura's score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Vulnerable Health Status
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Vulnerable Health Status
A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 8 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.499

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 61 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.000

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 58 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.131

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 43 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.153

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 7 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.522

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 59 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.000
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)  

Bajura's score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:
Safer world.
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NEPAL
BANKE
Area: 2,337 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

- **MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Low
  Score: 0.485 • Rank: 57/77

- **RESILIENCE (R)** - Very High
  Score: 0.593 • Rank: 14/77

- **MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Moderate
  Score: 0.642 • Rank: 30/77

- **VULNERABILITY (V)** - Low
  Score: 0.416 • Rank: 50/77

- **COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Very High
  Score: 0.602 • Rank: 7/77

- **Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)**
  603,393

- **Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)**
  48.5

- **Population below Poverty Line**
  26.4%

- **Population with Safe Drinking Water**
  96.0%

- **Adult Literacy**
  56.3%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 30 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.642

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%

- 534,976
- $1.12 Billion

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
<1%

- 348
- $10.43 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

Extreme Heat
100%

- 533,780
- $1.12 Billion

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Wildfire
33%

- 175,462
- $270.84 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 24%

Fluvial Flood
11%

- 56,230
- $121.12 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 11%

Pluvial Flood
31%

- 167,618
- $317.39 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 28%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
Information Access Vulnerability

- Adult Literacy: 56.3%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 3.59
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 86.7%
- Student Teacher Ratio: 30.14

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 96.0%
- Households without Toilet: 51.7%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 32.6%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 160.4
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 28.2

Economic Constraints

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $1,133
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 26.4%
- Poverty Gap Ratio: 6.6%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 74.5

Food Insecurity

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 18.2%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 29.2%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 54.1%

Gender Inequality

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.29
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.04
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 79.9%
VULNERABILITY (V) RANK: 50 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.416

Vulnerability in Banke is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status RANK: 35/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.394

- Life Expectancy: 63.8
- Disabled Population: 1.5%

Child Health RANK: 35/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.437

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 44.8%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 48.5
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 589.5
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 50.7
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 55.8
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
**RANK: 7 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.602**

Banke exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

**SCORE: 0.526  RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **22,620** Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
- **133,048** Labor Productivity (Rs.)

### Governance

**SCORE: 0.656  RANK: 6/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **0.2** Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)
- **7.56** Government Management (Score out of 9)
- **4.38** Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)
- **6.5** Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- **7.56** Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- **9.88** Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- **5.31** Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- **6.31** Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

- **4.88** Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)
- **4.94** Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)
- **3.38** Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

### Environmental Capacity

**SCORE: 0.609  RANK: 19/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **36.9%** Protected Area
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 7 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.602

Banke exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  RANK: 20/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.597

Communications Capacity  RANK: 37/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.464

Logistics Capacity  RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.688

Energy Capacity  RANK: 20 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.638

**Communications Capacity**

- **6.0%** Households with Landline
- **1.6%** Households with Internet
- **37.0%** Households with Television
- **37.6%** Households with Radio
- **60.3%** Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- **10** Road Density (km per sq. km)
- **89.8%** Improved Roadway
- **13.5** Average Distance to Airport (km)
- **212.7** Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- **13.5** Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- **6.5** Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- **8.9** Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- **2.49** Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- **68.8%** Households with Electricity
- **20.6%** Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 14 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.593
Banke’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population's ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
# HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>53 / 77</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>17 / 77</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>30 / 77</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>21 / 77</td>
<td>0.242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>72 / 77</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>30 / 77</td>
<td>0.227</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Banke’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.642
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.416
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.602
  - Country Score: 0.436
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NEPAL
BARA
Area: 1,190 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Moderate
Score: 0.554  •  Rank: 31/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Moderate
Score: 0.530  •  Rank: 31/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Very High
Score: 0.723  •  Rank: 11/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Moderate
Score: 0.448  •  Rank: 38/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - High
Score: 0.508  •  Rank: 21/77
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 11 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.723

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
698,224
$1.17 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed:
100%

Landslide
1%
9,698
$10.37 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed:
1%

Extreme Heat
100%
697,356
$1.17 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed:
100%

Wildfire
26%
180,845
$255.78 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed:
22%

Fluvial Flood
18%
125,482
$290.58 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed:
25%

Pluvial Flood
39%
274,325
$495.54 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed:
43%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Bara is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- 43.3% Adult Literacy
- 2.72 Mean Years of Schooling
- 81.7 Primary School Net Enrollment
- 47.87 Student Teacher Ratio

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- 96.3% Access to Safe Drinking Water
- 72.4% Households without Toilet
- 27.3% Water Schemes in Disrepair
- 90.2 Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- 28.0 Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

Economic Constraints

- $1,480 Income per Capita (PPP $)
- 29.9% Poverty Headcount Ratio
- 7.2% Poverty Gap
- 86.2 Age Dependency Ratio

Food Insecurity

- 21.1% Food Poverty Prevalence
- 25.5% Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- 47.9% Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

Gender Inequality

- 0.50 Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 0.02 Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 78.6% No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.448

Vulnerability in Bara is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
SCORE: 0.353  
RANK: 47/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

64.6  
Life Expectancy

1.7%  
Disabled Population

Child Health  
SCORE: 0.319  
RANK: 55/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

39.6%  
Child Malnutrition Rate

48.9  
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

415.7  
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

31.2  
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

24.5  
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
DISTRICT PROFILE

COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.508

Bara exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity

SCORE: 0.922  RANK: 2/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

41,527  192,413
Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)  Labor Productivity (Rs.)

Governance

SCORE: 0.251  RANK: 72/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

0.2  5  2.5  4.5  6.75  4.5  4  3.5
Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)  Government Management (Score out of 9)  Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)  Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)  Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)  Service Flow (Score out of 16)  Judicial Work (Score out of 7)  Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

2.5  2  3
Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)  Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)  Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

Environmental Capacity

SCORE: 0.461  RANK: 24/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

21.1%
Protected Area
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.508

Bara exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.506  RANK: 38/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.358  RANK: 53/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 2.3% Households with Landline
- 0.5% Households with Internet
- 37.7% Households with Television
- 33.3% Households with Radio
- 61.5% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.651  RANK: 17/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 16 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 92.8% Improved Roadway
- 20.6 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 27.5 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 20.6 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 11.7 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 14.3 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.34 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.508  RANK: 39 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 68.3% Households with Electricity
- 4.7% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  

RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.530

Bara’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 30 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.393
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.380
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 13 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.287
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 10 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.342
- **Landslide**: RANK: 63 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.051
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 23 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.276
Bara’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
BARDESHIYA
Area: 2,025 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High
Score: 0.580  •  Rank: 23/77

RESILIENCE (R) - High
Score: 0.537  •  Rank: 26/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very High
Score: 0.815  •  Rank: 6/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Low
Score: 0.385  •  Rank: 56/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Moderate
Score: 0.460  •  Rank: 30/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
460,831

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
58.1

Population below Poverty Line
28.7%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
98.1%

Adult Literacy
56.5%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.815

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 818,331 people
  - $697.13 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 0%
  - 2,363 people
  - $14.38 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 100%
  - 818,184 people
  - $697.13 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Wildfire**
  - 50%
  - 411,603 people
  - $316.57 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 45%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 45%
  - 364,282 people
  - $423.05 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 61%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 44%
  - 357,573 people
  - $326.87 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 47%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Bardiya is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- Adult Literacy: 56.5%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 3.46
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 96.6%
- Student Teacher Ratio: 23.83

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 98.1%
- Households without Toilet: 51.3%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 34.0%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 172.0
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 9.7

Economic Constraints

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $1,086
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 28.7%
- Poverty Gap: 7.1%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 70.9

Food Insecurity

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 19.9%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 28.6%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 52.9%

Gender Inequality

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.30
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.01
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 80.3%
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 56 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.385

Vulnerability in Bardiya is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
SCORE: 0.414  RANK: 33/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>64.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health  
SCORE: 0.456  RANK: 33/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>724.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
**RANK: 30 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.460**

Bardiya exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **Score:** 0.379  
  **Rank:** 24/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Rs.)</td>
<td>18,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>100,882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance

- **Score:** 0.379  
  **Rank:** 61/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>3.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>4.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>4.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

- **Score:** 0.804  
  **Rank:** 6/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**DISTRICT PROFILE**

### COPING CAPACITY (CC)

**RANK: 30 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.460**

Bardiya exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

#### Infrastructure Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>42/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Communications Capacity

- **2.5%** Households with Landline
- **0.5%** Households with Internet
- **27.9%** Households with Television
- **47.4%** Households with Radio
- **61.8%** Households with Mobile Phone

#### Logistics Capacity

- **10 Road Density (km per sq. km)**
- **86.3%** Improved Roadway
- **17.8 Average Distance to Airport (km)**
- **260.6 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)**
- **17.8 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)**
- **11.5 Average Distance to Police Station (km)**
- **14.4 Average Distance to Hospital (km)**
- **0.54 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)**

#### Energy Capacity

- **62.6%** Households with Electricity
- **4.4%** Households using Gas for Cooking

---

National Disaster Preparedness Baseline Assessment: Nepal
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 26 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.537

Bardiya’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 35 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.384

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 10 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.369

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 4 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.389

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 12 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.332

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 65 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.047

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 15 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.316
Bardiya's score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
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NEPAL
BHAKTAPUR
Area: 119 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low**
Score: 0.304 • Rank: 75/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Very High**
Score: 0.709 • Rank: 4/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low**
Score: 0.329 • Rank: 73/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low**
Score: 0.227 • Rank: 75/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High**
Score: 0.644 • Rank: 6/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
430,408

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
11.0

Population below Poverty Line
12.5%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
88.6%

Adult Literacy
78.1%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 73 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.329

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
334,427
$911.71 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
13%
44,272
$60.19 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 7%

Extreme Heat
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Wildfire
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Fluvial Flood
13%
42,849
- 
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Pluvial Flood
22%
72,927
- 
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC's AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
### Vulnerability in Bhaktapur

Vulnerability in Bhaktapur is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

#### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy (%)</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>73/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>47/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>63/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>15.43</td>
<td>75/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>88.6%</td>
<td>77/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>77/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>77/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>77/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>77/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$1,379</td>
<td>73/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>73/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>73/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>73/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>47/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>47/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>47/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>63/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>63/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>63/77</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 75 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.227

Vulnerability in Bhaktapur is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.053  RANK: 77/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 74.2 Life Expectancy
- 1.1% Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.136  RANK: 74/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 26.9% Child Malnutrition Rate
- 11.0 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- 250.2 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- 21.4 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- 28.7 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.644

Bhaktapur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Economic Capacity and Environmental Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow</td>
<td>11.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.644

Bhaktapur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Economic Capacity and Environmental Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity
SCORE: 0.921  RANK: 2/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity
SCORE: 0.882  RANK: 2/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity
SCORE: 0.925  RANK: 2/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity
SCORE: 0.956  RANK: 3 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)

Bhaktapur’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Capacity
- Environmental Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Capacity
A strong economic foundation provides an indication of a region’s ability to absorb economic losses and quickly mobilize financial assets for preparedness, response and recovery activities. Limited economic capacity correlates to disproportionate disaster impacts.

Environmental Capacity
Properly managed environments sustain populations by providing food, water, and even economic benefits from industries such as tourism. Increasing protected areas can also serve as additional buffers between the population and impacted areas.
# HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 72 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.244

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 61 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.000

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 35 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.175

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 39 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.163

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 61 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.071

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 59 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.000
### Multi-Hazard Risk (MHR)

**Rank within Districts:** 75 / 77  
Score: 0.304

Bhaktapur's score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.

#### Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Districts Score</th>
<th>Country Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Hazard Exposure</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.227</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Capacity</td>
<td>0.644</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NEPAL
BHOJPUR
Area: 1,507 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low
Score: 0.502  •  Rank: 50/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.448  •  Rank: 51/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low
Score: 0.402  •  Rank: 60/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate
Score: 0.435  •  Rank: 41/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very Low
Score: 0.331  •  Rank: 64/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
158,991

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
35.2

Population below Poverty Line
24.4%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
71.0%

Adult Literacy
63.1%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 60 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.402

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

**Earthquake**
- 100%
- 161,375
- $393.33 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Landslide**
- 97%
- 156,982
- $385.37 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 98%

**Extreme Heat**
- 27%
- 43,501
- $102.64 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 26%

**Wildfire**
- 1%
- 1,875
- $9.89 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

**Fluvial Flood**
- <1%
- 293
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

**Pluvial Flood**
- 1%
- 1,295
- $4.31 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC's AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Bhojpur is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>41/77</td>
<td>0.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>53/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>26/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>17.99</td>
<td>41/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>71.0%</td>
<td>41/77</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
<td>26/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>41/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>240.9</td>
<td>35/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>51/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$999</td>
<td>41/77</td>
<td>0.482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>41/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>41/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>51/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>51/77</td>
<td>0.403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>28.8%</td>
<td>51/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>62.0%</td>
<td>51/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>35/77</td>
<td>0.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>78.5%</td>
<td>35/77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.435

Vulnerability in Bhojpur is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.390  RANK: 38/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health

SCORE: 0.503  RANK: 28/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>983.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

**RANK: 64 / 77**  
**DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.331**

Bhojpur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

**Score:** 0.185  
**Rank:** 57/77  
**Districts Assessed**

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 7,384
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 78,401

### Governance

**Score:** 0.517  
**Rank:** 34/77  
**Districts Assessed**

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.19
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 7.22
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 6):** 4.38
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 6.16
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 7.06
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 8
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 5.06
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 4.97
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 3.75
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 3.91
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 2.25

### Environmental Capacity

**Score:** 0.026  
**Rank:** 43/77  
**Districts Assessed**

- **Protected Area:** 0.1%
Bhojpur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

**Communications Capacity**

**Logistics Capacity**

**Energy Capacity**
Bhojpur’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
- **Economic Constraints**
- **Energy Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

**KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE**

**Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.390

- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 45 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.116

- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 75 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.035

- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 76 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.055

- **Landslide**: RANK: 26 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.398

- **Wildfire**: RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.082
Bhojpur’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.402
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.435
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.331
  - Country Score: 0.436
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NEPAL
CHITAWAN
Area: 2,218 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low**
Score: 0.508  •  Rank: 48/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Very High**
Score: 0.702  •  Rank: 5/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very High**
Score: 0.928  •  Rank: 1/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low**
Score: 0.242  •  Rank: 73/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High**
Score: 0.646  •  Rank: 5/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
722,168

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
30.1

Population below Poverty Line
8.9%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
92.1%

Adult Literacy
72.2%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.928

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

**Earthquake**
- 100%
- 583,750
- $1.38 Billion
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Landslide**
- 10%
- 55,787
- $32.45 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

**Extreme Heat**
- 100%
- 581,124
- $1.38 Billion
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Wildfire**
- 100%
- 583,249
- $1.38 Billion
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Fluvial Flood**
- 24%
- 140,139
- $437.43 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 32%

**Pluvial Flood**
- 48%
- 281,088
- $650.93 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 47%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
**DISTRICT PROFILE**

**VULNERABILITY (V)**

Vulnerability in Chitawan is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability Area</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank: Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Access Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>69/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Clean Water Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>74/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Constraints</td>
<td>0.238</td>
<td>74/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Insecurity</td>
<td>0.127</td>
<td>76/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Inequality</td>
<td>0.252</td>
<td>60/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Information Access Vulnerability

- **Adult Literacy:** 72.2%
- **Mean Years of Schooling:** 5.01
- **Student-Teacher Ratio:** 96.8
- **Primary School Net Enrollment:** 17.21

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **Access to Safe Drinking Water:** 92.1%
- **Households without Toilet:** 5.9%
- **Water Schemes in Disrepair:** 32.6%
- **Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000):** 109.7
- **Cholera Incidence (per 100,000):** 15.2

### Economic Constraints

- **Income per Capita (PPP $):** $1,537
- **Poverty Headcount Ratio:** 8.9%
- **Poverty Gap:** 1.7%
- **Age Dependency Ratio:** 61.5

### Food Insecurity

- **Food Poverty Prevalence:** 10.6%
- **Low kcal Intake Prevalence:** 28.1%
- **Agricultural Insufficiency Rate:** 35.9%

### Gender Inequality

- **Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity):** 0.20
- **Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity):** 0.15
- **No Female Home nor Land Ownership:** 70.5%
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 73 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.242  

Vulnerability in Chitawan is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

SCORE: 0.286  
RANK: 62/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

- Life Expectancy: 69.2
- Disabled Population: 2.2%

Child Health  

SCORE: 0.284  
RANK: 63/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 42.0%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 30.1
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 361.4
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 22.4
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 49.8

VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 74 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.286  

- Multiplier: 0 1
- Score: 0.286  

Score: 0 1  

RANK: 62/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.284  
RANK: 63/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.286  
RANK: 74/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.286
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

Chitawan exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Score**: 0.720
- **Rank**: 6/77 Districts Assessed
- **GDP (Million Rs.)**: 36,271
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.)**: 148,523

**Governance**

- **Score**: 0.371
- **Rank**: 62/77 Districts Assessed
- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)**: 0.2
- **Government Management (Score out of 9)**: 6.29
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)**: 3.39
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)**: 5.25
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)**: 6.5
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16)**: 8.46
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7)**: 4.82
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)**: 4.21
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)**: 2.57
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)**: 2.32
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)**: 1.68

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Score**: 0.781
- **Rank**: 8/77 Districts Assessed
- **Protected Area**: 60.6%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

RANK: 5 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.646

Chitawan exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

SCORE: 0.782  
RANK: 5/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity

SCORE: 0.768  
RANK: 5/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity

SCORE: 0.768  
RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity

SCORE: 0.810  
RANK: 5 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)

Chitawan’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Vulnerable Health Status
- Communications Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Vulnerable Health Status

A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

Communications Capacity

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Communications Capacity

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - RANK: 71 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.258

- **Extreme Heat**
  - RANK: 30 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.254

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 22 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.213

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 22 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.240

- **Landslide**
  - RANK: 62 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.060

- **Wildfire**
  - RANK: 19 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.295
Chitawan’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.

**Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Districts Score</th>
<th>Country Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Hazard Exposure</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.242</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Capacity</td>
<td>0.646</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NEPAL
DADELDHURA
Area: 1,538 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Very High
Score: 0.631 • Rank: 8/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Very Low
Score: 0.375 • Rank: 62/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - High
Score: 0.643 • Rank: 29/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Very High
Score: 0.619 • Rank: 12/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Low
Score: 0.369 • Rank: 55/77

**Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)**
139,420

**Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)**
42.8

**Population below Poverty Line**
43.3%

**Population with Safe Drinking Water**
73.6%

**Adult Literacy**
57.3%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 29 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.643

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
- 100%
- 275,558 people
- $239.26 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
- 90%
- 247,487 people
- $216.13 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 90%

Extreme Heat
- 28%
- 78,470 people
- $62.21 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 26%

Wildfire
- 97%
- 265,963 people
- $206.89 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 86%

Fluvial Flood
- 1%
- 3,597 people
- $10.45 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 4%

Pluvial Flood
- 6%
- 16,901 people
- $27.34 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 11%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
### Vulnerability in Dadeldhura

Vulnerability in Dadeldhura is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

#### Information Access Vulnerability
- **Score:** 0.527
- **Rank:** 36/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability
- **Score:** 0.472
- **Rank:** 27/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>171.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic Constraints
- **Score:** 0.743
- **Rank:** 10/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>94.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Food Insecurity
- **Score:** 0.752
- **Rank:** 9/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender Inequality
- **Score:** 0.620
- **Rank:** 10/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VULNERABILITY (V)**

Vulnerability in Dadeldhura is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Vulnerable Health Status**

RANK: 10/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.599

- **64.4** Life Expectancy
- **3.6%** Disabled Population

**Child Health**

RANK: 17/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.614

- **48.6%** Child Malnutrition Rate
- **42.8** Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- **1041.7** Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- **78.9** Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- **108.4** Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 55 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.369

Dadeldhura exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**
- **Score:** 0.108  RANK: 69/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 4,392
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 64,739

**Governance**
- **Score:** 0.617  RANK: 16/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.23
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 7.14
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 6):** 5.39
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 7.64
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 7.96
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 10.04
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 4.75
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 5.79
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 4.18
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 4.18
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 2.5

**Environmental Capacity**
- **Score:** 0.018  RANK: 44/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Protected Area:** <0.1%
Dadeldhura exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Infrastructure Capacity

**SCORE: 0.401**  
**RANK: 56/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

### Communications Capacity

**SCORE: 0.350**  
**RANK: 55/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 2.5% Households with Landline
- 0.6% Households with Internet
- 11.1% Households with Television
- 51.7% Households with Radio
- 48.1% Households with Mobile Phone

### Logistics Capacity

**SCORE: 0.486**  
**RANK: 58/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 10 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 72.7% Improved Roadway
- 14.4 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 398.5 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 14.4 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 19.3 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 11.0 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 4.66 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

### Energy Capacity

**SCORE: 0.365**  
**RANK: 50/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 48.0% Households with Electricity
- 2.7% Households using Gas for Cooking
**RESILIENCE (R)**  
**RANK: 62 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.375**

Dadeldhura's score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Food Insecurity**
- **Economic Constraints**
- **Communications Capacity**
- **Energy Capacity**

---

**KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE**

**Food Insecurity**

The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Economic Constraints**

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Energy Capacity**

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
## HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>17 / 77</td>
<td>0.456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>46 / 77</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>57 / 77</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>44 / 77</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>16 / 77</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>2 / 77</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dadeldhura’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL

DAILEKH
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NEPAL
DAILEKH
Area: 1,502 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High**
Score: 0.602  •  Rank: 16/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low**
Score: 0.352  •  Rank: 65/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate**
Score: 0.511  •  Rank: 42/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Very High**
Score: 0.634  •  Rank: 11/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very Low**
Score: 0.338  •  Rank: 62/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
253,319

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
39.8

Population below Poverty Line
35.8%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
53.9%

Adult Literacy
52.3%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 42 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.511

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake** 100%
  - 258,632 people
  - $465.39 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide** 99%
  - 257,187 people
  - $460.14 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 99%

- **Extreme Heat** 3%
  - 7,698 people
  - $15.77 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

- **Wildfire** 46%
  - 119,318 people
  - $189 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 41%

- **Fluvial Flood** 1%
  - 1,840 people
  - $11.62 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

- **Pluvial Flood** 3%
  - 6,826 people
  - $26.66 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 6%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 11 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.634

Vulnerability in Dailekh is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**

- **Score:** 0.590  
  **Rank:** 28/77 Districts Assessed  
  - **52.3%** Adult Literacy  
  - **3.06** Mean Years of Schooling  
  - **96.7%** Primary School Net Enrollment  
  - **34.11** Student Teacher Ratio

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**

- **Score:** 0.789  
  **Rank:** 1/77 Districts Assessed  
  - **53.9%** Access to Safe Drinking Water  
  - **51.0%** Households without Toilet  
  - **45.8%** Water Schemes in Disrepair  
  - **346.9** Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)  
  - **77.4** Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

**Economic Constraints**

- **Score:** 0.685  
  **Rank:** 13/77 Districts Assessed  
  - **$684** Income per Capita (PPP $)  
  - **35.8%** Poverty Headcount Ratio  
  - **8.8%** Poverty Gap  
  - **97.7** Age Dependency Ratio

**Food Insecurity**

- **Score:** 0.683  
  **Rank:** 13/77 Districts Assessed  
  - **34.1%** Food Poverty Prevalence  
  - **38.3%** Low kcal Intake Prevalence  
  - **84.7%** Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

**Gender Inequality**

- **Score:** 0.507  
  **Rank:** 20/77 Districts Assessed  
  - **0.43** Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)  
  - **0.05** Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)  
  - **93.2%** No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 11 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.634

Vulnerability in Dailekh is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.552  RANK: 15/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

65.2
Life Expectancy

2.9%
Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.678  RANK: 10/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

45.6%
Child Malnutrition Rate

39.8
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

1318.4
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

102.4
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

106.9
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 62 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.338

Dailekh exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.140  
RANK: 65/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

7,267  
Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)

65,334  
Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**  
SCORE: 0.648  
RANK: 8/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

0.14  
Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)

6.75  
Government Management (Score out of 9)

5.75  
Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)

9  
Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)

8.5  
Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)

9.5  
Service Flow (Score out of 16)

5.5  
Judicial Work (Score out of 7)

6.63  
Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

4  
Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)

4.25  
Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)

2.38  
Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

**Environmental Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.000  
RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

0.0%  
Protected Area
Dailekh exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
**KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE**

**Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

Earthquake: RANK: 11 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.475

Extreme Heat: RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.048

Fluvial Flood: RANK: 62 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.113

Pluvial Flood: RANK: 49 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.134

Landslide: RANK: 8 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.521

Wildfire: RANK: 8 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.376
Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- Multi-Hazard Exposure: 0.511 (Districts Score: 0.559, Country Score: 0.559)
- Vulnerability: 0.634 (Districts Score: 0.463, Country Score: 0.463)
- Coping Capacity: 0.338 (Districts Score: 0.436, Country Score: 0.436)

Dailekh's score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
DANG
Area: 2,955 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate**
Score: 0.541 • Rank: 35/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - High**
Score: 0.544 • Rank: 22/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High**
Score: 0.710 • Rank: 15/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Low**
Score: 0.418 • Rank: 47/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High**
Score: 0.507 • Rank: 22/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
676,277

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
41.0

Population below Poverty Line
25.1%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
68.0%

Adult Literacy
62.4%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 15 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.710

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
550,124
$1.09 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
22%
118,994
$194.64 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 18%

Extreme Heat
91%
502,835
$1.07 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 99%

Wildfire
58%
321,391
$754.04 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 69%

Fluvial Flood
4%
21,304
$133.54 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 12%

Pluvial Flood
20%
109,919
$273.92 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 25%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Dang is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability
- Adult Literacy: 62.4%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 3.83
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 91.2
- Student Teacher Ratio: 19.45

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability
- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 68.0%
- Households without Toilet: 39.1%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 31.0%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 179.7
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 8.4

Economic Constraints
- Income per Capita (PPP $): $1,127
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 25.1%
- Poverty Gap: 5.9%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 74.8

Food Insecurity
- Food Poverty Prevalence: 21.1%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 32.0%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 50.5%

Gender Inequality
- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.29
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.12
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 76.5%
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 47 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.418

Vulnerability in Dang is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.380  RANK: 40/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

66.3
Life Expectancy

2.3%
Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.366  RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

39.3%
Child Malnutrition Rate

41.0
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

518.1
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

40.6
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

56.8
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

**RANK: 22 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.507**

Dang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 25,240
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 109,338
- **Score:** 0.474  
  **Rank:** 20/77  
  **Districts Assessed:**

### Governance

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.17
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 7.1
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 6):** 4.88
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 7.43
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 6.98
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 10.3
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 4.68
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 5.98
- **Score:** 0.586  
  **Rank:** 20/77  
  **Districts Assessed:**

### Environmental Capacity

- **Protected Area:** 2.7%
- **Score:** 0.163  
  **Rank:** 38/77  
  **Districts Assessed:**

---

**Note:** The scores and rankings are indicative of the district's performance across various socioeconomic themes.
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 22 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.507

Dang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.549  RANK: 28/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.512  RANK: 25/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 4.0% Households with Landline
- 1.0% Households with Internet
- 26.9% Households with Television
- 55.8% Households with Radio
- 70.8% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.559  RANK: 41/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 12 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 100.0% Improved Roadway
- 41.9 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 136.9 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 41.9 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 18.4 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 13.6 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 2.07 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.577  RANK: 31 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 64.6% Households with Electricity
- 14.1% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 22 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.544  
Dang’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Logistics Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Information Access Vulnerability**
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Logistics Capacity**
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - RANK: 36 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.383

- **Extreme Heat**
  - RANK: 14 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.359

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.183

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 26 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.230

- **Landslide**
  - RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.136

- **Wildfire**
  - RANK: 10 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.345
Dang’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.
NePAL

DARCHULA

Area: 2,322 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

- **MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Moderate
  Score: 0.544  •  Rank: 34/77

- **RESILIENCE (R)** - Low
  Score: 0.407  •  Rank: 58/77

- **MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Low
  Score: 0.446  •  Rank: 52/77

- **VULNERABILITY (V)** - High
  Score: 0.587  •  Rank: 16/77

- **COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Low
  Score: 0.400  •  Rank: 44/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
  **135,056**

- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
  **39.8**

- Population below Poverty Line
  **53.0%**

- Population with Safe Drinking Water
  **83.2%**

- Adult Literacy
  **58.2%**
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 52 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.446

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
256,403
$213 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
100%
256,334
$210.83 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 99%

Extreme Heat
19%
49,644
$43.6 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 20%

Wildfire
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Fluvial Flood
6%
14,920
$15.5 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 7%

Pluvial Flood
11%
29,339
$16.72 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 8%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 16 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.587

Vulnerability in Darchula is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

SCORE: 0.453
RANK: 51/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

SCORE: 0.461
RANK: 29/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Economic Constraints

SCORE: 0.843
RANK: 6/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Food Insecurity

SCORE: 0.660
RANK: 14/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Gender Inequality

SCORE: 0.594
RANK: 13/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 16 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.587

Vulnerability in Darchula is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.509  RANK: 16/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 64.6 Life Expectancy
- 2.8% Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.535  RANK: 24/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 47.8% Child Malnutrition Rate
- 39.8 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- 1022.9 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- 39.1 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- 126.7 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 44 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.400

Darchula exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3,397 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>73/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57,067 Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.11 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>73/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.2 Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>73/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.15 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.65 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>73/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.45 Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.9 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>73/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.75 Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>73/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6 Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55 Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>73/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>80.7% Protected Area</td>
<td>0.901</td>
<td>3/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 44 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.400

Darchula exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.347  RANK: 63/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.353  RANK: 54/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 3.2% Households with Landline
- 0.3% Households with Internet
- 7.1% Households with Television
- 63.6% Households with Radio
- 38.8% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.421  RANK: 70/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 5 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 58.8% Improved Roadway
- 12.0 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 433.1 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 12.0 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 55.7 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 13.8 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 2.52 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.266  RANK: 59 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 27.0% Households with Electricity
- 3.3% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
**RANK: 58 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.407**

Darchula’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Economic Constraints**
- **Food Insecurity**
- **Energy Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

**KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE**

**Economic Constraints**

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Food Insecurity**

The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Energy Capacity**

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 27 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.411
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 48 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.090
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 18 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.229
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.187
- **Landslide**: RANK: 18 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.437
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - District Score: 0.446
  - Country Score: 0.559
- **Vulnerability**
  - District Score: 0.587
  - Country Score: 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**
  - District Score: 0.400
  - Country Score: 0.436

Darchula’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.
Better solutions.
Fewer disasters.

Safer world.
NEPAL
DHADING

Area: 1,926 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High**
Score: 0.560  •  Rank: 29/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Moderate**
Score: 0.514  •  Rank: 35/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High**
Score: 0.708  •  Rank: 16/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Low**
Score: 0.418  •  Rank: 48/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Moderate**
Score: 0.445  •  Rank: 33/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
322,751

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
27.6

Population below Poverty Line
18.8%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
85.9%

Adult Literacy
53.3%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 16 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.708

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

**Earthquake**
- 100%
- 310,584 people
- $765.1 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Landslide**
- 98%
- 304,565 people
- $751.5 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 98%

**Extreme Heat**
- 70%
- 216,645 people
- $599.67 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 78%

**Wildfire**
- 15%
- 47,796 people
- $65.03 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 9%

**Fluvial Flood**
- 1%
- 3,914 people
- $30.43 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 4%

**Pluvial Flood**
- 5%
- 16,015 people
- $94.39 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 12%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Dhading is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>31/77</td>
<td>0.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>95.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>39/77</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td></td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>227.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>52/77</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>82.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>54/77</td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td></td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>37/77</td>
<td>0.401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td>85.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 48 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.418

Vulnerability in Dhading is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
RANK: 58/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.307

68.8  
2.3%  
Life Expectancy  
Disabled Population

Child Health  
RANK: 60/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.298

26.3%  
27.6  
509.5  
35.1  
84.7  
Child Malnutrition Rate  
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)  
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)  
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)  
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
DISTRICT PROFILE

COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 33 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.445

Dhading exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity

- **Score**: 0.254  RANK: 44/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **13,392** Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
- **80,575** Labor Productivity (Rs.)

Governance

- **Score**: 0.593  RANK: 19/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **0.19** Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)
- **7.15** Government Management (Score out of 9)
- **4.88** Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)
- **6.17** Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- **7.83** Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- **9.29** Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- **5.54** Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- **5.6** Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)
- **4.63** Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)
- **4** Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)
- **2.42** Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

Environmental Capacity

- **Score**: 0.060  RANK: 42/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **0.4%** Protected Area
DISTRICT PROFILE

COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 33 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.445

Dhading exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  SCORE: 0.525  RANK: 34/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  SCORE: 0.499  RANK: 28/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 3.6% Households with Landline
- 0.7% Households with Internet
- 22.6% Households with Television
- 63.9% Households with Radio
- 63.5% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  SCORE: 0.538  RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 11 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 79.5% Improved Roadway
- 35.7 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 104.4 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 35.7 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 7.1 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 12.4 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.33 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  SCORE: 0.537  RANK: 35/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 62.6% Households with Electricity
- 10.2% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
**RANK: 35 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.514**  
Dhading’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Information Access Vulnerability**
- **Economic Constraints**
- **Communications Capacity**
- **Energy Capacity**

### KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

#### Information Access Vulnerability

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

#### Economic Constraints

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

#### Communications Capacity

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

#### Energy Capacity

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- Earthquake: RANK: 29 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.397
- Extreme Heat: RANK: 22 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.303
- Fluvial Flood: RANK: 40 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.161
- Pluvial Flood: RANK: 33 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.182
- Landslide: RANK: 17 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.448
- Wildfire: RANK: 34 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.201
Dhading’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

### Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - **Dhading’s Score**: 0.708
  - **Country Score**: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - **Dhading’s Score**: 0.418
  - **Country Score**: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - **Dhading’s Score**: 0.445
  - **Country Score**: 0.436
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NEPAL
DHANKUTA
Area: 891 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -
Very Low
Score: 0.430  •  Rank: 71/77

RESILIENCE (R) - High
Score: 0.576  •  Rank: 16/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low
Score: 0.442  •  Rank: 54/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Low
Score: 0.338  •  Rank: 60/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High
Score: 0.491  •  Rank: 24/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
149,984

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
20.6

Population below Poverty Line
15.9%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
83.5%

Adult Literacy
68.6%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.442

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%

- 150,595
- $292.09 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
99%

- 148,904
- $284.02 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 97%

Extreme Heat
24%

- 36,805
- $98.71 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 34%

Wildfire
7%

- 11,143
- $27.19 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 9%

Fluvial Flood
<1%

- 484
- $9.83 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

Pluvial Flood
1%

- 2,088
- $37.58 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 13%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Dhankuta is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- **Score:** 0.338
- **Rank:** 60/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>4.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>96.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>12.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **Score:** 0.373
- **Rank:** 53/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>83.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>22.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>136.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Constraints

- **Score:** 0.350
- **Rank:** 63/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Insecurity

- **Score:** 0.422
- **Rank:** 45/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>60.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Inequality

- **Score:** 0.149
- **Rank:** 73/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Dhankuta is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>37/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>60/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>41/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>63/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>0.391</td>
<td>37/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>0.410</td>
<td>41/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>0.338</td>
<td>60/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)

RANK: 24 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.491

Dhankuta exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

**Score:** 0.239  **Rank:** 47/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 8,335
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 91,562

**Governance**

**Score:** 0.670  **Rank:** 3/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.42
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 7.25
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 6):** 5.29
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 6.21
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 8.04
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 10.25
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 6.04
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 5.36

- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 5.07
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 4.18
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 3.18

**Environmental Capacity**

**Score:** 0.000  **Rank:** 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **Protected Area:** 0.0%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

RANK: 24 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.491

Dhankuta exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.606  RANK: 18/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.603  RANK: 9/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 4.9% Households with Landline
- 1.3% Households with Internet
- 40.1% Households with Television
- 61.0% Households with Radio
- 75.8% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.550  RANK: 44/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 15 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 93.3% Improved Roadway
- 45.3 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 76.7 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 45.3 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 15.6 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 13.0 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.8 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.666  RANK: 16 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 84.0% Households with Electricity
- 12.2% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 16 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.576  
Dhankuta’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Food Insecurity**  
- **Vulnerable Health Status**  
- **Logistics Capacity**  
- **Communications Capacity**

### KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

#### Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

#### Vulnerable Health Status
A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

#### Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

#### Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 65 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.304

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 49 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.082

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 74 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.041

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 75 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.077

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 45 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.318

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 53 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.092
DHANKUTA'S score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
DHANUSHA
Area: 1,180 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High
Score: 0.560  •  Rank: 30/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Moderate
Score: 0.508  •  Rank: 37/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High
Score: 0.695  •  Rank: 18/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - High
Score: 0.488  •  Rank: 26/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High
Score: 0.505  •  Rank: 23/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
873,274

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
78.4

Population below Poverty Line
23.1%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
89.0%

Adult Literacy
41.9%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 18 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.695

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- Earthquake
  - 100%
  - 736,941
  - $2.15 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- Extreme Heat
  - 100%
  - 736,733
  - $2.15 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- Landslide
  - <1%
  - 1,870
  - $9.96 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- Wildfire
  - 2%
  - 14,669
  - $47.65 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

- Fluvial Flood
  - 26%
  - 192,059
  - $1.05 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 49%

- Pluvial Flood
  - 34%
  - 254,156
  - $1.54 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 72%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Dhanusha is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- **Adult Literacy**: 41.9%
- **Mean Years of Schooling**: 2.97
- **Student Teacher Ratio**: 77.1
- **Female to Male Literacy Ratio**: 42.28
- **Distance from Parity**: 0.07

**Score**: 0.865

**Rank**: 6/77 Districts Assessed

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **Access to Safe Drinking Water**: 89.0%
- **Households without Toilet**: 64.9%
- **Water Schemes in Disrepair**: 50.0%
- **Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)**: 180.9
- **Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)**: 106.3

**Score**: 0.594

**Rank**: 13/77 Districts Assessed

Economic Constraints

- **Income per Capita (PPP $)**: $938
- **Poverty Headcount Ratio**: 23.1%
- **Poverty Gap**: 4.6%
- **Age Dependency Ratio**: 80.1

**Score**: 0.475

**Rank**: 45/77 Districts Assessed

Food Insecurity

- **Food Poverty Prevalence**: 18.2%
- **Low kcal Intake Prevalence**: 21.4%
- **Agricultural Insufficiency Rate**: 55.2%

**Score**: 0.245

**Rank**: 68/77 Districts Assessed

Gender Inequality

- **Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)**: 0.47
- **Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)**: 0.07
- **No Female Home nor Land Ownership**: 76.3%

**Score**: 0.370

**Rank**: 42/77 Districts Assessed
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 26/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.488

Vulnerability in Dhanusha is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
SCORE: 0.379  
RANK: 41/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Life Expectancy: 62.9
- Disabled Population: 1.1%

Child Health  
SCORE: 0.430  
RANK: 36/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 43.6%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 78.4
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 443.5
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 31.2
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 42.0
Dhanusha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
<td>28,727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity</td>
<td>134,589</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management</td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management</td>
<td>6.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 23 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.505

Dhanusha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.604  RANK: 19/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.468  RANK: 35/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 4.4% Households with Landline
- 0.6% Households with Internet
- 41.7% Households with Television
- 42.5% Households with Radio
- 67.2% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.750  RANK: 7/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 17 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 85.9% Improved Roadway
- 9.8 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 129.0 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 9.8 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 4.2 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 8.5 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 2.86 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.593  RANK: 27 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 73.2% Households with Electricity
- 10.1% Households using Gas for Cooking
KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 24 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.423

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 8 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.421

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 7 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.357

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 5 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.396

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 75 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.006

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 46 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.129
Dhanusha’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: 0.695 (Districts Score: 0.559)
- **Vulnerability**: 0.488 (Country Score: 0.463)
- **Coping Capacity**: 0.505 (Country Score: 0.436)
NEPAL
DOLAKHA
Area: 2,191 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low
Score: 0.465  •  Rank: 64/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Moderate
Score: 0.521  •  Rank: 33/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low
Score: 0.437  •  Rank: 55/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - High
Score: 0.486  •  Rank: 27/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High
Score: 0.527  •  Rank: 16/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
172,726

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
25.8

Population below Poverty Line
26.0%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
78.2%

Adult Literacy
53.6%
### MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

**RANK: 55 / 77 DISTRICTS**  
**SCORE: 0.437**

#### ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Population Exposure</th>
<th>Critical Infrastructure Exposed</th>
<th>Economic Exposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$312.31 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>167,263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>$297.53 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>164,111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>$6.49 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1,589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>$26.67 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
DISTRICT PROFILE

VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Dolakha is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- **Score**: 0.521
- **Rank**: 37/77 Districts Assessed
- **53.6%** Adult Literacy
- **3.26** Mean Years of Schooling
- **96.2** Primary School Net Enrollment
- **16.9** Student Teacher Ratio

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **Score**: 0.520
- **Rank**: 22/77 Districts Assessed
- **78.2%** Access to Safe Drinking Water
- **30.4%** Households without Toilet
- **44.7%** Water Schemes in Disrepair
- **268.3** Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- **17.1** Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

Economic Constraints

- **Score**: 0.515
- **Rank**: 33/77 Districts Assessed
- **$922** Income per Capita (PPP $)
- **26.0%** Poverty Headcount Ratio
- **5.7%** Poverty Gap
- **82.7** Age Dependency Ratio

Food Insecurity

- **Score**: 0.473
- **Rank**: 38/77 Districts Assessed
- **34.9%** Food Poverty Prevalence
- **34.1%** Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- **57.6%** Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

Gender Inequality

- **Score**: 0.468
- **Rank**: 28/77 Districts Assessed
- **0.38** Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **0.14** Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **81.2%** No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 27 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.486

Vulnerability in Dolakha is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

SCORE: 0.419  
RANK: 31/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Life Expectancy: 69.8
- Disabled Population: 3.0%

Child Health  

SCORE: 0.535  
RANK: 25/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 44.0%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 25.8
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 1304.1
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 64.8
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 89.0
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 16 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.527

Dolakha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**  RANK: 60/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.166

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>6,992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>74,112</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**  RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.631

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>7.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>10.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>6.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>5.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**  RANK: 7/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.796

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>63.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Dolakha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.562
- **Rank:** 25/77 Districts Assessed

**Communications Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.458
- **Rank:** 39/77 Districts Assessed

- 1.8% Households with Landline
- 0.5% Households with Internet
- 21.2% Households with Television
- 72.8% Households with Radio
- 53.0% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.652
- **Rank:** 16/77 Districts Assessed

- 7 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 79.3% Improved Roadway
- 14.4 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 46.5 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 14.4 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 10.7 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 10.8 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.87 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.577
- **Rank:** 30/77 Districts Assessed

- 81.8% Households with Electricity
- 4.5% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

RANK: 33 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.521

Dolakha’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - **RANK:** 50 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - **SCORE:** 0.365

- **Extreme Heat**
  - **RANK:** 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - **SCORE:** 0.000

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - **RANK:** 64 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - **SCORE:** 0.112

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - **RANK:** 50 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - **SCORE:** 0.133

- **Landslide**
  - **RANK:** 34 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - **SCORE:** 0.378

- **Wildfire**
  - **RANK:** 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - **SCORE:** 0.000
Dolakha’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.
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### NEPAL

**DOLPA**

Area: 7,889 km²

---

#### RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)</strong></td>
<td>0.613</td>
<td>12/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESILIENCE (R)</strong></td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>74/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)</strong></td>
<td>0.358</td>
<td>68/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>VULNERABILITY (V)</strong></td>
<td>0.753</td>
<td>4/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COPING CAPACITY (CC)</strong></td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>72/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

- **Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)**: 42,959
- **Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)**: 70.9
- **Population below Poverty Line**: 42.8%
- **Population with Safe Drinking Water**: 64.7%
- **Adult Literacy**: 44.2%
**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)**

*RANK: 68 / 77 DISTRICTS  
SCORE: 0.358*

### ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Population Exposure</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Critical Infrastructure Exposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>37,140</td>
<td>$51.82 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>36,733</td>
<td>$50.35 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6,947</td>
<td>$11.65 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3,205</td>
<td>$0.74 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>6,315</td>
<td>$2.5 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
Vulnerability in Dolpa is primarily driven by Gender Inequality and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 4 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.753

Vulnerability in Dolpa is primarily driven by Gender Inequality and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Vulnerable Health Status**

RANK: 3/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.827

- **57.7** Life Expectancy
- **4.4%** Disabled Population

**Child Health**

RANK: 7/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.708

- **54.1%** Child Malnutrition Rate
- **70.9** Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- **874.6** Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- **48.3** Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- **190.9** Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 72 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.272

Dolpa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity  RANK: 63/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.153

- Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.): 1,559
- Labor Productivity (Rs.): 86,910

Governance  RANK: 68/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.307

- Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000): 0.44
- Government Management (Score out of 9)
- Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)
- Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)
- Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)
- Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)
- Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

Environmental Capacity  RANK: 13/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.703

- Protected Area: 49.1%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 72 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.272

Dolpa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  SCORE: 0.197  RANK: 76/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  SCORE: 0.244  RANK: 71/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity  SCORE: 0.229  RANK: 77/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity  SCORE: 0.118  RANK: 74 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 74 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.259

Dolpa’s score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Gender Inequality
- Vulnerable Health Status
- Energy Capacity
- Logistics Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Gender Inequality
Marginalized populations are less likely to have their needs met under pre-disaster conditions, and therefore become even more susceptible to harm during times of disaster. Increase gender-based inclusion in all phases of DM, ensuring the implementation at subnational and local levels. Courses of action must recognize the role of women in society and support changes to policies and programs to promote gender-equal access.

Vulnerable Health Status
A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

Earthquake  
RANK: 23 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.425

Extreme Heat  
RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.000

Fluvial Flood  
RANK: 14 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.267

Pluvial Flood  
RANK: 24 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.235

Landslide  
RANK: 15 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.451

Wildfire  
RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.184
Dolpa’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
DOTI
Area: 2,025 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very High
Score: 0.623  •  Rank: 10/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low
Score: 0.313  •  Rank: 69/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low
Score: 0.496  •  Rank: 47/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very High
Score: 0.698  •  Rank: 7/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very Low
Score: 0.324  •  Rank: 66/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
205,683

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
42.2

Population below Poverty Line
48.9%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
66.0%

Adult Literacy
47.7%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 47 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.496

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 253,352 people
  - $366.96 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 100%
  - 252,734 people
  - $360.26 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 98%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 3%
  - 7,207 people
  - $9.79 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

- **Wildfire**
  - 48%
  - 122,140 people
  - $152.56 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 42%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 2%
  - 3,823 people
  - $7.05 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 6%
  - 15,115 people
  - $24.51 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 7%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 7 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.698

Vulnerability in Doti is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**  
SCORE: 0.779  
RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 47.7% Adult Literacy
- 2.53 Mean Years of Schooling
- 85.5 Primary School Net Enrollment
- 30.37 Student Teacher Ratio

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**  
SCORE: 0.584  
RANK: 14/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 66.0% Access to Safe Drinking Water
- 58.3% Households without Toilet
- 32.2% Water Schemes in Disrepair
- 155.8 Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- 118.5 Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

**Economic Constraints**  
SCORE: 0.825  
RANK: 7/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- $774 Income per Capita (PPP $)
- 48.9% Poverty Headcount Ratio
- 13.5% Poverty Gap
- 104.0 Age Dependency Ratio

**Food Insecurity**  
SCORE: 0.782  
RANK: 7/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 56.7% Food Poverty Prevalence
- 41.4% Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- 80.5% Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

**Gender Inequality**  
SCORE: 0.654  
RANK: 9/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 0.59 Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 0.05 Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 96.6% No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 7 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.698

Vulnerability in Doti is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
RANK: 13/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.566

65.0  
Life Expectancy

3.4%  
Disabled Population

Child Health  
RANK: 19/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.593

57.6%  
Child Malnutrition Rate

42.2  
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

1017.7  
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

71.1  
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

76.2  
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
Doti exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>6,591</td>
<td>62/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>71,448</td>
<td>62/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>8.59</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>4.59</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>46/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>32/77 DSA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 66 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.324

Doti exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**  SCORE: 0.322  RANK: 66/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Communications Capacity**  SCORE: 0.249  RANK: 68/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 2.7% Households with Landline
- 0.4% Households with Internet
- 6.6% Households with Television
- 42.8% Households with Radio
- 34.0% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**  SCORE: 0.444  RANK: 66/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 11 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 54.1% Improved Roadway
- 13.0 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 362.1 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 13.0 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 13.8 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 17.2 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.73 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**  SCORE: 0.272  RANK: 58 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 30.2% Households with Electricity
- 2.7% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

RANK: 69 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.313

Doti’s score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Food Insecurity
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Food Insecurity**
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.503

- **Extreme Heat**
  - RANK: 57 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.021

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 36 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.174

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 36 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.170

- **Landslide**
  - RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.542

- **Wildfire**
  - RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.365
Doti's score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.
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NEPAL
GORKHA
Area: 3,610 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Moderate
Score: 0.545 • Rank: 33/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Moderate
Score: 0.526 • Rank: 32/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - High
Score: 0.685 • Rank: 21/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Low
Score: 0.421 • Rank: 46/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - High
Score: 0.472 • Rank: 28/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) 252,201
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) 21.0
Population below Poverty Line 20.4%
Population with Safe Drinking Water 65.1%
Adult Literacy 58.2%
### Multi-Hazard Exposure (MHE)

**Rank:** 21 / 77 Districts  
**Score:** 0.685

#### ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Economic Loss</th>
<th>Critical Infrastructure Exposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>245,343</td>
<td>$493.65 Million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>232,713</td>
<td>$435.44 Million</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>182,717</td>
<td>$418.46 Million</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30,163</td>
<td>$27.83 Million</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2,620</td>
<td>$11.91 Million</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10,262</td>
<td>$52.33 Million</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Gorkha is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability
0 1
58.2% 3.47 96.2 14.97
Adult Literacy Mean Years of Schooling Primary School Net Enrollment Student Teacher Ratio

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability
0 1
65.1% 27.0% 46.5% 192.3 4.7
Access to Safe Drinking Water Households without Toilet Water Schemes in Disrepair Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000) Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

Economic Constraints
0 1
$1,039 20.4% 4.9% 84.0
Income per Capita (PPP $) Poverty Headcount Ratio Poverty Gap Age Dependency Ratio

Food Insecurity
0 1
21.6% 30.9% 64.1%
Food Poverty Prevalence Low kcal Intake Prevalence Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

Gender Inequality
0 1
0.27 0.09 82.1%
Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity) Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity) No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 46 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.421

Vulnerability in Gorkha is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 57/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.321

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health

RANK: 50/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.345

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>21.0</th>
<th>802.8</th>
<th>41.6</th>
<th>76.8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>31.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence</td>
<td>802.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per 1,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(per 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

Gorkha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **Score**: 0.253  
  - **Rank**: 45 / 77 Districts Assessed
- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)**: 11,420
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.)**: 86,391

### Governance

- **Score**: 0.449  
  - **Rank**: 47 / 77 Districts Assessed
- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)**: 0.24
- **Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9)**: 3.91
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)**: 6.23
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)**: 6.77
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16)**: 9.07
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7)**: 4.73
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)**: 3.32

### Environmental Capacity

- **Score**: 0.673  
  - **Rank**: 15 / 77 Districts Assessed
- **Protected Area**: 45.0%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)

RANK: 28 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.472

Gorkha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

SCORE: 0.549  RANK: 27/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity

SCORE: 0.494  RANK: 31/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 2.7% Households with Landline
- 0.5% Households with Internet
- 32.3% Households with Television
- 65.3% Households with Radio
- 61.6% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity

SCORE: 0.538  RANK: 48/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 6 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 28.1% Improved Roadway
- 22.2 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 126.4 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 22.2 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 7.9 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 12.2 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.67 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity

SCORE: 0.616  RANK: 25 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 76.4% Households with Electricity
- 10.9% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 32 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.526  
Gorkha’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Information Access Vulnerability
- Communications Capacity
- Logistics Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

Earthquake  RANK: 42 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.375

Extreme Heat  RANK: 20 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.308

Fluvial Flood  RANK: 52 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.142

Pluvial Flood  RANK: 40 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.162

Landslide  RANK: 32 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.388

Wildfire  RANK: 43 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.152
Gorkha’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Districts score 0.685, Country score 0.559
- **Vulnerability**: Districts score 0.421, Country score 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**: Districts score 0.472, Country score 0.436
NEPAL
GULMI
Area: 1,149 km$^2$

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Low
Score: 0.481 • Rank: 59/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Moderate
Score: 0.488 • Rank: 39/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Low
Score: 0.419 • Rank: 58/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Low
Score: 0.409 • Rank: 52/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Low
Score: 0.384 • Rank: 50/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
246,836

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
28.4

Population below Poverty Line
25.6%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
90.0%

Adult Literacy
65.6%
## Multi-Hazard Exposure (MHE)

### Rank: 58 / 77 Districts

### Score: 0.419

### Estimated Exposure to Each Hazard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Critical Infrastructure Exposed</th>
<th>Economic Loss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>254,025</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$431.09 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>252,508</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>$431.09 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>32,758</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>$19.88 Million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3,253</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11,208</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>$23.83 Million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Notes:

- Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Gulmi is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**
- Adult Literacy: 65.6%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 3.92
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 97.2
- Student Teacher Ratio: 15.38

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**
- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 90.0%
- Households without Toilet: 18.4%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 32.6%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 207.8
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 3.4

**Economic Constraints**
- Income per Capita (PPP $): $752
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 25.6%
- Poverty Gap: 5.9%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 92.7

**Food Insecurity**
- Food Poverty Prevalence: 23.5%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 30.0%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 77.3%

**Gender Inequality**
- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.26
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.11
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 83.0%
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 52 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.409

Vulnerability in Gulmi is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 53/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.329

70.6 Life Expectancy
2.7% Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 46/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.383

43.3% Child Malnutrition Rate
28.4 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
895.2 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
36.5 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
49.2 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 50 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.384

Gulmi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity  
RANK: 64/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.148

8,418  
Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)

64,322  
Labor Productivity (Rs.)

Governance  
RANK: 39/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.500

0.07  
Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)

6.73  
Government Management (Score out of 9)

4.29  
Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)

6.56  
Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)

6.77  
Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)

8.33  
Service Flow (Score out of 16)

4.92  
Judicial Work (Score out of 7)

5.19  
Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

Environmental Capacity  
RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.000

0.0%  
Protected Area
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 50 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.384

Gulmi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.512  RANK: 37/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.541  RANK: 21/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.482  RANK: 60/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.512  RANK: 37 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)  

RANK: 39 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.488  

Gulmi’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Food Insecurity
- Logistics Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Food Insecurity**
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Logistics Capacity**
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 47 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.369

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 52 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.067

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 45 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.152

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 64 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.115

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 25 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.405

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 59 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.000
Gulmi’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
HUMLA
Area: 5,655 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

- **MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Very High
  Score: 0.662  •  Rank: 3/77

- **RESILIENCE (R)** - Very Low
  Score: 0.182  •  Rank: 77/77

- **MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Very Low
  Score: 0.349  •  Rank: 70/77

- **VULNERABILITY (V)** - Very High
  Score: 0.810  •  Rank: 1/77

- **COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Very Low
  Score: 0.174  •  Rank: 76/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
  **55,496**

- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
  **61.1**

- Population below Poverty Line
  **56.0%**

- Population with Safe Drinking Water
  **69.7%**

- Adult Literacy
  **37.2%**
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 70 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.349

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 53,164 people
  - $75.85 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 100%
  - 53,161 people
  - $74.84 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 99%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 0%
  - 0 people
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Wildfire**
  - 24%
  - 12,904 people
  - $11.12 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 15%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 5%
  - 2,921 people
  - $1.59 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 12%
  - 6,313 people
  - $2.67 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 4%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

**RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
**SCORE: 0.810**

Vulnerability in Humla is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

- **Score: 0.888**
- **RANK: 3/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
- 37.2% Adult Literacy
- 2.22 Mean Years of Schooling
- 77.8 Primary School Net Enrollment
- 31.62 Student Teacher Ratio

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **Score: 0.738**
- **RANK: 3/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
- 69.7% Access to Safe Drinking Water
- 49.8% Households without Toilet
- 35.6% Water Schemes in Disrepair
- 350.0 Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- 291.3 Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

### Economic Constraints

- **Score: 0.858**
- **RANK: 5/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
- $794 Income per Capita (PPP $)
- 56.0% Poverty Headcount Ratio
- 16.6% Poverty Gap
- 92.1 Age Dependency Ratio

### Food Insecurity

- **Score: 0.868**
- **RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
- 50.4% Food Poverty Prevalence
- 53.2% Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- 80.4% Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

### Gender Inequality

- **Score: 0.671**
- **RANK: 6/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
- 0.69 Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 0.01 Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 97.2% No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.810

Vulnerability in Humla is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 2/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.834

58.9
Life Expectancy

4.7%
Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.734

65.7%
Child Malnutrition Rate

61.1
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

874.5
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

69.7
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

151.9
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 76 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.174

Humla exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

| 1,649 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.) | 68,905 Labor Productivity (Rs.) |

**Governance**

- Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000) 0.31
- Government Management (Score out of 9) 0
- Organization and Administration (Score out of 8) 0
- Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11) 0
- Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11) 0
- Service Flow (Score out of 16) 0
- Judicial Work (Score out of 7) 0
- Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13) 0
- Social Inclusion (Score out of 10) 0
- Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9) 0
- Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 8) 0

**Environmental Capacity**

- Protected Area 0.0%
COPING CAPACITY (CC) | RANK: 76 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED | SCORE: 0.174

Humla exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity
- RANK: 73/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity
- RANK: 66/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity
- RANK: 76/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity
- RANK: 70/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)

RANK: 77 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.182

Humla's score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Food Insecurity
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Information Access Vulnerability**
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Food Insecurity**
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - RANK: 3 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.520

- **Extreme Heat**
  - RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.000

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 25 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.204

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.163

- **Landslide**
  - RANK: 5 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.543

- **Wildfire**
  - RANK: 24 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.274
Humla’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

**Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:**

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: 0.349 (Districts) / 0.559 (Country)
- **Vulnerability**: 0.810 (Districts) / 0.463 (Country)
- **Coping Capacity**: 0.174 (Districts) / 0.436 (Country)
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RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Very Low
Score: 0.454  •  Rank: 66/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - High
Score: 0.548  •  Rank: 21/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Low
Score: 0.457  •  Rank: 50/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Very Low
Score: 0.323  •  Rank: 63/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Moderate
Score: 0.419  •  Rank: 37/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
**280,565**

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
**34.5**

Population below Poverty Line
**7.3%**

Population with Safe Drinking Water
**79.0%**

Adult Literacy
**73.5%**
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 50 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.457

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
272,998
$300.2 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
88%
240,851
$197.23 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 66%

Extreme Heat
25%
67,958
$191.59 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 64%

Wildfire
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Fluvial Flood
1%
1,696
$25.88 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 9%

Pluvial Flood
5%
12,977
$54.06 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 18%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Ilam is primarily driven by Gender Inequality and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>0.274</td>
<td>72/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>10.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>0.284</td>
<td>65/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>34.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>0.254</td>
<td>72/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>0.320</td>
<td>58/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>55.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>34/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>81.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 63 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.323

Vulnerability in Ilam is primarily driven by Gender Inequality and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 36/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.392

Life Expectancy: 67.5
Disabled Population: 2.6%

Child Health

RANK: 43/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.406

Child Malnutrition Rate: 46.1%
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 34.5
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 726.6
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 29.9
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 79.4
Ilam exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
Ilam exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.548

Ilam’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Gender Inequality
- Vulnerable Health Status
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Gender Inequality
Marginalized populations are less likely to have their needs met under pre-disaster conditions, and therefore become even more susceptible to harm during times of disaster. Increase gender-based inclusion in all phases of DM, ensuring the implementation at subnational and local levels. Courses of action must recognize the role of women in society and support changes to policies and programs to promote gender-equal access.

Vulnerable Health Status
A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 58 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.333

- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 43 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.125

- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 68 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.096

- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 56 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.129

- **Landslide**: RANK: 48 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.308

- **Wildfire**: RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.000
Ilam’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
JAJARKOT
Area: 2,230 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Very High
Score: 0.686 • Rank: 1/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Very Low
Score: 0.248 • Rank: 75/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Moderate
Score: 0.555 • Rank: 38/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Very High
Score: 0.648 • Rank: 10/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Very Low
Score: 0.144 • Rank: 77/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
  **189,365**

- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
  **63.4**

- Population below Poverty Line
  **37.7%**

- Population with Safe Drinking Water
  **56.5%**

- Adult Literacy
  **46.9%**
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.555

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 173,122
  - $215.94 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 99%
  - 171,134
  - $215.94 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 6%
  - 10,974
  - $26.58 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 12%

- **Wildfire**
  - 60%
  - 104,383
  - $128.58 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 60%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 1%
  - 2,138
  - $6.22 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 5%
  - 8,131
  - $6.22 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Jajarkot is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- Adult Literacy: 46.9%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 2.7
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 97
- Student Teacher Ratio: 43.15

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 56.5%
- Households without Toilet: 56.2%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 46.7%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 192.5
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 63.3

Economic Constraints

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $611
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 37.7%
- Poverty Gap: 9.0%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 99.9

Food Insecurity

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 36.2%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 39.5%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 76.7%

Gender Inequality

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.44
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.02
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 96.9%
**VULNERABILITY (V)**

Vulnerability in Jajarkot is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Vulnerable Health Status**

- Life Expectancy: 61.7
- Disabled Population: 4.0%

**Child Health**

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 51.3%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 63.4
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 758.5
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 60.1
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 84.0

**RANK: 10 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.648**

**RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.671**

**RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.572**
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

RANK: 77 / 77  
DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.144

Jajarkot exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.116  
RANK: 67/77  
DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 4,255  
  Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
- 67,478  
  Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**  
SCORE: 0.159  
RANK: 75/77  
DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 0.26  
  Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)
- 0  
  Government Management (Score out of 9)
- 0  
  Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)
- 0  
  Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- 0  
  Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- 0  
  Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- 0  
  Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- 0  
  Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)
- 0  
  Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)
- 0  
  Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)
- 0  
  Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

**Environmental Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.000  
RANK: 49/77  
DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 0.0%  
  Protected Area
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 77 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.144

Jajarkot exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.183  RANK: 77/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.108  RANK: 77/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

1.3%  Households with Landline
0.1%  Households with Internet
1.6%  Households with Television
45.9%  Households with Radio
22.1%  Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.402  RANK: 73/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

7  Road Density (km per sq. km)
31.7%  Improved Roadway
19.0  Average Distance to Airport (km)
224.2  Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
19.0  Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
25.1  Average Distance to Police Station (km)
20.5  Average Distance to Hospital (km)
1.32  Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.037  RANK: 77 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

4.0%  Households with Electricity
0.2%  Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 75 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.248

Jajarkot’s score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

1. Economic Constraints
2. Clean Water Access Vulnerability
3. Energy Capacity
4. Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 2 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.524

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 51 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.080

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 34 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.178

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 42 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.158

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 4 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.549

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 3 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.494
Jajarkot’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: 0.555 (Districts Score) vs. 0.559 (Country Score)
- **Vulnerability**: 0.648 (Districts Score) vs. 0.463 (Country Score)
- **Coping Capacity**: 0.144 (Districts Score) vs. 0.436 (Country Score)
NEPAL
JHAPKA
Area: 1,606 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low
Score: 0.442 • Rank: 67/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very High
Score: 0.668 • Rank: 6/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High
Score: 0.661 • Rank: 24/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low
Score: 0.224 • Rank: 76/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High
Score: 0.560 • Rank: 11/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
994,090

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
38.0

Population below Poverty Line
10.6%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
95.5%

Adult Literacy
69.9%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 24 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.661

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**: 100%
  - Population: 806,022
  - Damage: $1.6 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure: 100%

- **Landslide**: 1%
  - Population: 8,893
  - Damage: $34.63 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure: 2%

- **Extreme Heat**: 100%
  - Population: 805,757
  - Damage: $1.6 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure: 100%

- **Wildfire**: 0%
  - Population: 0
  - Damage: $0
  - Critical Infrastructure: 0%

- **Fluvial Flood**: 21%
  - Population: 166,692
  - Damage: $516.48 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure: 32%

- **Pluvial Flood**: 49%
  - Population: 398,186
  - Damage: $958.37 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure: 60%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 76 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.224

Vulnerability in Jhapa is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.319  
RANK: 68/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.240  
RANK: 72/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Economic Constraints  
SCORE: 0.294  
RANK: 70/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Food Insecurity  
SCORE: 0.065  
RANK: 77/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Gender Inequality  
SCORE: 0.131  
RANK: 75/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 76 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.224

Vulnerability in Jhapa is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 59/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.295

67.3
Life Expectancy

1.9%
Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 71/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.264

24.2%
Child Malnutrition Rate

38.0
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

543.1
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

29.2
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

44.9
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
Jhapa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Economic Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>40,370 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>9/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>122,577 Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>49/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.13 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>38/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.75 Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.52 Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>3/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.54 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>8.38</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.6 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.48 Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.48 Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0% Protected Area</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>49/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC) RANK: 11 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.560

Jhapa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity
SCORE: 0.685 RANK: 8/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity
SCORE: 0.652 RANK: 6/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 7.8% Households with Landline
- 2.3% Households with Internet
- 62.7% Households with Television
- 51.3% Households with Radio
- 73.7% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity
SCORE: 0.684 RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 12 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 91.4% Improved Roadway
- 13.1 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 30.2 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 13.1 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 8.1 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 12.9 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.19 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity
SCORE: 0.720 RANK: 8/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 82.1% Households with Electricity
- 22.7% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

Jhapa’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Vulnerable Health Status
- Communications Capacity
- Logistics Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Vulnerable Health Status

A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

Communications Capacity

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Logistics Capacity

Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 70 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.286
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 26 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.282
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 23 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.210
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 18 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.256
- **Landslide**: RANK: 73 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.011
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
Multihazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: 0.661 (DISTRICTS) vs. 0.559 (COUNTRY)
- **Vulnerability**: 0.224 (DISTRICTS) vs. 0.463 (COUNTRY)
- **Coping Capacity**: 0.560 (DISTRICTS) vs. 0.436 (COUNTRY)

Jhapa’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL

JUMLA

Area: 2,531 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY

COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High
Score: 0.578  •  Rank: 25/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low
Score: 0.330  •  Rank: 67/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low
Score: 0.395  •  Rank: 64/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very High
Score: 0.695  •  Rank: 8/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low
Score: 0.355  •  Rank: 57/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
119,377

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
64.0

Population below Poverty Line
49.0%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
80.1%

Adult Literacy
44.4%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 64 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.395

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 109,375
  - $160.7 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 98%
  - 106,846
  - $160.7 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 0%
  - 0
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Wildfire**
  - 1%
  - 1,361
  - $15.73 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 10%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 3%
  - 3,692
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 21%
  - 23,219
  - $4.95 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 8 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.695

Vulnerability in Jumla is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.776  
RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Adult Literacy: 44.4%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 2.62
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 90.7
- Student Teacher Ratio: 37.34

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.453  
RANK: 31/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 80.1%
- Households without Toilet: 30.7%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 46.5%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 89.6
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 70.4

Economic Constraints  
SCORE: 0.738  
RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $1,007
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 49.0%
- Poverty Gap: 13.1%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 88.4

Food Insecurity  
SCORE: 0.791  
RANK: 6/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 41.1%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 47.5%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 82.7%

Gender Inequality  
SCORE: 0.767  
RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.61
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.15
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 93.7%
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 8 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.695

Vulnerability in Jumla is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.643  RANK: 7/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

62.7  3.0%
Life Expectancy  Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.777  RANK: 3/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

54.1%  64.0  1113.1  86.8  166.1
Child Malnutrition Rate  Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)  Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)  Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)  Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
### COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
**RANK: 57 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.355**

Jumla exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

#### Economic Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>4,475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>89,553</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Environmental Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Delta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

RANK: 57 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.355

Jumla exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.353  
RANK: 61/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Communications Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.267  
RANK: 63/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 1.7% Households with Landline
- 0.4% Households with Internet
- 10.9% Households with Television
- 42.4% Households with Radio
- 46.1% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.591  
RANK: 31/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 3 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 47.5% Improved Roadway
- 15.0 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 274.4 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 15.0 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 4.3 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 14.7 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 8.38 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.200  
RANK: 63 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 29.3% Households with Electricity
- 0.6% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 67 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.330

Jumla’s score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Food Insecurity**
- **Information Access Vulnerability**
- **Energy Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

### KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

#### Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

#### Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

#### Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

#### Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 16 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.464

- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.000

- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 24 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.207

- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 25 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.231

- **Landslide**: RANK: 12 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.475

- **Wildfire**: RANK: 44 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.136
Jumla's score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Districts Score 0.395, Country Score 0.559
- **Vulnerability**: Districts Score 0.695, Country Score 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**: Districts Score 0.355, Country Score 0.436
NEPAL
KABHREPALANCHOK

Area: 3,235 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low
Score: 0.437 • Rank: 68/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very High
Score: 0.609 • Rank: 13/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate
Score: 0.530 • Rank: 40/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Low
Score: 0.334 • Rank: 61/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High
Score: 0.552 • Rank: 14/77
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 40 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.530

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**: 100%
  - 236,449 people
  - $1.01 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**: 84%
  - 198,481 people
  - $750.15 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 74%

- **Extreme Heat**: 40%
  - 95,532 people
  - $211.55 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 21%

- **Wildfire**: 0%
  - 0 people
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Fluvial Flood**: 1%
  - 2,730 people
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Pluvial Flood**: 8%
  - 18,466 people
  - $310.07 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 31%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Kabhrepalanchok is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**

- **62.8%** Adult Literacy
- **4.18** Mean Years of Schooling
- **95.3%** Primary School Net Enrollment
- **16.69** Student Teacher Ratio

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**

- **85.5%** Access to Safe Drinking Water
- **26.9%** Households without Toilet
- **37.2%** Water Schemes in Disrepair
- **174.5** Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- **21.4** Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

**Economic Constraints**

- **$1,399** Income per Capita (PPP $)
- **13.9%** Poverty Headcount Ratio
- **2.5%** Poverty Gap
- **68.1** Age Dependency Ratio

**Food Insecurity**

- **21.7%** Food Poverty Prevalence
- **34.7%** Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- **54.8%** Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

**Gender Inequality**

- **0.32** Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **0.03** Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **79.4%** No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.334

Vulnerability in Kabhrepalanchok is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.211  RANK: 73/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

70.7
Life Expectancy

1.7%
Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.261   RANK: 72/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

21.7%
Child Malnutrition Rate

24.1
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

701.8
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

36.4
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

50.2
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
Kabhrepalanchok exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**
- **Score:** 0.483
- **Rank:** 18/77 Districts Assessed

21,778
Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)

122,744
Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**
- **Score:** 0.659
- **Rank:** 5/77 Districts Assessed

0.09
Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)

7.25
Government Management (Score out of 9)

5.27
Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)

6.77
Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)

7.9
Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)

11
Service Flow (Score out of 16)

5.92
Judicial Work (Score out of 7)

6.19
Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

4.81
Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)

4.83
Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)

2.35
Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

**Environmental Capacity**
- **Score:** 0.000
- **Rank:** 49/77 Districts Assessed

0.0%
Protected Area
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 14 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.552
Kabhrepalanchok exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.644  RANK: 9/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.620  RANK: 7/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 7.1% Households with Landline
- 2.0% Households with Internet
- 51.2% Households with Television
- 57.1% Households with Radio
- 66.7% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.601  RANK: 27/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 11 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 100.0% Improved Roadway
- 30.3 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 65.1 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 30.3 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 9.4 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 10.6 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.23 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.711  RANK: 9 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 87.3% Households with Electricity
- 16.1% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  

Kabhrepalanchok’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Information Access Vulnerability**
- **Food Insecurity**
- **Logistics Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

**KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE**

**Information Access Vulnerability**

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Food Insecurity**

The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Logistics Capacity**

Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 60 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.323

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 44 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.118

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 67 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.096

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 30 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.190

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 47 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.309

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 59 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.000
Kabhrepalanchok’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
KAILALI

NDPBA SUBNATIONAL PROFILE
NEPAL
KAILALI
Area: 1,741 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very High
Score: 0.612 • Rank: 14/77

RESILIENCE (R) - High
Score: 0.532 • Rank: 28/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very High
Score: 0.902 • Rank: 2/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Low
Score: 0.410 • Rank: 51/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High
Score: 0.474 • Rank: 25/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
144,917

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
49.2

Population below Poverty Line
33.6%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
94.1%

Adult Literacy
58.9%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 2 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.902

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 1,900,334
  - $1.26 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 5%
  - 96,907
  - $40.41 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 99%
  - 1,871,880
  - $1.25 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Wildfire**
  - 68%
  - 1,295,776
  - $1.02 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 82%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 36%
  - 679,804
  - $479.8 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 38%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 43%
  - 815,253
  - $581.12 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 46%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 51 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.410

Vulnerability in Kailali is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.
Vulnerability in Kailali is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Vulnerable Health Status

- **Score:** 0.340  
  **Rank:** 52/77 Districts Assessed

#### 66.2
- Life Expectancy

#### 2.0%
- Disabled Population

### Child Health

- **Score:** 0.307  
  **Rank:** 58/77 Districts Assessed

#### 31.4%
- Child Malnutrition Rate

#### 49.2
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

#### 485.1
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

#### 37.2
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

#### 23.8
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
Kailali exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.482
- **Rank:** 19/77 Districts Assessed
- Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.): 29,570
- Labor Productivity (Rs.): 98,420

**Governance**

- **Score:** 0.527
- **Rank:** 31/77 Districts Assessed
- Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000): 0.87
- Government Management (Score out of 9): 6.75
- Organization and Administration (Score out of 8): 4.31
- Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11): 6
- Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11): 7.03
- Service Flow (Score out of 16): 8.94
- Judicial Work (Score out of 7): 4.88
- Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13): 4.81
- Social Inclusion (Score out of 10): 3.88
- Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9): 3.03
- Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6): 1.75

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.002
- **Rank:** 48/77 Districts Assessed
- Protected Area: <0.1%
Kailali exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>29/77</td>
<td>0.548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communications Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>29/77</td>
<td>0.497</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 5.7% Households with Landline
- 1.3% Households with Internet
- 32.7% Households with Television
- 46.4% Households with Radio
- 65.8% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>28/77</td>
<td>0.600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 10 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 88.5% Improved Roadway
- 327.1 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 29.3 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 29.3 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 13.7 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 15.7 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 18.22 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>34/77</td>
<td>0.546</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 70.5% Households with Electricity
- 6.8% Households using Gas for Cooking
Key Factors Influencing Resilience

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
### HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>25 / 77</td>
<td>0.416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>7 / 77</td>
<td>0.422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>6 / 77</td>
<td>0.374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>7 / 77</td>
<td>0.366</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>57 / 77</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>5 / 77</td>
<td>0.408</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The scores represent the assessed risk for each hazard, with higher scores indicating greater risk.
Kailali’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
KALIKOT
Area: 1,610 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High
Score: 0.592 • Rank: 20/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low
Score: 0.274 • Rank: 72/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low
Score: 0.325 • Rank: 74/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very High
Score: 0.726 • Rank: 5/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very Low
Score: 0.274 • Rank: 71/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
517,645

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
63.0

Population below Poverty Line
57.9%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
59.0%

Adult Literacy
45.3%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 74 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.325

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 69,206 people
  - $157.55 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 100%
  - 69,206 people
  - $157.55 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 0%
  - 0 people
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Wildfire**
  - <1%
  - 249 people
  - $11.07 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 7%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 1%
  - 568 people
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 3%
  - 2,095 people
  - $15.29 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 10%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
### Vulnerability (V)

Vulnerability in Kalikot is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

#### Information Access Vulnerability

| Metric                                      | Score | Rank
|---------------------------------------------|-------|------
| Adult Literacy                             | 45.3% | 23/77
| Mean Years of Schooling                    | 2.54  | 15/77
| Primary School Enrollment                  | 96.4% | 3/77
| Student Teacher Ratio                      | 32.89 | 3/77

#### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

| Metric                                      | Score | Rank
|---------------------------------------------|-------|------
| Access to Safe Drinking Water               | 59.0% | 5/77
| Households without Toilet                   | 43.1% | 23/77
| Water Schemes in Disrepair                  | 49.4% | 5/77
| Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)              | 80.2  | 2/77
| Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)             | 51.5  | 2/77

#### Economic Constraints

| Metric                                      | Score | Rank
|---------------------------------------------|-------|------
| Income per Capita (PPP $)                   | $578  | 3/77
| Poverty Headcount Ratio                     | 57.9% | 3/77
| Poverty Gap                                | 16.8% | 3/77
| Age Dependency Ratio                       | 105.7 | 3/77

#### Food Insecurity

| Metric                                      | Score | Rank
|---------------------------------------------|-------|------
| Food Poverty Prevalence                     | 54.6% | 3/77
| Low kcal Intake Prevalence                  | 43.9% | 3/77
| Agricultural Insufficiency Rate             | 84.1% | 3/77

#### Gender Inequality

| Metric                                      | Score | Rank
|---------------------------------------------|-------|------
| Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity) | 0.54  | 11/77
| Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity) | 0.04  | 11/77
| No Female Home nor Land Ownership           | 97.4% | 3/77

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.942</td>
<td>5/77</td>
<td>0.821</td>
<td>11/77</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>23/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.726</td>
<td>5/77</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>23/77</td>
<td>0.576</td>
<td>23/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  RANK: 5 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.726

Vulnerability in Kalikot is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.745

59.7  3.8%
Life Expectancy  Disabled Population

Child Health  RANK: 6/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.719

54.1%  63.0  1087.8  90.1  112.1
Child Malnutrition Rate  Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)  Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)  Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)  Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 71 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.274

Kalikot exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Score**: 0.068  
- **Rank**: 74/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)**: 3,228  
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.)**: 56,553

**Governance**

- **Score**: 0.542  
- **Rank**: 27/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)**: 0.09  
- **Government Management (Score out of 9)**: 6.55  
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)**: 4.85  
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)**: 5.7  
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)**: 7.85  
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16)**: 8.95  
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7)**: 5.4  
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)**: 5.3

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Score**: 0.000  
- **Rank**: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
- **Protected Area**: 0.0%
Kalikot exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 72 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.274

Kalikot’s score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Food Insecurity
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 15 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.469
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 37 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.173
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 48 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.139
- **Landslide**: RANK: 11 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.488
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 50 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.104
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Kalikot’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.325
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.726
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.274
  - Country Score: 0.436
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NEPAL
KANCHANPUR
Area: 1,738 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

- **MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - High
  Score: 0.573 • Rank: 26/77

- **RESILIENCE (R)** - High
  Score: 0.559 • Rank: 20/77

- **MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Very High
  Score: 0.836 • Rank: 4/77

- **VULNERABILITY (V)** - Low
  Score: 0.391 • Rank: 54/77

- **COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - High
  Score: 0.509 • Rank: 20/77

- **Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)**: 686,739
- **Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)**: 40.3
- **Population below Poverty Line**: 31.4%
- **Population with Safe Drinking Water**: 96.9%
- **Adult Literacy**: 63.0%

KANCHANPUR, NEPAL
Area: 1,738 km²
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 4 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.836

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 1,498,500
  - $745.98 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - <1%
  - 2,212
  - $19.83 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 100%
  - 1,498,457
  - $745.98 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Wildfire**
  - 92%
  - 1,374,398
  - $641.01 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 86%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 26%
  - 388,472
  - $269.54 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 36%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 39%
  - 581,889
  - $364.32 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 49%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  

Vulnerability in Kanchanpur is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability  

- Adult Literacy: 63.0%  
- Mean Years of Schooling: 3.97  
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 97.2  
- Student Teacher Ratio: 19.82  

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability  

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 96.9%  
- Households without Toilet: 44.8%  
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 38.1%  
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 185.1  
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 31.1

Economic Constraints  

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $938  
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 31.4%  
- Poverty Gap: 8.0%  
- Age Dependency Ratio: 77.9

Food Insecurity  

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 28.2%  
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 24.6%  
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 39.4%

Gender Inequality  

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.35  
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.07  
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 84.4%
VULNERABILITY (V)  RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.391

Vulnerability in Kanchanpur is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  RANK: 44/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.365

- Life Expectancy: 66.1
- Disabled Population: 2.0%

Child Health  RANK: 48/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.378

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 31.7%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 40.3
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 647.8
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 64.2
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 35.7
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 20 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.509

Kanchanpur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)**: 17,141
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.)**: 100,042

**Governance**

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)**: 0.18
- **Government Management (Score out of 9)**: 7.29
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)**: 4.61
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)**: 6.43
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)**: 7.64
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16)**: 9.54
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7)**: 4.89
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)**: 5.25
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)**: 4.07
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)**: 2.5
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)**: 2.36

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Protected Area**: 42.2%

SCORE: 0.359  RANK: 26/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

SCORE: 0.534  RANK: 28/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

SCORE: 0.652  RANK: 16/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 20 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.509

Kanchanpur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.530  RANK: 33/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.514  RANK: 24/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 6.9% Households with Landline
- 1.0% Households with Internet
- 41.8% Households with Television
- 45.8% Households with Radio
- 64.3% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.495  RANK: 56/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 10 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 85.8% Improved Roadway
- 13.9 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 391.9 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 13.9 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 26.6 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 14.7 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.96 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.581  RANK: 29 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 75.2% Households with Electricity
- 7.7% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

RANK: 20 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.559

Kanchanpur’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Information Access Vulnerability
- Logistics Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
## HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>RANK: 45 / 77</td>
<td>0.370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>RANK: 13 / 77</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>RANK: 16 / 77</td>
<td>0.264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>RANK: 14 / 77</td>
<td>0.303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>RANK: 74 / 77</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>RANK: 7 / 77</td>
<td>0.385</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kanchanpur’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.836
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.391
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.509
  - Country Score: 0.436
NEPAL
KAPILVASTU
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NEPAL
KAPILVASTU
Area: 2,017 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High
Score: 0.595 • Rank: 19/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.464 • Rank: 47/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very High
Score: 0.712 • Rank: 14/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - High
Score: 0.470 • Rank: 29/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low
Score: 0.397 • Rank: 47/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
599,504

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
66.8

Population below Poverty Line
35.5%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
95.5%

Adult Literacy
47.1%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 14 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.712

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

**Earthquake**  
100%  
625,679  
$1.17 Billion  
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Landslide**  
1%  
3,159  
$1.45 Million  
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: <1%

**Extreme Heat**  
100%  
625,405  
$1.17 Billion  
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Wildfire**  
30%  
189,508  
$292.85 Million  
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 25%

**Fluvial Flood**  
15%  
93,369  
$241.47 Million  
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 21%

**Pluvial Flood**  
27%  
169,557  
$443.56 Million  
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 38%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
Vulnerability in Kapilvastu is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.
VULNERABILITY (V)  

**RANK: 29 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.470**

Vulnerability in Kapilvastu is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Vulnerable Health Status**  

**SCORE: 0.417  RANK: 32/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Child Health**  

**SCORE: 0.402  RANK: 44/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>329.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

Kapilvastu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>44/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>7.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>49/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kapilvastu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**
- **SCORE:** 0.423  
- **RANK:** 55/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Communications Capacity**
- **SCORE:** 0.296  
- **RANK:** 61/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - 2.4% Households with Landline
  - 0.5% Households with Internet
  - 25.9% Households with Television
  - 31.4% Households with Radio
  - 51.6% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**
- **SCORE:** 0.459  
- **RANK:** 64/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - 10 Road Density (km per sq. km)
  - 35.6% Improved Roadway
  - 44.4 Average Distance to Airport (km)
  - 54.6 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
  - 44.4 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
  - 9.4 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
  - 10.3 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
  - 0.82 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**
- **SCORE:** 0.515  
- **RANK:** 36/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - 63.7% Households with Electricity
  - 7.3% Households using Gas for Cooking
KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - RANK: 18 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.451

- **Extreme Heat**
  - RANK: 5 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.436

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 12 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.320

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 11 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.336

- **Landslide**
  - RANK: 64 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.051

- **Wildfire**
  - RANK: 11 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.340
Kapilvastu's score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: 0.712 (Districts Score: 0.559)
- **Vulnerability**: 0.470 (Districts Score: 0.463)
- **Coping Capacity**: 0.397 (Districts Score: 0.436)
NEPAL
KASIKI
Area: 395 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low
Score: 0.374 • Rank: 73/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very High
Score: 0.764 • Rank: 2/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High
Score: 0.652 • Rank: 28/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low
Score: 0.232 • Rank: 74/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High
Score: 0.761 • Rank: 3/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
2,017,532

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
13.1

Population below Poverty Line
4.0%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
93.3%

Adult Literacy
78.6%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 28 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.652

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
459,752
$1.21 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
57%
261,090
$298.9 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 25%

Extreme Heat
87%
400,911
$1.18 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 97%

Wildfire
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Fluvial Flood
3%
16,000
$2.81 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: <1%

Pluvial Flood
17%
77,252
$12.94 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 74 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.232

Vulnerability in Kaski is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability
- **78.6%** Adult Literacy
- **5.76** Mean Years of Schooling
- **96.9** Primary School Net Enrollment
- **14.63** Student Teacher Ratio

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability
- **93.3%** Access to Safe Drinking Water
- **0.9%** Households without Toilet
- **33.1%** Water Schemes in Disrepair
- **283.0** Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- **10.0** Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

### Economic Constraints
- **$1,561** Income per Capita (PPP $)
- **4.0%** Poverty Headcount Ratio
- **0.8%** Poverty Gap
- **60.3** Age Dependency Ratio

### Food Insecurity
- **9.2%** Food Poverty Prevalence
- **36.2%** Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- **70.0%** Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

### Gender Inequality
- **0.21** Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **0.03** Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **72.7%** No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 74 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.232

Vulnerability in Kaski is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

SCORE: 0.124  RANK: 74/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>73.5 Life Expectancy</td>
<td>0.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9% Disabled Population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health  

SCORE: 0.126  RANK: 75/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22.9% Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.1 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>373.0 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.9 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.0 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 3 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.761

Kaski exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.777  RANK: 5/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 31,245
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 180,983

**Governance**

- **Score:** 0.627  RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.1
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 7.38
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 6):** 4.94
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 6.38
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 7.69
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 8.19
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 5.63
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 5.5
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 5.5
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 4.06
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 3.69

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.891  RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Protected Area:** 78.9%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 3 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.761

Kaski exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.821  
RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.820  
RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.718  
RANK: 9/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.924  
RANK: 4 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 2 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.764  
Kaski’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Logistics Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

Earthquake
- RANK: 75 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.206

Extreme Heat
- RANK: 33 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.187

Fluvial Flood
- RANK: 70 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.077

Pluvial Flood
- RANK: 70 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.096

Landslide
- RANK: 53 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.144

Wildfire
- RANK: 58 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.001
Kaski’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
KATHMANDU
Area: 1,396 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low
Score: 0.296  •  Rank: 76/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very High
Score: 0.800  •  Rank: 1/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low
Score: 0.490  •  Rank: 48/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low
Score: 0.199  •  Rank: 77/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High
Score: 0.800  •  Rank: 1/77
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 48 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.490

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 2,940,083
  - $4.07 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 17%
  - 514,007
  - $389.96 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 10%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - <1%
  - 12,754
  - $19.45 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: <1%

- **Wildfire**
  - 0%
  - 0
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 13%
  - 376,324
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 26%
  - 767,145
  - $314.45 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 8%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Kathmandu is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td>77/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>77/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>74/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.149</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 77 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.199

Vulnerability in Kathmandu is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.058  RANK: 76/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

73.0
Life Expectancy

1.0%
Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.100  RANK: 77/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

32.0%
Child Malnutrition Rate

14.6
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

129.6
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

8.8
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

7.4
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.800

Kathmandu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Environmental Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>196,723 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>1/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>320,171 Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.35 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>29/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.95 Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.32 Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.82 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.91 Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.32 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.02 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.3% Protected Area</td>
<td>0.579</td>
<td>20/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 1.000

RANK: 29/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.534

RANK: 20/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.579
Kathmandu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Environmental Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

- **SCORE: 0.954**  
  **RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**Communications Capacity**

- **SCORE: 0.892**  
  **RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
  - 27.9% Households with Landline
  - 19.4% Households with Internet
  - 74.8% Households with Television
  - 56.1% Households with Radio
  - 90.7% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- **SCORE: 0.970**  
  **RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
  - 63 Road Density (km per sq. km)
  - 90.8% Improved Roadway
  - 5.3 Average Distance to Airport (km)
  - 78.1 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
  - 5.3 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
  - 1.6 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
  - 2.3 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
  - 47.56 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- **SCORE: 1.000**  
  **RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
  - 98.1% Households with Electricity
  - 88.4% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.800

Kathmandu's score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Communications Capacity
- Environmental Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity  
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability  
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Communications Capacity  
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Environmental Capacity  
Properly managed environments sustain populations by providing food, water, and even economic benefits from industries such as tourism. Increasing protected areas can also serve as additional buffers between the population and impacted areas.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 76 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.200
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 58 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.009
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 51 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.142
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 62 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.119
- **Landslide**: RANK: 56 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.095
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
MUTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Kathmandu’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Districts Score 0.490, Country Score 0.559
- **Vulnerability**: Districts Score 0.199, Country Score 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**: Districts Score 0.800, Country Score 0.436
NEPAL
KHOTANG
Area: 1,591 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low**
Score: 0.492 • Rank: 54/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Low**
Score: 0.461 • Rank: 49/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low**
Score: 0.397 • Rank: 62/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate**
Score: 0.456 • Rank: 34/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low**
Score: 0.379 • Rank: 54/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
175,340

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
34.6

Population below Poverty Line
25.0%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
80.0%

Adult Literacy
62.0%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 62 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.397

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
∈ 183,022
$435.79 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
98%
∈ 179,761
$424.88 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 98%

Extreme Heat
18%
∈ 32,419
$146.77 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 34%

Wildfire
0%
∈ 0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Fluvial Flood
<1%
∈ 608
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Pluvial Flood
1%
∈ 2,113
$24.79 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 6%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  RANK: 34 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.456

Vulnerability in Khotang is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability  RANK: 50/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 62.0% Adult Literacy
- 3.78 Mean Years of Schooling
- 96.4 Primary School Net Enrollment
- 19.39 Student Teacher Ratio

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability  RANK: 37/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 80.0% Access to Safe Drinking Water
- 36.6% Households without Toilet
- 29.6% Water Schemes in Disrepair
- 168.1 Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- 54.0 Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

Economic Constraints  RANK: 37/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- $1,132 Income per Capita (PPP $)
- 25.0% Poverty Headcount Ratio
- 5.0% Poverty Gap
- 89.8 Age Dependency Ratio

Food Insecurity  RANK: 33/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 29.2% Food Poverty Prevalence
- 35.1% Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- 64.4% Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

Gender Inequality  RANK: 33/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 0.31 Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 0.17 Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 78.5% No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)  RANK: 34 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.456

Vulnerability in Khotang is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.429  RANK: 30/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Life Expectancy: 67.0
- Disabled Population: 2.6%

Child Health

SCORE: 0.487  RANK: 31/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 33.6%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 34.6
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 1041.0
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 59.2
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 105.5
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.379

Khotang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **SCORE: 0.288**  
  - 9,477 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
  - 102,608 Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**

- **SCORE: 0.572**  
  - 0.32 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)
  - 6.69 Government Management (Score out of 9)
  - 4.83 Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)
  - 5.83 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
  - 7.03 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
  - 8.81 Service Flow (Score out of 16)
  - 5.39 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
  - 5.47 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

**Environmental Capacity**

- **SCORE: 0.000**  
  - 0.0% Protected Area
Khotang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
**RESILIENCE (R)**

Khotang’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Economic Constraints**
- **Food Insecurity**
- **Energy Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

### KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

#### Economic Constraints

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

#### Food Insecurity

The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

#### Energy Capacity

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

#### Communications Capacity

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 37 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.383
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 50 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.081
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 66 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.100
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 71 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.090
- **Landslide**: RANK: 27 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.398
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
Khotang’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.

### Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Districts Score</th>
<th>Country Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Hazard Exposure</td>
<td>0.397</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Capacity</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Safer world.
NEPAL
LALITPUR
Area: 385 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low**
Score: 0.289 • Rank: 77/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Very High**
Score: 0.759 • Rank: 3/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low**
Score: 0.385 • Rank: 65/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low**
Score: 0.248 • Rank: 72/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High**
Score: 0.766 • Rank: 2/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
548,401

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
13.8

Population below Poverty Line
7.6%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
79.1%

Adult Literacy
79.7%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 65 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.385

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
509,978
$2.6 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
20%
103,984
$275.71 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 11%

Extreme Heat
<1%
449

Wildfire
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Fluvial Flood
9%
45,908

Pluvial Flood
16%
81,237

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 72 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.248

Vulnerability in Lalitpur is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

- **79.7%** Adult Literacy  
- **6.47** Mean Years of Schooling  
- **95.5** Primary School Net Enrollment  
- **15.45** Student Teacher Ratio

SCORE: 0.239  
RANK: 75/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **79.1%** Access to Safe Drinking Water  
- **4.3%** Households without Toilet  
- **32.5%** Water Schemes in Disrepair  
- **135.0** Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)  
- **19.7** Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

SCORE: 0.308  
RANK: 63/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

### Economic Constraints

- **$1,894** Income per Capita (PPP $)  
- **7.6%** Poverty Headcount Ratio  
- **1.5%** Poverty Gap  
- **46.5** Age Dependency Ratio

SCORE: 0.136  
RANK: 76/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

### Food Insecurity

- **14.5%** Food Poverty Prevalence  
- **39.1%** Low kcal Intake Prevalence  
- **79.7%** Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

SCORE: 0.546  
RANK: 22/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

### Gender Inequality

- **0.21** Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)  
- **0.05** Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)  
- **77.7%** No Female Home nor Land Ownership

SCORE: 0.193  
RANK: 68/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 72 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.248

Vulnerability in Lalitpur is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.063  RANK: 75/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Life Expectancy: 73.2
- Disabled Population: 1.1%

Child Health

SCORE: 0.106  RANK: 76/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 16.2%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 13.8
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 327.5
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 18.8
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 30.5
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 2 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.766

Lalitpur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Environmental Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity</td>
<td>0.766</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>10.19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.38</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>13.1%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 2/77  
SCORE: 0.766

Lalitpur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Environmental Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.903  
RANK: 3/77

**Communications Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.862  
RANK: 3/77

- 30.4% Households with Landline
- 16.3% Households with Internet
- 66.2% Households with Television
- 57.4% Households with Radio
- 86.2% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.880  
RANK: 3/77

- 34 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 75.5% Improved Roadway
- 6.4 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 82.1 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 6.4 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 3.3 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 6.4 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 9.15 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.968  
RANK: 2/77

- 96.6% Households with Electricity
- 77.2% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 3 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.759

Lalitpur’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Environmental Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Environmental Capacity
Properly managed environments sustain populations by providing food, water, and even economic benefits from industries such as tourism. Increasing protected areas can also serve as additional buffers between the population and impacted areas.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

Earthquake  RANK: 74 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.218

Extreme Heat  RANK: 60 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.001

Fluvial Flood  RANK: 50 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.143

Pluvial Flood  RANK: 60 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.121

Landslide  RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.083

Wildfire  RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.000
Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: 0.385 (Districts Score: 0.248, Country Score: 0.559)
- **Vulnerability**: 0.248 (Districts Score: 0.463, Country Score: 0.463)
- **Coping Capacity**: 0.766 (Districts Score: 0.436, Country Score: 0.436)

Lalitpur’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
LAMJUNG
Area: 1,692 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low
Score: 0.499 • Rank: 53/77

RESILIENCE (R) - High
Score: 0.534 • Rank: 27/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate
Score: 0.564 • Rank: 36/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low
Score: 0.327 • Rank: 62/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low
Score: 0.396 • Rank: 48/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
153,480

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
17.0

Population below Poverty Line
16.8%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
89.1%

Adult Literacy
63.6%
# Multi-Hazard Exposure (MHE)

**RANK: 36 / 77 DISTRICTS**  
**SCORE: 0.564**

## Estimated Exposure to Each Hazard:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Probability</th>
<th>Estimated Population</th>
<th>Estimated Damage</th>
<th>Critical Infrastructure Exposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>152,086</td>
<td>$284.55 Million</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>147,752</td>
<td>$277.39 Million</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>113,026</td>
<td>$217.79 Million</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6,592</td>
<td>$10.61 Million</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>1,902</td>
<td>$18.63 Million</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8,518</td>
<td>$48.75 Million</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC's AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  

Vulnerability in Lamjung is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.315  RANK: 70/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 63.6% Adult Literacy
- 96.4 Mean Years of Schooling
- 10.84 Student Teacher Ratio

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.355  RANK: 57/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 89.1% Access to Safe Drinking Water
- 19.1% Households without Toilet
- 201.1 Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- 19.5 Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

Economic Constraints  
SCORE: 0.315  RANK: 67/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- -$9,999 Income per Capita (PPP $)
- 16.8% Poverty Headcount Ratio
- 79.9 Age Dependency Ratio

Food Insecurity  
SCORE: 0.401  RANK: 52/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 19.2% Food Poverty Prevalence
- 31.1% Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- 64.1% Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

Gender Inequality  
SCORE: 0.253  RANK: 59/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- 0.28 Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 0.07 Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 76.6% No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Lamjung is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 55/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.324

69.5
Life Expectancy

2.8%
Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 66/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.278

32.2%
Child Malnutrition Rate

17.0
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

659.1
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

36.0
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

49.4
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
Lamjung exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity.

The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Score**: 0.276  
- **Rank**: 39/77 Districts Assessed

- **8,058** Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)  
- **103,610** Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**

- **Score**: 0.197  
- **Rank**: 74/77 Districts Assessed

- **0.17** Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)  
- **5.75** Government Management (Score out of 9)  
- **3.83** Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)  
- **5.17** Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)  
- **6.33** Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)  
- **6.83** Service Flow (Score out of 16)  
- **2.67** Judicial Work (Score out of 7)  
- **1.5** Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

- **1.75** Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)  
- **1.33** Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)  
- **0.83** Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Score**: 0.469  
- **Rank**: 23/77 Districts Assessed

- **21.8%** Protected Area
Lamjung exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

**Communications Capacity**

**Logistics Capacity**

**Energy Capacity**
RESILIENCE (R)  

RANK: 27 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.534  

Lamjung's score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Communications Capacity
- Logistics Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity  
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability  
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Communications Capacity  
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Logistics Capacity  
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 56 / 77 districts assessed
  - Score: 0.336

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 32 / 77 districts assessed
  - Score: 0.222

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 69 / 77 districts assessed
  - Score: 0.094

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 47 / 77 districts assessed
  - Score: 0.139

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 40 / 77 districts assessed
  - Score: 0.346

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 47 / 77 districts assessed
  - Score: 0.129
Lamjung’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
MAHOTTARI
Area: 1,002 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -
Very High
Score: 0.639  •  Rank: 7/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.384  •  Rank: 61/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE
(MHE) - High
Score: 0.684  •  Rank: 22/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - High
Score: 0.506  •  Rank: 25/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very
Low
Score: 0.275  •  Rank: 70/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
715,040

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
61.8

Population below Poverty Line
16.2%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
90.6%

Adult Literacy
37.0%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 22 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.684

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
- 620,548
- $1.16 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
1%
- 4,792
- $19.9 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

Extreme Heat
100%
- 619,710
- $1.16 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Wildfire
8%
- 49,376
- $132.99 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 11%

Fluvial Flood
29%
- 178,964
- $312.47 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 27%

Pluvial Flood
42%
- 259,724
- $454.22 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 39%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  

Vulnerability in Mahottari is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**  
SCORE: 0.866  
RANK: 5/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
- Adult Literacy: 37.0%  
- Mean Years of Schooling: 2.46  
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 89.5%  
- Student Teacher Ratio: 47.93

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**  
SCORE: 0.612  
RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 90.6%  
- Households without Toilet: 72.5%  
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 43.8%  
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 218.3  
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 137.2

**Economic Constraints**  
SCORE: 0.495  
RANK: 38/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
- Income per Capita (PPP $): $681  
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 16.2%  
- Poverty Gap: 3.5%  
- Age Dependency Ratio: 90.5

**Food Insecurity**  
SCORE: 0.264  
RANK: 65/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
- Food Poverty Prevalence: 20.3%  
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 21.8%  
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 55.5%

**Gender Inequality**  
SCORE: 0.402  
RANK: 36/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.50  
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.05  
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 78.9%
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 25 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.506

Vulnerability in Mahottari is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Vulnerable Health Status**  
SCORE: 0.399  
RANK: 34/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 63.5 Life Expectancy
- 1.6% Disabled Population

**Child Health**  
SCORE: 0.411  
RANK: 40/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 43.6% Child Malnutrition Rate
- 61.8 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- 499.9 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- 32.5 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- 52.6 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

**RANK: 70 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.275**

Mahottari exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

**SCORE: 0.341**

**RANK: 31/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 17,284
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 94,400

### Governance

**SCORE: 0.062**

**RANK: 76/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.14
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 0
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 8):** 1
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 0
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 0
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 0
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 0
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 0
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 0
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 0
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 0

### Environmental Capacity

**SCORE: 0.000**

**RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **Protected Area:** 0.0%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 70 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.275

Mahottari exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Infrastructure Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications</td>
<td>45/77</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics</td>
<td>14/77</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy</td>
<td>45/77</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communications Capacity

- 2.2% Households with Landline
- 0.2% Households with Internet
- 31.9% Households with Television
- 34.9% Households with Radio
- 51.0% Households with Mobile Phone

### Logistics Capacity

- 18 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 92.7% Improved Roadway
- 16.2 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 111.2 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 16.2 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 10.6 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 10.6 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.42 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

### Energy Capacity

- 63.2% Households with Electricity
- 3.0% Households using Gas for Cooking
**RESILIENCE (R)**

RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

SCORE: 0.384

Mahottari’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Information Access Vulnerability**
- **Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
- **Communications Capacity**
- **Energy Capacity**

**KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE**

**Information Access Vulnerability**

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Clean Water Access Vulnerability**

Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Energy Capacity**

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 5 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.506

- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.485

- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 2 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.430

- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.437

- **Landslide**: RANK: 68 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.036

- **Wildfire**: RANK: 26 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.263
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Mahottari’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Districts Score 0.684, Country Score 0.559
- **Vulnerability**: Districts Score 0.506, Country Score 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**: Districts Score 0.275, Country Score 0.436
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NEPAL
MAKAWANPUR
Area: 2,426 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate**
Score: 0.550 • Rank: 32/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - High**
Score: 0.542 • Rank: 23/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very High**
Score: 0.736 • Rank: 10/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate**
Score: 0.441 • Rank: 39/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High**
Score: 0.526 • Rank: 17/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) **461,053**
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) **32.4**
- Population below Poverty Line **27.9%**
- Population with Safe Drinking Water **80.8%**
- Adult Literacy **61.8%**
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 10 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.736

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
- 100%
- 399,546
- $1.06 Billion
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
- 59%
- 235,181
- $620.06 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 59%

Extreme Heat
- 68%
- 273,110
- $848.92 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 80%

Wildfire
- 50%
- 199,922
- $506.13 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 48%

Fluvial Flood
- 3%
- 13,710
- $315.13 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 30%

Pluvial Flood
- 14%
- 54,886
- $480.66 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 45%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Makawanpur is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Gender Inequality. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- **61.8%** Adult Literacy
- **3.63** Mean Years of Schooling
- **91.4** Primary School Net Enrollment
- **29.23** Student Teacher Ratio

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **80.8%** Access to Safe Drinking Water
- **40.3%** Households without Toilet
- **41.6%** Water Schemes in Disrepair
- **51.3** Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- **14.2** Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

Economic Constraints

- **$1,410** Income per Capita (PPP $)
- **27.9%** Poverty Headcount Ratio
- **7.3%** Poverty Gap
- **72.9** Age Dependency Ratio

Food Insecurity

- **25.6%** Food Poverty Prevalence
- **41.4%** Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- **46.0%** Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

Gender Inequality

- **0.28** Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **0.22** Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **80.2%** No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 39 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.441

Vulnerability in Makawanpur is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Gender Inequality. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 60/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.294

68.0 Life Expectancy
2.0% Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 65/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.280

25.1% Child Malnutrition Rate
32.4 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
568.6 Child ARIs Incidence (per 1,000)
42.5 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
40.5 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 17 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.526

Makawanpur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**  RANK: 13/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.510

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>24,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>123,348</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**  RANK: 48/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.443

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>7.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>2.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**  RANK: 28/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.400

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 17 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.526

Makawanpur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.628  RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.602  RANK: 10/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 6.6% Households with Landline
- 2.4% Households with Internet
- 38.5% Households with Television
- 59.7% Households with Radio
- 66.7% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.633  RANK: 19/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 14 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 80.9% Improved Roadway
- 13.7 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 63.5 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 13.7 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 10.0 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 14.3 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 2.71 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.649  RANK: 17 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 72.6% Households with Electricity
- 18.9% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
**RANK: 23 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.542**

Makawanpur’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Information Access Vulnerability**
- **Gender Inequality**
- **Communications Capacity**
- **Logistics Capacity**

### KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

#### Information Access Vulnerability

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

#### Gender Inequality

Marginalized populations are less likely to have their needs met under pre-disaster conditions, and therefore become even more susceptible to harm during times of disaster. Increase gender-based inclusion in all phases of DM, ensuring the implementation at subnational and local levels. Courses of action must recognize the role of women in society and support changes to policies and programs to promote gender-equal access.

#### Communications Capacity

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

#### Logistics Capacity

Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 34 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.385
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 24 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.290
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 19 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.226
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 20 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.245
- **Landslide**: RANK: 46 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.314
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 17 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.299
Makawanpur’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Score 0.736 (Districts Score 0.559)
- **Vulnerability**: Score 0.441 (Districts Score 0.463)
- **Coping Capacity**: Score 0.526 (Districts Score 0.436)
NEPAL
MANANG
Area: 2,246 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low
Score: 0.365  •  Rank: 74/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very High
Score: 0.644  •  Rank: 7/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low
Score: 0.383  •  Rank: 66/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Low
Score: 0.364  •  Rank: 59/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High
Score: 0.653  •  Rank: 4/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
5,645

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
0.0

Population below Poverty Line
36.9%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
95.5%

Adult Literacy
70.8%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 66 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.383

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
5,201
$16.65 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
100%
5,197
$16.48 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 99%

Extreme Heat
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Wildfire
49%
2,536
$5.49 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 33%

Fluvial Flood
29%
1,532
$0.25 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

Pluvial Flood
37%
1,937
$2.08 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 12%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
Vulnerability in Manang is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**
- Adult Literacy: 70.8%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 4.79
- Primary School Net Enrollment Student Teacher Ratio: 1.98
- Female to Male Literacy Ratio: 0.30
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.10

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**
- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 95.5%
- Households without Toilet: 34.6%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 36.1%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 39.1
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 0.0

**Economic Constraints**
- Income per Capita (PPP $): $3,166
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 36.9%
- Poverty Gap: 9.9%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 47.2

**Food Insecurity**
- Food Poverty Prevalence: 22.9%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 34.9%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 86.3%

**Gender Inequality**
- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.30
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.10
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 79.4%
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Manang is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

Score: 0.376  RANK: 42/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

69.9  Life Expectancy
3.1%  Disabled Population

Child Health

Score: 0.389  RANK: 45/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

54.7%  Child Malnutrition Rate
0.0  Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
725.2  Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
47.8  Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
75.1  Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
**RANK: 4 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.653**

Manang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **Score:** 0.500  
- **Rank:** 14/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>232,454</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance

- **Score:** 0.820  
- **Rank:** 1/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>7.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>11.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>6.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>4.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

- **Score:** 0.943  
- **Rank:** 2/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>88.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Manang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

**Communications Capacity**

- 8.0% Households with Landline
- 1.3% Households with Internet
- 32.9% Households with Television
- 53.9% Households with Radio
- 66.5% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- 1 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 0.0% Improved Roadway
- 44.4 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 164.6 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 44.4 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 8.7 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 15.9 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 17.71 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- 88.9% Households with Electricity
- 1.6% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

Manang’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Food Insecurity**
- **Information Access Vulnerability**
- **Logistics Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Food Insecurity**

The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Information Access Vulnerability**

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Logistics Capacity**

Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 77 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.188
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 49 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.144
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 53 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.131
- **Landslide**: RANK: 52 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.209
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 42 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.165
Manang’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.

| Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores: |
|---|---|---|
| Multi-Hazard Exposure | 0.383 | 0.559 |
| Vulnerability | 0.364 | 0.463 |
| Coping Capacity | 0.653 | 0.436 |
NEPAL
MORANG
Area: 1,855 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -**
Low
Score: 0.512 • Rank: 47/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Very High**
Score: 0.619 • Rank: 11/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very High**
Score: 0.774 • Rank: 7/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low**
Score: 0.317 • Rank: 66/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High**
Score: 0.554 • Rank: 13/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
1,147,186

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
36.5

Population below Poverty Line
16.5%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
97.2%

Adult Literacy
64.9%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 7 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.774

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 971,624 people
  - $2.34 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 3%
  - 33,957 people
  - $25.87 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 99%
  - 962,991 people
  - $2.32 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Wildfire**
  - 0%
  - 0 people
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 30%
  - 293,475 people
  - $1.29 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 55%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 49%
  - 473,038 people
  - $1.69 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 72%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
Vulnerability in Morang is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability Area</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Information Access Vulnerability</strong></td>
<td>0.561</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>24.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Access to Clean Water Vulnerability</strong></td>
<td>0.331</td>
<td>59/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>233.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Economic Constraints</strong></td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>64/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$1,251</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food Insecurity</strong></td>
<td>0.169</td>
<td>72/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender Inequality</strong></td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>64/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vulnerability in Morang is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Child Health**

- **Score**: 0.264
- **Rank**: 70/77 districts assessed

- **31.5%** Child Malnutrition Rate
- **36.5** Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- **486.1** Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- **25.5** Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- **35.3** Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)

**Vulnerable Health Status**

- **Score**: 0.288
- **Rank**: 61/77 districts assessed

- **67.3** Life Expectancy
- **1.8%** Disabled Population

---

*National Disaster Preparedness Baseline Assessment: Nepal*
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**  
**RANK: 13 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.554**

Morang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th><strong>RANK: 4/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>49,026 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>129,899 Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th><strong>RANK: 43/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.17 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.790</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.75 Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.27 Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>0.300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.86 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>0.200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.57 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>0.100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5 Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.09 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.46 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th><strong>RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0% Protected Area</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 13 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.554

Morang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

**Communications Capacity**

**Logistics Capacity**

**Energy Capacity**

12
Road Density (km per sq. km)
89.2%
Improved Roadway
11.9
Average Distance to Airport (km)
31.6
Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
11.9
Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
12.0
Average Distance to Police Station (km)
10.9
Average Distance to Hospital (km)
2.88
Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

7.9%
Households with Landline
2.6%
Households with Internet
45.5%
Households with Television
39.8%
Households with Radio
67.8%
Households with Mobile Phone

75.8%
Households with Electricity
23.3%
Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 11 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.619

Morang’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.343
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 16 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.350
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 8 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.334
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.346
- **Landslide**: RANK: 70 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.027
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
Morang's score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:</th>
<th>DISTRICTS SCORE</th>
<th>COUNTRY SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Hazard Exposure</td>
<td>0.774</td>
<td>0.559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.317</td>
<td>0.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coping Capacity</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.436</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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NEPAL
MUGU
Area: 3,535 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate
Score: 0.529  •  Rank: 39/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low
Score: 0.365  •  Rank: 63/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low
Score: 0.319  •  Rank: 76/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very High
Score: 0.680  •  Rank: 9/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Moderate
Score: 0.410  •  Rank: 39/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) 66,658
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) 41.2
Population below Poverty Line 47.1%
Population with Safe Drinking Water 75.3%
Adult Literacy 39.3%
### MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

**RANK:** 76 / 77 DISTRICTS  
**SCORE:** 0.319

#### ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Value (Million)</th>
<th>Critical Infrastructure Exposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56,315</td>
<td>$75.03</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>56,315</td>
<td>$74.92</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1,069</td>
<td>$3.87</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>$0.97</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>4,440</td>
<td>$1.82</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.680 

Vulnerability in Mugu is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.676  RANK: 18/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
39.3%  Adult Literacy  
2.5  Mean Years of Schooling  
96.3  Primary School Net Enrollment  
27.75  Student Teacher Ratio  

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.565  RANK: 17/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
75.3%  Access to Safe Drinking Water  
51.6%  Households without Toilet  
43.9%  Water Schemes in Disrepair  
165.5  Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)  
73.0  Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)  

Economic Constraints  
SCORE: 0.777  RANK: 9/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
$866  Income per Capita (PPP $)  
47.1%  Poverty Headcount Ratio  
12.5%  Poverty Gap  
99.7  Age Dependency Ratio  

Food Insecurity  
SCORE: 0.694  RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
47.2%  Food Poverty Prevalence  
42.6%  Low kcal Intake Prevalence  
71.1%  Agricultural Insufficiency Rate  

Gender Inequality  
SCORE: 0.658  RANK: 8/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
0.68  Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)  
0.02  Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)  
95.5%  No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.680

Vulnerability in Mugu is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Vulnerable Health Status**

RANK: 5/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.709

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>59.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Child Health**

RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.669

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>933.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>183.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 39 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.410

Mugu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.125  **Rank:** 66/77 Districts Assessed
- **GDP:** 1,955 Million Rs.
- **Labor Productivity:** 77,260 Rs.

**Governance**

- **Score:** 0.811  **Rank:** 2/77 Districts Assessed
- **Average Annual Conflict:** 0.57 (per 10,000)
- **Government Management:** 7.5 (Score out of 9)
- **Organization and Administration:** 6.75 (Score out of 6)
- **Budget and Plan Management:** 7.25 (Score out of 11)
- **Fiscal and Financial Management:** 7.5 (Score out of 11)
- **Service Flow:** 12.5 (Score out of 16)
- **Judicial Work:** 3.25 (Score out of 7)
- **Physical Infrastructure:** 3.25 (Score out of 13)
- **Social Inclusion:** 6 (Score out of 10)
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management:** 6 (Score out of 9)
- **Cooperation and Coordination:** 6 (Score out of 6)

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.623  **Rank:** 18/77 Districts Assessed
- **Protected Area:** 38.5%
Mugu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 63 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.365

Mugu’s score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Vulnerable Health Status
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Economic Constraints**

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Vulnerable Health Status**

A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

**Energy Capacity**

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 26 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.412

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 61 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.000

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 65 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.107

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 69 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.099

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 19 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.432

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 48 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.122
Mugu’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
Safer world.
**NEPAL MUSTANG**

Area: 3,573 km²

---

**RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE**

- **MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low**
  - Score: 0.391  •  Rank: 72/77

- **RESILIENCE (R) - High**
  - Score: 0.568  •  Rank: 18/77

- **MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low**
  - Score: 0.310  •  Rank: 77/77

- **VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate**
  - Score: 0.424  •  Rank: 45/77

- **COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High**
  - Score: 0.559  •  Rank: 12/77

---

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)

**14,596**

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

**26.3**

Population below Poverty Line

**40.0%**

Population with Safe Drinking Water

**90.4%**

Adult Literacy

**61.3%**
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 77 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.310

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
11,988
$25.78 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
96%
11,500
$22.99 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 89%

Extreme Heat
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Wildfire
12%
1,414
$2.57 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 10%

Fluvial Flood
8%
903
$0.38 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

Pluvial Flood
25%
3,010
$5.91 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 23%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY

Vulnerability in Mustang is primarily driven by Vulnerable Health Status and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability
- **Score:** 0.465
- **Rank:** 46/77 Districts Assessed
- **61.3%** Adult Literacy
- **3.86** Mean Years of Schooling
- **92.1%** Primary School Net Enrollment
- **6.14** Student Teacher Ratio

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability
- **Score:** 0.350
- **Rank:** 58/77 Districts Assessed
- **90.4%** Access to Safe Drinking Water
- **36.6%** Households without Toilet
- **36.0%** Water Schemes in Disrepair
- **79.5** Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- **49.7** Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

### Economic Constraints
- **Score:** 0.435
- **Rank:** 54/77 Districts Assessed
- **$1,922** Income per Capita (PPP $)
- **40.0%** Poverty Headcount Ratio
- **10.9%** Poverty Gap
- **52.1** Age Dependency Ratio

### Food Insecurity
- **Score:** 0.425
- **Rank:** 44/77 Districts Assessed
- **21.5%** Food Poverty Prevalence
- **37.2%** Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- **56.7%** Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

### Gender Inequality
- **Score:** 0.399
- **Rank:** 38/77 Districts Assessed
- **0.33** Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **0.06** Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **88.0%** No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)  

SCORE: 0.424  
RANK: 45/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Vulnerability in Mustang is primarily driven by Vulnerable Health Status and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

SCORE: 0.468  
RANK: 25/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Life Expectancy: 69.6
- Disabled Population: 3.4%

Child Health  

SCORE: 0.581  
RANK: 20/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 54.7%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 26.3
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 1175.6
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 42.7
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 148.4
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

**RANK: 12 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.559**

Mustang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**  

- **Score:** 0.311  
- **Rank:** 32/77 Districts Assessed  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GDP</td>
<td>1.055</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>135,529</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>135,529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**  

- **Score:** 0.667  
- **Rank:** 4/77 Districts Assessed  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>9.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>6.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**  

- **Score:** 1.000  
- **Rank:** 1/77 Districts Assessed  

- **Score:** 99.4%  
- **Protected Area**
COPING CAPACITY (CC)

RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.559

Mustang exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

SCORE: 0.492
RANK: 39/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity

SCORE: 0.443
RANK: 41/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity

SCORE: 0.396
RANK: 74/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity

SCORE: 0.637
RANK: 21/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Households with Landline: 7.3%
Households with Internet: 1.5%
Households with Television: 13.6%
Households with Radio: 37.4%
Households with Mobile Phone: 71.2%

Road Density (km per sq. km): 0.0%
Average Distance to Airport (km): 83.1
Average Distance to Dry Port (km): 173.1
Average Distance to Warehouse (km): 83.1
Average Distance to Police Station (km): 11.2
Average Distance to Hospital (km): 20.8
Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000): 10.28

Households with Electricity: 71.2%
Households using Gas for Cooking: 18.1%
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 18 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.568

Mustang’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Vulnerable Health Status
- Information Access Vulnerability
- Logistics Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Vulnerable Health Status
A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 73 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.237
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.113
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 34 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.180
- **Landslide**: RANK: 49 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.257
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 49 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.106
Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.310
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.424
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.559
  - Country Score: 0.436

Mustang’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.
Safer world.
NEPAL MYAGDI
Area: 2,297 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low**
Score: 0.480 • Rank: 60/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Moderate**
Score: 0.501 • Rank: 38/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low**
Score: 0.442 • Rank: 53/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - High**
Score: 0.471 • Rank: 28/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High**
Score: 0.473 • Rank: 27/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
  107,372

- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
  29.1

- Population below Poverty Line
  28.6%

- Population with Safe Drinking Water
  87.8%

- Adult Literacy
  65.2%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 53 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.442

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

**Earthquake**
- Percentage: 100%
- Population: 103,042
- Economic Loss: $188.19 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Landslide**
- Percentage: 100%
- Population: 103,042
- Economic Loss: $188.19 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Extreme Heat**
- Percentage: 0%
- Population: 0
- Economic Loss: $0
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

**Wildfire**
- Percentage: 26%
- Population: 27,295
- Economic Loss: $68.55 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 36%

**Fluvial Flood**
- Percentage: 4%
- Population: 3,791
- Economic Loss: $2.96 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

**Pluvial Flood**
- Percentage: 7%
- Population: 7,628
- Economic Loss: $2.96 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
**VULNERABILITY (V)**  
**RANK: 28 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.471**  

Vulnerability in Myagdi is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>62/77</td>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>97.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>12.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>46/77</td>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>37.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>186.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.553</td>
<td>30/77</td>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$1,028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>86.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>36/77</td>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>25/77</td>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>84.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VULNERABILITY (V)**

Vulnerability in Myagdi is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Vulnerable Health Status**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Child Health**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>47.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>663.7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 27 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.473

Myagdi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **SCORE:** 0.187  
- **RANK:** 56/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 4,722 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
- 87,205 Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**

- **SCORE:** 0.648  
- **RANK:** 9/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 0.23 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)
- 7.15 Government Management (Score out of 9)
- 5.25 Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)
- 6.7 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- 7.85 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- 10.2 Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- 6.1 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- 6.65 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

**Environmental Capacity**

- **SCORE:** 0.508  
- **RANK:** 22/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 25.7% Protected Area
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 27 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED 
SCORE: 0.473

Myagdi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.476  RANK: 41/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.486  RANK: 33/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.357  RANK: 75/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.584  RANK: 28 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.501  
Myagdi’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Economic Constraints
- Logistics Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Logistics Capacity**
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 55 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.339
- **Extreme Heat**:  
  RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.000
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 56 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.132
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.119
- **Landslide**: RANK: 39 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.353
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 29 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
  SCORE: 0.235
Myagdi’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Districts score 0.442, Country score 0.559
- **Vulnerability**: Districts score 0.471, Country score 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**: Districts score 0.473, Country score 0.436

**RANK WITHIN DISTRICTS**

Score: 0.480
NEPAL
NAWALPARASI EAST
Area: 1,826 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate
Score: 0.515 • Rank: 45/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very High
Score: 0.641 • Rank: 8/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very High
Score: 0.827 • Rank: 5/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low
Score: 0.290 • Rank: 70/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High
Score: 0.571 • Rank: 10/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
381,105

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
37.8

Population below Poverty Line
17.0%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
91.9%

Adult Literacy
63.7%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 5 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.827

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
- 100%
- 307,095
- $589.03 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
- 26%
- 78,621
- $179.61 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 30%

Extreme Heat
- 100%
- 307,095
- $589.03 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Wildfire
- 100%
- 305,817
- $589.03 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Fluvial Flood
- 13%
- 40,349
- $81.18 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 14%

Pluvial Flood
- 29%
- 89,956
- $201.16 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 34%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Nawalparasi East is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>RANK: 70 / 77</td>
<td>SCORE: 0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrolment</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>91.9%</td>
<td>RANK: 66 / 77</td>
<td>SCORE: 0.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>150.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$1,157</td>
<td>RANK: 59 / 77</td>
<td>SCORE: 0.384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
<td>RANK: 74 / 77</td>
<td>SCORE: 0.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>RANK: 69 / 77</td>
<td>SCORE: 0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  

**RANK: 70 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.290**

Vulnerability in Nawalparasi East is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Vulnerable Health Status**  

**RANK: 66/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.267**

- **67.8** Life Expectancy
- **1.7%** Disabled Population

**Child Health**  

**RANK: 73/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.253**

- **38.9%** Child Malnutrition Rate
- **37.8** Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- **349.0** Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- **17.9** Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- **25.5** Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 10 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.571

Nawalparasi East exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30,140 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>16/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97,732 Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.11 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.624</td>
<td>14/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.43 Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.14 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.46 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.18 Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.54 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.25 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.21 Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.54 Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.61 Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.8% Protected Area</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.411</td>
<td>26/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nawalparasi East exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

**Communications Capacity**

- 4.6% Households with Landline
- 1.9% Households with Internet
- 46.8% Households with Television
- 45.5% Households with Radio
- 76.6% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- 17 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 60.3% Improved Roadway
- 44.8 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 77.3 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 44.8 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 7.2 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 10.4 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.15 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- 80.9% Households with Electricity
- 17.0% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 8 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.641

Nawalparasi East’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Information Access Vulnerability**
- **Economic Constraints**
- **Communications Capacity**
- **Logistics Capacity**

### KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Information Access Vulnerability**

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Economic Constraints**

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Logistics Capacity**

Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- Earthquake: RANK: 69 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.287
- Extreme Heat: RANK: 28 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.270
- Fluvial Flood: RANK: 32 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.179
- Pluvial Flood: RANK: 28 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.212
- Landslide: RANK: 55 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.108
- Wildfire: RANK: 12 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.323
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Nawalparasi East’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Districts Score: 0.827, Country Score: 0.559
- **Vulnerability**: Districts Score: 0.290, Country Score: 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**: Districts Score: 0.571, Country Score: 0.436
DISTRICT PROFILE

NEPAL
NAWALPARASI WEST

Area: 927 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Low
Score: 0.488 • Rank: 56/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Very High
Score: 0.615 • Rank: 12/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - High
Score: 0.694 • Rank: 19/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Very Low
Score: 0.291 • Rank: 68/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - High
Score: 0.521 • Rank: 18/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) 385,515
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) 37.8
Population below Poverty Line 17.0%
Population with Safe Drinking Water 91.9%
Adult Literacy 63.7%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 19 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.694

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake

100%

335,722
$729.77 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide

1%

2,987
$21.18 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

Extreme Heat

100%

335,514
$729.77 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Wildfire

25%

84,983
$161.27 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 22%

Fluvial Flood

32%

105,837
$278.69 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 38%

Pluvial Flood

40%

132,660
$245.39 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 34%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Nawalparasi West is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>63.7% Adult Literacy</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.97 Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95.4 Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.8 Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>67/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91.9% Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>0.277</td>
<td>67/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.0% Households without Toilet</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.7% Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.4 Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8 Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,157 Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>59/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.0% Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8% Poverty Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72.0 Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.9% Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>0.159</td>
<td>74/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.2% Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.9% Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.29 Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>69/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.03 Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.9% No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 68 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.291

Vulnerability in Nawalparasi West is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.278  RANK: 64/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

67.8  Life Expectancy
1.7%  Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.286  RANK: 61/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

38.9%  Child Malnutrition Rate
37.8  Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
356.9  Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
32.8  Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
26.4  Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

Rank: 18 / 77
Score: 0.521

Nawalparasi West exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **Score:** 0.486
- **Rank:** 16/77
- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 30,140
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 97,732

### Governance

- **Score:** 0.550
- **Rank:** 25/77
- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.21
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 7.14
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 6):** 4.54
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 6.14
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 6.96
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 9.57
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 6.14
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 6.43
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 4.18
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 3.04
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 1.25

### Environmental Capacity

- **Score:** 0.118
- **Rank:** 40/77
- **Protected Area:** 1.4%
Nawalparasi West exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Communications Capacity**

- 4.6% Households with Landline
- 1.9% Households with Internet
- 46.8% Households with Television
- 45.5% Households with Radio
- 76.6% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- 17 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 60.3% Improved Roadway
- 36.1 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 30.9 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 36.1 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 6.8 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 8.2 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.14 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- 80.9% Households with Electricity
- 17.0% Households using Gas for Cooking
KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population's ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
### HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>RANK:</th>
<th>SCORE:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>63 / 77</td>
<td>0.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>25 / 77</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>15 / 77</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>17 / 77</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>67 / 77</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>33 / 77</td>
<td>0.202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nawalparasi West's score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL NUWKOT
Area: 1,121 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

- MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate
  Score: 0.517  •  Rank: 43/77

- RESILIENCE (R) - Moderate
  Score: 0.530  •  Rank: 30/77

- MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate
  Score: 0.611  •  Rank: 33/77

- VULNERABILITY (V) - Low
  Score: 0.394  •  Rank: 53/77

- COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Moderate
  Score: 0.455  •  Rank: 31/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
262,981

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
23.2

Population below Poverty Line
20.3%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
88.6%

Adult Literacy
50.6%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 33 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.611

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%

- 253,229
- $527.34 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
97%

- 246,110
- $453.14 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 86%

Extreme Heat
55%

- 139,350
- $401.56 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 76%

Wildfire
<1%

- 85
- $7.49 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Fluvial Flood
1%

- 3,192
- $7.49 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

Pluvial Flood
5%

- 13,704
- $7.49 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
DISTRICT PROFILE

VULNERABILITY (V)

Score: 0.394

Vulnerability in Nuwakot is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Gender Inequality. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- Adult Literacy: 50.6%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 3.26
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 95.8
- Student Teacher Ratio: 20.02

Score: 0.564

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 88.6%
- Households without Toilet: 40.7%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 30.3%
- Typhoid Incidence: 146.7
- Cholera Incidence: 50.8

Score: 0.385

Economic Constraints

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $1,086
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 20.3%
- Poverty Gap: 4.2%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 74.9

Score: 0.422

Food Insecurity

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 25.3%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 36.7%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 36.9%

Score: 0.315

Gender Inequality

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio: 0.32
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio: 0.11
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 84.5%

Score: 0.430
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 53 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.394

Vulnerability in Nuwakot is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Gender Inequality. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 69/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.251

69.1
Life Expectancy
1.7%
Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 62/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.284

37.1%
Child Malnutrition Rate
23.2
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
482.6
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
33.9
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
47.3
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.455

Nuwakot exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.283  
- **Rank:** 37/77 Districts Assessed

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 12,267
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 92,653

**Governance**

- **Score:** 0.429  
- **Rank:** 51/77 Districts Assessed

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.2
- **Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9):** 6.44
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 5.83
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 6.13
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 7.9
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 5.06
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 4.85
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 2.96
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 2.33
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 2.77

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.404  
- **Rank:** 27/77 Districts Assessed

- **Protected Area:** 16.3%

- **Districts Assessed:**
  - Communications Capacity: 2
  - Energy Capacity: 1
  - Environmental Capacity: 1
  - Economic Capacity: 1
  - Governance: 1
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.455

Nuwakot exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  SCORE: 0.572  RANK: 22/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  RANK: 32/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.487

Logistics Capacity  RANK: 20/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.619

Energy Capacity  RANK: 26 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.610
KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Information Access Vulnerability**
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Gender Inequality**
Marginalized populations are less likely to have their needs met under pre-disaster conditions, and therefore become even more susceptible to harm during times of disaster. Increase gender-based inclusion in all phases of DM, ensuring the implementation at subnational and local levels. Courses of action must recognize the role of women in society and support changes to policies and programs to promote gender-equal access.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- Earthquake: RANK: 43 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.373

- Extreme Heat: RANK: 29 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.257

- Fluvial Flood: RANK: 63 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.112

- Pluvial Flood: RANK: 58 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.124

- Landslide: RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.388

- Wildfire: RANK: 55 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.042
Nuwakot's score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
OKHALDHUNGA
Area: 1,074 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low**
Score: 0.489 • Rank: 55/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Low**
Score: 0.463 • Rank: 48/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low**
Score: 0.395 • Rank: 63/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate**
Score: 0.431 • Rank: 44/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low**
Score: 0.358 • Rank: 56/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
140,914

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
24.7

Population below Poverty Line
20.5%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
84.5%

Adult Literacy
56.1%
**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)**

RANK: 63 / 77 DISTRICTS  
SCORE: 0.395

### ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

**Earthquake**
- 100%
- 134,316
- $260.37 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Landslide**
- 100%
- 134,201
- $260.37 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Extreme Heat**
- 6%
- 7,605
- $7.39 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

**Wildfire**
- 0%
- 0
- $0
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

**Fluvial Flood**
- 1%
- 795
- $11.18 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 4%

**Pluvial Flood**
- 2%
- 2,512
- $23.57 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 9%

---

**NOTE:** Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Okhaldhunga is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

- **Score**: 0.495
- **Rank**: 43/77 Districts Assessed
- **56.1%** Adult Literacy
- **3.43** Mean Years of Schooling
- **96.2%** Primary School Net Enrollment
- **15.81** Student Teacher Ratio

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **Score**: 0.406
- **Rank**: 41/77 Districts Assessed
- **84.5%** Access to Safe Drinking Water
- **29.2%** Households without Toilet
- **35.6%** Water Schemes in Disrepair
- **172.4** Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- **37.8** Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

### Economic Constraints

- **Score**: 0.477
- **Rank**: 44/77 Districts Assessed
- **$957** Income per Capita (PPP $)
- **20.5%** Poverty Headcount Ratio
- **4.1%** Poverty Gap
- **86.4** Age Dependency Ratio

### Food Insecurity

- **Score**: 0.512
- **Rank**: 28/77 Districts Assessed
- **29.1%** Food Poverty Prevalence
- **33.9%** Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- **68.4%** Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

### Gender Inequality

- **Score**: 0.211
- **Rank**: 65/77 Districts Assessed
- **0.35** Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **0.06** Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **70.2%** No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Okhaldhunga is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

Score: 0.487  Rank: 23/77 Districts Assessed

- Life Expectancy: 66.8
- Disabled Population: 2.4%

Child Health

Score: 0.694  Rank: 8/77 Districts Assessed

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 56.7%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 24.7
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 1589.1
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 76.3
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 133.7
Okhaldhunga exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

\[ \text{SCORE: 0.182} \quad \text{RANK: 58/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED} \]

\[ \text{Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.): 5,748} \]
\[ \text{Labor Productivity (Rs.): 82,547} \]

**Governance**

\[ \text{SCORE: 0.505} \quad \text{RANK: 37/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED} \]

\[ \text{Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000): 0.15} \]
\[ \text{Government Management (Score out of 9): 6.75} \]
\[ \text{Organization and Administration (Score out of 6): 3.79} \]
\[ \text{Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11): 5.75} \]
\[ \text{Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11): 7.75} \]
\[ \text{Service Flow (Score out of 16): 9.08} \]
\[ \text{Judicial Work (Score out of 7): 5.83} \]
\[ \text{Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13): 4.42} \]

**Environmental Capacity**

\[ \text{SCORE: 0.000} \quad \text{RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED} \]

\[ \text{Protected Area: 0.0%} \]
Okhaldhunga exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

SCORE: 0.425  RANK: 54/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Communications Capacity**

SCORE: 0.401  RANK: 47/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Logistics Capacity**

SCORE: 0.570  RANK: 38/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Energy Capacity**

SCORE: 0.304  RANK: 57/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 48 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.463  
Okhaldhunga’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Information Access Vulnerability
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

Earthquake
- RANK: 33 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.386

Extreme Heat
- RANK: 55 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.035

Fluvial Flood
- RANK: 71 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.063

Pluvial Flood
- RANK: 68 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.104

Landslide
- RANK: 23 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.405

Wildfire
- RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.000
Okhaldhunga’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL PALPA
Area: 1,373 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate
Score: 0.526 • Rank: 40/77

RESILIENCE (R) - High
Score: 0.540 • Rank: 25/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High
Score: 0.660 • Rank: 26/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Low
Score: 0.383 • Rank: 57/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Moderate
Score: 0.464 • Rank: 29/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) 242,423
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) 19.3
Population below Poverty Line 21.6%
Population with Safe Drinking Water 81.3%
Adult Literacy 70.8%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 26 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.660

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 239,817 people
  - $609.55 million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 90%
  - 216,217 people
  - $598.65 million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 98%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 80%
  - 192,330 people
  - $525.8 million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 86%

- **Wildfire**
  - 15%
  - 35,944 people
  - $66.68 million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 11%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 1%
  - 2,171 people
  - -
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 4%
  - 10,615 people
  - $27.11 million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 4%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
## District Profile

### Vulnerability (V)

Vulnerability in Palpa is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>67/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>57/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>66/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>57/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>66/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>0.565</td>
<td>57/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>0.444</td>
<td>41/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>66/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.211</td>
<td>66/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>66/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>0.472</td>
<td>47/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 57 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.383

Vulnerability in Palpa is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
SCORE: 0.284  RANK: 63/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>71.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health  
SCORE: 0.336  RANK: 52/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>35.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence</td>
<td>621.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence</td>
<td>37.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence</td>
<td>85.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 29 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.464

Palpa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity  
SCORE: 0.245  
RANK: 46/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.): 10,374
- Labor Productivity (Rs.): 87,236

Governance  
SCORE: 0.570  
RANK: 22/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000): 0.16
- Government Management (Score out of 9): 6.98
- Organization and Administration (Score out of 6): 4.2
- Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11): 6.03
- Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11): 7.03
- Service Flow (Score out of 16): 9.05
- Judicial Work (Score out of 7): 5.38
- Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13): 5.35
- Social Inclusion (Score out of 10): 6.18
- Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9): 3.73
- Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6): 2.38

Environmental Capacity  
SCORE: 0.000  
RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Protected Area: 0.0%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 29 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.464

Palpa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Logistics Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  SCORE: 0.609  RANK: 17/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  SCORE: 0.609  RANK: 8/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

3.7% Households with Landline
2.4% Households with Internet
31.9% Households with Television
66.0% Households with Radio
75.7% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  SCORE: 0.590  RANK: 32/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

18 Road Density (km per sq. km)
57.4% Improved Roadway
26.1 Average Distance to Airport (km)
52.8 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
26.1 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
11.0 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
9.9 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
1.24 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  SCORE: 0.628  RANK: 24/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

73.0% Households with Electricity
15.0% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
**RANK: 25 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.540**

Palpa's score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
- **Economic Constraints**
- **Logistics Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

---

**KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE**

**Clean Water Access Vulnerability**

Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

**Economic Constraints**

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Logistics Capacity**

Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
## HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>51 / 77</td>
<td>33 / 77</td>
<td>0.358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>23 / 77</td>
<td>39 / 77</td>
<td>0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>60 / 77</td>
<td>63 / 77</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>63 / 77</td>
<td>63 / 77</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>33 / 77</td>
<td>33 / 77</td>
<td>0.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>39 / 77</td>
<td>39 / 77</td>
<td>0.173</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Palpa’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
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Better solutions.
Fewer disasters.

Safer world.
NEPAL
PANCHTHAR
Area: 1,241 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low
Score: 0.480 • Rank: 61/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Moderate
Score: 0.483 • Rank: 42/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low
Score: 0.406 • Rank: 59/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Low
Score: 0.385 • Rank: 55/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low
Score: 0.351 • Rank: 59/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
174,419

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
49.6

Population below Poverty Line
11.4%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
73.2%

Adult Literacy
66.9%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.406

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
- 100%
- 173,887
- $379.45 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
- 100%
- 173,707
- $379.45 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Extreme Heat
- 0%
- 0
- $0
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Wildfire
- 13%
- 22,076
- $84.44 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 22%

Fluvial Flood
- <1%
- 236
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Pluvial Flood
- 1%
- 1,680
- $10.57 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
**Vulnerability (V)**

Vulnerability in Panchthar is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

- **Score**: 0.359
- **Rank**: 62/77 Districts Assessed

- **66.9%** Adult Literacy
- **4.21** Mean Years of Schooling
- **96.7** Primary School Net Enrollment
- **16.78** Student Teacher Ratio

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **Score**: 0.276
- **Rank**: 68/77 Districts Assessed

- **73.2%** Access to Safe Drinking Water
- **11.8%** Households without Toilet
- **40.6%** Water Schemes in Disrepair
- **79.4** Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- **0.0** Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

### Economic Constraints

- **Score**: 0.359
- **Rank**: 62/77 Districts Assessed

- **$1,082** Income per Capita (PPP $)
- **11.4%** Poverty Headcount Ratio
- **1.9%** Poverty Gap
- **77.4** Age Dependency Ratio

### Food Insecurity

- **Score**: 0.508
- **Rank**: 30/77 Districts Assessed

- **24.0%** Food Poverty Prevalence
- **33.6%** Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- **72.5%** Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

### Gender Inequality

- **Score**: 0.294
- **Rank**: 53/77 Districts Assessed

- **0.25** Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **0.05** Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- **83.7%** No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Panchthar is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>56.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence</td>
<td>1024.1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence</td>
<td>151.2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.351

Panchthar exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity

- **Score**: 0.261  RANK: 42/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)**: 8,414
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.)**: 97,887

Governance

- **Score**: 0.398  RANK: 58/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)**: 0.22
- **Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9)**: 6.5
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)**: 3.5
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)**: 5.03
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16)**: 6.44
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7)**: 8.22
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)**: 4.53
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)**: 3.69
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)**: 3.41
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)**: 1.59

Environmental Capacity

- **Score**: 0.000  RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Protected Area**: 0.0%
Panchthar exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

- Score: 0.450
- Rank: 48/77

**Communications Capacity**

- Score: 0.428
- Rank: 42/77

- 2.3% Households with Landline
- 0.6% Households with Internet
- 11.6% Households with Television
- 63.8% Households with Radio
- 59.2% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- Score: 0.614
- Rank: 21/77

- 18 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 52.9% Improved Roadway
- 15.7 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 75.0 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 15.7 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 10.8 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 14.2 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 2.01 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- Score: 0.307
- Rank: 56/77

- 27.9% Households with Electricity
- 5.8% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 42 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.483  
Panchthar’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Food Insecurity**
- **Vulnerable Health Status**
- **Energy Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

### KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

#### Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

#### Vulnerable Health Status
A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

#### Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

#### Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 49 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.365
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 76 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.029
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 72 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.084
- **Landslide**: RANK: 30 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.393
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 37 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.195
Panchthar’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.
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Better solutions.
Fewer disasters.

Safer world.
NEPAL
PARBAT

Area: 494 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

- **MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Very Low
  Score: 0.463  •  Rank: 65/77

- **RESILIENCE (R)** - High
  Score: 0.541  •  Rank: 24/77

- **MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Low
  Score: 0.471  •  Rank: 49/77

- **VULNERABILITY (V)** - Very Low
  Score: 0.318  •  Rank: 65/77

- **COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Moderate
  Score: 0.401  •  Rank: 43/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
132,703

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
15.4

Population below Poverty Line
12.7%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
83.2%

Adult Literacy
67.6%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 49 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.471

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- Earthquake
  - 100%
  - 85,401
  - $263.78 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- Landslide
  - 99%
  - 84,442
  - $263.78 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- Extreme Heat
  - 33%
  - 28,224
  - $126.47 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 48%

- Wildfire
  - 0%
  - 0
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- Fluvial Flood
  - 2%
  - 2,103
  - -
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- Pluvial Flood
  - 7%
  - 5,908
  - $32.56 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 12%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
### Vulnerability (V)

Vulnerability in Parbat is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Access Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>66/77</td>
<td>67/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Clean Water Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>69/77</td>
<td>69/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Constraints</td>
<td>0.396</td>
<td>57/77</td>
<td>57/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Insecurity</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>42/77</td>
<td>42/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Inequality</td>
<td>0.228</td>
<td>62/77</td>
<td>62/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**VULNERABILITY (V)**

RANK: 65/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.318

Vulnerability in Parbat is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Vulnerable Health Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Child Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence</td>
<td>984.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK: 67/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.256
Parbat exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Economic Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

**Score:** 0.192  
**RANK:** 54/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **6,005** Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
- **84,924** Labor Productivity (Rs.)

### Governance

**Score:** 0.384  
**RANK:** 59/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **0.2** Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)
- **6.83** Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9)
- **4.13** Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- **5.88** Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- **7.04** Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- **3.88** Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- **4.46** Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

### Environmental Capacity

**Score:** 0.015  
**RANK:** 45/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **0.0%** Protected Area
## COPING CAPACITY (CC)

RANK: 43 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.401

Parbat exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Economic Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Infrastructure Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>15/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Communications Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Landline</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>17/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Internet</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>17/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Television</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>17/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Radio</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>17/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Mobile Phone</td>
<td>76.0%</td>
<td>17/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Logistics Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Density (km per sq. km)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Roadway</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Airport (km)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Dry Port (km)</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Warehouse (km)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Police Station (km)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Hospital (km)</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Energy Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Electricity</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households using Gas for Cooking</td>
<td>12.6%</td>
<td>18/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 24 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.541

Parbat’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Economic Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Economic Capacity
A strong economic foundation provides an indication of a region’s ability to absorb economic losses and quickly mobilize financial assets for preparedness, response and recovery activities. Limited economic capacity correlates to disproportionate disaster impacts.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

Earthquake: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.318

Extreme Heat: RANK: 39 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.141

Fluvial Flood: RANK: 53 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.138

Pluvial Flood: RANK: 55 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.130

Landslide: RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.332

Wildfire: RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.000
Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

**Multi-Hazard Exposure**
- Districts Score: 0.471
- Country Score: 0.559

**Vulnerability**
- Districts Score: 0.318
- Country Score: 0.463

**Coping Capacity**
- Districts Score: 0.401
- Country Score: 0.436

Parbat’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
PARSA
Area: 1,353 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Moderate
Score: 0.540 • Rank: 36/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - High
Score: 0.568 • Rank: 17/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Very High
Score: 0.758 • Rank: 9/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Moderate
Score: 0.461 • Rank: 32/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Very High
Score: 0.598 • Rank: 8/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) **649,397**
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) **36.3**
- Population below Poverty Line **29.2%**
- Population with Safe Drinking Water **95.7%**
- Adult Literacy **48.7%**
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.758

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
- 952,425
- $1.51 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
<1%
- 930
- $7.79 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

Extreme Heat
100%
- 951,949
- $1.51 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Wildfire
29%
- 280,175
- $311.77 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 21%

Fluvial Flood
26%
- 251,615
- $455.76 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 30%

Pluvial Flood
42%
- 400,940
- $816.37 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 54%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Parsa is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 32 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.461

Vulnerability in Parsa is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

SCORE: 0.231  RANK: 71/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

67.3  1.0%

Life Expectancy  Disabled Population

Child Health  

SCORE: 0.275  RANK: 67/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

37.2%  36.3  321.2  31.7  31.9

Child Malnutrition Rate  Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)  Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)  Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)  Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

RANK: 8 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.598

Parsa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **30,005** Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
- **164,708** Labor Productivity (Rs.)

### Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government and Administration (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>8.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

- **53.4%** Protected Area

RANK: 7/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.710

RANK: 35/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.516

RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.733
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
**RANK: 8 / 77** **DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.598**

Parsa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

SCORE: 0.570  
**RANK: 23/77** **DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**Communications Capacity**

SCORE: 0.406  
**RANK: 44/77** **DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
3.7% Households with Landline  
1.5% Households with Internet  
39.4% Households with Television  
29.9% Households with Radio  
59.9% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

SCORE: 0.676  
**RANK: 13/77** **DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
6 Road Density (km per sq. km)  
63.6% Improved Roadway  
11.8 Average Distance to Airport (km)  
15.5 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)  
11.8 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)  
8.5 Average Distance to Police Station (km)  
10.0 Average Distance to Hospital (km)  
4.85 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

SCORE: 0.628  
**RANK: 23 /77** **DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
72.2% Households with Electricity  
15.7% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

RANK: 17 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.568

Parsa's score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability

Limitations in information access can impede a population's ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Constraints

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
## HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>44 / 77</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>0.372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>11 / 77</td>
<td>10 / 77</td>
<td>0.368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>10 / 77</td>
<td>11 / 77</td>
<td>0.328</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>8 / 77</td>
<td>76 / 77</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>76 / 77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>32 / 77</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parsa’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
PYUTHAN
Area: 1,309 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High**
Score: 0.580  •  Rank: 24/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Low**
Score: 0.405  •  Rank: 59/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate**
Score: 0.550  •  Rank: 39/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - High**
Score: 0.540  •  Rank: 21/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low**
Score: 0.351  •  Rank: 60/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) 231,848
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) 54.4
- Population below Poverty Line 32.2%
- Population with Safe Drinking Water 79.9%
- Adult Literacy 58.0%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 39 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.550

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
216,901
$403.54 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
97%
210,885
$386.8 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 96%

Extreme Heat
33%
70,573
$169.53 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 42%

Wildfire
30%
65,917
$157.19 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 39%

Fluvial Flood
2%
3,632
$44.36 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 11%

Pluvial Flood
7%
15,592
$60.75 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 15%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
### Vulnerability in Pyuthan

Vulnerability in Pyuthan is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**
- **Score**: 0.673
- Rank: 20/77 Districts Assessed
- Adult Literacy: 58.0%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 2.91
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 87.8
- Student Teacher Ratio: 25

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**
- **Score**: 0.390
- Rank: 44/77 Districts Assessed
- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 79.9%
- Households without Toilet: 28.8%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 33.9%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 252.7
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 0.4

**Economic Constraints**
- **Score**: 0.681
- Rank: 14/77 Districts Assessed
- Income per Capita (PPP $): $681
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 32.2%
- Poverty Gap: 7.9%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 104.6

**Food Insecurity**
- **Score**: 0.708
- Rank: 11/77 Districts Assessed
- Food Poverty Prevalence: 40.1%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 42.3%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 78.3%

**Gender Inequality**
- **Score**: 0.296
- Rank: 52/77 Districts Assessed
- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.36
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.00
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 83.8%
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.540

Vulnerability in Pyuthan is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
SCORE: 0.496  
RANK: 20/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health  
SCORE: 0.614  
RANK: 16/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>1077.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>113.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pyuthan exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
Pyuthan exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**
- **Score:** 0.444
- **RANK:** 50/77

**Communications Capacity**
- **Score:** 0.380
- **RANK:** 51/77
- 1.4% Households with Landline
- 0.5% Households with Internet
- 7.4% Households with Television
- 65.0% Households with Radio
- 54.9% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**
- **Score:** 0.543
- **RANK:** 46/77
- 13 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 59.3% Improved Roadway
- 15.0 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 105.0 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 15.0 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 22.6 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 14.6 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.08 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**
- **Score:** 0.408
- **RANK:** 48/77
- 53.6% Households with Electricity
- 3.3% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

Pyuthan's score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity

The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Economic Constraints

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
## HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Rank:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>22 / 77 DTA</td>
<td>0.426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>36 / 77 DTA</td>
<td>0.166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>46 / 77 DTA</td>
<td>0.150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>32 / 77 DTA</td>
<td>0.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>14 / 77 DTA</td>
<td>0.452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>20 / 77 DTA</td>
<td>0.293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pyuthan’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.550
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.540
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.351
  - Country Score: 0.436

Score: 0.580

RANK WITHIN DISTRICTS
NEPAL
RAMECHHAP
Area: 1,546 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low
Score: 0.513 • Rank: 46/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Moderate
Score: 0.483 • Rank: 41/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate
Score: 0.504 • Rank: 44/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate
Score: 0.466 • Rank: 31/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Moderate
Score: 0.433 • Rank: 36/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
170,620

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
24.5

Population below Poverty Line
25.6%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
82.0%

Adult Literacy
52.1%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 44 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.504

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
184,416
$391.8 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
100%
184,198
$391.8 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Extreme Heat
16%
29,944
$118.29 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 30%

Wildfire
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Fluvial Flood
1%
1,396
$8.44 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

Pluvial Flood
3%
5,121
$13.8 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 4%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
**VULNERABILITY (V)**

Vulnerability in Ramechhap is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>31/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.37</td>
<td>42/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>24/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>16.49</td>
<td>31/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>82.0%</td>
<td>31/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household without Toilet</td>
<td>36.6%</td>
<td>27/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>24/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>202.8</td>
<td>33/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>30/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$951</td>
<td>31/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>31/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>31/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>31/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>70.3%</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.466

Vulnerability in Ramechhap is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

RANK: 43/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.366

68.8  
Life Expectancy

2.2%  
Disabled Population

Child Health  

RANK: 29/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.497

44.4%  
Child Malnutrition Rate

24.5  
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

1134.3  
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

63.9  
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

77.6  
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 36 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.433

Ramechhap exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.195  
RANK: 52/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **7,836** Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
- **80,029** Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**  
SCORE: 0.560  
RANK: 24/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **0.13** Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)
- **7.11** Government Management (Score out of 9)
- **5.29** Organization and Administration (Score out of 9)
- **6.71** Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- **8.39** Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- **9.21** Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- **4.93** Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- **4.86** Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)
- **4.57** Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)
- **3.43** Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)
- **1.82** Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

**Environmental Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.514  
RANK: 21/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- **26.3%** Protected Area
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 36 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.433

Ramechhap exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  
SCORE: 0.435  RANK: 51/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  
SCORE: 0.391  RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 2.5% Households with Landline
- 0.3% Households with Internet
- 12.7% Households with Television
- 66.3% Households with Radio
- 50.1% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  
SCORE: 0.568  RANK: 39/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 7 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 38.8% Improved Roadway
- 20.1 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 70.0 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 20.1 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 8.0 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 17.0 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.88 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  
SCORE: 0.347  RANK: 54 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 45.5% Households with Electricity
- 2.4% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.483

Ramechhap’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Economic Constraints**
- **Food Insecurity**
- **Energy Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

**KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE**

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Food Insecurity**
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

**Earthquake**
- RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.382

**Extreme Heat**
- RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.135

**Fluvial Flood**
- RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.130

**Pluvial Flood**
- RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.123

**Landslide**
- RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.411

**Wildfire**
- RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.000
Ramechhap’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
RASUWA

Area: 1,544 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate
Score: 0.517 • Rank: 44/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.452 • Rank: 50/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low
Score: 0.454 • Rank: 51/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - High
Score: 0.536 • Rank: 22/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Moderate
Score: 0.440 • Rank: 34/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
45,554

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
30.8

Population below Poverty Line
31.6%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
87.6%

Adult Literacy
41.3%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 51 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.454

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
40,045
$72.74 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
100%
40,042
$72.73 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Extreme Heat
11%
4,448
-
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Wildfire
51%
20,342
$33.21 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 46%

Fluvial Flood
2%
742
-
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Pluvial Flood
4%
1,672
$1.82 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
## Vulnerability (V)

Vulnerability in Rasuwa is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.712</td>
<td>16/77</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15.07</td>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>35/77</td>
<td>87.6%</td>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>41.6%</td>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>40/77</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.6%</td>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>79.6</td>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.603</td>
<td>19/77</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>36.1%</td>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>70.7%</td>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Metric</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.545</td>
<td>17/77</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91.3%</td>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 22 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.536

Vulnerability in Rasuwa is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

SCORE: 0.441  
RANK: 28/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 67.4 Life Expectancy
- 2.3% Disabled Population

Child Health  

SCORE: 0.617  
RANK: 14/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 45.0% Child Malnutrition Rate
- 30.8 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- 1155.0 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- 92.4 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- 112.1 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

Rasuwa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity

- **Score:** 0.301  
  **Rank:** 34/77 Districts Assessed

  - **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 2,677
  - **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 127,599

Governance

- **Score:** 0.264  
  **Rank:** 70/77 Districts Assessed

  - **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.58
  - **Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9):** 2.95
  - **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 5.7
  - **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 6.35
  - **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 6.55
  - **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 2.95
  - **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 4.25
  - **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 1.95
  - **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 2.2
  - **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 0.3

Environmental Capacity

- **Score:** 0.832  
  **Rank:** 5/77 Districts Assessed

  - **Protected Area:** 68.8%
COPING CAPACITY (CC) RANK: 34 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.440

Rasuwa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity
SCORE: 0.544  RANK: 30/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity
SCORE: 0.461  RANK: 38/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity
SCORE: 0.604  RANK: 25/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity
SCORE: 0.566  RANK: 32 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)

Rasuwa’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Food Insecurity
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 52 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.350
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 53 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.056
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.133
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 67 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.106
- **Landslide**: RANK: 36 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.369
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 16 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.303
Rasuwa's score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.454
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.536
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.440
  - Country Score: 0.436
NEPAL
RAUTAHAT
Area: 1,126 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -
Very High
Score: 0.643  •  Rank: 6/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.418  •  Rank: 56/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE
(MHE) - Very High
Score: 0.764  •  Rank: 8/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - High
Score: 0.573  •  Rank: 19/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) -
Moderate
Score: 0.409  •  Rank: 40/77

Population (2021 Statistical
Yearbook)
825,623

Infant Mortality Rate (per
1,000 live births)
80.9

Population below Poverty
Line
33.4%

Population with Safe
Drinking Water
95.5%

Adult Literacy
33.9%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 8 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.764

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
702,473
$1.18 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
1%
6,515
$13.63 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 1%

Extreme Heat
100%
702,459
$1.18 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Wildfire
18%
123,227
$193.5 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 16%

Fluvial Flood
43%
303,587
$764.99 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 65%

Pluvial Flood
40%
280,166
$659.31 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 56%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 19 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.573

Vulnerability in Rautahat is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- Score: 1.000  RANK: 1/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Adult Literacy: 33.9%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 2.19
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 73.2
- Student Teacher Ratio: 67.38

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- Score: 0.389  RANK: 45/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 95.5%
- Households without Toilet: 75.5%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 26.5%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 97.9
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 46.7

Economic Constraints

- Score: 0.640  RANK: 18/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Income per Capita (PPP $): $757
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 33.4%
- Poverty Gap: 8.3%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 92.5

Food Insecurity

- Score: 0.356  RANK: 55/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Food Poverty Prevalence: 24.0%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 23.6%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 63.6%

Gender Inequality

- Score: 0.590  RANK: 14/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.52
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.16
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 80.9%
VULNERABILITY (V)  RANK: 19 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.573

Vulnerability in Rautahat is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
SCORE: 0.464  RANK: 26/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>RANK: 26/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>59.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health  
SCORE: 0.440  RANK: 34/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>80.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>405.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>55.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 40 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.409

Rautahat exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 21,193
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 107,519

**Governance**

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.22
- **Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 6):** 7.25
- **Government Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 5
- **Government Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 9
- **Government Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 8
- **Government Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 6
- **Government Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 5.25

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Protected Area (%):** 0.0
Rautahat exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>58/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communications Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.250</td>
<td>67/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5% Households with Landline
0.2% Households with Internet
22.8% Households with Television
37.1% Households with Radio
47.0% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>43/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11 Road Density (km per sq. km)
94.2% Improved Roadway
25.9 Average Distance to Airport (km)
51.6 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
25.9 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
14.4 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
12.3 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
0.48 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>RANK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>55/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46.6% Households with Electricity
2.1% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 56 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.418  

Rautahat’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability  
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Constraints  
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity  
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity  
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 10 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.483

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 2 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.466

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 1 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.517

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 3 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.432

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 66 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.041

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 22 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.281
Rautahat's score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
RANK WITHIN DISTRICTS
Score: 0.643
NEPAL
ROLPA
Area: 1,879 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - High
Score: 0.565  •  Rank: 28/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Very Low
Score: 0.343  •  Rank: 66/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Very Low
Score: 0.381  •  Rank: 67/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Very High
Score: 0.610  •  Rank: 13/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Very Low
Score: 0.296  •  Rank: 68/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
236,226

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
52.0

Population below Poverty Line
26.0%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
77.5%

Adult Literacy
50.7%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 67 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.381

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 214,866 people
  - $327.59 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 99%
  - 212,680 people
  - $327.59 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - <1%
  - 567 people
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Wildfire**
  - 0%
  - 0 people
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 1%
  - 1,693 people
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 3%
  - 7,441 people
  - $13.17 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 4%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
**DISTRICT PROFILE**

---

### VULNERABILITY (V)

**RANK: 13 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.610**

Vulnerability in Rolpa is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

#### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>13/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>5/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>13/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>13/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>5/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>13/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>13/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>13/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>13/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>21/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>5/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>0.596</td>
<td>13/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>13/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>26/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>5/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>0.695</td>
<td>5/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>21/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>21/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>0.500</td>
<td>21/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 13 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.610

Vulnerability in Rolpa is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.593  RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Life Expectancy 64.8
Disabled Population 3.3%

Child Health

SCORE: 0.687  RANK: 9/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Child Malnutrition Rate 51.3%
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) 52.0
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000) 1001.2
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100) 80.7
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000) 146.3
DISTRICT PROFILE

COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 68 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.296

Rolpa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity  1  SCORE: 0.110  RANK: 68/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
5,779  €61,192
Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)  Labor Productivity (Rs.)

Governance  1  SCORE: 0.451  RANK: 45/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
0.21  6.94  4.44  5.44  6.06  9.44  4.78  4.31
Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)  Government Management (Score out of 9)  Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)  Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)  Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)  Service Flow (Score out of 16)  Judicial Work (Score out of 7)  Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)
3.94  2.89  1.42
Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)  Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)  Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

Environmental Capacity  1  SCORE: 0.000  RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
0.0%
Protected Area
Rolpa exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.347
- **Rank:** 62/77 Districts Assessed

**Communications Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.320
- **Rank:** 58/77 Districts Assessed

- 1.2% Households with Landline
- 0.3% Households with Internet
- 5.7% Households with Television
- 63.3% Households with Radio
- 47.0% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.509
- **Rank:** 53/77 Districts Assessed

- 9 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 77.1% Improved Roadway
- 30.2 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 148.4 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 30.2 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 19.4 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 16.6 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.63 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.214
- **Rank:** 62/77 Districts Assessed

- 21.5% Households with Electricity
- 2.2% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 66 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.343

Rolpa's score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population's ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - RANK: 14 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.471

- **Extreme Heat**
  - RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.003

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 39 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.166

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.130

- **Landslide**
  - RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.504

- **Wildfire**
  - RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.000
Rolpa’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
RUKUM EAST
Area: 2,193 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate**
Score: 0.539  •  Rank: 38/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Low**
Score: 0.408  •  Rank: 57/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low**
Score: 0.432  •  Rank: 57/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - High**
Score: 0.584  •  Rank: 17/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low**
Score: 0.400  •  Rank: 46/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) 57,962

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) 34.2

Population below Poverty Line 26.3%

Population with Safe Drinking Water 74.0%

Adult Literacy 50.8%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 57 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.432

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
59,500
$146.76 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
100%
59,500
$146.76 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Extreme Heat
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Wildfire
38%
22,559
$48.89 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 33%

Fluvial Flood
1%
358
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed:

Pluvial Flood
6%
3,784
$5.21 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 4%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC's AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
## Vulnerability (V)

Vulnerability in Rukum East is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

- **Score**: 0.660
- **Rank**: 21/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>93.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>30.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **Score**: 0.712
- **Rank**: 4/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>259.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

- **Score**: 0.564
- **Rank**: 25/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>91.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

- **Score**: 0.605
- **Rank**: 17/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

- **Score**: 0.468
- **Rank**: 26/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 17 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.584  

Vulnerability in Rukum East is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

VULNERABLE HEALTH STATUS  

SCORE: 0.496  
RANK: 19/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

64.9  
Life Expectancy  

2.8%  
Disabled Population  

CHILD HEALTH  

SCORE: 0.516  
RANK: 27/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

51.3%  
Child Malnutrition Rate  

34.2  
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)  

600.5  
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)  

44.1  
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)  

148.8  
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
**RANK: 46 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.400**

Rukum East exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

**Score: 0.199**  
**RANK: 50/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 6,595
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 85,067

### Governance

**Score: 0.626**  
**RANK: 13/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.22
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 6.5
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 6):** 5
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 6.25
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 7.75
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 9.75
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 5.5
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 7.5

### Environmental Capacity

**Score: 0.639**  
**RANK: 17/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **Protected Area: 40.5%**
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
RANK: 46/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.400

Rukum East exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

SCORE: 0.271  RANK: 70/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity

SCORE: 0.246  RANK: 69/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

1.3% Households with Landline  
0.2% Households with Internet  
3.6% Households with Television  
58.1% Households with Radio  
36.9% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity

SCORE: 0.409  RANK: 72/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

6 Road Density (km per sq. km)  
19.8% Improved Roadway  
21.2 Average Distance to Airport (km)  
168.4 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)  
21.2 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)  
24.7 Average Distance to Police Station (km)  
24.5 Average Distance to Hospital (km)  
4.31 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity

SCORE: 0.158  RANK: 65/77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED

14.8% Households with Electricity  
1.4% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 57 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.408
Rukum East’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
- **Information Access Vulnerability**
- **Energy Capacity**
- **Communications Capacity**

### KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

**Information Access Vulnerability**
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 39 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.381
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 28 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.189
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 46 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.144
- **Landslide**: RANK: 28 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.396
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 25 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.273
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Rukum East’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.432
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.584
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.400
  - Country Score: 0.436
NEPAL
RUKUM WEST
Area: 1,584 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High
Score: 0.598 • Rank: 18/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low
Score: 0.355 • Rank: 64/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate
Score: 0.505 • Rank: 43/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - High
Score: 0.575 • Rank: 18/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very Low
Score: 0.286 • Rank: 69/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
166,354

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
34.2

Population below Poverty Line
26.3%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
74.0%

Adult Literacy
50.8%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 43 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.505

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

**Earthquake**
- 100%
- 144,233
- $217.2 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Landslide**
- 99%
- 142,073
- $208.3 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 96%

**Extreme Heat**
- 6%
- 8,811
- $39.89 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 18%

**Wildfire**
- 31%
- 44,692
- $99.12 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 46%

**Fluvial Flood**
- 2%
- 2,339
- $31 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 14%

**Pluvial Flood**
- 7%
- 9,417
- $42.79 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 20%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Rukum West is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>RANK: 21/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>30.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>74.0%</td>
<td>RANK: 10/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>51.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>269.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$782</td>
<td>RANK: 25/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>RANK: 17/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>RANK: 26/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 18 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.575

Vulnerability in Rukum West is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

VULNERABLE HEALTH STATUS

RANK: 22 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.487

64.9
Life Expectancy

2.8%
Disabled Population

CHILD HEALTH

RANK: 30 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.489

51.3%
Child Malnutrition Rate

34.2
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

684.9
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

45.5
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

111.4
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC) RANK: 69 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.286

Rukum West exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity

SCORE: 0.199  RANK: 50/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)

6,595

Labor Productivity (Rs.)

85,067

Governance

SCORE: 0.382  RANK: 60/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)

0.39

Government Management (Score out of 9)

5.85

Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)

3.95

Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)

5.45

Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)

6.6

Service Flow (Score out of 16)

7.1

Judicial Work (Score out of 7)

3.8

Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

3.05

Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)

4

Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)

3.2

Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

2

Environmental Capacity

SCORE: 0.000  RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Protected Area

0.0%
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

Rukum West exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.329
- **Rank:** 65/77

**Communications Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.246
- **Rank:** 69/77

- 1.3% Households with Landline
- 0.2% Households with Internet
- 3.6% Households with Television
- 58.1% Households with Radio
- 36.9% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.583
- **Rank:** 35/77

- 6 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 19.8% Improved Roadway
- 9.7 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 191.3 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 9.7 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 8.4 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 10.3 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.5 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- **Score:** 0.158
- **Rank:** 65/77

- 14.8% Households with Electricity
- 1.4% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 64 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.355

Rukum West's score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Information Access Vulnerability
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population's ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
## HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>19 / 77</td>
<td>0.450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>47 / 77</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>29 / 77</td>
<td>0.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>29 / 77</td>
<td>0.199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>13 / 77</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>14 / 77</td>
<td>0.317</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rukum West’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
RUPANDEHI
Area: 1,360 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate
Score: 0.523 • Rank: 41/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very High
Score: 0.635 • Rank: 9/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very High
Score: 0.839 • Rank: 3/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low
Score: 0.312 • Rank: 67/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very High
Score: 0.581 • Rank: 9/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
1,118,975

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
38.1

Population below Poverty Line
17.3%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
97.6%

Adult Literacy
64.4%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 3 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.839

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 876,696
  - $1.91 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 1%
  - 6,580
  - $181.87 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 10%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 100%
  - 876,492
  - $1.91 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Wildfire**
  - 7%
  - 65,416
  - $451.2 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 24%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 35%
  - 308,739
  - $1 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 53%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 44%
  - 381,365
  - $1.38 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 72%

**NOTE:** Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
**DISTRICT PROFILE**

**VULNERABILITY (V)**

Vulnerability in Rupandehi is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>29/77</td>
<td>0.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>26.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>97.6%</td>
<td>60/77</td>
<td>0.326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>138.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$1,123</td>
<td>58/77</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>73/77</td>
<td>0.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>71/77</td>
<td>0.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>74.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 67 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.312

Vulnerability in Rupandehi is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.222   RANK: 72/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

68.0 Life Expectancy
1.1% Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.267   RANK: 69/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

37.7% Child Malnutrition Rate
38.1 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
344.0 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
29.2 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
20.7 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.581  

Rupandehi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Environmental Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.685  RANK: 8 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>40,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>126,222</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**  
SCORE: 0.548  RANK: 26 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>7.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>5.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>4.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.000  RANK: 49 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.581

Rupandehi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Environmental Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity  SCORE: 0.700  RANK: 6/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity  SCORE: 0.576  RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSES

- 10.0% Households with Landline
- 3.0% Households with Internet
- 43.0% Households with Television
- 37.6% Households with Radio
- 77.3% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity  SCORE: 0.763  RANK: 5/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 17 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 91.8% Improved Roadway
- 13.5 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 21.1 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 13.5 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 6.4 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 8.4 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 2.41 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity  SCORE: 0.762  RANK: 6 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 80.6% Households with Electricity
- 34.2% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
Rupandehi's score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Very High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Environmental Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population's ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Environmental Capacity
Properly managed environments sustain populations by providing food, water, and even economic benefits from industries such as tourism. Increasing protected areas can also serve as additional buffers between the population and impacted areas.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- Earthquake: RANK: 59 / 77, SCORE: 0.326
- Extreme Heat: RANK: 19 / 77, SCORE: 0.331
- Fluvial Flood: RANK: 11 / 77, SCORE: 0.321
- Pluvial Flood: RANK: 13 / 77, SCORE: 0.330
- Landslide: RANK: 60 / 77, SCORE: 0.077
- Wildfire: RANK: 31 / 77, SCORE: 0.209
Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: 0.839 (Districts Score) vs 0.559 (Country Score)
- **Vulnerability**: 0.312 (Districts Score) vs 0.463 (Country Score)
- **Coping Capacity**: 0.581 (Districts Score) vs 0.436 (Country Score)

Rupandehi’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Very High Coping Capacity scores.
Safer world.
NEPAL
SALYAN
Area: 1,462 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -
Very High
Score: 0.668  •  Rank: 2/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very Low
Score: 0.303  •  Rank: 71/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE
(MHE) - Moderate
Score: 0.609  •  Rank: 34/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very High
Score: 0.601  •  Rank: 15/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Very Low
Score: 0.207  •  Rank: 75/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
238,668

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
52.3

Population below Poverty Line
28.8%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
60.3%

Adult Literacy
55.5%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 34 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.609

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
- 100%
- 235,260
- $465.93 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
- 92%
- 216,339
- $407.27 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 87%

Extreme Heat
- 13%
- 30,660
- $178.72 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 38%

Wildfire
- 71%
- 166,006
- $378.17 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 81%

Fluvial Flood
- 2%
- 4,627
- -
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Pluvial Flood
- 8%
- 17,914
- $12.05 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
Vulnerability in Salyan is primarily driven by Gender Inequality and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Information Access Vulnerability**

- Adult Literacy: 55.5%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 3.17
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 97.3
- Student Teacher Ratio: 27.64

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 60.3%
- Households without Toilet: 70.8%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 37.9%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 248.9
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 34.4

**Economic Constraints**

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $786
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 28.8%
- Poverty Gap: 6.3%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 87.4

**Food Insecurity**

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 34.1%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 40.8%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 72.1%

**Gender Inequality**

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.39
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.36
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 89.4%
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 15 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.601  

Vulnerability in Salyan is primarily driven by Gender Inequality and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

SCORE: 0.504  
RANK: 17/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

- Life Expectancy: 65.3
- Disabled Population: 2.6%

Child Health  

SCORE: 0.610  
RANK: 18/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 54.1%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 52.3
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 948.0
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 62.7
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 106.2
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 75 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.207

Salyan exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity  RANK: 59/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.180

- Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.): 7,704
- Labor Productivity (Rs.): 76,156

Governance  RANK: 77/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.011

- Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000): 0.08
- Government Management (Score out of 9)
- Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)
- Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)
- Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)
- Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)
- Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)

Environmental Capacity  RANK: 35/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.239

- Protected Area: 5.7%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 75 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.207

Salyan exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity
SCORE: 0.358  RANK: 60/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity
SCORE: 0.345  RANK: 56/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

1.5% Households with Landline
0.3% Households with Internet
4.8% Households with Television
67.7% Households with Radio
45.0% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity
SCORE: 0.571  RANK: 37/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

12 Road Density (km per sq. km)
67.0% Improved Roadway
16.2 Average Distance to Airport (km)
182.5 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
16.2 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
10.8 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
14.7 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
0.84 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity
SCORE: 0.158  RANK: 67 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

14.5% Households with Electricity
1.5% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 71 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.303

Salyan’s score and ranking are due to Very High Vulnerability combined with Very Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Gender Inequality
- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Gender Inequality
Marginalized populations are less likely to have their needs met under pre-disaster conditions, and therefore become even more susceptible to harm during times of disaster. Increase gender-based inclusion in all phases of DM, ensuring the implementation at subnational and local levels. Courses of action must recognize the role of women in society and support changes to policies and programs to promote gender-equal access.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 4 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED | SCORE: 0.514
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED | SCORE: 0.149
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED | SCORE: 0.217
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 37 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED | SCORE: 0.167
- **Landslide**: RANK: 10 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED | SCORE: 0.502
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 1 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED | SCORE: 0.513
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Salyan’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very High Vulnerability and Very Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
SANKHUWASABHA
Area: 3,480 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Moderate
Score: 0.519 • Rank: 42/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.472 • Rank: 46/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Low
Score: 0.501 • Rank: 46/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate
Score: 0.437 • Rank: 40/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low
Score: 0.382 • Rank: 52/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
159,046

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
28.6

Population below Poverty Line
21.0%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
68.9%

Adult Literacy
63.2%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 46 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.501

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake

100%

146,756
$266.08 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide

96%

141,243
$251.5 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 95%

Extreme Heat

51%

74,891
$147.63 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 55%

Wildfire

6%

8,119
$13.67 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 5%

Fluvial Flood

1%

882
-$

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Pluvial Flood

2%

2,802
$15.32 Million

Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 6%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Sankhuwasabha is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>63.2%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>16.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>262.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$1,193</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>48.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 40 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.437

Vulnerability in Sankhuwasabha is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.380  RANK: 39/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>69.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health

SCORE: 0.480  RANK: 32/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>47.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>757.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>149.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sankhuwasabha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 7,688
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 86,305

**Governance**

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.13
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 6.5
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 6):** 1.75
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 2
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 4
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 6.25
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 4
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 5
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 6.5
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 2.5
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 1.5

**Environmental Capacity**

- **Protected Area:** 46.9%
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 52 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.382

Sankhuwasabha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.447  RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Communications Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.495  RANK: 30/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Landline</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>49/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Internet</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>30/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Television</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>49/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Radio</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>49/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Mobile Phone</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>49/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Logistics Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.429  RANK: 68/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Density (km per sq. km)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Roadway</td>
<td>59.8%</td>
<td>48/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Airport (km)</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>48/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Dry Port (km)</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>48/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Warehouse (km)</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>48/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Police Station (km)</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>48/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Hospital (km)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>48/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>48/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Energy Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.416  RANK: 47/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Electricity</td>
<td>52.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households using Gas for Cooking</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESILIENCE (R)

RANK: 46 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.472

Sankhuwasabha’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Information Access Vulnerability
- Energy Capacity
- Logistics Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

Earthquake
- RANK: 48 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.367

Extreme Heat
- RANK: 34 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.184

Fluvial Flood
- RANK: 43 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.155

Pluvial Flood
- RANK: 57 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.129

Landslide
- RANK: 35 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.376

Wildfire
- RANK: 52 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- SCORE: 0.100
Sankhuwasabha’s score and ranking are due to Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.
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Area: 1,363 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -**
High
Score: 0.572  •  Rank: 27/77

**RESILIENCE (R) -** Moderate
Score: 0.473  •  Rank: 45/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) -** High
Score: 0.662  •  Rank: 23/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) -** High
Score: 0.468  •  Rank: 30/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) -** Moderate
Score: 0.415  •  Rank: 38/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
713,203

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
49.2

Population below Poverty Line
39.5%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
96.3%

Adult Literacy
45.4%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 23 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.662

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
620,320
$1.22 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
<1%
19
$2.21 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: <1%

Extreme Heat
100%
620,317
$1.22 Billion
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Wildfire
12%
72,890
$98.66 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 8%

Fluvial Flood
17%
106,213
$334.64 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 28%

Pluvial Flood
35%
216,736
$619 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 51%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
**VULNERABILITY (V)**

Vulnerability in Saptari is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank/# of Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Access Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>10/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Clean Water Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>61/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Constraints</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td>17/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Insecurity</td>
<td>0.286</td>
<td>64/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Inequality</td>
<td>0.456</td>
<td>30/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information Access Vulnerability**
- Adult Literacy: 45.4%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 3.21
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 86.4
- Student Teacher Ratio: 38.98

**Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**
- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 96.3%
- Households without Toilet: 79.3%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 18.1%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 79.7
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 24.7

**Economic Constraints**
- Income per Capita (PPP $): $801
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 39.5%
- Poverty Gap: 10.0%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 80.1

**Food Insecurity**
- Food Poverty Prevalence: 17.9%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 18.5%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 66.2%

**Gender Inequality**
- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.50
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.10
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 78.1%
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 30 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.468

Vulnerability in Saptari is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 54/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.324

64.8
Life Expectancy

1.3%
Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 53/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.335

33.4%
Child Malnutrition Rate

49.2
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

509.7
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

43.9
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

25.6
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.415

Saptari exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>SCORE: 0.349</th>
<th>RANK: 29/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>20,823</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85,860</td>
<td>20,823 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>85,860</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>85,860</td>
<td>85,860 Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>SCORE: 0.423</th>
<th>RANK: 52/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>0.3</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.92</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.92 Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.46</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4.46 Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5.88</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.88 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.04</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.04</td>
<td>7.04 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>7.29</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.29 Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.38</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>4.38 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.58</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>4.58 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4.42</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.42</td>
<td>4.42 Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2.25</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.25 Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.83</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.83 Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>SCORE: 0.336</th>
<th>RANK: 31/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.2%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.2% Protected Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11.2%</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>11.2% Protected Area</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saptari exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

RANK: 47/77
SCORE: 0.462

Communications Capacity

RANK: 59/77
SCORE: 0.303

Logistics Capacity

RANK: 8/77
SCORE: 0.724

Energy Capacity

RANK: 52/77
SCORE: 0.359
RESILIENCE (R)

RANK: 45 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.473

Saptari’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Information Access Vulnerability**

Limitations in information access can impede a population's ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Economic Constraints**

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Energy Capacity**

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 20 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.444
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.430
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 9 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.331
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 6 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.383
- **Landslide**: RANK: 77 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.000
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 35 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.198
Saptari’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- Multi-Hazard Exposure: 0.662 (Districts Score: 0.559)
- Vulnerability: 0.468 (Districts Score: 0.463)
- Coping Capacity: 0.415 (Districts Score: 0.436)
NEPAL
SARLAHI
Area: 1,259 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -
Very High
Score: 0.614 • Rank: 11/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.432 • Rank: 54/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High
Score: 0.704 • Rank: 17/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - High
Score: 0.519 • Rank: 24/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low
Score: 0.382 • Rank: 51/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
857,360

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
61.3

Population below Poverty Line
17.7%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
89.9%

Adult Literacy
38.0%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 17 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.704

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 767,639
  - $1.57 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 2%
  - 16,976
  - $38.88 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 100%
  - 767,551
  - $1.57 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Wildfire**
  - 11%
  - 87,305
  - $194.31 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 12%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 35%
  - 271,588
  - $508.92 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 32%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 42%
  - 325,566
  - $1.23 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 78%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
### District Profile

#### Vulnerability (V)

Vulnerability in Sarlahi is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

#### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>43/77</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>63/77</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>77/77</td>
<td>0.530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>56.82</td>
<td>2/77</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>89.9%</td>
<td>19/77</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>73.6%</td>
<td>1/77</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
<td>21/77</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>24/77</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>20/77</td>
<td>0.530</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$809</td>
<td>63/77</td>
<td>0.478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>77/77</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>26/77</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>3/77</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>63/77</td>
<td>0.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>24.0%</td>
<td>19/77</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>55.5%</td>
<td>1/77</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>19/77</td>
<td>0.512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>20/77</td>
<td>0.519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>2/77</td>
<td>0.957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 24 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.519

Vulnerability in Sarlahi is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
SCORE: 0.349  RANK: 48/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Life Expectancy: 62.9
- Disabled Population: 1.2%

Child Health  
SCORE: 0.317  RANK: 57/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 37.7%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 61.3
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 332.0
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 21.0
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 31.6
### COPING CAPACITY (CC)

**RANK: 51 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.382**

Sarlahi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

#### Economic Capacity

- **Score:** 0.487
- **Rank:** 15/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Rs.)</td>
<td>25,341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>112,789</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Governance

- **Score:** 0.434
- **Rank:** 49/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)</td>
<td>3.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>7.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>8.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Environmental Capacity

- **Score:** 0.000
- **Rank:** 49/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sarlahi exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 54 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.432

Sarlahi’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

Information Access Vulnerability
Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Communications Capacity
Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
# District Profile

## Hazard-Specific Risk (HSR)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hazard</th>
<th>Rank: % of Districts Assessed</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Earthquake</td>
<td>12 / 77</td>
<td>0.473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme Heat</td>
<td>3 / 77</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvial Flood</td>
<td>3 / 77</td>
<td>0.404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pluvial Flood</td>
<td>2 / 77</td>
<td>0.432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landslide</td>
<td>71 / 77</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildfire</td>
<td>27 / 77</td>
<td>0.253</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sarlahi’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Districts Score 0.704, Country Score 0.559
- **Vulnerability**: Districts Score 0.519, Country Score 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**: Districts Score 0.382, Country Score 0.436
NEPAL
SINDHULI
Area: 2,491 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) -
Very High
Score: 0.613  •  Rank: 13/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.399  •  Rank: 60/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate
Score: 0.635  •  Rank: 31/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - High
Score: 0.553  •  Rank: 20/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low
Score: 0.350  •  Rank: 61/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
300,117

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
35.1

Population below Poverty Line
38.3%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
67.1%

Adult Literacy
51.1%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.635

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
266,836
$565.57 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
73%
194,105
$418.43 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 74%

Extreme Heat
71%
188,330
$450.39 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 80%

Wildfire
27%
71,519
$207.83 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 37%

Fluvial Flood
1%
3,039
$49.02 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 9%

Pluvial Flood
12%
31,186
$80.66 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 14%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
### Vulnerability (V)

Vulnerability in Sindhuli is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

#### Information Access Vulnerability

- **Score: 0.559**
- **Rank: 33/77 Districts Assessed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>96.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>23.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- **Score: 0.694**
- **Rank: 6/77 Districts Assessed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>288.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Economic Constraints

- **Score: 0.666**
- **Rank: 15/77 Districts Assessed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$822</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Food Insecurity

- **Score: 0.491**
- **Rank: 34/77 Districts Assessed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Gender Inequality

- **Score: 0.553**
- **Rank: 16/77 Districts Assessed**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 20 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.553

Vulnerability in Sindhuli is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

**Vulnerable Health Status**

RANK: 46/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.356

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Status</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Child Health**

RANK: 42/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.408

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Indicators</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>747.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC) 

RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED 
SCORE: 0.350 

Sindhuli exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

0  
1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>53/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9,884  
73,326  

Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)  
Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**

0  
1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>41/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.15  
6.42  
4.11  
6.47  
7.03  
8.39  
5.31  
4.64  

Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)  
Government Management (Score out of 9)  
Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)  
Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)  
Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)  
Service Flow (Score out of 16)  
Judicial Work (Score out of 7)  
Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)  

4.08  
3.83  
1.11  

Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)  
Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)  
Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)  

**Environmental Capacity**

0  
1  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>49/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

0.0%  
Protected Area
Sindhuli exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure Capacity</th>
<th>Score: 0.426</th>
<th>Rank: 52/77 Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications Capacity</td>
<td>Score: 0.389</td>
<td>Rank: 50/77 Districts Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Capacity</td>
<td>Score: 0.539</td>
<td>Rank: 47/77 Districts Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Capacity</td>
<td>Score: 0.350</td>
<td>Rank: 53/77 Districts Assessed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Households with Landline:** 5.1%
- **Households with Internet:** 0.4%
- **Households with Television:** 18.2%
- **Households with Radio:** 53.8%
- **Households with Mobile Phone:** 45.2%

- **Road Density (km per sq. km):** 11
- **Improved Roadway:** 72.9%
- **Average Distance to Airport (km):** 20.1
- **Average Distance to Dry Port (km):** 100.3
- **Average Distance to Warehouse (km):** 20.1
- **Average Distance to Police Station (km):** 13.6
- **Average Distance to Hospital (km):** 17.7
- **Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000):** 1.2

- **Households with Electricity:** 37.9%
- **Households using Gas for Cooking:** 5.0%
Sindhuli’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

**Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- Earthquake: RANK: 13 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.472
- Extreme Heat: RANK: 12 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.365
- Fluvial Flood: RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.167
- Pluvial Flood: RANK: 27 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.217
- Landslide: RANK: 29 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.394
- Wildfire: RANK: 18 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.299
Sindhuli’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.
RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low**  
Score: 0.502  •  Rank: 51/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - High**  
Score: 0.532  •  Rank: 29/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate**  
Score: 0.569  •  Rank: 35/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate**  
Score: 0.456  •  Rank: 35/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High**  
Score: 0.520  •  Rank: 19/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)  
  262,852

- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)  
  27.5

- Population below Poverty Line  
  25.4%

- Population with Safe Drinking Water  
  81.8%

- Adult Literacy  
  49.5%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 35 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.569

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

**Earthquake**
- 100%
- 269,585 people
- $529.79 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Landslide**
- 98%
- 265,075 people
- $529.79 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

**Extreme Heat**
- 38%
- 101,158 people
- $290.01 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 55%

**Wildfire**
- <1%
- 9 people
- $0.66 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

**Fluvial Flood**
- 1%
- 3,948 people
- $14.18 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

**Pluvial Flood**
- 4%
- 9,992 people
- $53.61 Million
- Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 10%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability</th>
<th>Score: 0.456</th>
<th>Rank: 35/77 Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Information Access Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td>25/77 Districts Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy (%)</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>18.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Clean Water Vulnerability</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>38/77 Districts Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water (%)</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet (%)</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair (%)</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Constraints</td>
<td>0.471</td>
<td>49/77 Districts Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>1,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap Ratio</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Insecurity</td>
<td>0.486</td>
<td>35/77 Districts Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>88.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Inequality</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>39/77 Districts Assessed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>88.0</td>
<td>136.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Vulnerable Health Status

- Life Expectancy: 69.3
- Disabled Population: 2.3%

Child Health

- Child Malnutrition Rate: 46.6%
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births): 27.5
- Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000): 776.1
- Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100): 43.2
- Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000): 81.2

Vulnerability in Sindhupalchok is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  
**RANK: 19 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**  
**SCORE: 0.520**

Sindhupalchok exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

**SCORE: 0.270  
RANK: 40/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 12,976
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 86,494

### Governance

**SCORE: 0.602  
RANK: 18/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.11
- **Government Management (Score out of 9):** 6.65
- **Organization and Administration (Score out of 8):** 4.73
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 7.05
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 7.78
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 9.85
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 5.38
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 6.7
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 4.53
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 4.1
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 2.63

### Environmental Capacity

**SCORE: 0.736  
RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- **Protected Area:** 53.8%
Sindhupalchok exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications Capacity</td>
<td>0.531</td>
<td>31/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Capacity</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>50/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Capacity</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>22/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Communications Capacity**

- 2.0% Households with Landline
- 0.6% Households with Internet
- 33.9% Households with Television
- 52.0% Households with Radio
- 59.3% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

- 8 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 72.7% Improved Roadway
- 20.6 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 38.7 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 20.6 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 14.8 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 16.6 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 1.03 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

- 88.3% Households with Electricity
- 5.9% Households using Gas for Cooking

---

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

**RANK: 19 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.520**

Sindhupalchok exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 29 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.532

Sindhupalchok’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>@</th>
<th>Food Insecurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>🍎</td>
<td>Communications Capacity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🛒</td>
<td>Information Access Vulnerability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>🛒</td>
<td>Logistics Capacity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Information Access Vulnerability**

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Food Insecurity**

The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Logistics Capacity**

Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 46 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.370

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 35 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.173

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 47 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.149

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 45 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.149

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 22 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.408

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 57 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.022
Sindhupalchok’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.569
  - Country Score: 0.559

- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.456
  - Country Score: 0.463

- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.520
  - Country Score: 0.436
NEPAL
SIRAHA

Area: 1,188 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High**
Score: 0.599  •  Rank: 17/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Low**
Score: 0.431  •  Rank: 55/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High**
Score: 0.660  •  Rank: 25/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - High**
Score: 0.529  •  Rank: 23/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low**
Score: 0.392  •  Rank: 49/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
748,416

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
50.3

Population below Poverty Line
34.6%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
90.0%

Adult Literacy
40.0%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 25 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.660

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**: 100%
  - Population: 792,023
  - Damage: $1.09 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**: 1%
  - Population: 4,851
  - Damage: $21.91 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

- **Extreme Heat**: 100%
  - Population: 791,945
  - Damage: $1.09 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Wildfire**: <1%
  - Population: 24
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Fluvial Flood**: 20%
  - Population: 157,872
  - Damage: $371.16 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 34%

- **Pluvial Flood**: 39%
  - Population: 310,078
  - Damage: $597.2 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 55%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Siraha is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Gender Inequality. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- Adult Literacy: 40.0%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 2.82
- Primary School Net Enrollment: 78.1
- Student Teacher Ratio: 25.69

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 90.0%
- Households without Toilet: 78.7%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 28.1%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 150.4
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 49.8

Economic Constraints

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $689
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 34.6%
- Poverty Gap: 8.0%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 86.3

Food Insecurity

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 17.1%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 18.5%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 62.3%

Gender Inequality

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.52
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.25
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 77.8%
VULNERABILITY (V)  

Vulnerability in Siraha is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Gender Inequality. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  

SCORE: 0.347  RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

65.6  Life Expectancy  
1.4%  Disabled Population

Child Health  

SCORE: 0.430  RANK: 37/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

39.7%  Child Malnutrition Rate
50.3  Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
658.6  Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
46.1  Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
65.1  Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
Siraha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**
- 17,784 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
- 82,972 Labor Productivity (Rs.)

**Governance**
- 0.18 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)
- 6.2 Government Management (Score out of 9)
- 4.25 Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)
- 6.65 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- 6.2 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- 9.8 Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- 5.3 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- 4.78 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

**Environmental Capacity**
- 0.0% Protected Area
Siraha exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.474  
RANK: 43/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Communications Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.326  
RANK: 57/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 1.8% Households with Landline
- 0.3% Households with Internet
- 35.5% Households with Television
- 36.5% Households with Radio
- 56.4% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.612  
RANK: 22/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 12 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 90.3% Improved Roadway
- 8.4 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 109.8 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 8.4 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 11.9 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 11.3 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.87 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**  
SCORE: 0.484  
RANK: 41/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 67.3% Households with Electricity
- 3.5% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 55 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.431  
Siraha’s score and ranking are due to High Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

Information Access Vulnerability  
Gender Inequality  
Communications Capacity  
Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Gender Inequality
Marginalized populations are less likely to have their needs met under pre-disaster conditions, and therefore become even more susceptible to harm during times of disaster. Increase gender-based inclusion in all phases of DM, ensuring the implementation at subnational and local levels. Courses of action must recognize the role of women in society and support changes to policies and programs to promote gender-equal access.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- Earthquake: RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.429
- Extreme Heat: RANK: 4 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.456
- Fluvial Flood: RANK: 5 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.381
- Pluvial Flood: RANK: 4 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.427
- Landslide: RANK: 69 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.034
- Wildfire: RANK: 56 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.026
Siraha’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with High Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: 0.660 (0.559)  
- **Vulnerability**: 0.529 (0.463)  
- **Coping Capacity**: 0.392 (0.436)
NEPAL
SOLUKHUMBU
Area: 3,312 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low**
Score: 0.433 • Rank: 70/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - Moderate**
Score: 0.516 • Rank: 34/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low**
Score: 0.330 • Rank: 72/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Low**
Score: 0.418 • Rank: 49/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Moderate**
Score: 0.449 • Rank: 32/77
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 72 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.330

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
50,355
$172.03 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
100%
50,312
$165.46 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 96%

Extreme Heat
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Wildfire
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Fluvial Flood
<1%
184
$8.53 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 5%

Pluvial Flood
3%
1,577
$29.96 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 17%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
**VULNERABILITY (V)**

Vulnerability in Solukhumbu is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

- **Information Access Vulnerability**
  - Score: 0.507
  - Rank: 41/77
  - 57.5% Adult Literacy
  - 3.3 Mean Years of Schooling
  - 95.9 Primary School Net Enrollment
  - 16.45 Student Teacher Ratio

- **Access to Clean Water Vulnerability**
  - Score: 0.238
  - Rank: 73/77
  - 89.1% Access to Safe Drinking Water
  - 24.6% Households without Toilet
  - 32.1% Water Schemes in Disrepair
  - 99.2 Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
  - 1.0 Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

- **Economic Constraints**
  - Score: 0.398
  - Rank: 56/77
  - $1,841 Income per Capita (PPP $)
  - 25.7% Poverty Headcount Ratio
  - 5.7% Poverty Gap
  - 78.4 Age Dependency Ratio

- **Food Insecurity**
  - Score: 0.538
  - Rank: 27/77
  - 41.7% Food Poverty Prevalence
  - 38.5% Low kcal Intake Prevalence
  - 56.4% Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

- **Gender Inequality**
  - Score: 0.373
  - Rank: 41/77
  - 0.34 Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
  - 0.12 Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
  - 77.6% No Female Home nor Land Ownership
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 49 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.418

Vulnerability in Solukhumbu is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Information Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

SCORE: 0.451  RANK: 27/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

66.7 Life Expectancy
2.5% Disabled Population

Child Health

SCORE: 0.559  RANK: 22/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

47.6% Child Malnutrition Rate
42.2 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
1031.9 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
47.4 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
126.1 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

**RANK: 32 / 77**
**DISTRICTS ASSESSED**
**SCORE: 0.449**

Solukhumbu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **Score: 0.361**
- **Rank: 25/77**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>7,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>129,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance

- **Score: 0.367**
- **Rank: 64/77**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>7.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>7.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

- **Score: 0.778**
- **Rank: 9/77**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 32 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.449

Solukhumbu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

SCORE: 0.472  RANK: 44/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity

SCORE: 0.453  RANK: 40/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 5.2% Households with Landline
- 0.7% Households with Internet
- 7.8% Households with Television
- 70.2% Households with Radio
- 44.4% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity

SCORE: 0.599  RANK: 29/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 1 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 100.0% Improved Roadway
- 29.8 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 98.2 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 29.8 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 14.1 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 16.9 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 2.77 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity

SCORE: 0.365  RANK: 51 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 62.8% Households with Electricity
- 0.4% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 34 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.516
Solukhumbu's score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Information Access Vulnerability
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Information Access Vulnerability
Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 66 / 77 RANK: 66 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED SCORE: 0.294
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED SCORE: 0.000
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 73 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED SCORE: 0.056
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 74 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED SCORE: 0.081
- **Landslide**: RANK: 42 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED SCORE: 0.332
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED SCORE: 0.000
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Solukhumbu’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Districts Score 0.330, Country Score 0.559
- **Vulnerability**: Districts Score 0.418, Country Score 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**: Districts Score 0.449, Country Score 0.436

70 / 77
RANK WITHIN DISTRICTS
Score: 0.433
NEPAL

SUNSARI

NDPBA SUBNATIONAL PROFILE
NEPAL
SUNSARI
Area: 1,257 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low
Score: 0.484 • Rank: 58/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Very High
Score: 0.633 • Rank: 10/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very High
Score: 0.717 • Rank: 12/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low
Score: 0.278 • Rank: 71/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High
Score: 0.544 • Rank: 15/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
934,461

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
40.5

Population below Poverty Line
12.0%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
96.8%

Adult Literacy
62.9%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 12 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.717

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 1,531,943
  - $1.74 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 4%
  - 64,434
  - $123.32 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 7%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 100%
  - 1,529,908
  - $1.74 Billion
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Wildfire**
  - 4%
  - 65,008
  - $40.51 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 2%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 45%
  - 692,281
  - $344.55 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 20%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 55%
  - 836,152
  - $473.94 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 27%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Sunsari is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- Adult Literacy: 62.9%
- Mean Years of Schooling: 4.21
- Student-Teacher Ratio: 18.75

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 96.8%
- Households without Toilet: 36.1%
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 27.8%
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 42.7
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 13.2

Economic Constraints

- Income per Capita (PPP $): $1,104
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 12.0%
- Poverty Gap: 2.2%
- Age Dependency Ratio: 67.4

Food Insecurity

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 10.8%
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 22.4%
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 56.0%

Gender Inequality

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.28
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.01
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 68.6%
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 71 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.278  

Vulnerability in Sunsari is primarily driven by Information Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status  
SCORE: 0.272  RANK: 65/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

67.2 Life Expectancy  
1.4% Disabled Population

Child Health  
SCORE: 0.302  RANK: 59/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  

29.4% Child Malnutrition Rate  
40.5 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)  
451.9 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)  
38.4 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)  
47.5 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

Sunsari exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **Score:** 0.629  
  **Rank:** 10/77 Districts Assessed  
  - **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 34,261  
  - **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 127,610

### Governance

- **Score:** 0.355  
  **Rank:** 66/77 Districts Assessed  
  - **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.21  
  - **Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9):** 6.19  
  - **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 5.73  
  - **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 6.1  
  - **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 6.67  
  - **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 4.67  
  - **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 3.5

### Environmental Capacity

- **Score:** 0.369  
  **Rank:** 29/77 Districts Assessed  
  - **Protected Area:** 13.6%

---

This material is from PDC Global. For more information, visit [www.pdc.org](http://www.pdc.org).
Sunsari exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communications Capacity</td>
<td>0.559</td>
<td>16/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logistics Capacity</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>6/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Capacity</td>
<td>0.747</td>
<td>7/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 10 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.633

Sunsari’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Information Access Vulnerability
- Economic Constraints
- Communications Capacity
- Energy Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Information Access Vulnerability**

Limitations in information access can impede a population’s ability to receive, understand, and take action. Emergency messages must take into account the unique information access constraints of the district. Emergency messages presented to the population must contain clear and simple information to ensure an appropriate response to save lives and reduce losses.

**Economic Constraints**

Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Communications Capacity**

The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Energy Capacity**

Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- Earthquake: RANK: 67 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.293
- Extreme Heat: RANK: 18 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.334
- Fluvial Flood: RANK: 17 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.263
- Pluvial Flood: RANK: 16 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.267
- Landslide: RANK: 58 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.088
- Wildfire: RANK: 51 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.102
**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)**

Sunsari’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.

### Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: 0.717\(\text{DISTRICTS SCORE}\), 0.559\(\text{COUNTRY SCORE}\)
- **Vulnerability**: 0.278\(\text{DISTRICTS SCORE}\), 0.463\(\text{COUNTRY SCORE}\)
- **Coping Capacity**: 0.544\(\text{DISTRICTS SCORE}\), 0.436\(\text{COUNTRY SCORE}\)
NEPAL
SURKHET
Area: 2,451 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - High
Score: 0.588 • Rank: 21/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Moderate
Score: 0.474 • Rank: 44/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Very High
Score: 0.713 • Rank: 13/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Moderate
Score: 0.453 • Rank: 36/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Moderate
Score: 0.401 • Rank: 42/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) **417,776**
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) **46.9**
- Population below Poverty Line **30.5%**
- Population with Safe Drinking Water **66.2%**
- Adult Literacy **67.0%**
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 13 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.713

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake 100%
- 299,909 people
- $803.17 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide 52%
- 154,496 people
- $267.04 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 33%

Extreme Heat 63%
- 189,890 people
- $521.77 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 65%

Wildfire 100%
- 299,909 people
- $803.17 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Fluvial Flood 3%
- 8,238 people
- $72.48 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 9%

Pluvial Flood 14%
- 43,362 people
- $95.37 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 12%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  

Vulnerability in Surkhet is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability  

SCORE: 0.405  
RANK: 58/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability  

SCORE: 0.445  
RANK: 33/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Economic Constraints  

SCORE: 0.559  
RANK: 27/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Food Insecurity  

SCORE: 0.540  
RANK: 24/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Gender Inequality  

SCORE: 0.287  
RANK: 55/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Surkhet is primarily driven by Economic Constraints and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

66.5 Life Expectancy
2.9% Disabled Population

Child Health

57.9% Child Malnutrition Rate
46.9 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
802.6 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
59.7 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
64.8 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 42 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.401

Surkhet exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12,925 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>0.279</td>
<td>38/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89,443 Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Governance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.16 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>54/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6 Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7 Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.05 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.65 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.6 Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.55 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4 Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.7 Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.55 Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Environmental Capacity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.9% Protected Area</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>33/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 42 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.401

Surkhet exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

SCORE: 0.479  RANK: 40/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity

SCORE: 0.468  RANK: 34/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Logistics Capacity

SCORE: 0.516  RANK: 52/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Energy Capacity

SCORE: 0.454  RANK: 44 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 44 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.474

Surkhet’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Economic Constraints
- Food Insecurity
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Economic Constraints
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 40 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.377
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 31 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.244
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 33 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.179
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 23 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.237
- **Landslide**: RANK: 51 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.221
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 4 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  SCORE: 0.475
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Surkhet’s score and ranking are due to Very High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:
Better solutions. Fewer disasters.
RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low**
Score: 0.501 • Rank: 52/77

**RESILIENCE (R) - High**
Score: 0.560 • Rank: 19/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Moderate**
Score: 0.623 • Rank: 32/77

**VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low**
Score: 0.319 • Rank: 64/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Moderate**
Score: 0.440 • Rank: 35/77

- Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook) 254,965
- Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births) 22.0
- Population below Poverty Line 11.8%
- Population with Safe Drinking Water 86.7%
- Adult Literacy 70.4%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 32 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.623

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**: 100%
  - Population: 267,690
  - Cost: $522.45 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**: 97%
  - Population: 258,664
  - Cost: $504.36 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 97%

- **Extreme Heat**: 82%
  - Population: 218,476
  - Cost: $405.56 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 78%

- **Wildfire**: 0%
  - Population: 0
  - Cost: $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Fluvial Flood**: 1%
  - Population: 3,447
  - Cost: $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

- **Pluvial Flood**: 4%
  - Population: 11,661
  - Cost: $13.92 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 3%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  RANK: 64 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.319

Vulnerability in Syangja is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability  RANK: 71/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.293

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability  RANK: 70/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.257

Economic Constraints  RANK: 61/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.368

Food Insecurity  RANK: 37/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.476

Gender Inequality  RANK: 56/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.268
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 64 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.319

Vulnerability in Syangja is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 68/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.253

- 70.1 Life Expectancy
- 2.0% Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 64/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.283

- 39.1% Child Malnutrition Rate
- 22.0 Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
- 654.9 Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
- 27.0 Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
- 34.5 Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 35 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.440

Syangja exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **Score:** 0.356  RANK: 27/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 14,180
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 108,234

### Governance

- **Score:** 0.404  RANK: 56/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.13
- **Government Organization and Administration (Score out of 9):** 6.2
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 4.93
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 5.85
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 8.3
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 4.85
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 5.33

### Environmental Capacity

- **Score:** 0.007  RANK: 47/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
- **Protected Area (%):** 0.0

Syangja exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)**

**RANK: 35 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.440**

Syangja exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**

**SCORE: 0.616**

**RANK: 14/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**Communications Capacity**

**SCORE: 0.553**

**RANK: 18/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 3.3% Households with Landline
- 1.9% Households with Internet
- 25.3% Households with Television
- 57.5% Households with Radio
- 79.7% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**

**SCORE: 0.602**

**RANK: 26/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 15 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 68.5% Improved Roadway
- 19.7 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 78.3 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 19.7 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 13.8 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 11.3 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 0.59 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**

**SCORE: 0.694**

**RANK: 10 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

- 86.5% Households with Electricity
- 14.2% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)

Syangja’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with Moderate Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Food Insecurity**
- **Economic Constraints**
- **Communications Capacity**
- **Logistics Capacity**

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Food Insecurity**
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Logistics Capacity**
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 64 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.307
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 27 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.278
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.157
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 65 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.113
- **Landslide**: RANK: 38 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.354
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 59 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.000
Syangja’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and Moderate Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL TANAHU
Area: 1,546 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Low
Score: 0.503 • Rank: 49/77

RESILIENCE (R) - High
Score: 0.591 • Rank: 15/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High
Score: 0.691 • Rank: 20/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Very Low
Score: 0.291 • Rank: 69/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - High
Score: 0.474 • Rank: 26/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
327,620

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
29.2

Population below Poverty Line
14.8%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
80.7%

Adult Literacy
68.3%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 20 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.691

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
303,151
$524.15 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
87%
265,227
$457.53 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 87%

Extreme Heat
100%
303,151
$524.15 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Wildfire
13%
38,811
$44.38 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 8%

Fluvial Flood
3%
7,966
$44.06 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 8%

Pluvial Flood
8%
25,077
$54.15 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 10%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)  
RANK: 69 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.291

Vulnerability in Tanahu is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.257  
RANK: 74/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Adult Literacy: 68.3%  
- Mean Years of Schooling: 97.3  
- Student Teacher Ratio: 15

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability  
SCORE: 0.387  
RANK: 48/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Access to Safe Drinking Water: 80.7%  
- Households without Toilet: 16.1%  
- Water Schemes in Disrepair: 39.1%  
- Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000): 171.3  
- Cholera Incidence (per 100,000): 20.3

Economic Constraints  
SCORE: 0.290  
RANK: 71/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Income per Capita (PPP $): -  
- Poverty Headcount Ratio: 14.8%  
- Poverty Gap: 3.3%  
- Age Dependency Ratio: 79.5

Food Insecurity  
SCORE: 0.412  
RANK: 50/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Food Poverty Prevalence: 17.7%  
- Low kcal Intake Prevalence: 33.2%  
- Agricultural Insufficiency Rate: 64.2%

Gender Inequality  
SCORE: 0.152  
RANK: 72/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.25  
- Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity): 0.02  
- No Female Home nor Land Ownership: 76.1%
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 69 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.291

Vulnerability in Tanahu is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Clean Water Access Vulnerability. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 70 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.247

69.8
Life Expectancy
1.9%
Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 68 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.268

47.3%
Child Malnutrition Rate
29.2
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
347.6
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)
21.3
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)
22.0
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 26 / 77  DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.474

Tanahu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14,007 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>105,818 Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.18 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.13 Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.23 Organization and Administration (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.33 Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5 Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.68 Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0% Protected Area</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RANK: 30/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

RANK: 33/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

RANK: 49/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
Tanahu exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Logistics Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Infrastructure Capacity**
- SCORE: 0.622  RANK: 12/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

**Communications Capacity**
- SCORE: 0.565  RANK: 13/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - 5.3% Households with Landline
  - 1.5% Households with Internet
  - 34.9% Households with Television
  - 54.1% Households with Radio
  - 74.7% Households with Mobile Phone

**Logistics Capacity**
- SCORE: 0.611  RANK: 23/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - 12 Road Density (km per sq. km)
  - 71.6% Improved Roadway
  - 25.1 Average Distance to Airport (km)
  - 108.4 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
  - 25.1 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
  - 10.3 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
  - 11.9 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
  - 1.25 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

**Energy Capacity**
- SCORE: 0.691  RANK: 11/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - 77.1% Households with Electricity
  - 22.3% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 15 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.591

Tanahu’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Vulnerability combined with High Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Communications Capacity
- Logistics Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

Logistics Capacity
Efficient movement, storage and delivery of resources are key to effective humanitarian assistance and disaster relief operations. Ensuring that the supply chain can reach vulnerable and isolated communities can significantly improve the speed and quality of response and mass care operations, reducing the negative social and economic impacts of an emergency.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**: RANK: 68 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.289
- **Extreme Heat**: RANK: 21 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.307
- **Fluvial Flood**: RANK: 55 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.133
- **Pluvial Flood**: RANK: 51 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.132
- **Landslide**: RANK: 43 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.326
- **Wildfire**: RANK: 45 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED, SCORE: 0.130
MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)

Tanahu’s score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Very Low Vulnerability and High Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**: Districts Score 0.691 vs. Country Score 0.559
- **Vulnerability**: Districts Score 0.291 vs. Country Score 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**: Districts Score 0.474 vs. Country Score 0.436

RANK WITHIN DISTRICTS
Score: 0.503
NEPAL
TAPLEJUNG
Area: 3,646 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY
COMPONENT SCORE

**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)** - Very Low
Score: 0.469 • Rank: 63/77

**RESILIENCE (R)** - Moderate
Score: 0.474 • Rank: 43/77

**MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)** - Very Low
Score: 0.356 • Rank: 69/77

**VULNERABILITY (V)** - Moderate
Score: 0.433 • Rank: 42/77

**COPING CAPACITY (CC)** - Low
Score: 0.381 • Rank: 53/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
120,359

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
54.1

Population below Poverty Line
27.0%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
90.6%

Adult Literacy
65.7%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 69 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.356

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**: 100%
  - 115,413 people
  - $201.64 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**: 100%
  - 115,412 people
  - $201.61 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Extreme Heat**: 0%
  - 0 people
  - $0
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

- **Wildfire**: 31%
  - 35,388 people
  - $61.32 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 30%

- **Fluvial Flood**: <1%
  - 467 people
  - $12.34 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 6%

- **Pluvial Flood**: 1%
  - 1,505 people
  - $20.18 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 10%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC's AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
## Vulnerability (V)

Vulnerability in Taplejung is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

### Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>55/77</td>
<td>55/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>16.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>54/77</td>
<td>54/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>37.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>152.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>$1,313</td>
<td>46/77</td>
<td>46/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>25/77</td>
<td>25/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Districts Assessed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>51/77</td>
<td>51/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)  

RANK: 42 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.433

Vulnerability in Taplejung is primarily driven by Food Insecurity and Vulnerable Health Status. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

RANK: 18/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.502

65.1  
Life Expectancy

2.9%  
Disabled Population

Child Health

RANK: 26/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.523

38.5%  
Child Malnutrition Rate

54.1  
Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)

892.4  
Child ARI Incidence (per 1,000)

53.4  
Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)

104.5  
Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  

RANK: 53 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.381

Taplejung exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Economic Capacity

SCORE: 0.301  RANK: 35/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 6,803 Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.)
- 114,824 Labor Productivity (Rs.)

Governance

SCORE: 0.253  RANK: 71/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 0.15 Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)
- 5.31 Government Management (Score out of 9)
- 3.17 Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)
- 5.58 Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)
- 6.28 Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)
- 6.72 Service Flow (Score out of 16)
- 3.92 Judicial Work (Score out of 7)
- 3.56 Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)

Environmental Capacity

SCORE: 0.749  RANK: 10/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 55.7% Protected Area
COPING CAPACITY (CC)

RANK: 53 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.381

Taplejung exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity
SCORE: 0.426  RANK: 53/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity
SCORE: 0.467  RANK: 36/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 4.2% Households with Landline
- 0.5% Households with Internet
- 11.2% Households with Television
- 67.6% Households with Radio
- 58.8% Households with Mobile Phone

Logistics Capacity
SCORE: 0.556  RANK: 42/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 2 Road Density (km per sq. km)
- 69.8% Improved Roadway
- 28.9 Average Distance to Airport (km)
- 103.3 Average Distance to Dry Port (km)
- 28.9 Average Distance to Warehouse (km)
- 22.0 Average Distance to Police Station (km)
- 12.4 Average Distance to Hospital (km)
- 2.91 Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)

Energy Capacity
SCORE: 0.254  RANK: 60 /77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

- 25.1% Households with Electricity
- 3.2% Households using Gas for Cooking
RESILIENCE (R)  RANK: 43 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.474

Taplejung’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Food Insecurity
- Vulnerable Health Status
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Vulnerable Health Status
A population with a compromised health status will have a greatly reduced ability to manage short- and long-term disaster outcomes. Improving health is often correlated with decreased susceptibility to injury, disease, and stress associated with disasters. Acute or prolonged vulnerable health status limits the basic capacity of response functions.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 57 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.335

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 61 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.000

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 72 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.060

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 73 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.083

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 37 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.355

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 40 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.171
Taplejung’s score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.
NEPAL
TERHATHUM
Area: 679 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - Very Low
Score: 0.434  •  Rank: 69/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Moderate
Score: 0.511  •  Rank: 36/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - Very Low
Score: 0.324  •  Rank: 75/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Low
Score: 0.379  •  Rank: 58/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low
Score: 0.400  •  Rank: 45/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
89,125

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
24.9

Population below Poverty Line
14.6%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
78.6%

Adult Literacy
69.4%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 75 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.324

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

Earthquake
100%
91,081
$198.85 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Landslide
98%
89,444
$198.85 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

Extreme Heat
0%
0
$0
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 0%

Wildfire
25%
23,157
$88.82 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 45%

Fluvial Flood
<1%
33
-
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: -

Pluvial Flood
<1%
389
$0.92 Million
Critical Infrastructure Exposed: <1%

NOTE: Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Terathum is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

- 69.4% Adult Literacy
- 4.56 Mean Years of Schooling
- 96.5 Primary School Net Enrollment
- 11.76 Student Teacher Ratio

Score: 0.337
RANK: 65/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

- 78.6% Access to Safe Drinking Water
- 24.8% Households without Toilet
- 40.3% Water Schemes in Disrepair
- 252.6 Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)
- 28.6 Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)

Score: 0.487
RANK: 25/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Economic Constraints

- $1,419 Income per Capita (PPP $)
- 14.6% Poverty Headcount Ratio
- 2.5% Poverty Gap
- 76.1 Age Dependency Ratio

Score: 0.340
RANK: 65/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Food Insecurity

- 20.6% Food Poverty Prevalence
- 33.6% Low kcal Intake Prevalence
- 68.5% Agricultural Insufficiency Rate

Score: 0.462
RANK: 39/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Gender Inequality

- 0.27 Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 0.04 Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)
- 77.1% No Female Home nor Land Ownership

Score: 0.209
RANK: 67/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
VULNERABILITY (V)

RANK: 58 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.379

Vulnerability in Terhathum is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Food Insecurity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

VULNERABLE HEALTH STATUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Life Expectancy</td>
<td></td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled Population</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CHILD HEALTH

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td>63.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)</td>
<td></td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child All-Round Illness (per 1,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1142.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Diarrhea Incidence (per 100)</td>
<td></td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Pneumonia Incidence (per 1,000)</td>
<td></td>
<td>120.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)

**RANK: 45 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED**

**SCORE: 0.400**

Terathum exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

### Economic Capacity

- **Score:** 0.260  
  **Rank:** 43/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross Domestic Product (Rs.)</td>
<td>5,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor Productivity (Rs.)</td>
<td>105,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Governance

- **Score:** 0.407  
  **Rank:** 55/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000)</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>6.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organization and Administration (Score out of 8)</td>
<td>5.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11)</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Flow (Score out of 16)</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judicial Work (Score out of 7)</td>
<td>4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Inclusion (Score out of 10)</td>
<td>3.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9)</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6)</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Environmental Capacity

- **Score:** 0.000  
  **Rank:** 49/77 Districts Assessed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Protected Area</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 45 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.400

Terhathum exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Energy Capacity and Communications Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

SCORE: 0.565  RANK: 24/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Communications Capacity

SCORE: 0.537  RANK: 22/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Households with Landline: 3.7%
Households with Internet: 0.7%
Households with Television: 27.9%
Households with Radio: 65.8%
Households with Mobile Phone: 68.5%

Logistics Capacity

SCORE: 0.653  RANK: 15/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Road Density (km per sq. km): 28
Improved Roadway: 59.8%
Average Distance to Airport (km): 91.5
Average Distance to Dry Port (km): 26.4
Average Distance to Warehouse (km): 9.9
Average Distance to Police Station (km): 9.9
Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000): 1.91

Energy Capacity

SCORE: 0.505  RANK: 40 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED

Households with Electricity: 67.2%
Households using Gas for Cooking: 4.9%
DISTRICT PROFILE

RESILIENCE (R)  
RANK: 36 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  
SCORE: 0.511

Terathum’s score and ranking are due to Low Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- Clean Water Access Vulnerability
- Food Insecurity
- Energy Capacity
- Communications Capacity

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

Clean Water Access Vulnerability
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

Food Insecurity
The changing frequency and intensity of disasters can expose the entire food system to supply chain disruptions. Promoting resilient agricultural systems through training of local farmers in sustainable practices (e.g., soil improvement, erosion reduction) and improving efficiencies in food marketing, storage, delivery, and waste management will help to increase the nutrition and food security of present and future generations.

Energy Capacity
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.

Communications Capacity
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - RANK: 62 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.308

- **Extreme Heat**
  - RANK: 61 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.000

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 77 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.000

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - RANK: 77 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.000

- **Landslide**
  - RANK: 44 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.321

- **Wildfire**
  - RANK: 41 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
  - SCORE: 0.166
**MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR)**

Terathum's score and ranking are due to Very Low Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Low Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.

Multi-hazard risk component scores compared to overall average country scores:

- **Multi-Hazard Exposure**
  - Districts Score: 0.324
  - Country Score: 0.559
- **Vulnerability**
  - Districts Score: 0.379
  - Country Score: 0.463
- **Coping Capacity**
  - Districts Score: 0.400
  - Country Score: 0.436
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NEPAL
UDAYAPUR

Area: 2,063 km²

RISK AND VULNERABILITY COMPONENT SCORE

MULTI-HAZARD RISK (MHR) - High
Score: 0.587  •  Rank: 22/77

RESILIENCE (R) - Low
Score: 0.448  •  Rank: 52/77

MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE) - High
Score: 0.656  •  Rank: 27/77

VULNERABILITY (V) - Moderate
Score: 0.459  •  Rank: 33/77

COPING CAPACITY (CC) - Low
Score: 0.355  •  Rank: 58/77

Population (2021 Statistical Yearbook)
342,773

Infant Mortality Rate (per 1,000 live births)
33.9

Population below Poverty Line
25.9%

Population with Safe Drinking Water
79.2%

Adult Literacy
60.7%
MULTI-HAZARD EXPOSURE (MHE)

RANK: 27 / 77 DISTRICTS
SCORE: 0.656

ESTIMATED EXPOSURE TO EACH HAZARD:

- **Earthquake**
  - 100%
  - 307,639
  - $544.69 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 100%

- **Landslide**
  - 54%
  - 166,282
  - $258.59 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 47%

- **Extreme Heat**
  - 86%
  - 265,978
  - $474.65 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 87%

- **Wildfire**
  - 29%
  - 87,773
  - $252.26 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 46%

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - 2%
  - 7,617
  - $78.44 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 14%

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - 15%
  - 45,203
  - $154.03 Million
  - Critical Infrastructure Exposed: 28%

**NOTE:** Population exposure values for Nepal districts are estimated using PDC’s AIM model. Values may differ from Census population estimates.
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Udayapur is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Information Access Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Literacy</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>49/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean Years of Schooling</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School Net Enrollment</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Teacher Ratio</td>
<td>19.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Access to Clean Water Vulnerability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access to Safe Drinking Water</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>20/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households without Toilet</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Schemes in Disrepair</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typhoid Incidence (per 10,000)</td>
<td>165.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholera Incidence (per 100,000)</td>
<td>178.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Economic Constraints

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income per Capita (PPP $)</td>
<td>0.516</td>
<td>32/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Headcount Ratio</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Gap</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Dependency Ratio</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Food Insecurity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Food Poverty Prevalence</td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>43/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low kcal Intake Prevalence</td>
<td>34.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Insufficiency Rate</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender Inequality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Literacy Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>29/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female to Male Secondary Enrollment Ratio (Distance from Parity)</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Female Home nor Land Ownership</td>
<td>76.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VULNERABILITY (V)

Vulnerability in Udayapur is primarily driven by Clean Water Access Vulnerability and Economic Constraints. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Vulnerability score.

Vulnerable Health Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>68.3 Life Expectancy</td>
<td>0.342</td>
<td>50/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5% Disabled Population</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Child Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.0% Child Malnutrition Rate</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>54/77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.9 Infant Mortality Rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>556.2 Child ARI Incidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.1 Child Diarrhea Incidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77.2 Child Pneumonia Incidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
COPING CAPACITY (CC)  RANK: 58 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.355

Udayapur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

**Economic Capacity**  RANK: 41/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.265

- **Gross Domestic Product (Million Rs.):** 11,842
- **Labor Productivity (Rs.):** 88,649

**Governance**  RANK: 65/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.356

- **Average Annual Conflict (per 10,000):** 0.14
- **Government Organization and Management (Score out of 9):** 6.4
- **Budget and Plan Management (Score out of 11):** 4.85
- **Fiscal and Financial Management (Score out of 11):** 5.95
- **Service Flow (Score out of 16):** 6.9
- **Judicial Work (Score out of 7):** 5.4
- **Physical Infrastructure (Score out of 13):** 4.75
- **Social Inclusion (Score out of 10):** 2.8
- **Environmental Protection and Disaster Management (Score out of 9):** 2.4
- **Cooperation and Coordination (Score out of 6):** 1.7

**Environmental Capacity**  RANK: 41/77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED  SCORE: 0.085

- **Protected Area:** 0.7%
COPING CAPACITY (CC) RANK: 58 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED
SCORE: 0.355

Udayapur exhibits weaker Coping Capacity in the areas of Communications Capacity and Energy Capacity. The bar charts indicate the socioeconomic themes contributing to the overall Coping Capacity score.

Infrastructure Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.466</td>
<td>46/77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Communications Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Landline</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Internet</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Television</td>
<td>25.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Radio</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households with Mobile Phone</td>
<td>61.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Logistics Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road Density (km per sq. km)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved Roadway</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Airport (km)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Dry Port (km)</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Warehouse (km)</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Police Station (km)</td>
<td>20.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Distance to Hospital (km)</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational Hospital Beds (per 10,000)</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Energy Capacity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Households with Electricity</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Households using Gas for Cooking</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISTRICT PROFILE

RESILIENCE (R) RANK: 52 / 77 DISTRICTS ASSESSED SCORE: 0.448

Udayapur’s score and ranking are due to Moderate Vulnerability combined with Low Coping Capacity scores.

Below are the four thematic areas with the weakest relative scores:

- **Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
- **Economic Constraints**
- **Communications Capacity**
- **Energy Capacity**

KEY FACTORS INFLUENCING RESILIENCE

**Clean Water Access Vulnerability**
Those without easy or adequate access to water distribution and containment systems face significant demands on daily routines that effectively limit their response and recovery capacity and the ability to maintain livelihoods. Increasing access to improved water and sanitation improves health outcomes and frees up resources to decrease further susceptibility to impacts.

**Economic Constraints**
Economic constraints have individual, household, community, and district-wide influence. Limitations on available financial resources reduce opportunities to invest in mitigation and preparedness measures and limit the ability to facilitate short- and long-term recovery.

**Communications Capacity**
The density, diversity, resilience, and quality of communications infrastructure influence how subnational- and local-level populations are able to facilitate effective and coordinated communication.

**Energy Capacity**
Homes, businesses, industry, and government all rely on access to energy resources for continuity of daily activities. Expanding, strengthening, and securing the energy network and increasing the availability and quantity of energy reserves will contribute to economic development and increase the speed of recovery processes in the aftermath of a disaster.
HAZARD-SPECIFIC RISK (HSR)

- **Earthquake**
  - Rank: 32 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.387

- **Extreme Heat**
  - Rank: 15 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.354

- **Fluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 27 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.199

- **Pluvial Flood**
  - Rank: 19 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.256

- **Landslide**
  - Rank: 50 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.248

- **Wildfire**
  - Rank: 13 / 77 Districts Assessed
  - Score: 0.323
Udayapur's score and ranking are due to High Multi-hazard Exposure combined with Moderate Vulnerability and Low Coping Capacity scores.