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CRM  Complaints Response Mechanism
FSC  Food Security Cluster
GBV  Gender Based Violence
HH  Household
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Definitions

**CBT- Community Based Targeting:** Targeting approach premised on the idea that communities understand their vulnerability better than external persons and should participate in defining eligibility and exercising discretion in the identification of recipients of assistance (e.g. village-level, community and settlement level).

**CSC- Community Selection Committee:** Governance bodies nominated by communities charged with the identification of vulnerable persons according to pre-determined and/or negotiated eligibility criteria (Village Relief Committee, Community Development Committee, etc.).

**CRM- Complaints Response Mechanism:** Systems and structures established by external parties to provide communities public and/or confidential means to make their concerns and needs known (complaints response committees, hotlines, etc.).
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Background

The 2018 Humanitarian Response Plan placed centrality of protection at the heart of humanitarian efforts, challenging food security actors to identify and address differential forms of exclusion, including those based on societal discrimination, power structures, vulnerability, age, and gender. The Food Security Cluster met its membership and community committees to understand how protection principles highlighted in the Somalia 2013 Food Security Cluster Protection Mainstreaming Guidelines have been operationalised to reach the most vulnerable in a safe, accountable and participatory manner, and to identify emerging best practice to share with others.

Rationale

To develop targeting guidelines to assist Food Security Cluster members to identify the most vulnerable communities, groups and individuals. Drawing on the collective wisdom of the cluster membership, Food Security Cluster hopes to provide a learning platform of tools presently in use to inspire the development of ever more effective community based targeting practice. The guidelines and tools are not prescriptive or definitive but aim to promote standardised engagement with communities where Food Security Cluster members have access to affected populations. The guidelines target both the designers of food security projects and the implementers of the targeting process at field-level.

Targeting Basics

Targeting is a process, not an event. It is a practical process of defining, identifying, and reaching intended recipients of assistance. Targeting considerations inform all steps of the project management cycle, starting at design, and continuing through implementation, monitoring and evaluation (Annex 1: Targeting Process Checklist). An important objective of targeting is to identify the potential cost and benefits involved in using targeting approaches for both the organisation and recipients of assistance. Thinking through the whole targeting process in advance can aid in identifying and addressing potential risk for the organisation and the recipients of aid, as well as supporting the establishment of a robust monitoring and learning framework to allow for fine-tuning and correcting of targeting.

Targeting of humanitarian assistance is defined as ensuring that assistance reaches people who need it when and where they need it, in appropriate form, in appropriate quantities and through effective modalities, and conversely does not flow to people who do not need it. Effective targeting also aims to create lasting benefits for the beneficiaries, through the promotion of community self-help structures and the creation of sustainable assets. Accurate targeting aims to maximise coverage of assistance by minimising inclusion and exclusion errors.

---

5 FSC met with 186 members and 100 Village Relief Committee (VRC) members during 16 engagement meetings held in 10 locations: Nairobi (x2), Dolow, Baidoa, Kismayo, Mogadishu, N. Galkayo, S. Galkayo, Garowe, Bossaso, Hargeisa.
7 Food Aid After 50 Years: Recasting Its Role, 2005, C. Barrett and D. Maxwell
8 FSNAU On-Line Courses, Module 8: Targeting, http://www.fao.org/docrep/008/y5702e/y5702e0a.htm#TopOfPage
• Inclusion error: Inclusion in the programme of those who do not meet the eligibility criteria.
• Exclusion error: Exclusion from the programme of those who meet the eligibility criteria.

Defining Target Groups
Vulnerability defines the characteristics of a person or group and their situation that influence their capacity to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from the impact of a hazard. The effect of disaster on people’s resources determines the resilience of their livelihoods and their vulnerability to food insecurity. These resources include financial capital (such as livestock, cash, credit, and savings), the physical (houses, machinery), the natural (land, water, and forest), the human (labour, skills), the social (networks, norms) and the political (influence, policy).

Vulnerability analysis and needs assessment informs objectives and thus defines activities, numbers and the profiles of people to target for food security, which in turn help to generate criteria and choice of approaches. Vulnerability should be assessed in each emergency, otherwise groups which are in particular need may be overlooked and others, whose needs are less profound, may be included. For example, displacement into or out of an area could require organisations to revisit population numbers in target locations, adjusting figures upwards and/or downwards to reflect changing realities. Assessing the impact of hazards (or positive changes), over time, and developing profiles of vulnerable groups can facilitate defining eligibility criteria and planning responses (Annex 3: Vulnerability Profiling Analysis for Somalia). For food security interventions, organisations generally use a mix of easy-to-identify socio-economic indicators to define eligibility criteria for households and individuals in both rural and urban settings. Good targeting criteria includes both inclusion and exclusion criteria, and is specific, verifiable, and understandable by staff and community. Communities are more likely to apply criteria if they have been involved in its development. (Annex 4: FSC Partners Eligibility Criteria in Somalia). Identifying the most vulnerable within groups who are poor and similarly exposed to multiple hazards is difficult for both organisations and CSC members (Annex 5: Vulnerability Key Concepts and Analysis Tool). Some organisations have developed settlement vulnerability profiles to aid in identifying villages within districts (Annex 6: Village Level Targeting Form). Households in urban areas are often vulnerable in different ways than their counterparts in rural settings. It is important to understand these differences when assessing needs, setting objectives and establishing criteria. Livelihood projects profile target groups differently, weighing issues such as sustainability of interventions and using other criteria to determine eligibility for activities. For example, participants in agricultural production projects must have access to land and be willing/able to participate in obligatory activities (e.g. training) (Annex 7: Livelihood Eligibility Criteria).

Urban Vulnerability
The vulnerability profile of urban families is different than their rural counterparts: the structure of urban households differs with higher dependency ratios; many are highly reliant on precarious informal employment, with women playing an important role as income-earners; they access food through expensive local markets and/or consume food outside the house; and they often have limited access to formal and informal safety nets. (Annex 8: Vulnerability and Targeting in Urban Settings).

---

9 At Risk: Natural hazards, people’s vulnerability and disasters, 2nd edition, Wisner et al, 2004
10 Sphere Handbook, Food security and nutrition chapter, Draft 1, April 2017. 4.2 Food Security- Livelihoods.
Target groups can be defined and identified at the following levels of detail. Most organisations use more than one level for targeting.

**Table 1: Levels of Targeting**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Geographic targeting</strong>:</th>
<th>All people living in a specific area receive assistance defined by administrative boundaries (e.g. districts) or analytical units such as agricultural or climatic regions, or livelihood zones.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community/Group targeting</strong>:</td>
<td>Sections of the population. Community: group of households that are, to a greater of lesser extent, economically interdependent, (e.g. village, IDP settlement, etc.). Groups with observable characteristics: gender, age, disability, etc. Livelihood groups: fishers, pastoralists, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household targeting</strong>:</td>
<td>All households fulfilling certain criteria receive assistance based on profiles of groups whose lives and livelihoods are at risk, such as IDP households or female-headed households. Smallest social and economic unit. A group of individuals, usually related, who form an economic unit within which income, assets, food supplies, etc. are shared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual targeting</strong>:</td>
<td>Within households, individuals whose lives are at risk receive assistance, such as malnourished children, pregnant and lactating women. Often applied for nutritional and health programmes through direct measures (e.g. weight-for-height).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Approaches for Targeting**

Finally, organisations must choose which targeting approach(es) to employ. Targeting approaches should answer the question: How will the eligibility criteria be applied? How will the organisation ensure that the assistance actually reaches beneficiaries? The principle approaches to targeting in use in Somalia are:

**Geographic Targeting**: Identification of specific administrative units, economic areas or livelihood zones that have food-insecure women, men and children. Often guided by FSNAU seasonal IPC classification, shocks and organisational preferences.

---


13 WFP Targeting in Emergencies, 2006, https://www.wfp.org/content/targeting-emergencies
Community Based Targeting: Communities identify their most vulnerable members through a participatory process. In community based targeting, the assumption is that communities have a better understanding of their own vulnerability than external actors. It is often employed when administrative capacity is limited, or where community empowerment and capacity-building are among the programme’s objectives.

Self-Targeting: The individual concerned identifies him/herself according to some kind of externally imposed criteria and sometimes purely through his/her own self-identification. With regards to cost, the main targeting factors are the time and effort required from recipients (working, travelling, or waiting) and social stigma of receiving assistance. Some types of interventions, such as food for work are based on the principle that target groups select themselves. However, such projects are often implemented in areas of high unemployment, where the work implemented cannot absorb all the people willing to work. This can provide incentives for the better-off to compete with the worst-off for opportunities.

Mixed Targeting: Organisations employ a mix of different targeting approaches: geographic targeting to determine livelihood zone and/or economic group, complemented by categorical targeting to define type of individual and household (-), combined with some sort of proxy means testing (e.g. household with no income source) or vulnerability index score such as Coping Strategy Index, or status indicators (e.g. refugee, displaced) to further identify households.

Blanket Assistance: If the situation is very severe, such as rapid displacement, and the period of assistance is short-lived, it may be more cost effective and socially beneficial simply to provide assistance to everyone. Blanket targeting can save lives, but can result in higher levels of inclusion error of better-off segments of society.

Other targeting approaches associated with general food security, safety net and social protection: see Annex 2: Other Targeting Approaches

Key Considerations:

- Mixing targeting approaches improves targeting accuracy;
- SWOT analysis/risk assessment important when deciding which targeting approaches to use;
- During rapid on-set emergencies, geographic targeting to impacted area and blanket assistance is recommended. In crisis, inclusion errors are more tolerable than exclusion errors.

In Somalia, the identification of the eligible households usually takes place at community level, involving community based targeting.

Additional Resources for Food Security Targeting


---
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Targeting Environment in Somalia

The state formation process is underway throughout Somalia and Food Security Cluster members encounter a variety of different governance environments through which they must navigate to identify the most vulnerable. To be successful, a targeting system must take account of the existing governance and power structures in beneficiary countries and communities. If this aspect is ignored, there may be unnecessary conflict or high levels of “leakage”—that is, benefits may go to the powerful and their favoured groups instead of the needy.17

Throughout Somalia, more and more government institutions are participating in humanitarian and development affairs. Federal and member state ministries, district and municipal authorities are increasing in capacity to exercise their mandates and willingness to support organisations to overcome challenges related to targeting. Nevertheless, some locations in Somalia are in conflict and there are varying levels of government capacity and legitimacy. In parts of the country, there might be several administrations functioning in parallel, requiring organisations to negotiate access to communities through multiple formal and informal governance structures. In recently established states where government controls relatively small areas, ministry, municipal and district mandates overlap, with different layers vying for coordination and monitoring control of projects. While in other locations, ministries related to agriculture, livestock and humanitarian affairs have clear mandates and articulate their priorities, and promote coordination and common standards. Progressively, District Commissioners can be called upon to assist with issues related to inclusion/exclusion errors, taxation of assistance and curtailing other harmful practices of gatekeepers. However, government offices in some locations are under-resourced and view projects as a means to secure funding to pay salaries by enlisting staff members as recipients of assistance.

At village and settlement level, traditional leadership structures, involving clan elders, Imams, and businesspersons remain strong and play a pivotal role in the identification of the most vulnerable by proposing CSC members, resolving complaints of inclusion/exclusion error, etc. In some locations however, dominant groups might control the civil administration, and their participation may reinforce marginalisation and lead to mistrust amongst segments of the community. Powerholders might try to direct assistance to home areas or to family members. In urban settings, in the absence of strong government and policy, IDPs have self-organised, establishing governance structure “umbrellas” which sometimes allocate assistance according to their own perceptions of needs and objectives. Gatekeepers of various description (landlords, militia leaders, community committees, etc.) have filled the void left by the government both advocating on behalf of and exploiting affected populations to varying degrees. Despite these challenges, efforts are underway to institutionalise informal camp management structures through engagement and awareness raising of humanitarian principles and norms.

It is always important to consult, but organisations must make individual decisions as to the level of involvement they want from government stakeholders at different levels. Contextual analysis with an emphasis on understanding the socio-political context and a strong focus on clan dynamics can help FSC members navigate this complex and rapidly changing governance environment.

Guiding Principles

**Be pragmatic:** Strike a balance in the design of targeting systems between imperative to act, cost and accuracy.\(^{18}\) Recognise no targeting system is ever perfect: every situation is unique, changes over time and requires a flexible mix of approaches to limit exclusion errors (which can be life threatening) and wasteful inclusion errors.\(^{19}\)

**Reach those in greatest need:** Improve contextual awareness to identify differential forms of exclusion and develop context-sensitive targeting strategies to reach the most vulnerable groups and households at village and settlement levels.

**Accountability to affected populations:** Promote two-way communication and share information that is accessible, reliable and timely. Ensure the participation of women, youth, and less dominant groups in needs assessment, design, targeting process, implementation and re-design of food security projects. Establish formal feedback mechanisms to give the voiceless a means to make their concerns and needs known.

**Engage with governance structures:** Work with and/or through community structures and promote transparency and accountability, designing and adapting targeting processes to strengthen engagement of marginalised groups. Encourage horizontal and vertical linkages with governance structures (community-level, governmental and humanitarian) to improve targeting outcomes.

**“Do No Harm”**: Targeting process should be informed through contextual analysis (political environment, risk of diversion, exploitation, taxation and theft\(^{20}\)) and well designed and implemented to avoid risk of violence against and further marginalisation and stigmatisation of groups and individuals.

**Closer coordination and standardisation:** Adopt common community based targeting approaches, incorporating: protection analysis, accountability to affected populations, gender awareness, transparency, and “Do No Harm” principles to reach invisible groups and raise awareness of humanitarian standards with communities. Participate in joint assessment, community engagement, registration and verification of recipients of assistance and negotiation/advocacy to improve targeting outcomes. Develop common and/or improve interoperability between registration mechanisms to support coordination (i.e. avoid duplication) and facilitate referral within programmes or to other organisations and other types of assistance.

---


\(^{19}\) Adaptation of WFP Targeting in Emergencies, 2006. https://www.wfp.org/content/targeting-emergencies

Protection Principles in Targeting

Community based targeting is like an engine. It requires oil, which represent protection, to lubricate the parts, reducing friction for smooth running; and water, which represents accountability, to cool systems reducing the build-up of heat which can damage the moving parts and lead to a breakdown.

For Food Security Cluster members, protection mainstreaming means implementing food assistance, agricultural, nutritional and livelihood activities in non-discriminatory and impartial ways that promote safety, dignity and integrity for people receiving assistance. Food Security Cluster members aim to avoid any unintended consequences of their assistance or interventions and where not feasible, would strive to minimise the negative impact. The members are committed to a “Do No Harm” approach to programming. Equality, accountability to affected populations, participation and empowerment are principles incorporated into all stages of implementing food security activity, programme or project intervention. These principles contribute to appropriate targeting of beneficiaries so as to avoid the harm potentially generated by food security assistance, increase the safety of the staff, the intervention, and the beneficiaries.\(^\text{21}\)

Operationalising Protection Analysis

Targeting approach and implementation modality should be informed by a protection assessment and analysis to ensure the assistance is delivered in a safe, accessible, accountable and participatory manner. There are a number of barriers to inclusion of vulnerable groups (women, disabled, minority groups, etc.). Promote active participation of women and girls in food security and agricultural assessment and planning. Identify protection risk and develop mitigation measures (Annex 9: Protection Analysis Frameworks). Protect and promote affected people’s safe access to services, producers, consumers and traders. Women and men receive equal access to appropriate income earning opportunities where income generation and employment are feasible livelihood strategies. When applying a gender focus in the targeting process, it is important to consider the different impacts of the emergency on men, women

and girls. It is also important to be aware of the impact of humanitarian assistance on women and girls in relation to SEA. The effectiveness and applicability of targeting female-headed households should take into account the prevailing workload of women and relations with their actual nourishment and health status. Assess the physical safety risk associated with food security and livelihood activities for women. For example, household activities like procuring and cooking food is primarily the responsibility of women and girls, and often requires them to travel long distances to water points or to collect firewood, therefore exposing them to GBV and SEA.

Organisations should remain vigilant for GBV related issues and preposition linkages with protection actors to facilitate safe and confidential referrals. Identify and train GBV focal points to provide basic skills to support survivors and to attend field-level coordination mechanisms. Identify service providers in target locations and establish dignified and effective referral for treatment and psychosocial support. Organisations engaged in conditional works programmes, especially in areas of recent conflict, should also preposition relationships with actors involved in the disposal of unexploded ordinances. (Annex 10: Protection Cluster Referral List.)

**Key Steps:** Identify protection issues, protect and promote access, gender issues and cost to recipient considered, design mitigation measures, and monitor their effectiveness. Preposition relationships with protection service providers and establish pathways to safe, confidential systems of care.

**Operationalising “Do No Harm” Analysis**

Preferably at design phase undertake a “Do No Harm” analysis with an emphasis on understanding clan dynamics to understand community profile and mechanisms for disenfranchisement. “Do No Harm” is key to effective stakeholder mapping. Use trusted senior staff external to context or third parties to work with staff/partners from that location to do gather data. Understand historic connectors and dividers and ensure targeting and assistance does not cause harm and lead to conflict or weaken structures that make peace sustainable in conflicted communities. Recognise that targeting approach and choice of delivery mechanism can lead to harm, especially as context changes. Continuously monitor context and be prepared to change approaches. (Annex 11: Do No Harm Analysis).

**Key Steps:** As soon as possible, do an analysis to profile community, use trusted facilitators, design conflict-sensitive targeting approaches, modify approaches as circumstances dictate.

---

*Good Practice*

Undertaking an in-depth socio-political analysis to better understand which groups are present and the power dynamics amongst them can help organisations navigate complex environments to reach the most vulnerable.

---

Operationalising Principles of Accountability to Affected Populations

Leadership

Involving stakeholders in project design and implementation is a key element of AAP. Before undertaking community-level targeting, it is important to decide to what degree your organisation wants to consult and/or involve different layers of government (ministry, district, municipal, etc.) in the targeting process. Identify key informants and understand their relationship to the target locations/groups and possible preference and/or biases (Annex 12: Stakeholder Assessment Questions).

Participation

Involving all segments of the community in the design, targeting and implementation of interventions is another key element of AAP. Undertake public addresses, and targeted outreach through various appropriate communication channels to ensure all segments of community are aware of the project (Annex 13: Community Engagement Checklist). Ensure CSC is gender and age-balanced and contains representatives from all segments of community. In complex contexts, ensure voiceless segments of society have mechanisms to promote meaningful participation (e.g. one-on-one engagement with organisation staff, separate forums, call-in mechanisms, etc.). Faith leaders have an extensive view of community and have greater insights and say in matters of: (i) rhythm and patterns; (ii) pre-existing coping mechanisms; (iii) self-protection activities; (iv) critical traditions; (v) composition of community; and they have potential to be champions of change and advocate for participation.

Partnership (Communities and Organisations)

Meaningful partnership involves communities and organisations holding each other accountable. Take into account community preferences regarding type and modality of assistances. Formalise relationships between organisation and CSC members through comprehensive training on roles and responsibilities, objectives of programme and overview of humanitarian standards (Annex 14: CSC Roles and Responsibilities Checklist). Promote transparency in the identification of recipients of assistance (e.g. CSC members affix signature on registration form, joint verification exercises, public validation meetings, etc.) (Annex 15: Sample Registration Form). Sign MoU with CSC and post/announce its terms, clearly delineating each parties’ role in delivery of assistance (Annex 16: Sample MoUs with Communities). Allowing communities to contribute/validate eligibility criteria promotes buy-in and increases likelihood it will be adhered to.

Key Steps: Decide on the level of government engagement, develop vulnerability profile of target village/settlement, carry out in-depth stakeholder mapping and engagement, develop mechanisms to raise awareness and ensure meaningful participation of communities in targeting, and consolidate and formalise relationships.

Good Practice

Establish formal mechanisms, such as MoUs between organisation and community and encourage CSC and staff members to endorse their recommendations for participants in programmes as a means of strengthening accountability.
Information Provision

Share information which is accessible, reliable and timely. Identify barriers which limit access to timely and relevant information for most vulnerable groups as leaders may hoard information and word-of-mouth can distort facts. Develop a communications strategy with key messages delivered in a medium communities use. Regularly update on project as needed. Call public forums at times and places convenient and accessible to all groups.

Key Steps: Identify communication barriers, develop communication strategies, use context-sensitive mediums and deliver messages at times, places, convenient and accessible to all segments of community.

Consult communities on design of CRM, gathering input on how, when and where they prefer to communicate feedback. Raise awareness of system at first meetings to all segments of community (Annex 13: Community Engagement Checklist). Establish accessible, confidential and responsive feedback and response mechanisms, ensuring procedures are in place to address issues in 10 working days. Monitor CSC performance (type and frequency of complaints), identifying troubled committees and take remedial action if appropriate.

Key Steps: Community input for design of CRM, ensure accessibility and confidentiality of CRM, communicate how to access/use CRM, establish responsive system, monitor type and frequency of complaints.

Good Practice

After draft registration list is prepared and made public, allow three to five days to give the community time to provide feedback and for organisation to follow up on complaints before enrolling participants in programme.

Additional Resources to Establish Two-Way Communication with Communities

Communication-Engagement-Accountability Toolkit, IFRC

CDAC Resources Information & Communication Questions in Rapid Needs Assessments
http://www.cdacnetwork.org/tools-and-resources/i/20140721173332-ihw5g
Negotiation and Advocacy

In this complex environment, it is critical that humanitarian actors continue to advocate for the delivery of needs-based, principled humanitarian action with authorities and other relevant actors. Analyse powerholders’ vertical and horizontal relationships. Understand organisation’s negotiation position by identifying strengths (e.g. network of influential stakeholders, good standing in community, number of concurrent projects, etc.) to calculate leverage to bring to negotiation and advocacy efforts. Define issue and design strategy. Identify person(s) within organisation with authority/skills to negotiate/advocate. Analyse risk if negotiation/advocacy approach might lead to further marginalisation and/or conflict. For example, targeting sub-sections of a population in times of crisis can serve as a source of vulnerability for those who receive assistance. Build capacity of CSC members to resist and respond to pressure from powerholders. Enhance the capacity of staff members to negotiate with powerholders. Coordinate with NGO and UN partners on common stance, messaging and delivery methods if advocacy is required (Annex 17: Protection Action Areas).

Key Steps: Assess both parties’ negotiation power, define issue, analyse positive and negative aspects of advocacy/negotiation strategy, build capacity of CSC to persuade, network with others to increase voice.

Monitoring Targeting Performance

Key approaches for measuring targeting accuracy look at: (i) how many people were correctly or incorrectly targeted; (ii) how much aid reached the right people; (iii) who are the beneficiaries (and non-beneficiaries). Develop process monitoring tools and feedback mechanisms to measure the effectiveness of community based targeting process: (i) inclusivity of committees; (ii) CSC (and individual member’s) performance in selecting appropriate recipients; (iii) perceptions of fairness by eligible and non-eligible groups. Build the capacity of field staff to respectfully, confidentially probe informants regarding perceptions. Third Party Monitors track targeting performance: competence and knowledge of CSC members, review inclusion/exclusion case management, engagement with targeted and non-targeted segments of community regarding perceptions of fairness of the process. Evaluating the effectiveness of targeting from a protection and “Do No Harm” perspective is an emergent area in Somalia context and organisations should share their experience on a regular basis to determine what is working and what is not. (Annex 18: Targeting Effectiveness Protection).

Community Based Targeting

Community based targeting is premised on the view that community members often have better information about their neighbours’ vulnerability levels. Organisations work through multiple formal and informal layers of governance when identifying participants in food security interventions. Organisations have an important role to play in terms of promoting transparency, empowerment, gender awareness

---

23 Centrality of Protection Strategy, Draft Key Messages, April 2018
26 CARE Somalia, Beneficiary Targeting and Verification Guidelines, Cash Based Programming 2014
and full community participation. It is important to undertake a risk analysis to determine some of the barriers to community based targeting effectiveness given the socio-political environment and the objectives of your programme (Annex 19: Assessing Appropriateness of CBT Analysis Tools).

Community based targeting works best

- when local leadership has good capacity and its legitimacy is not contested.
- with homogenous, rural communities with functioning formal and informal governance structures and no conflict.

**Organisational Consideration**

Ensure staff/partners are trained on key details of project; functionality of CRM; rationale of eligibility criteria; M&E methods, schedule, and internal and external actors (e.g. TPM vs. regular process monitoring team); CSC’s roles and responsibilities; key humanitarian principles. Management within organisations and those who implement through partners develop supportive relationships with those who lead targeting processes at community level, encouraging front-line staff members to raise challenges and request assistance. Organisations/partners should be mindful of unfair demands from family which staff members might face when called upon to target their own village/settlements and put in place mitigation mechanisms to reduce risk, such as substituting staff members from other areas or have other teams (re)verify enrolled recipients. Having female staff participate in targeting and/or provide training to male counterparts on how best to address women can enhance meaningful female participation in targeting process. As soon as feasible, organisations should provide project information, including (i) type of assistance (cash vs. in-kind); (ii) entitlement values; (iii) target locations; and (iv) duration and frequency of assistance to Food Security Cluster support coordinated action, such as joint community engagement, verification, validation and communication and to avoid wasteful duplication and confusion within communities and promote better coverage of limited assistance and complementarities between projects/programmes.

Important to consult government on projects, but organisations must make decisions in advance as to the level of involvement they want from these stakeholders. Organisation to undertake “Do No Harm,” with strong clan analysis to assess the reliability of key informants and mechanisms of disenfranchisement and decide the degree of discretion it will permit state/regional/village powerholders to play regarding targeting: (i) geographical prioritisation, (ii) appropriate percentage of population to receive support (iii) entitlement level; (iv) overall level of resource to be made available to community; (v) monitoring role. (Annex 12: Stakeholder Assessment Questions). Develop clear geographic targeting criteria to share with state/district stakeholders and ask advice on how best to approach village/settlement authorities for targeting different groups within those communities (Annex 6: Village Level Targeting Form).
STEP-BY-STEP COMMUNITY BASED TARGETING

1. FIRST PUBLIC MEETING

2. FORMATION OF CSC

3. VALIDATION OF CRITERIA

4. DEVELOP REGISTRATION LISTS & VERIFICATION

5. VALIDATION & ENROLMENT
Step-By Step Community Based Targeting

1.0 First Public Meeting

1.1 During stakeholder mapping, triangulate information provided by powerholders amongst multiple key informants at various levels to identify all groups in the community/settlement and strategise for their participation in the project (Annex 11: Do No Harm Analysis);

1.2 Develop context specific/sensitive communication strategies to ensure information concerning the project reaches all segments of community. Maintain key contacts with representatives from silent and less powerful groups;

1.3 Meet local administration, explain the proposed project, and request public meeting to share outline of programme. Cross-check to ensure proposed location is accessible to all segments of the community;

1.4 Hold public meeting, bringing together all segments of community (including both eligible and non-eligible for assistance), and present programme information and other important messages (Annex 13: Community Engagement Checklist);

1.5 Establish and/or validate existing CSC. Highlight roles and responsibilities and desired characteristics of CSC members to community. Communities elect chair and secretary. Read proposed committee member names publicly. Organisation to wait until public validation of CSC members before engaging with them;

1.6 Communicate CRM and ensure its details are posted in a public place in format(s) accessible to community (pictorial, written, word-of-mouth, etc.);

2.0 Formation of CSC

2.1 Ensure CSC is gender and age-balanced and has representation from all relevant groups. Advocate/negotiate for inclusion of all vulnerable segments of community. Remain mindful of context and do not expose marginalised groups/individuals to further discrimination;

2.2 Sign MoU with CSC detailing: (i) role in identification of HH who meet eligibility criteria; (ii) expected roles in CRM and conflict resolution; (iii) responsibilities in project implementation and monitoring; (iv) organisation/partners’ project deliverables. (Annex 16: Sample MoUs with Communities). Post MoU and read aloud terms at 2nd community meeting;

2.3 Build capacity of CSC members (Annex 14: CSC Roles and Responsibilities Checklist);

3.0 Validation of Criteria

3.1 Consider community constraints and perceptions of targeting and build understanding of differential vulnerability (identifying the most vulnerable amongst similarly vulnerable HH) (Annex 5: Vulnerability Key Concepts and Analysis Tool);

3.2 Allow CSC members to review eligibility criteria and introduce context-specific vulnerability criteria. Engage other levels of government if consensus cannot be reached;

3.3 Hold 2nd public meeting to ensure all segments of community are aware of eligibility criteria and validate them;
4.0 Develop Registration List & Verification

4.1 CSC takes lead in identifying names of HHs who meet the eligibility criteria. (Annex 15: Sample Registration Form); Ensure CSC clearly understands that registration will be done in partnership, but organisation reserves the right to undertake independent verification to remove people who do not meet eligibility criteria;

4.2 Organisation’s field staff member monitor the work of CSC members, including review meetings of draft registration list;

4.3 CSC members sign-off on draft registration list, affirming proposed HHs meet eligibility criteria;

4.4 Organisation’s field staff verify proposed registration list by:

(i) Reaching out to key informants, including civil society organisations, religious leaders, etc. to see if they meet criteria;

(ii) Organisation staff visit proposed HHs to affirm they meet eligibility criteria. A sample of HHs is also sufficient if there are time/logistical constraints;

(iii) Careful review of proposed HH names, telephone numbers and other unique identifiers to remove duplicates;

5.0 Validation and Enrolment

5.1 Hold 3rd public meeting. Verified registration list read publicly in front of large community gathering. In challenging context, organisations may choose to engage sub-groups involving men, women, boys and girls to encourage silent groups to voice concerns.

5.2 Organisation staff remind community of their right to raise concerns regarding fairness and outcome of registration process. Group(s) invited to make their opinions known at public meeting regarding proposed registration list. Staff should raise awareness of confidential feedback channels including hotlines, one-on-one engagement with organisation staff, complaints box, etc., allowing 3-5 days waiting period between 3rd public meeting and start of enrolment process. Staff take note of community feedback and address issues with CSC members (for possible revision of registration list if necessary);

5.3 Organisation enrols HH in programme. If it is safe and does not negatively impact dignity of the recipient, post final list in public place.
Community Perceptions of Identifying Eligible Households

It is important to understand some the constraints CSC members experience when identifying the most vulnerable on behalf of organisations. Moreover, it is key to recognise that the objectives of organisations and the objectives of communities sometimes differ. Different perceptions of need can influence how these key stakeholders can influence targeting.27

- The assistance provided is rarely sufficient to meet the full needs of the community. As such, many eligible people for assistance cannot be reached, forcing committee members to choose between households of similar poverty and exposure to shocks. As a result community members perceive CSC members as biased. Distribution to a few people can fuel jealousy between households.

- Committee members come under pressure from a wide range of stakeholders when required to distribute limited resources in settings of great, similar need: (i) clan members claim first rights to resources from their poorer kinsmen; (ii) new arrivals into urban settings, such as destitute pastoralists, threaten violence to assert their claims to resources; (iii) strong belief that no family should receive benefits twice in a row (even if destitute) so as to promote equity/fairness.

- Committees often service request from multiple organisations, drawing them away from other more productive pursuits. Generally, they are not compensated for their time (this can result in them taxing benefits when they become available).

- Assistance is unpredictable and limited. Committees often pre-determine distribution in advance to ensure an equitable distribution of resources, along clan lines and to the widest number of similarly vulnerable households to avoid conflicts.

- Sharing of assistance, especially of food, is widespread and is generally viewed as a form of positive social capital, reinforcing reciprocating bonds of kinship and promoting social cohesion.

Other Considerations

- Introduce accountability steps/mechanism into targeting process
  - Registration list should include information concerning eligibility criteria; both CSC members and staff to affirm HH meet criteria; organisation evaluates performance of registration process and community perceptions of fairness;

- Time permitting, introduce participatory methodologies
  - Vulnerability/wealth ranking, transect walks, hazards mapping, historic profiling, seasonal calendar, Venn diagrams, SWOT analysis to enhance understanding of community and support AAP principles of leadership and participation. For example, involve CSC members in “Do No Harm” analysis and invite recommendations to support access to all segments of the community (Annex 20: Participatory Methods of Targeting – Examples).

Rapid Community Based Targeting

Rapid on-set emergencies might not allow for organisations to undertake an exhaustive community based targeting processes. Evictions, conflicts, fires and floods can lead to the displacement of entire communities.

---

27 Food Security Cluster met with 7 groups of CRC members (Somaliland, Bossaso, Garowe, N. Galkayo, S. Galkayo, Baidoa, Kismayo), asking them (i) their role in targeting; (ii) challenges; (iii) recommendations.
communities, fraying of self-help mechanisms, loss of productive assets and income sources and rapid erosion of food security. Targeting strategy must strike a balance between imperative to act, cost and accuracy. In acute emergencies some level of inclusion error might have to be accepted if the time-cost of extensive engagement impedes life-saving efforts. In the spirit of “Good Enough” humanitarian action, the following principles and process are recommended. This is adapted from a rapid community engagement process used in urban settings in Somalia.

Table 2: Community Engagement Steps for Rapid On-set Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Process</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Initial mobilisation</td>
<td>Publicly gather community and communicate programme purpose and basic targeting process;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>Communicate CRM</td>
<td>Ensure that it will be publicly viewable on posters at all future community targeting steps/events.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Elect Community Committee</td>
<td>Ensure committee is gender balanced, age balanced and has representatives from less dominant factions;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Appoint chair and secretary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>Publicly read committee member names</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>Train committee on targeting process and jointly decide selection criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Committee selects and documents recommended households for the programme</td>
<td>Each recommended name is accompanied by (i) criteria they were selected under; (ii) name and signature of a single committee member personally ensuring that the targeted HH accurately meets the criteria as listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Recommended households are individually verified by NGO staff following internal processes</td>
<td>HH verification using recipient verification form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>List of verified recommended households are read publicly in front of large community gathering</td>
<td>Call 2nd public meeting, public validation process held and 3-5 day waiting period implemented to allow community members to lodge complaints through the CRM; In complex contexts, gathering is split into at least 4 sub-groups: Men, Women, Boys and Girls. Each group is then consulted separately about whether the recommended HH is fair or requires HHs to be replaced. This should be documented in writing by staff. Sub-group recommendations are then anonymously brought back to the selection committee by staff for discussion.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analytical Framework for Targeting in Complex Settings

Every community and every targeting situation is unique. The analytical framework supports field staff to identify community dynamics they may encounter when working through informal and formal governance structures to identify the most vulnerable. This tool simplifies a complex set of dynamics which could impact the effectiveness of the targeting process. By breaking down complex, overlapping dynamics into manageable categories, the tool assists field teams to strategise context-specific actions to address barriers to reaching the most vulnerable. Staff identify community dynamics such as:

1. Excesses (+) of Monopoly (of knowledge about community composition, history, etc.)
2. Excesses (+) of Decision Power
3. Lack of (-) Accountability which are barriers to effective targeting.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{IE} &= \{ \text{M} + \text{D} - \text{A} \} \\
\{ \text{N} \times \text{X} \} &= \{ \text{O} \times \text{C} \} \\
\{ \text{C} \times \text{U} \} &= \{ \text{E} \times \text{C} \} \\
\{ \text{L} \times \text{U} \} &= \{ \text{N} \times \text{O} \} \\
\{ \text{T} \times \text{S} \} &= \{ \text{I} \times \text{P} \} \\
\{ \text{O} \times \text{N} \} &= \{ \text{C} \times \text{O} \} \\
\{ \text{N} \times \text{O} \} &= \{ \text{C} \times \text{T} \} \\
\{ \text{A} \times \text{L} \} &= \{ \text{I} \times \text{I} \} \\
\{ \text{R} \times \text{E} \} &= \{ \text{M} \times \text{M} \} \\
\{ \text{E} \times \text{R} \} &= \{ \text{A} \times \text{A} \}
\end{align*}
\]

\text{ERRORS}

The number of inclusion and exclusion errors in targeting is likely to increase in governance settings where:

- Organisations have very little contextual awareness and experience, and where there is an over-reliance on information provided by powerful individuals or groups;
- Organisations lack direct access to the affected populations due to insecurity or by design;
- Power is concentrated in the hands of an individual or small group of individuals;
- Organisations have very limited bargaining power to make demands on powerholders (e.g. to adhere to targeting criteria);
- Some groups are voiceless and have limited channels to make their needs/opinions known;
- Powerholders do not feel answerable to certain sections of society and can ignore their rights.

To improve targeting environment, organisations implement actions to (Annex 21: Analytic Framework for Targeting):

- Decrease (-) monopoly of knowledge by community through improved stakeholder mapping and contextual awareness;
- Decrease decision-making power (discretion) (-) of individuals or dominant groups by increasing vertical and horizontal linkages to other powerholders/influencers;
- Increase answerability of powerholders and organisations (+) to communities by seeking to include all groups of society in decision-making and strengthening accountability mechanisms.

Table 3: FSC Members Address Community Dynamic to Improve Targeting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples from Somalia³⁰</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LNGO and INGOs are operationalising protection principles and overcoming some challenging dynamics which can hamper accurate targeting of the most vulnerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability (+)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Power (+)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

³⁰ FSC engaged 8 groups of FSC members with tool. This is a sample of some of the ways actors are already addressing these dynamics in Somalia.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monopoly(+)</th>
<th>Organisations credited complaints response mechanism, such as hotlines, for providing them with access to information regarding the existence of less powerful, less visible groups and their perceptions of the fairness of selection processes. This information has assisted them to probe further with community leadership regarding the composition of community selection committees.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability (+)</td>
<td>A LNGO was trying to undertake an unconditional cash transfer in three communities. When they approached the District Commissioner, he insisted that only he knew who to select in the community and they therefore did not need the selection criteria. In short, he would personally select households. The LNGO approached the three community selection committees, informing them of the District Commissioner’s decision. The committees approached the District Commissioner telling him that they instructed the LNGO to go away, but still expected the District Commissioner to provide the unconditional cash transfer. The District Commissioner backed down and requested the LNGO to work directly with the local community to select eligible households to participate in the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monopoly (+)</td>
<td>During the recent food security crisis, an organisation was requested to move into a new area. Before engaging with leaders in this new area, the organisation undertook an assessment and mapped the different groups, their respective power and influence. This information helped them understand community dynamics and helped ensure that when community selection committees were established, they advocated for less-powerful, invisible groups to be included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability (+)</td>
<td>Field-level staff detailed how the willingness of senior management to get involved in issues related to targeting encouraged them to challenge local administrations regarding poor targeting. Supportive help from senior leaders gave them confidence to tackle issues of inclusion and revisit the selection processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability (+)</td>
<td>A LNGO won a grant to begin operations in a new area. The LNGO (made-up from a minority clan) approached a senior elder from the dominant clan in the district and requested that he come with them to a village outside town where the LNGO wanted to work. By bringing the senior elder from the same dominant clan where they hoped to work, they were better able to negotiate at the village level. The LNGO injected accountability by showing the village leadership that they had access to a senior member of their clan in the event that there might be any attempts to influence targeting outcomes. The LNGO credited the senior elder’s involvement for ensuring a respectful relationship with the target community from the beginning.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

Targeting is complex, even under the best of circumstances. Somalia presents actors with a wide range of governance environments and there is not a one-size-fits-all approach. Mainstreaming protection, accountability to affected populations and undertaking deep contextual analysis can improve targeting outcomes. Importantly, humanitarian actors can positively influence the targeting context by harmonising approaches and joining together to advocate for access to food security interventions for all segments of Somali society.

There are no “quick fixes” to targeting and organisations should continue to share their learning and application of emerging best practice. The 2018 Version of the Targeting Guidelines is not a definitive set of recommendations but a platform for standardisation and sharing of lessons learnt through the targeting work stream. Key areas for future sharing/learning include:

- Capacity development to improve staff members’ ability to negotiate with formal and informal governance structures;
- Further develop profiling and processes to identify CSC members and build their capacity;
- Strengthen the ability to identify the most vulnerable in emergency and safety net programmes and refer them to other projects and programmes to enhance livelihood strategies;
- Share learning regarding protection indicators and other methods to evaluate perceptions of fairness to reach the most vulnerable groups and populations.
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