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Acronyms

AAP  Accountability to Affected Populations  
CBT  Community Based Targeting  
CSC  Community Selection Committee  
CRM  Complaints Response Mechanism  
FSC  Food Security Cluster  
GBV  Gender Based Violence  
HH  Household  
SEA  Sexual Exploitation & Abuse  
TPM  Third Party Monitor

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.

---

2 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.
4 Food Aid After 50 Years: Recasting Its Role, 2005, C. Barrett and D. Maxwell
• **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.

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. Identifying the most vulnerable within groups who are poor and similarly exposed to multiple hazards is difficult for both organisations and CSC members. Some organisations have developed settlement vulnerability profiles to aid in identifying villages within districts. 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).

---

**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).

---


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$^{12}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Approach</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic targeting</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community/Group targeting</td>
<td>Sections of the population. Community: group of households that are, to a greater or 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>Household targeting</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>Individual targeting</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.$^{13}$ 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**


---

16 WFP Targeting in Emergencies, 2006, https://www.wfp.org/content/targeting-emergencies
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

Protection & Accountability Ensure Smooth Running Community Based 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.\(^{21}\)

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.\(^{22}\) 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 of 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.  

- 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

---

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

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></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></td>
<td>Communicate CRM and 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; <strong>In complex contexts</strong>, 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.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social, Economic, Political Disenfranchisement</th>
<th>Factors in Targeting at Community level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image" alt="Analytical Framework Diagram" /></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

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>
<th>LNGO and INGOs are operationalising protection principles and overcoming some challenging dynamics which can hamper accurate targeting of the most vulnerable.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability (+)</td>
<td>Many organisations highlighted the importance of communicating to the widest number of people concerning the project as an effective mechanism for holding powerholders accountable to objectives of the project. FSC members pointed to the first public meeting at the inception of the project as important for establishing expectations and equipping community members’ information to hold powerholders accountable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Power (-)</td>
<td>A Programme Officer was monitoring an implementing partner during a food distribution. During the distribution, a local leader demanded that each beneficiary provide him US$2. The Programme Officer personally knew the District Commissioner from the location and gave him a call and informed him of the local leader’s behaviour. The District Commissioner showed up and scolded the local leader and allowed the distribution to take place unmolested.</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 NGO 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 NGO 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 NGO to go away, but still expected the District Commissioner to provide the unconditional cash transfer. The District Commissioner backed down and requested the NGO 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 NGO won a grant to begin operations in a new area. The NGO (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 NGO 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 NGO 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 NGO 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.

WFP volunteer assesses vulnerability at household level.
Annex I: Targeting Process Checklist

**Targeting is a Process**

Targeting considerations are part of every step in the project management cycle. Engage with communities throughout the targeting process, consulting them at needs assessment, design and establishment of eligibility criteria, taking into consideration their feedback on the effectiveness of the targeting mechanisms and incorporating their impressions and preferences during redesign.

Sensitisation and two-way communication throughout the process

Source: Operational Guidance & Toolkit for Multipurpose Cash Grants, CaLP
## Step-By Step Targeting Considerations: Project Management Cycle

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CONSULT STAKEHOLDERS</th>
<th>CHOOSE METHODS &amp; MECHANISMS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participatory Community Engagement</td>
<td>Design food security responses and targeting mechanism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Do it in the right way (appropriateness to context, “Do No Harm”, be accountable to affected population, identify/address protection issues);</td>
<td>- Define objective(s): relief, protect livelihoods, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Stakeholder engagement: understand government/community counterpart(s); their relationship with affected groups and potential impact on targeting – consult widely, triangulate information;</td>
<td>- Decide whether the objective is to provide lower entitlement to a large number of vulnerable, or higher entitlement to few, most vulnerable, or in far-flung locations and timeframe/resource required;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Undertake socio-political analysis (e.g. “Do No Harm”) to understand connectors, dividers, capacity for peace, power dynamics, history, and existence of marginalised groups;</td>
<td>- Define intervention(s): activity type, transfer modality, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consider community engagement strategy: elect new CSC vs. use existing one, composition of CSC (mechanisms to provide women, marginalised, etc. voice), decide government level involvement (consulted vs. involved for different level);</td>
<td>- Define target group(s): well-targeted, avoiding diversion and tailored to the different needs of different groups: women, disabled, elderly, less powerful groups;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Involve communities in needs analysis and consult with them on design of project, objectives and targeting strategy and eligibility criteria, e.g. target cash-for-work by involving population and host community in participatory action planning, consider physical/time constraint for women;</td>
<td>- Do SWOT/Risk analysis for targeting approaches and interventions- look at: security, safety, protection, different cost: organisation and recipients. Mixing targeting approaches most effective method;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Consult communities on feedback complaints mechanism and communication strategy to cater to their needs/preferences and identify barriers for communication to reach the most vulnerable – three-pillars: (i) information-sharing, (ii) participation; (iii) complaints and response;</td>
<td>- Determine eligibility criteria: use mix of easy-to-identify socio-economic characteristics. Not too broad to invite inclusion of better-off (e.g. overreliance of categorical targeting); not too narrow to exclude needy groups (e.g. overreliance on single nutrition status of U5, therefore excluding vulnerable youth, elderly).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Inform communities of their entitlement, quality, duration and delivery mechanism;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Coordinate with cluster and other actors in area to understand ongoing/planned activities to avoid duplication and seek complementarities.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Find Those Eligible and Draft Registration List

- **Decide process to identify eligible people**
  - **Targeting mechanism should**: maximise coverage, minimise cost incurred – identifying eligible (avoid census approach), and agreed-upon with target community;
  - **Involve** CSC in defining eligibility criteria, hold public validation of eligibility criteria;
  - **Promote** transparent and accountable selection process: MoU with CSC; information provision: two-way communication, feedback/complaints, public meetings in time and place, accessible to all groups;
  - **Develop** communication strategy and outreach to silent groups (women) and invisible groups (less powerful groups);
  - **Coordinate** registration processes, verification and validation exercises with others to promote consistent community engagement, avoid duplication and promote referral linkages;

### Review & Adjust List

- **Verify** households provided by CSC through sample of survey (organisation reserves right to remove households who do not meet eligibility criteria);
- **Establish mechanisms** to allow silent and less-powerful groups to provide feedback on draft registration list: key informants, sub-committees, phone-up, etc.;
- **Public** validation of draft registration list;
- **Revise** list, validate anew in public forum and post in public place (if safe to do so);

### Distribute

- **Distribute** at the right time (timely response, optimal duration, seasonality considerations, etc);
- Carefully introduce inputs and services. Do not exacerbate vulnerability, or increase risk: for example, increasing competition for scarce natural resources or damaging social cohesion;
- Monitor effectiveness of delivery mechanism in reaching most vulnerable, especially “opportunity cost” to recipient to participate:
  - **Frequency**: When will the assistance be made available? How often will mobile vendor pass through community, at what time, how long will stay? Do these times suit busy mothers?
  - **Location**: Where is the assistance available (where it is not)? Large network of distributors (vendors, money lenders, etc.) or a small number? Does this result in long waiting times for recipients (elderly, disabled, busy mothers)? Do people have to incur costs (e.g. transport) to obtain benefit? Can benefits be topped-up from anywhere or require recipients to be physically present in a specific location at a specific time (pastoralist)?
  - **Communication**: How will beneficiaries receive information concerning distribution times and changes in benefit? E.g. vulnerable groups might have fewer social networks to receive information: how to bridge gap?
  - **Agents**: Who are the vendors vis-à-vis the recipient community? Is there a potential for discrimination or exploitation which can discourage use or dilute benefit?
  - **Energy**: Do the calories spent working or travelling to aid reduce the net calories obtained by the benefits?
  - **Incentives**: Does the benefit draw people away from more productive activities or attract better-off to compete with the worst-off for inclusion in the project? Does the targeting criteria change the behaviour of beneficiaries in negative ways (e.g. selling assets to meet eligibility criteria).
When developing monitoring systems it is important to decide:

- **Set objective:** What is the targeting objective? Is it minimising inclusion, avoiding waste or resource or reducing pull factors?
- **How will targeting efficiency be evaluated,** what are the costs in term of data requirements and additional data collection and analysis?
- **Decide** when process monitoring reports will be developed, who will develop them, analyse them, provide summary findings how/when to provide to management to make adjustments to programme;
- **Incorporate targeting effectiveness indicators in process monitoring:** (i) inclusivity of committees; (ii) CSC members’ performance in selecting eligible; (iii) perceptions of fairness; (iv) perceptions of dignity and safety. Capture both eligible recipients’ and non-eligible recipients’ impression of targeting effectiveness.
- **Promote** participatory monitoring of projects with CSC;
- **Use** result monitoring and person receiving assistance feedback to guide further course corrections, including adjustments to transfer modalities, agility to switch modalities, and as required, and delivery mechanisms refinement of targeting mechanism (e.g. retraining of CSC, removal of biased member);
- **Monitor** to determine the level of acceptance and access to the interventions by different groups and individuals and ensure overall coverage of the affected population without discrimination. Identify which groups are systematically excluded;
- **Refine** CRM to make it relevant to communities, responsive to inclusion/exclusion errors, and manageable (escalation protocols of inclusion/exclusion error for management actions; adequate staffing level/capacity, etc.);
- **Develop** a simple-to-use feedback/complaints data base to enable collection of statistics and track any trends and feed learning into decision-making and project activities;
- **Third Party Monitors** track targeting performance: competence and knowledge of CSC, review of inclusion/exclusion case management, engagement with non-targeted segments of community on fairness;

**REASSESS & UPDATE**

- Group, household and individual vulnerability is ever-changing and targeting should remain sensitive to this (retargeting every 6 to 12 months) or in the event of new hazard;
- Common registration and/or inter-operability between platforms present opportunities to target specific households in other projects and programmes. E.g. Linking cash/food safety net programmes to longer-term social protection and/or livelihood diversification opportunities;
- Learning sessions with communities to document good practice and lessons for future programming;
- Consult with communities regarding any changes to targeting mechanism.

Adaptation of: CaLP Operational Guidance and Toolkit for Multipurpose Cash Grants & Sphere Handbook April 2017, Draft 1: Food Assistance and General Food Security.31

---

31 CaLP Operational Guidance and Toolkit for Multipurpose Cash Grant and SPHERE Draft Handbook April 2017, Food Assistance and General Food Security
During the design phase of the project, it is important to ask some simple questions to help better understand the objectives of your targeting. Also, it helps you think through how you plan to assess your targeting at the end/redesign phase.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Targeting Questions</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the objective of the assistance?</td>
<td>Protect livelihoods, poverty reduction, disaster risk reduction or support particularly vulnerable groups: single-head households, disabled, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the aim of the targeting process?</td>
<td>Reach those people most at-risk of death due to food insecurity, reach the poorest, reach traditionally marginalised groups, help the disabled?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who decides eligibility criteria?</td>
<td>UN/NGO workers, politicians and communities?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the eligibility criteria?</td>
<td>Poverty, food insecurity, age, disability, status: e.g. refugee returnee?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When does identification of beneficiaries occur?</td>
<td>Before delivery of transfer, or on collection of transfer?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What information is available to facilitate the targeting process?</td>
<td>At what frequency and level of disaggregation, with what quality, at what cost: e.g. Food Security Nutrition Analysis Unit (FSNAU): geographic/livelihood; stakeholder mapping; “Do No Harm” analysis?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### How targeting is targeting assessed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Is the assistance delivered to people identified as eligible – and to people who are the most vulnerable?</th>
<th>How large are the inclusion errors? How large are the exclusion errors?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What is the financial cost of the targeting process?</td>
<td>How much of the programme budget was used to identify recipients and capture complaints involving inclusion/exclusion errors?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What are the secondary consequences of the targeting process?</td>
<td>Did the exclusion of community members lead to social tension; did targeting certain groups in certain ways further stigmatise them; does targeting women as opposed to men demoralise the latter?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Annex 2: Other Targeting Approaches

### Food Security, Safety Net, Social Protection Targeting Approach

**Administrative Targeting:** Organisation or people external to the community select households or individuals using standard observable or measureable criteria or indicators, such as asset holding or other socio-economic characteristics developed by organisation during vulnerability analysis.\(^{32}\) This is a type of approach used in means-tested welfare systems in developed countries.

**Categorical targeting** is used to identify households and individuals by “categories” that are easily observable, obvious, and difficult to dispute. Categorical targeting starts with categories of community members who are generally considered as “vulnerable”.\(^{33,34}\) Categorical targeting based on vulnerability is simple, fair and can reduce inclusion errors. As these categories change slowly, it does not require frequent re-targeting.\(^{35}\) Categorical targeting indicators are basically Yes/No questions. For example, a person’s gender is either male or female.\(^{36}\)

- presence of elderly person;
- condition: pregnant/lactating women; people with disability;
- household size: dependency ratio;
- disabled or ill compared with the number of able-bodied adults;
- presence of children (under 2);
- single-parent household.\(^{37}\)

### Food Security Targeting

Food Security Targeting is used to identify groups and households through proxy indicators and sometimes direct measurement. Socio-economic characteristics and contextual factors are combined and analysed to determine the severity of food insecurity.

Socio-economic characteristics are combined with other measures such as:

- Food consumption score which assess: (i) food consumption, (ii) food access; (iii) food security group;
- Coping mechanisms, which identifies: (i) coping strategies used to obtain food and income; (ii) risks to lives and livelihoods caused by these strategies; (iii) associations between food security status and coping mechanisms.

---

32 World Food Program: Targeting in Emergencies, 2006
33 Development Pathways, Nepal Social Assistance; What does the evidence tell us? DFID Nepal, 2011
34 Targeting and Universalism in Poverty Reduction, Mkandawire, T. UNRISD, 2005
35 Targeting for Cash Based programming, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), 2016
### Food Security, Safety Net, Social Protection Targeting Approach

**Continuous targeting:** Eligibility is usually based on outcomes of household surveys compared to economic threshold such as poverty line or minimum wage. “Continuous” means that poverty and vulnerability are relative; they can be defined in different ways in different contexts; thresholds for poverty, economic security and vulnerability are relative and imply a certain level of subjectivity; and measuring this type of vulnerability is done in different ways. In continuous targeting, identifying the poor or vulnerable is often done through income or expenditure surveys, or in creating some kind of vulnerability index.\(^{38}\) Indicators can have a whole range of values. For example, income; weight; number of livestock owned; kg of grain produced; age. For continuous indicators, a threshold or cut-off point must be set before they can be applied as targeting criteria:

- Income (compared to the locally-determined poverty line, or compared to minimum wage);
- Expenditure (compared to a minimum expenditure basket);
- Other proxy indicators:
  - Access to goods (includes assets such as bicycles, land, livestock);
  - Access to services (includes water, health care, government services);
  - Coping strategies index (CSI).\(^ {39}\)

**Acute malnutrition (SAM and MAM) targeting:** The nutrition status of children (presence of malnourished children in households) is a frequently used eligibility criteria for safety net and food security interventions. This form of life-cycle targeting (directing assistance to particular age cohort) is a common administrative targeting technique. For detailed guidance (p. 9-12) for nutrition targeting logic.

Preventing Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) Through Nutrition-Sensitive Interventions

---

\(^{38}\) Targeting for Cash Based programming, Catholic Relief Services (CRS), 2016

\(^{39}\) Adapted from: CaLP, UNHCR, 2016. Operational Guidance and Toolkit for Multi-purpose Cash Grants
## Annex 3: Vulnerability Profiling Analysis for Somalia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vulnerability Profiling Analysis for Somalia</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Somalia Livelihood Profile 2016.</strong> Using Household Economy Methodology, FSNAU &amp; FEWS NET assessed the impact of hazards (or positive changes) on household livelihoods over 19 zones. The HEA quantifies and qualitatively describes the total food and cash economy of households, covering all food sources, cash income sources, and expenditure patterns across all seasons for a full one-year period. HEA looks at two different thresholds: (i) Livelihoods Protection Threshold; (ii) Survival Threshold (this represents the cost to cover minimum survival requirement 2100 calories per day and water if purchased). Reference year 2014-2015 (analysis valid for approx. five to ten years). HEA analysis provides an estimate of what the deficit might be given certain conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Food and Nutrition Insecurity in Somalia.</strong> A trend analysis (2007-2014) reviewing the number of food insecure populations; areas of recurring food insecurity, malnutrition and shocks, and where these converge to assist in identifying if and where relief, recovery, DRR and resilience may be required; land cover and livelihoods analysis to inform response; seasonal variations, potential impact of civil insecurity on food security.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Internal Displacement Profiling in Mogadishu 2016.</strong> A multi-UN, NGO and community analysis of displacement affected populations in Mogadishu led by the IDP Profiling Working Group. The profiling exercise was conducted on evidence to assist in durable solutions strategy development and programmatic planning. Provides a picture of IDP vulnerability in an urban setting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Crisis Management and Politics of Reconciliation in Somalia 1994.</strong> Understanding the historic circumstances which have rendered some groups more exposed to shocks can assist designers of targeting systems to better understand the root causes of vulnerability and inform profiling efforts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Annex 4: FSC Partners Eligibility Criteria in Somalia

This is drawn from an analysis of all eligibility criteria in Somalia by FSC Partners for food security and livelihood response. A helpful list when considering vulnerability criteria.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics of good targeting indicators</th>
<th>Compendium of Targeting Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key considerations in selecting indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two key considerations in selecting targeting indicators are validity and practicality.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1) VALIDITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicators must be strongly associated with the target group in the specific local context, so that they will identify the right people. For example, gender may be suggested as an indicator for targeting poor and economically vulnerable households. This is valid in some contexts, where female-headed households are poorer and more vulnerable than their male neighbours – but in other contexts this is not true. Local analysis is always needed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2) PRACTICALITY</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always keep in mind how the suggested indicators will be applied. Can they be measured or observed? Who by, and how? Do they need complex data collection and analysis (and if so, is the necessary time and capacity available)? These questions go hand in hand with choosing targeting methods. For example, household grain stocks may be a very valid indicator of short-term food security – but in many storage systems they are impossible to observe, and potential beneficiaries have a strong incentive to under-report them.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key qualities of indicators</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Targeting indicators should be</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• sensitive (that is, they will always correctly identify a target group member);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• specific (they will correctly exclude non-target group members);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• feasible (given the time, resources and capacities available);</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• acceptable to the beneficiaries and their community; and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• transparent or verifiable, so that targeting decisions can be checked and challenged by monitoring staff or community members.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of vulnerability</th>
<th>Possible target group definitions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| ECONOMIC vulnerability | • Poor areas/groups/households/individuals  
• People suffering food insecurity because of inadequate incomes, livelihoods, market access or entitlements  
• Poorest x% of a population  
• People in specified livelihoods or occupations (locally defined) |
| PHYSIOLOGICAL vulnerability | • Children under five years old  
• Malnourished children  
• Groups with specific nutritional needs (e.g. the elderly; sick people; pregnant and breast-feeding women) |
| SOCIAL vulnerability | • Unsupported older people, widows or orphans  
• People with disabilities  
• Socially excluded individuals or households |
| POLITICAL vulnerability | • Refugees or displaced people  
• Communities exposed to violence or marginalisation41 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nutritional indicators</td>
<td>Nutritional indicators are appropriate when the problem has been diagnosed as malnutrition or vulnerability to malnutrition, and the target group is defined as currently malnourished people or members of physiologically vulnerable groups. Malnutrition may be a late indicator. Targeting by nutritional status alone excludes vulnerable groups who are not yet malnourished. Nutritional surveys and screening require technically trained staff.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic indicators</td>
<td>Socio-economic indicators are appropriate when the target group is defined as economically vulnerable, and when food insecurity is considered to be closely linked with poverty and livelihood constraints. Income, assets and other livelihood factors can be difficult and expensive for outsiders to assess beyond the geographical level. Therefore, in many food security programmes, household-level socio-economic criteria are applied through community-based targeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographic indicators</td>
<td>Demographic indicators (gender and age) are relatively easy to apply. They are appropriate at group level, when the target population is defined as physiologically or socially vulnerable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meteorological and production indicators</td>
<td>Meteorological and production indicators are widely used for geographical targeting, in combination with other dimensions of food security. They are less useful at group, household and individual levels, although sometimes household production is used as an indicator of income or food access.42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Annex 5: Vulnerability Key Concepts and Analysis Tool

Tools for Analysing Vulnerability

| NRC Vulnerability Tree | An analytical tool for categorising different vulnerabilities based on the nature of the crisis. A tool for analysing potential eligibility criteria. | Example: Vulnerability analysis tool, NRC, “Vulnerability Tree” |

Community Constraints with Targeting

It is important to recognise some the constraints CSC members experience when identifying the most vulnerable on behalf of organisations. Moreover, it is key to understand that the objectives of organisations and the objectives of communities sometimes differ. Different perceptions of need can influence how and in which ways these key stakeholders can influence targeting.43

- 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.

Key Concept of Vulnerability

Be Aware!

“We are all poor here!”

In food assistance, organisations are often requesting both field staff members and communities to identify the vulnerable amongst the vulnerable (poor amongst the poor).

43 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.
**What is Vulnerability?**

Vulnerability defines the characteristics of a person or group and the situation that influences their capacity to anticipate, cope with, resist and recover from the impact of a hazard.\footnote{At Risk: Natural hazards, people’s vulnerability and disasters, 2nd edition, Wisner et al, 2004} 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, savings) and the physical (houses, machinery), the natural (land, water, forest), the human (labour, skills), the social (networks, norms) and the political (influence, policy).\footnote{Sphere Handbook, Food security and nutrition chapter, Draft 1, April 2017. 4.2 Food Security- Livelihoods.}

Vulnerability involves a multitude of processes and factors which influence how hazards affect people differently and with varying intensities. It is often a combination of processes and factors which determines the degree to which a person or household’s life, livelihood, property or assets are put at risk by shocks, such as flood and drought, or a series of events like conflict and collapse of effective governance structures. Political powerlessness, exploitation and discrimination can increase the vulnerability of individuals and households.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disaster/risk analysis</th>
<th>Involves understanding (i) types of hazards that might affect people, (ii) differences in the levels of vulnerability of different groups of people.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hazard</td>
<td>Is a natural or manmade event (of varying degrees of intensity and severity) that results in physical damage, economic loss, and threatens human life and well-being, e.g. drought, flood, conflict, tsunami, living in a flood plain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure</td>
<td>The likelihood of people, households, groups or nations experiencing that event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk</td>
<td>The expected damage or loss due to a combination or vulnerability and hazards. People are considered at-risk when they are unable to cope with the hazard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk Horizon</td>
<td>The term “risk horizon” means the period over which harmful consequences are foreseen and calculated. In the humanitarian field, in relation to acute risk, this is typically 6 to 12 month. In situations of chronic (potential risk), the risk horizon may be years rather than months.\footnote{Adaptation of According to need? Needs assessment and decision-making in the humanitarian sector, 2003, ODI, Humanitarian Policy Group, J. Darcy and C. Hofmann; Participatory Vulnerability Analysis (PVA), actionaid, 2003}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Disaster} = \text{Vulnerability (defenselessness)} + \text{Hazard (an external event)} \]

A disaster occurs when a significant number of vulnerable people experience a hazard and suffer a disruption of their livelihood (die-off of animals, on-farm employment, seed stocks depleted) to such a degree that their lives are at risk and recovery is not likely without external support.

Adaptation: Participatory Vulnerability Analysis: A step-by-step guide for field staff: actionaid international
Factors and Geography of Vulnerability in Somalia

- Three recurrent shocks affect livelihood in Somalia: drought, floods and conflict. Conflict has increased vulnerability to drought and floods through loss of productive assets, destruction of infrastructure, collapse of basic services, and fraying of social cohesion.
- Since the 1990’s there have been a number of conflicts and severe droughts which have triggered displacement. In 2018, the number of displacement affected people stands at 2.1 million. Many of the displaced belong to the marginalised groups ... and it was they who suffered disproportionately from famine (and continue to be exposed to famine).
- Minority clans are estimated to represent 20% of the Somali population. Minority groups are not well represented politically, are marginalised from the rest of society, rendering them vulnerable to shocks.

Many of the regions and groups which were most affected in the severe drought episodes over the past three decades regularly suffer the highest rates of malnutrition.

Targeting the Most Vulnerable

IDP

Relative Vulnerability

No Breakfast, No food for Dinner

2 weeks of food stock


50 Somalia: Window of opportunity for addressing one of the world’s worst internal displacement crises, Internal Displacement Monitoring Centre (IDMC), 2006.


52 Inter-riverine regions of Bay, Bakool, riverine populations along the Juba and Shelle rivers and IDPs, Targeting in Complex Emergencies: Somalia Case Study, 2008, Feinstein International Centre, S. Jaspars & D. Maxwell.
For food security programming, the vulnerability analysis aims to identify people with restricted access to food, markets and livelihood opportunities. In a context like Somalia where many people are similarly exposed to a combination of hazards of increasing frequency and poverty is widespread, it is difficult to decide who is most vulnerable.

**Key Considerations:**
- Being vulnerable from a socio-economic perspective is not a binary yes/no proposition, but rather households and individuals are, often times, shifting between levels of need along a continuum;
- Vulnerability of groups and households changes over time;
- The term *most vulnerable* may vary depending on the impact of the disaster on the community or household;
- Identify a mix of vulnerability characteristics (categorical, socio-economic, etc.) when developing your eligibility criteria;
- Eligibility criteria need to be sensitive (to ensure those eligible are not excluded) and specific (to ensure those eligible are not excluded).\(^{53}\) Certain categories of people: persons with disabilities, PLHIV, older people, and women with dependents are more often vulnerable than most but not in every instance.
- When engaging with communities, it is important to distinguish between vulnerable groups and the most-vulnerable you hope to target.

---

**Annex 6: Village Level Targeting Form**

| Village Level Targeting Analysis Matrix | Concern Worldwide-led Cash Consortium has developed an analysis tool to assist in village-level targeting, equipping field-teams with characteristics of vulnerable village types and a process flow to assist in defining which settlements to target for assistance. This tool can assist field teams in engaging with ministry and regional-level actors to articulate targeting priorities of the organisation. Staff members must sign-off to validate that the process has been followed, assisting later monitoring and evaluation efforts through the identification of decision-makers in the process. | Example: Village level targeting tool, Concern Worldwide-led Cash Consortium, “Village Level Targeting Analysis Matrix” |

---

\(^{53}\) Targeting Food Aid in Emergencies, Emergency Nutrition Network: https://www.ennonline.net/targetingfoodaid2
Annex 7: Livelihood Eligibility Criteria

Food Security Sector
Beneficiary Selection Criteria, 2015/16/17

Beneficiary identification and registration process

The targeted beneficiaries selection and identification is carried out through the joint collaboration of NRC staff, local community leaders and Community Based Disaster Management Committees (CBDMCs) if they are engaged to build resilience and manage shocks related by the targeted families and communities. The selection process is done through the consideration of key set criteria that would have earlier on been agreed upon, then after NRC staff would register the beneficiary by using a NRC beneficiary data capture form based on the below highlighted criteria:

a. General conditions

- Within the targeted communities (identified using agreed criteria), NRC/BRCiS will focus particularly on:
  - Women and women-headed households;
  - Youth and youth-headed households;
  - Marginalised groups (e.g. minority clans and occupational clans in urban and rural areas);
  - Disabled.

b. Farming beneficiaries

- Areas/settlements that expressed farming based needs during Participatory Community analysis;
- Vulnerable poor households – female- or male-headed, with previous farming experience;
- Beneficiaries showing willingness to:
  - Sign MoU/Contract with landowners, or with peasants to cultivate the land in a sustainable manner and release the land to the owner (if share-cropper/farmer) upon expiration of the contract;
  - Contribute to the success of the project by playing their role of undertaking crop field management practices – land preparation, planting, weeding, making and applying manures, timely harvesting;
  - Sustain project output after its completion – adopting new farming technologies/techniques;
  - The farmer beneficiaries willing to form farming cooperatives, through which NRC and other agencies can support them.
- Settlements that have a lot of pregnant women and lactating mothers.
- Those that commit to contributing towards the development of group constitution and adhering to the constitution.
c. Restocking goat beneficiaries

- Female-headed households, child-headed households;
- Family with at least a disabled member in the household, chronically ill members or heads of the household;
- Urban and peri-urban IDPs with pastoral and agro-pastoral backgrounds and are willing to herd their animals so that they animals do not go grazing into crop lands or preserved communal pasture/grazing land;
- Families willing to accept shoats herd ranging from 5 to 10 and with capacity to keep these goats (livestock) until they multiply before they can benefit from sale or milk products;
- Households who will give information about their progress to relevant staff and authorities for the next five years;
- Families willing to attend all the trainings organised by NRC on animal husbandry and rangelands management.

d. Donkeys and donkey carts

- Destitute urban or rural poor dwellers who have strong people earning a living by doing casual works in the urban, peri urban or rural set ups;
- Female-headed households, child-headed households;
- Families with disabilities, chronically ill members or heads of the household;
- Families with capacity to keep a donkey and cart and use it for their income generation;
- Households who will give information about their progress to relevant staff and authorities.

e. Conditional Cash Transfer; Cash for Work

- Households that have lost their crop or livestock or lost their home but have strong members capable of doing difficult manual work;
- Households with debts of more than a defined amount (or as a proportion of their household income);
- Households with no family support/access to remittances;
- Households with members who are chronically ill or have disabled members;
- Elderly-headed households or child-headed households or female-headed households;
- Households with more than 8 members and only one member with income capacity;
- IDPs, returnees, refugees and host communities;
- Destitute pastoralists communities;
- Those willing to work as per the pre-determined work norms.

f. Income generation activities

- The individual must already be involving in small scale business within their locality;
- Female-headed households, child-headed households;
• Commit to join IGA-Common Interest group through which NRC will support them to run joint
group business;
• Commits to contribute to the development of group constitution and adhering to the constitution;
• Willing and commits to attend the training organised by NRC on small business skills development;
• Willing to form savings group in future as the group and the business grows.

g. **Tree nursery beneficiaries**

• Vulnerable farmers who are already working in the NRC supported farming activities or new
individuals willing to manage commercial tree nurseries;
• Willing to work in groups to manage the tree nursery;
• Commits to contribute to the development of group constitution and adhering to the constitution.

h. **Beekeeping**

• The individual must be willing and committed to join commercial beekeeping Common Interest
group through which NRC will support them to manage the apiaries and market bee products;
• Individual youth or adults willing to pilot commercial beekeeping;
• Willing and commits to attend the training organised by NRC on commercial beekeeping;
• Willing to participate in efforts aimed at protecting and conserving the environment;
• Commits to contribute to the development of group constitution and adhering to the constitution.

i. **Fisheries beneficiaries**

• The individual must already be involving in fishing and or marketing within their locality;
• Female-headed, child-headed or male-headed households who are vulnerable;
• Commit to join Fishing-Common Interest group through which NRC will support them to better
manage the fishery livelihoods;
• Willing and commits to attend the training organised by NRC on fisheries development and use
of fishing gear;
• Commits to contribute to the development of group constitution and adhering to the constitution.

j. **Shelter rehabilitation/construction beneficiaries.**

• Targeted households must be vulnerable HHs in SC Somalia regions;
• Disadvantaged/marginalised IDP members of the community, e.g. women-headed households and
female in general, elderly people, disabled community members, orphans/unaccompanied minors
(UAM);
• IDPs whose homes are badly or totally destroyed without any assistance offered to them such as
provision of shelter;
• Vulnerable members of the local host community living within the periphery of the IDP settlement.
Note:

Registration: Each beneficiary will be registered using mobile phone data collection system, Mobenzi. This information will support in post distribution monitoring and other surveys that shall be conducted in the course of the project.

Cash receipt acknowledgement for CFW/UCT: Each beneficiary shall receive the transfer through a contracted money transfer agent (Hormuud telecom [Mobile Money Transfer] or Dahabshiil [Hawala]). An authentic physical acknowledgement shall be made in writing to confirm that beneficiaries have received their entitlement, the correct amount, the month and a signature appended at the end.

Conditionality

(1) Beneficiaries meet beneficiary selection criteria for each particular project.

(2) Some beneficiaries will work in groups to increase the efficiency and maximise on the benefits accrued from the activity.

(3) Attend all TRAINING sessions: This is aimed at capacity building on specific livelihoods activity in question, for instance, agriculture inputs, tree nurseries, beekeeping, fisheries, small-scale business, etc. that have been organised. At the end of the training, an attendance register will be signed to document participation. From the compilation of the monthly attendance, cash transfer requests will be generated to be used by the money transfer agent.

(4) Attend all AWARENESS sessions: Awareness shall form the second part of the capacity building session. Awareness creation shall be in two main areas, namely:

   (i) Nutrition and child feeding practices: This will target mothers of child bearing age. The focus of the training shall be meal preparation, hygiene and feeding frequencies. Dieting and the like.

   (ii) Environmental conservation: Creating awareness on activities that are detrimental to the environment.

The training sessions shall have attendance registers marked to keep a record of attendance for each beneficiary against which payment shall be processed.

Penalty

Penalties will be attached to absenteeism from training or awareness creation sessions that have been organised or unwillingness to work with others in group. Full monthly conditional cash transfer will be remitted to beneficiaries based on full attendance of sessions. If beneficiaries miss work or training sessions, the monthly transfers will be reduced in proportion to the number of sessions missed.
## Annex 8: Vulnerability and Targeting in Urban Settings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Vulnerability and Targeting in Urban Settings</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urban Food Insecurity: Strategies for WFP. Food Assistance in Urban Areas.</strong> Individuals and households in urban settings face a range of different challenges when compared to their counterparts in rural settings. Identifying needs and setting criteria for eligibility should take into account the unique circumstances which make urban dwellers vulnerable to specific shocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adapting to an Urban World. Urban Case Study:</strong> Adapting Tools and Methods to Assess Food Security in Urban Areas of Somalia. In 2015, FSC Somalia undertook an assessment of current practice for identifying needs in urban settings. The report provides insights into the unique challenges which urban households face which exposes them to food insecurity.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Annex 9: Protection Analysis Frameworks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection Analysis Frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ERC Protection Risk Benefit Decision Tree</strong> Identifies and assigns context-specific weights/importance to protection risks in terms of safety, and dignity, access and data protection, market impacts, people with specific needs, risks, social relations, fraud, diversion and durable solutions/early recovery. Helpful for deciding type/method of assistance and targeting mechanism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cash Consortium Centrality of Protection Risk Analysis</strong> Risk analysis of key elements of a targeting strategy from a Centrality of Protection perspective. Based off key risk areas identified for targeting cash assistance in Somalia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Annex 10: Protection Referral Actors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protection Actors Contact List</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prepositioning of relationships with protection actors in the locations where your organisation works can help ensure the establishment of timely, confidential referral mechanisms to aid in treatment and psychosocial support for GBV survivors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the event that organisations are targeting conditional cash programmes in areas affected by conflict, it is important to maintain the contact details of organisations trained and equipped to handle UXOs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Annex 11: Do No Harm Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do No Harm</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undertaking a Do No Harm analysis, mapping key stakeholders and the power dynamics between groups can help organisations better understand the mechanisms of disenfranchisement. An in-depth socio-political analysis can assist actors to navigate complex settings and devise outreach strategies to reach the most-vulnerable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Annex 12: Stakeholder Assessment Questions

Stakeholder Assessment Questions

When engaging with the various levels of formal and informal governance structures, it is important to understand details regarding the person(s) you are dealing with and what their relationship is to the target areas/groups. In advance, it can be helpful to ask probing questions of staff members, peers from other organisations, and trusted key informants to better understand if powerholders are likely to provide unbiased information and advice regarding target locations.

- What is his/her/their affiliation to groups or segments of the population in the target location?
- What is this person/group’s role in governance structure and how it relates to targeting (village-level and/or household level)?
- What has been this person/group’s relationship with other groups in the targeted area? (e.g. dominate, exploitive, advocate)
- Are the locations where you are being directed related to the power structures of this individual/group?
- Are there less powerful groups not associated with this person in the area which could be targeted (occupational groups, different ethnic groups, clans outside the system)?
- How will this powerholder’s preference and biases impact the effectiveness of CSC? What other communication channels might be established?

Annex 13: Community Engagement Checklist

Checklist for Community Engagement

Project Overview

☐ Describe the process and results of the needs assessment;
☐ The overall purpose (drought relief, flood relief, livelihood protection, etc.);
☐ Nature of the project/type and duration (unconditional cash/voucher, cash-for-work, combination), total amount of the entitlement per location and for each recipient;
☐ Rationale for using this type of response and who made the decision;
☐ Why do we need to target in the first place? Broad description or targeting objective: (i) reaching those most in need of assistance; (ii) efficient use of scarce resources; (iii) conditionality for livelihood projects;
☐ Who is targeted; what are the selection criteria; who is involved in the selection and why? If using households (HH), describe what the organisation considers to be a HH (a group of individuals, usually related, who form an economic unit within which income, assets, food supplies, etc. are shared – 6 people per HH in Somalia);
| Stakeholders: The roles of CSC members. Role of field staff, organisations, local partners, money transfer agents, vendors, etc. in the project; |
| Outline desired configuration of CSC (inclusion of women, inclusion of all groups/segments of the community, etc.); |
| Organisation staff: who will be doing the work (e.g. what agency stands for, names of key staff member involved in project, etc.) and whom to contact in case more information is needed or if there are any issues to be raised; |
| Scope (geographic coverage). |

### Complaints Response Mechanism

| Explain the communication channels available to communities; |
| Right to give feedback and make a complaint; |
| Organisation's procedures on handling corruption, fraud, abuse and exploitation of the targeted population and adherence to the principle of confidentiality; |
| Engage community on CRM: explain different mechanisms and their advantages and disadvantages, (e.g. the hotline is toll-free and callers can talk to male/female Somali operators); |
| How to make a complaint. Basic information required for complaint: who, why, what, when, where and how. Explain the duration it takes to receive feedback on the complaint (Maximum 10 days). Explain the role CSC in the CRM (if there is one); |
| Provide examples of types of complaints which can be made: vendors, inclusion, exclusion, taxation, malfunctioning with delivery mechanism (e.g. benefit card failure), all forms of exploitation and abuse. |

### State of Vulnerability in Area of Need for Targeting

| Acknowledge difficulties of targeting the “most vulnerable” in context of widespread poverty and vulnerability; |
| Discuss the concept of vulnerability (e.g. food consumption gap: 1 day vs. 1 week; |
| Define clearly HH characteristics that can be used to assess relative wealth and vulnerability; |
| Describe organisation's pre-defined vulnerability criteria; |
| Invite stakeholders to provide other, context specific, characteristics of vulnerability through their CSC; |
| Explain the role of CSC in screening HHs and role of organisation in verifying and validating registration list. |
Implementation Mechanism

- Description of registration process;
- Role of CSC, including its role in selection of most vulnerable – highlighting the fact that assistance is free and nobody should pay to be included on the registration list (reference complaints/suggestion hotline);
- Total number of people targeted and size of benefit for the community;
- Frequency of benefit and timeline for activities;
- How to access benefit;
- Project duration and timeline;
- Conditions under which the project will be suspended (e.g. insecurity, taxation of benefits, etc.).

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Verification process (e.g. household verification, randomised call-up, post distribution monitoring);
- The role of Third Party Monitors (both the organisations and the donors);
- Impacts of the project (e.g. for cash assistance – impact on economy).

Annex 14: CSC Roles and Responsibilities Checklist

CSC Roles and Responsibilities Checklist

The Community Selection Committee should

- Ensure the fair representation of members from the community on the draft registration list;
- Identify most vulnerable people following the agreed upon selection criteria;
- Inform recipients after registration;
- Conduct verification and identification during distribution of benefit;
- Respect the intent and scope of the project;
- Mediate and resolve conflicts;
- Provide security information to project staff and act to resolve potential security incidents;
- Share all relevant information with the community;
- Facilitate coordination with the community, including relaying project information to the community;
- Ensure women and minority groups’ participation.
### Areas of Emphasis (1.0) for Staff with CSC members

- The CSC member is a facilitator, but ultimately the final decision regarding recipient selection lies with the organisation;
- The CSC member is responsible for identifying, inviting and facilitating participation of minority groups, new arrivals and creating space for women to participate and share their opinions;
- Being a CSC member means being an honest, persuasive and respected community member who does his/her best to support the success of the project. A person who puts the interest of the most vulnerable ahead of clan/tribe interest;
- CSC members will vouch for the eligibility of every recipient, affixing their name to the draft registration form. The CSC member will be answerable in the event that verification of beneficiary finds a person suggested by this member does not match eligibility criteria;
- The CSC member will sign their name to the MoU, agreeing to adhere to its agreements to the best of their ability.

### Areas of Emphasis (1.1) Key Humanitarian Standards and Codes

- Aid priorities are calculated on the basis of need alone. (Red Cross/Red Crescent Code of Conduct 2);
- Ways shall be found to involve program beneficiaries in the management of relief aid (Red Cross/Red Crescent Code of Conduct 7);
- Recipients of assistance have a right to receive aid free of harassment. Organisation will not tolerate corruption or sexual harassment (Inter-agency Standing Committee [IASC] Codes of Conduct);
- Recipients are free to express their opinions, give feedback and complain (Accountability to Affected Populations);
- “Organisations commit to”…establishing management systems to solicit, hear and act upon the voices and priorities of affected people…(2017 IASC commitments on AAP and PSEA Commitments 1,2 and 3);
- How to involve people throughout the project (Good Enough Guide, 2006, Tool 3);
- Communities and people affected by crisis have access to the humanitarian assistance they need at the right time (Core Humanitarian Standard Commitment 2).
### Annex 15: Sample Registration Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration List with Accountability Features</th>
<th>CWW has developed a registration list which contains information on targeting criteria and helps to promote accountability by requesting community leaders to sign their names, validating that the chosen community members do in fact meet the eligibility criteria. Tools such as this can establish an accountability trail and help in identifying individuals/groups who consistently put forth candidates who do not meet agreed-upon eligibility criteria.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong> Registration list with accountability features. Concern World Wide. “Committee Beneficiary Registration Form”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Annex 16: Sample MoUs with Communities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample MoUs/Agreements With Communities</th>
<th>To support meaningful accountability between organisation and community, it can be helpful to formalise relationships through the signing of a MoU. MoU details should be translated into the local language and communicated to the community in a way that is most easily accessible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Example:</strong> Sample MoU with community. ACTED and SADO. “MoU ACTED and SADO”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For projects which contain conditionality (Cash For Work), it is helpful to develop annexes to highlight specifics of the project in the event that there are misunderstandings during implementation phase.</td>
<td><strong>Example:</strong> Sample MoU with community for CFW. World Vision. “Cash For Work Community MoU”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CBT requires working through community structures to reach the most vulnerable. There are various levels where organisations can influence their environments and improve inclusion of the most vulnerable. WFP’s “concentric circles” model graphically presents domains where food security actors can act.

- **The inner circle (concerns and responses)** represents the domain which organisations can take direct action to improve protection in the design and implementation of interventions (e.g. establishing feedback hotlines).

- **The second layer (root causes)** challenges organisations to address the underlying factors of vulnerability to food insecurity. Sometimes this means going beyond purely technical solutions to inclusion/exclusion errors. Within the realm of CBT, this means ensuring that information reaches less powerful groups with few networks, but also advocating with powerholders for the inclusion of the most vulnerable in decision-making bodies like the CSC and/or as participants in projects. It can also mean vigorously addressing inclusion errors as they are identified. Sometimes socio-political barriers are beyond the capacity of a single staff member or organisation to address and requires reaching out for joint advocacy (UN, NGO, religious leaders, etc.) to improve access to the most vulnerable.

- **The outer rim are the social political structural issues** which FSC members can positively influence through promotion of common CBT standards and training to community leaders on roles and responsibility and humanitarian standards. Formalising relationships between communities and organisations through the signing of MoUs can help promote accountability. Promoting participatory processes to targeting can help communities understand factors of vulnerability and empower them to make plans and strategies to address them.

---
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Annex 18: Targeting Effectiveness Protection

**ECHO Protection Indicators**  
*Amended/Translated by Cash Consortium:* Organisations are piloting protection indicators as a means of gauging the effectiveness targeting and feedback mechanisms.

**Example:** Protection questions PDM (translated Somali). Concern World Wide-led Cash Consortium. Protection Indicators

**World Vision International Food Programme Field Guide**  
**Rapid Social Impact Evaluation:** A series of questions directed to beneficiary, non-beneficiary and staff members to gather qualitative information regarding their perceptions of fairness regarding the targeting process to assess it from a Do No Harm perspective.

**Example:** Rapid Social Impact Evaluation for “Do No Harm.” World Vision. World Vision Do No Harm PDM Questions

---

Annex 19: Assessing Appropriateness of CBT Analysis Tools

**Tool 1: Strengths and Weaknesses of CBT**

**Community Based Targeting**

Provides a full list of the strengths and weakness of CBT. Generally, CBT is most effective in homogenous communities, free of conflict with legitimate and respected governance structures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strengths</th>
<th>Weaknesses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communities are often better informed and are a reliable source of information and have better understanding of their own vulnerabilities and priorities.</td>
<td>Correct targeting is difficult and expensive to monitor, particularly in conflict-affected areas, where access is restricted and where there is community mistrust due to protracted conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involving the community in the targeting process is often the most effective way to safeguard against inclusion and exclusion errors, because they know who is eligible and who is not.</td>
<td>Community based targeting works well when the community buys into the idea of selecting those in the greatest need, particularly, where the needs are high.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Involving community in the targeting process may reduce the number of community complaints received by the agency.</strong></th>
<th><strong>Communities who do not buy into the idea may subvert the set criteria and introduce new ways of targeting.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The CBT approach enables communities to clearly articulate their needs and priorities, not only to the organisation, but also to the civil administration and private actors.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Leaving the decision to “target entirely” on the communities will not always guarantee that the most vulnerable groups are targeted.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based targeting is relevant across all core sectors (food security/livelihoods, WASH, nutrition, health, etc.).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community leaders may include their family members and the most vulnerable may not be selected.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBT helps to mobilise labour for community-owned infrastructure rehabilitation through the identification of participants.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Communities vary substantially in their ability and willingness to help those in need, particularly in conflict areas.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community participation can lead to better targeting, increase in programme efficiency and help achieve project impact. However, for communities, to target well, there has to be greater clarity about targeting criteria.</strong></td>
<td><strong>In certain conditions such as conflict, communities may be divided along ethnic, social and economic lines. In such situations, dominant communities control the allocation of resources.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Good targeting by communities leads to greater impact on women and children (e.g. health, nutrition, WASH)</strong></td>
<td><strong>In some situations, e.g. IDP settlements, community structures may be broken. This may make targeting more challenging.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When involved, communities feel a sense of ownership.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Women may be excluded from the beneficiary selection process, particularly decision-making.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>For pre-existing community committees, community based targeting builds on already established knowledge of community needs.</strong></td>
<td><strong>In some situations, asking communities to select some beneficiaries and not others may result in jealousy, tension or conflict, particularly from non-selected households. These kinds of tension can be reduced through effective sensitisation on who would be targeted and why.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community based targeting may be more cost effective in terms of administration and information (obtaining, processing and analysing data).</strong></td>
<td><strong>Requires communities to be well-defined and have self-knowledge. Only works where there is sufficient community cohesion; as such, may be inappropriate in urban displacement settings.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Helps to maintain community solidarity.</strong></td>
<td><strong>Abuse of power, elite capture, and favouritism within community may result in bias (e.g. exclusion of the relatively powerless).</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Community based targeting works well when there are more resource constraints and when only those in greatest need can be catered for.

Criteria defined are endogenous to the community and comparisons cannot be made between communities (e.g. different camps in one country).

Community based targeting increases community trust in beneficiary selection process.

Community based targeting increases community trust in beneficiary selection process. Initial start-up of CBT systems needs training and advocacy at the local level; this requires staff time, which at the initial stage can be costly.

Careful monitoring is required to ensure fairness and cross-checking of targeting decisions.

---

**Tool 2: Circumstances when to use Community Based Targeting**

Community Based Targeting is most appropriate in the three following set of circumstances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circumstances</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Slow onset</td>
<td>The food security situation deteriorates steadily over time, in a predictable way. Typical cases for slow-onset emergencies are droughts, or a food crisis in the wake of HIV/AIDS.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protracted</td>
<td>A long-term emergency has stabilised in terms of security, beneficiary numbers and population movements. CBT can also be considered in transition situations or in relief to recovery-oriented interventions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudden onset (ONLY when CBT is already well established)</td>
<td>In rare cases where CBT is well-established and successful within the community, CBT might also be considered should a rapid-onset emergency occur, as long as indispensable minimum conditions are still met (this may not be possible in conflict situations).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
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Tool 3: Assessing the Appropriateness of Community Based Targeting

Assessing general appropriateness of CBT

Does the nature of the crisis allow CBT? (time available/scale of needs/urgency)

Does the security situation allow access to the community?

Is the programme likely to have a certain duration?

Is there any likelihood for an extension?

Are there sufficient and capable partners?

Can partners be mobilised and capacitated?

Any likelihood for success of increased advocacy/sensitisation?

Can physical access realistically be improved?

Is there sufficient physical access to the community?

Do planned assessments broadly match assessed needs?

Any likelihood for success of increased advocacy?

Foresee renewed assessment

No sub-community targeting, use alternative targeting or distribution methods

Increase advocacy

Increase advocacy/sensitisation

Mobilise and capacitate partners

Improve access (SO)

Start preparations for CBT
Annex 20: Participatory Methods of Targeting in Emergencies (Examples and Topics)

Case Study: International Rescue Committee (IRC), DRC Congo

A number of examples exist in East Africa of organisations employing some methods of PRA in emergency contexts, such as participatory wealth/vulnerability ranking (PWR) to categorise groups in households.

- Facilitating discussions where communities identify different categories (based on wealth or community perceptions of vulnerability) – organisations can identify groups and households most in need;
- Facilitating communities’ involvement in identifying characteristics of vulnerability can generate more nuanced, context-specific indicators and promote community buy-in.

In Rutshuru Territory, DRC Congo, International Rescue Committee launched a Livelihoods Response Initiative, a cash transfer program, that delivered around $1.4 million to 10,000 households in 2014.

1. **Orientation:** IRC gave an overview of the PPCA process to Village Development Committee (VDCs).

2. **Creation of a household list:** Using a method of their choosing, the VDCs registered each household in their community. This list of households was posted publicly for at least 24 hours to allow for public verification.

3. **Validation of the household list and creation of criteria:** In the first of two general community assemblies, the list of households was discussed and adjusted if necessary. The final list was validated by general public vote and signed by the members of the VDC, local chiefs and an IRC staff member. In focus groups (separated into men, women and youth), community members developed criteria to categorise households into one of four levels of general need, from most vulnerable (‘Category A’) to least (‘Category D’). When the groups reconvened in the general assembly, these criteria were discussed, harmonised and validated in a general vote.

4. **Categorisation of households:** The VDCs, often with the support of additional members of the community, assigned each household to a category according to their level of need using the criteria generated by the assembly.

5. **Verification by the IRC:** IRC staff visited a sample of households across categories to confirm that the categorisation did not favour elites.

6. **The household list by category of need was posted for further public scrutiny.**

7. **In the second general assembly, the final list was validated through a general public vote.**

8. **Allocation of funds by category:** During the second general assembly, IRC staff met privately with the VDC to give them the total dollar amount allocated to the community, based on a combination of baseline Food Consumption Scores (FCS) and estimated population. The VDC then decided what specific amount to allocate per household per category. For example, the households in the neediest category (Category A) might be allocated $160 each, the households in the next needy category $130 each, and so on. The VDC then returned to the assembly to discuss their allocation plan and put it to a general public vote.
While this process demanded a considerable amount of time from the community, once staff members were familiar with each step they were able to guide the VDCs through it with little difficulty. A team of 10–12 staff took 32 communities (almost 10,000 households) through the process in less than a month.⁵⁷

---

**Participatory Rural Appraisal Overview Tools**

**Building Resilient Communities in Somalia (BRCiS)**

**OUR OBJECTIVE:**
- Produce a **COMMUNITY-BASED DISASTER MANAGEMENT PLAN** for each targeted village (targeted community in the case of Mogadishu)

**OUR METHOD:**
- A Disaster Management Plan can only be effective if it is the result of **BROAD COMMUNITY PARTICIPATIONS** so that:
  a) The Plan identifies, builds on, complements and strengthens the community's own coping capacities.
  b) The Plan is adapted to the local reality and needs.

**OUR TOOLS:**
- In our work with the communities, we make use of **PROFESSIONAL PRA TOOLS** to obtain, share and jointly analyse information. These tools include:
  A. **TRANSECT WALK:** A walk in the community area to observe and document similarities and differences of socio-economic and bio-physical features.
  B. **HAZARD MAPPING:** A map that highlights areas in the physical environment of the community that are affected or vulnerable to specific hazards.
  C. **HISTORICAL PROFILE:** A succession of historical moments, periods and/or events in the area that affected the community, showing the changes that took place in the community and how the community reacted.
  D. **SEASONAL CALENDAR:** A visualisation of activities and events that are relevant to the community and take place periodically, typically across seasons.
  E. **VENN DIAGRAMS:** A visual representation of the various organisations and groups that can be distinguished within a social system and the relations and interactions among them.
  F. **SWOT ANALYSIS:** The identification of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in relation to a problem or situation at the level of community, organisation, group, household, etc.

We use these and other PRA tools in a flexible way, so to best fulfill the research needs.

---

Annex 21: Analytical Framework for Targeting in Complex Settings

There is no one-size-fits-all approach to targeting in Somalia. Every community, every context is unique. The analytical framework presented here aims to help field-level staff to analyse and understand the unique circumstance they may encounter when targeting the most vulnerable in complex governance settings. The formula is an adaptation of a model for designing policy solutions in challenging governance environments. It seeks to isolate those specific dynamics within a governance system which can lead to poor targeting outcomes (inclusion error and exclusion error). The tool simplifies a complex set of dynamics to assists field teams to strategise context-specific actions to address barriers to reaching the most vulnerable.

Organisations identify community dynamics: excess (+) Monopoly, excess (+) Decision Power and/or lack (-) Accountability (mix of all) which are barriers to effective targeting.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK FOR TARGETING IN COMPLEX SETTINGS

Social, Economic, Political Disenfranchisement

Factors in Targeting at Community level

\[
IE = \{ M + D - A \}
\]

ERRORS

Social, Economic, Political Disenfranchisement

Excess (X) Monopoly, Excess (X) Decision Power and/or Lack (-) Accountability (mix of all)

IE = { M + D - A }

Errors
Community Dynamics

**Monopoly:** This represents the monopoly of knowledge which community leadership and community committee members have over the external organisation. One of the strengths of working through communities is that they have a better understanding of who is vulnerable than external actors. Monopoly of knowledge becomes a challenge when community leadership withholds vital information regarding community vulnerability in an effort to direct resources towards their own interest. Under these circumstances, organisations must seek ways to decrease this monopoly of knowledge.

**Decision Power:** This represents the discretion with which regional, local and community committee members have when deciding who will be a recipient of assistance. The level of decision power an individual or group has is a reflection of the governance and accountability environment. Where there is a concentration of decision-making power, there is likely to be more inclusion and exclusion errors. In complex settings, power is often concentrated in the hands of a dominant group or a specific individual who has control of resources, information and security apparatus. In these contexts, individual leaders can exercise considerable power.

**Accountability:** Inclusion and exclusion errors are more likely to occur when local communities (or sections of those of communities) are voiceless and have no formal channels to air grievances and demand their rights to services. Local leadership and/or community committees may lack legitimacy and are not accountable and therefore do not have the best interests of the people they represent at heart. In complex settings, there are few accountability mechanisms in place to limit the discretion of powerful groups and individuals.

The number of inclusion and exclusion errors in targeting are likely to increase in governance environments when:

(i) Organisations have very little contextual awareness, and experience and where there is an over-reliance on information provided by powerful individuals or groups;

(ii) Organisations lack direct access to the affected populations due to insecurity or by design;

(iii) Power is concentrated in the hands of an individual or small group of individuals and where organisations have very limited bargaining power to make demands on powerholders (adhere to targeting criteria);

(iv) 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.

**How to use this tool: Analytical Framework for Targeting in Complex Settings**

To address this governance environment, organisations must engage in ways to decrease inclusion and exclusion errors by:

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

(i) Deploying experienced staff familiar with the context and the different structures and groups to interface with community committees;

(ii) Conduct an in-depth stakeholder analysis and mapping to understand the power dynamics between the different clan groupings;

(iii) Promote the establishment of stronger structures. Sensitise communities of role of VRC member. Promote fair representation, inclusive of women and marginalised groups who can provide alternative views and perspective of vulnerability and inform better targeting;

(iv) Cultivate networks of key informants to keep abreast of community dynamics;
(v) Share widely information on the organisation and its programmes. The specific project, selection criteria and targeted population;

(vi) Establish a two-way communication systems and structures. Structure all-inclusive meetings, community notice boards, all-inclusive assessment, planning and monitoring.

**Note:** Reliable, accessible and timely information has been identified as a key component to community based targeting. Information is critical in reducing monopoly.

### Decrease discretion (decision-making power)

(i) Without creating parallel power structures, organisations should strengthen the existing structures through promoting inclusion and capacity building.

(ii) Establish an agreed upon eligibility criteria with emphasis on need and vulnerability;

(iii) Actively engage other levels of government and local authority, either directly to support the selection process or as part of verification, validation and monitoring of the project;

(iv) Promote negotiation, diplomacy and respect for authority;

(v) Calling upon traditional and religious leaders to play a more active role in humanitarian interventions.

**Note:** To decrease the decision power of individuals and groups, organisations are reaching out to networks inside and outside communities to limit the amount of unchecked power that some individuals and groups use to influence targeting decisions.

### Increase Accountability

(i) Sensitise stakeholders on accountability to affected populations and protection from all forms of exploitation and abuse;

(ii) Analyse existing CRM and generate different options for feedback and complaints stakeholders may prefer;

(iii) Design and implement the agreed upon CRM;

(iv) Explore innovative context-specific CRMs that are reliable, safe and responsive to the marginalised and the most vulnerable;

(v) Monitor, analyse and track feedback and complaints of VRC members;

(vi) Identify different levels of participation by different groups within the affected population and analyse how that can increase accountability.

**Note:** Organisations are finding technological and social solutions for helping the voiceless make their demands known.
There are a number of ways organisations are already influencing these community dynamics to improve targeting outcomes:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Examples from Somalia(^\text{58})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noted that by informing many stakeholders, you can decrease the discretionary power of the leaders.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A program officer was monitoring an implementing partner during a food distribution. During the distribution, a local leader demanded that each beneficiary provide him with US$2. The program officer personally knew the D.C. from the location and so gave him a call. The D.C. in charge showed up and scolded the local official, allowing the distribution to take place unmolested.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A LNGO was trying to undertake a distribution UCT in three communities. When they approached the D.C. he demanded that only they knew who to select in the community and they did not need the selection criteria. In short, he would provide them a list. The LNGO approached the three community committees directly, informing them of the D.C.’s decision. The committees approached the D.C. telling him that they instructed the LNGO to go away, but still expected the D.C. to provide the UCT. The D.C. backed down and requested the LNGO to work directly with the local community to determine who got the UCT.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monopoly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisation was new to an area and so mapped social structures/power and influential groups in a community to inform selection of committees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Power</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussing the programme openly and sharing information widely limits “discretionary” power wielded by local authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management involvement (due to complaints) motivates NGO staff to address these issues and revisit selection processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LNGO (made-up from a minority clan) approached a senior elder from the dominant clan and requested that he come with them to a village outside town where the LNGO wanted to work but where the village committee was made up of the dominant clan. By bringing the senior elder from the same dominant clan, they were better able to negotiate. They had injected accountability by showing the village committee they had access to a senior member of their clan in the event that there might be any attempts to influence targeting outcomes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{58}\) FSC engaged 8 groups of FSC members with tool. This is a sample some of the ways actors are already addressing these dynamics in Somalia.