**South Sudan targeting for FSL interventions** – October 2021

The basis for targeting in the current context is the **IPC food security severity levels** to ensure that ALL IPC phase 5 (catastrophe) and phase 4 (emergency) are targeted and that as many of the IPC phase 3 (crisis) households are targeted according to available resources often with reduced rations/ kits when resources are scarce.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Integrated food security phase classification (IPC)** | **Description & characteristic** |
| Food secure: **IPC 1** | Usually adequate and stable food access with moderate to low risk of sliding into Phase 3, 4, or 5. |
| Moderately/ borderline food insecure**: IPC 2** | Borderline adequate food access with recurrent high risk (due to probable hazard events and high vulnerability) of sliding into Phase 3, 4, or 5 |
| Acute food & livelihood crisis: **IPC 3** | Highly stressed and critical lack of food access with high and above usual malnutrition and accelerated depletion of livelihood assets that, if continued, will slide the population into Phase 4 or 5 and/ or likely result in chronic poverty. |
| Humanitarian emergency: **IPC 4** | Severe lack of food access with excess mortality, very high and increasing malnutrition, and irreversible livelihood asset stripping |
| Famine/ humanitarian catastrophe: **IPC 5** | Extreme social upheaval with complete lack of food access and/or other basic needs where mass starvation, death, and displacement are evident |



The targeting question has been hotly discussed since the Operation Lifeline Sudan (OLS) days and the publication just prior to the 1998 famine in NBEG of the **Southern Sudan Vulnerability Study** (see summary above) which concluded that local chiefs closest to the communities were best placed to target scarce resources based on the premise that established communities know one another and who is most food insecure and that traditional village institutions, unimpeded by the army or political interference, are relatively accountable to their constituents in the community or cattle camps.

More recently the importance of greater grass root participation with representative community members (especially inclusive of women and also reflecting other persons with special needs) has led to ‘**vulnerability targeting’** using Community Based Participatory Planning (CBPP) committees and forums in one guise or another.

Below we present a number of vulnerability targeting approaches/ criteria currently in use as suggested by WFP for GFD and FFA and FAO for livelihood support and which proximate closely to very similar approaches being used by our well-established INGO and NNGO partners:

* **WFP** in recent years have adjusted their **Operational Strategies** towards a shift from status based to more vulnerability based approaches; more targeted approach from blanket approaches (though blanket approach still the modality in RRM locations); beneficiary bio-metric registration currently being rolled out and becoming the ‘norm’; incorporating value added interventions in the GFD; strengthening community engagement to enhance accountability to the affected population which also aims at promoting transparency and greater social cohesion outcomes;
* The **WFP emergency targeting criteria/ procedure** is then based on: IPC Prioritization: Phase 3 – 5 (as per the table above); the results of internal assessment to be utilized for operational feasibility; FSNMS data collection and analysis; protection assessment and monitoring results; cooperating partners assessments; and consultation with local communities including traditional leadership;
* For **WFP/ FFA** **targeting process** (see details in the guide under annex 1), the Cooperating Partner (CP) triangulates the prioritization criteria generated from the CBPP process to ensure it is not excluding ‘vulnerable’ households based on the following criteria[[1]](#footnote-1):

1. Households with a high dependency ratio (i.e. one active income earner for 5+ members)
2. Female-headed households, particularly those recently widowed or abandoned;
3. Households with a family member discharged as cured in the last three months from an OTP/TSFP site;
4. Households with chronically ill or disabled family members;
5. Split up households (i.e. households where a member has left or been sent away in search of food; households where children have been sent away to live with relatives so they can eat);
6. Households facing zero-sum coping (i.e. Whatever choice a care-giver/ income earner makes, something else equally urgent critical to survival is ignored[[2]](#footnote-2));
7. Households who do not own or have access to productive assets, including land, or livestock[[3]](#footnote-3);
8. Daily wage-earning households or households with no reliable income (i.e. households who rely on casual daily labour for income);
9. Other criteria as defined in the context of the community, agreed by the CBPP Planning Team.

* **Targeting criteria as used by FAO / ELRP team** indicate that the following vulnerable groups should be targeted as follows: (1) HHs with handicapped and chronically ill, child headed families: should receive all kits but mostly vegetable seeds; (2) female headed households, households with pregnant women, IDPs and returnees: should receive vegetable seeds, fishing gears and crop seeds if with access to land; (3) HH’s affected by Fall Army worm/ Desert Locusts; and (4) HH’s supported  in  BRACE II and Non Brace II  intervention areas;

**FAO/ ELRP additional criteria, more specific for each type of kit:**

* **Selection criteria for crop kits/seeds:** Selected households must be farmers or agro-pastoralists; shall have access to a land for planting; shall have the capacity to mobilize enough labor for cropping (land preparation, planting, weeding, etc.…); should have no access to crop seeds and tools or have lost them; and shall commit to attend eventual capacity development programmes that will be carried out by FAO or the IP.
* **Selection criteria for vegetable kits/seeds: s**elected households shall have access to a small plot of land; shall have the capacity to mobilize enough labor for cropping (land preparation, planting, weeding, etc.…); shall commit to use the vegetable sees provided; shall commit to attend eventual capacity development programmes that will be carried out by FAO or the IP.
* **Selection criteria for fishing kits:** must be fisher folk, farmers and/or agro pastoralists; shall have access to a water source suitable for fishing; and shall commit to attend eventual capacity development programmes that will be carried out by FAO or the IP.
* The **FSLC integration plan** for the past 3 years has based on agreement and advice from the other famine prevention clusters: Health WASH and Nutrition to provide FSL support based on ‘vulnerability targeting’ to households residing in the catchment areas of health centers, nutrition facilities and community improved water infrastructure;

**Annex 1: draft FFA targeting guidance (WFP)**

# This guidance note seeks to inform WFP field staff and cooperating partners how to conduct targeting for FFA at the payam, boma and household level.

# **County to Village Targeting**

The Integrated Context Analysis (ICA) provides generalized types of interventions to respond to vulnerabilities posed by food insecurity and natural shocks at the state and county level. The [ICA findings](https://www.wfp.org/publications/south-sudan-integrated-context-analysis-december-2018) should be used to determine the appropriate programmatic response to the ICA classifications. Generally, FFA is most appropriate in areas identified as Category 3 by the ICA where a resilience building approach is necessary. Once it is agreed that FFA is the most appropriate programmatic response, county level targeting can be initiated.

## County

This first level of FFA targeting is geographic, based on food security analysis (IPC, FSNMS) and ICA recommendations. Counties with majority of households facing Phase III food insecurity are identified for FFA intervention, and the caseload to be allocated to that county is determined based on available or expected resources, severity of food insecurity, field office and partner capacity. FFA typically targets households in IPC Phase III, but may also include households in Phase IV.

County level targeting will be done at the WFP Country Office level, in consultation with Field Offices, as the WFP Operational Plan is developed

## Payam

Once the counties where FFA is going to be implemented are identified by WFP, payam level discussions should be held at the county level between WFP, the county and payam authorities, state level line ministries (mainly agriculture, physical infrastructure) and WFP’s cooperating partner(s) to select the specific payams where FFA will be implemented. Payam prioritization should be done in two layers by asking (at least) the following questions:

* Layer 1: which payam(s) has the most people who need this type of programme the most?[[4]](#footnote-4) Which payam(s) has been most affected by shocks? Which payam(s) have the highest concentration of poor and very poor households?
* Layer 2: which payam(s) has the most households meeting the prioritization criteria?

At this stage, it would also be able to find out from local authorities which other actors are already working in the area and what activities are they doing. This will assist in determining how resources could be shared within the payam.

In some cases, it may be necessary to equally allocate the FFA resources to all payams in the targeted county to avoid conflict. Ideally, only the payams identified in Layer 1 and Layer 2 will be targeted, with a view to concentrating the FFA coverage to enable easier and more consistent engagement during the asset creation period.

The community/government participants should be 50 percent male and 50 percent female; however, it is understood that at this level, payam administrators etc may be overwhelmingly male. Women’s community level organisations must be engaged in this stage to ensure that women’s views are included.

## Boma

Once the payams are selected, payam level discussions with payam and boma authorities should be conducted to identify the bomas in which Community-Based Participatory Planning (CBPP) will be conducted and FFA implemented. The process will be similar to payam-level prioritization, asking the following questions in two layers:

* Layer 1: which boma(s) has the most people who need this type of programme the most?[[5]](#footnote-5) Which boma(s) has been most affected by shocks? Which boma(s) have the highest concentration of poor and very poor households?
* Layer 2: which boma(s) has the most households meeting the prioritization criteria?

As was the case with payam targeting, it may be necessary to equally allocate the FFA resources to all bomas in the targeted payam to avoid conflict. Ideally, only the bomas identified in Layer 1 and Layer 2 will be targeted, with a view to concentrating the FFA coverage to enable easier and more consistent engagement during the asset creation period.

The community/government participants should be 50 percent male and 50 percent female; however, it is understood that at this level, payam/boma administrators, etc. may be overwhelmingly male. Women’s community level organisations must be engaged in this stage to ensure that women’s views are included.

Once the boma prioritization is complete, the CBPP Planning team can be formed and CBPP conducted. This will allow for village and household targeting.

## Village

During CBPP, WFP and its partners work with the community in creating a local definition and context-specific benchmarks of what constitutes a better off, medium well-off, poor and very poor household. The percentage of households in these different wealth groups is estimated by the community using a form of wealth ranking. FFA typically targets about 30% of the households within a boma, meaning that not all households or villages within a boma are targeted for FFA. During the CBPP and the identification of community development priorities, including the assets to be created through FFA, the specific villages in which the project will be implemented are determined by the CBPP Planning Team (see separate guidance note on forming a CBPP Planning Team).

Targeting of households should *not* be done during the CBPP. CBPP is an intensive and lengthy process through which communities are supported to identify their key challenges and priorities. While the process identifies the most appropriate bomas/villages and locations where assets can be created, a separate process for household targeting should be done.

# **Household Targeting**

Once the bomas/villages are selected through CBPP, the process for household targeting should be initiated. Through this process, the specific households who will create assets and receive food assistance will be identified. Targeted households always have the right to refuse to participate in FFA.

Participating households are selected by the community members based on a community defined prioritization criteria. The selection of households is done by a general assembly at a targeting and registration meeting where at least 80% (quorum) of the total number of households in the boma/village should be present to participate in the household selection process. The community agreed prioritization criteria listed by the Planning Team during the CBPP is validated by the general assembly and applied in household selection to target households from the poor and very poor socio-economic groups. Available resources should be allocated starting from households considered ‘very-poor’ and if resources are in excess, they should then be shared with ‘poor’ households. If the resources are *insufficient* to cover all poor/very poor households then prioritization should be done.

The CP facilitating the general assembly moderates the process, triangulating that the CBPP listed prioritization criteria, validation and selection by the general assembly is not exclusionary to other households including the following below criteria.[[6]](#footnote-6)

1. Households with a high dependency ratio (i.e. one active income earner for 5+ members)
2. Female-headed households, particularly those recently widowed or abandoned;
3. Households with a family member discharged as cured in the last three months from an OTP/TSFP site;
4. Households with chronically ill or disabled family members;
5. Split up households (i.e. households where a member has left or been sent away in search of food; households where children have been sent away to live with relatives so they can eat);
6. Households facing zero-sum coping (i.e. Whatever choice a care-giver/income earner makes, something else equally urgent critical to survival is ignored[[7]](#footnote-7));
7. Households who do not own or have access to productive assets, including land, or livestock[[8]](#footnote-8);
8. Daily wage-earning households or households with no reliable income (i.e. households who rely on casual daily labour for income);
9. Other criteria as defined in the context of the community, agreed by the CBPP Planning Team.

In situations where cultural norms and power structures will result in one group having their voice heard more than others, WFP and the partner should facilitate separate forums for these unheard groups to capture their views and needs, and then support their active participation in the general assembly and advocate for their input to be captured appropriately.

The majority of households targeted should have at least *two* able bodied family members – the primary person who will create the asset and an alternate. Able bodied refers to persons who do not have chronic (long-term) physical and or psychosocial impairments that prevent them from doing labour-based activities. These participants must be 18 years old[[9]](#footnote-9) or above. The primary participant and alternate must also be *willing* to participate in asset creation activities, including farming and communal asset creation. Household targeting should be in line with the objectives of the FFA programme.

During this process, the cooperating partner is responsible for creating a list of targeted households. The primary *participant* should be recorded on the beneficiary/ration card or registered in SCOPE as the principal. Partners should always ensure that WFP is made aware of the general assembly dates for participation of WFP staff, although it may not be possible for WFP to be present in each assembly meeting.

In a small number of cases per boma, households who meet the household prioritization criteria but do not have the labour capacity could be targeted as child-care givers. These participants will help establish child care friendly spaces near the asset creation sites and care for small children while their primary caregiver is participating in asset creation work. This should be managed in collaboration with child protection actors to ensure that those being selected to provide child care services meet and adhere to child protection standards (do no harm). Separate guidance on child care friendly spaces is being developed, but in general two caregivers could be included in the beneficiary list per boma (but depends on the overall number of participants per boma and simultaneous asset creation sites, as well as number of children requiring care).

Where possible, households that are not targeted for FFA because they lack the able-bodied requirement but meet the prioritization criteria and are considered poor/very poor households should be targeted for GFD. WFP and its partners, including the government, should aim to advocate on behalf of these households for support.

Once household targeting is complete, a separate meeting should be held with the targeted project participants and their alternates to discuss the Community Action Plan developed by the CBPP Planning Team and to develop an activity plan specific to FFA.

# **Key Principles in Community Based Targeting**

Community members themselves nominate households fitting the criteria. The proposition of nominees should ensure inclusivity and equal participation of women and men of all age groups and diversities (including persons with disabilities). The participation by all members of the community as a general assembly provides an opportunity for equal access to information on the project, equal and active (not representative) participation in household selection, ownership, accountability and transparency of the targeting process. The key to credible community-based targeting is consensus, hence the facilitator should be alert to cultural barriers and domination of the process by powerful individuals (i.e. chiefs) or groups and the potential for conflict in the process. In situations where cultural norms and power structures will result in one group having their voice heard more than others, WFP and the partner should facilitate separate forums for these unheard groups to capture their views and needs, and then support their active participation in the general assembly and advocate for their input to be captured appropriately.

All views and opinions of the community in the process of targeting at the various levels should be documented as a means to identifying good practices and lessons learned, as well as capturing feedback to inform decision making.

**Communicating Key Messages During Targeting**

The various stages of targeting are an important opportunity to communicate key messages, which WFP and partners must capitalize on. The following lists minimum messages to be communicated at the various stages:

Payam level targeting

* FFA objectives and timelines
* FFA targeting process
* Community rights and responsibilities, humanitarian principles and complaint and feedback mechanisms.

Boma/village level targeting (done through CBPP)

* FFA objectives and timelines
* FFA targeting process
* CBPP objectives and process
* Community rights and responsibilities, humanitarian principles and complaint and feedback mechanisms.

Household level targeting

* FFA objectives and timelines
* FFA targeting process
* Vulnerability/prioritization criteria as outlined by CBPP Planning Team
* FFA work norms and food assistance entitlements
* Community rights and responsibilities, humanitarian principles and complaint and feedback mechanisms.

Key messages to prevent gender-based violence, improve health and nutrition, etc could be communicated, particularly during CBPP and household level targeting.

**Annex 2: FAO: Beneficiary Selection Criteria**

A community-based approach motivates women, girls, boys and men in the community to participate in community activities, expressing their needs, empowering and recognizing the community members as participants in decision-making. It also seeks to understand the community’s concerns and priorities and strengthening of communities’ capacities to respond to risks and stressors and to make decisions over access to and use of resources. Participatory assessment is carried out in the spirit of shared responsibility for enhancing protection of all members of the community and is an essential component of community-based work.

1. **Targeting**

The selection of agents involved in targeting should be based on their impartiality, capacity and accountability. Targeting agents may include local elders, locally elected relief committees, civil society organisations, local NGOs, local governmental institutions or international NGOs. The selection of women targeting agents is strongly encouraged. Attempts to target vulnerable people should not add to any stigma that they already experience: this may be a particular issue in populations with a large number of people living with HIV and AIDS. Targeting approaches need to be clear and accepted by both recipient and non-recipient populations to avoid creating tensions and doing harm.

The beneficiaries of the ELRP 2019 are the most vulnerable people in South Sudan, those falling in category 3, and 4, of the Integrated Phase Classification (IPC). Beneficiaries include Internally Displaced Population (IPD), host communities, refugees, and community vulnerable groups’ representatives (female headed household, households with malnourished children, single mothers widows, elders, handicapped or chronically ill, IDP, refugee, youth at risk).

The below vulnerable groups should be targeted as follows:

* HHs with handicapped and chronically ill, child headed families: should receive all kits but mostly vegetable seeds
* Female headed households, households with pregnant women, IDPs and Returnees: should receive vegetable seeds, fishing gears and crop seeds if with access to land
* HH’s affected by Fall Army worm
* HH’s supported  in  BRACE II and Non Brace II  intervention areas

**Additional criteria, more specific for each type of kit.**

* **Selection criteria for crop kits/seeds:**
  + Selected households must be farmers or agro-pastoralists;
  + Selected households shall have access to a land for planting;
  + Selected households shall have the capacity to mobilise enough labour for cropping (land preparation, planting, weeding, etc.…);
  + Selected households should have no access to crop seeds and tools or have lost them;
  + Selected households shall commit to attend eventual capacity development programmes that will be carried out by FAO or the SP.
* **Selection criteria for vegetable kits/seeds:**
  + Selected households shall have access to a small plot of land;
  + Selected households shall have the capacity to mobilise enough labour for cropping (land preparation, planting, weeding, etc.…);
  + Selected households shall commit to use the vegetable sees provided;
  + Selected households shall commit to attend eventual capacity development programmes that will be carried out by FAO or the IP.
* **Selection criteria for fishing kits:**
  + Selected households must be fisher folk, farmers and/or agro pastoralists;
  + Selected households shall have access to a water source suitable for fishing;
  + Selected households shall commit to attend eventual capacity development programmes that will be carried out by FAO or the IP.

**2. Registration**

The SP will encourage the formation of community groups and committees that shall participate in the identification of beneficiaries, their registration, and encourage them to be present during the distribution. Sensitization prior to the beneficiary selection is required, with an adequate gender proportion and involving all community leaders. Regular meetings between the Parties shall be organized so as to ratify beneficiary targets and brief stakeholders on the implementation progress.

The local authorities in coordination with the community groups and committees will identify and select the beneficiaries from the community; women should be encouraged to help in the registration process.   
The SP will produce a list of beneficiaries, and identify those that shall receive one or more of the livelihood kits, based on the minimum criteria set below.

**The Service Provider (SP) is also required to:**

a) Sensitize the community few days before the activities take place, explaining the purpose of the distribution and date and location where distribution will take place;

b) Establish a complaint and response mechanism for registration and distribution processes;

c) Document sensitizations, crowd sourcing, broadcasts through pictures, complaints boxes videos diagrams or radio; all means of verification are required to be presented to FAO;

**Overarching principles for beneficiaries’ selection:**

For most emergency projects, the factors of social inclusion, protection and access are considered. Standard pillars of an emergency/ vulnerability targeting mechanism relevant for South Sudan context are:

1. An inclusive and participatory targeting - It considers the overall vulnerable population in the geographic area with Access to where they can utilize the kits i.e. the Sick, Elder, Child headed and Female Headed Household.
2. Geographic targeting; (Men and women with access to where they can utilize the kits)
   * The eligibility criteria; (transparency targeting on whom is eligible to receive in the particular community i.e. those with 1 hectare of land or less, access to group land for crop growing).

1. The list of household prioritization criteria is not exhaustive but typically describes the households most vulnerable to food insecurity and other shocks/stressors. In some cases, these may be the same prioritization criteria used in other WFP targeting processes. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. For example, the care-giver is constantly forced to choose between core survival activities on a daily basis because there is not the time or resources to do them all. This could include, for instance, having to choose between an income producing activity like collecting firewood or burning charcoal, and selling stock s/he has already collected (can’t do both on the same day). [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. In the case of targeting for FFA activities which support primarily pastoralist households, separate targeting criteria will be applied. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. This is not looking at who needs food assistance the most, but who needs food assistance *and* support for asset creation/resilience building the most. The dual objective of FFA must be kept in mind when asking this question. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. This is not looking at who needs food assistance the most, but who needs food assistance *and* support for asset creation/resilience building the most. The dual objective of FFA must be kept in mind when asking this question. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. The list of household prioritization criteria is not exhaustive but typically describes the households most vulnerable to food insecurity and other shocks/stressors. In some cases, these may be the same prioritization criteria used in other WFP targeting processes. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. For example, the care-giver is constantly forced to choose between core survival activities on a daily basis because there is not the time or resources to do them all. This could include, for instance, having to choose between an income producing activity like collecting firewood or burning charcoal, and selling stock s/he has already collected (can’t do both on the same day). [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. In the case of targeting for FFA activities which support primarily pastoralist households, separate targeting criteria will be applied. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. This is in accordance with FFA global SOPs and the Decent Work Agenda. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)