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Introduction
This document serves as a compendium of how agencies are approaching Targeting in Adamawa, Borno, and Yobe states. Based on the various experiences and lessons learned, the Food Security Sector has developed the recommendations outlined below.

Recommendations

- The Food Security Sector does not make a recommendation for one targeting approach (Door-to-Door or Community Based; Scored or Community Identified Vulnerability) over another approach. As outlined in the document, there are pros and cons to each approach, and organizations must make the decision based on the context of the community that they are serving.

- Elite/Influential capture of targeting processes is a real and valid concern expressed by partners. Agencies should be cognizant of elite/influential capture and involve elites and influential community members in the process, but should not defer to elites and influential. The following are recommendations to mitigate elite/influential capture
  - For any committees, the members should be publicly known, and selected by the community, rather than delegated by an authority, such as a Bulama
  - Criteria for inclusion in a program should be agreed on with the community
  - To ensure representation, create a process that allows women to meet together to discuss criteria and validation of any lists for inclusion separately
  - Ensure that all languages spoken in the area are included in the committee
  - Ensure host community and IDPs are included in the process

- Indicators, such as FCS, rCSI/CSI, HDDS should be used for monitoring, cognizant of differences that may be driven by seasonality and context. Food security indicators can be part of the targeting process, but should not be the only element of the targeting process. For example, a household with a poor FCS and high rCSI during the lean season, could have an acceptable FCS and low rCSI during the harvest period.

- The Food Security Sector recommends the inclusion of rCSI and FCS by all partners in their monitoring

- Sensitization from the beginning of the intervention, including who is getting what, when, and why; and what to do if there is an issue and should be continually reinforced by the agency.

- Agencies should utilize beneficiary registration lists and a database with the relevant indicators for accountability, as well as for information sharing within the sector

- Polygamous households should be registered individually. Households should be registered using the “cooking pot” method, each “cooking pot” or wife should be registered separately for assistance.

- Agencies should liaise with Nutrition Sector partners for support on MUAC screening and available referral mechanisms

- Agencies should review the proxy protection questions included below and incorporate into targeting processes

- All data collected should be disaggregated by sex and age (SADD)
Purpose of the Targeting Guidance
The purpose of this document is to explore how different agencies have approached targeting within the context of northeastern Nigeria. Initially, the response primarily targeted by status, but has moved toward targeting by vulnerability in mid-2017 based on the analysis that all populations, host and displaced, were vulnerable due to the conflict and not all populations by status were equally vulnerable. As vulnerability targeting has started, there are numerous lessons learned and approaches that can be used to strengthen how agencies conduct targeting. Additionally, Food Security Sector partners expressed a desire to have additional guidance on mitigating protection risks in targeting food assistance programming. This document focuses on food assistance, and does not include targeting for livelihood programming, which will be undertaken at a later date.

Background
At the early stage of the emergency, many agencies engaged in providing lifesaving assistance through blanket food distribution to Internally Displaced People (IDPs).

Additionally, as the situation has evolved over time and access has improved in some areas, some agencies have conducted assessments to determine geographic areas that have access to farming, market, or income opportunities, or the ability to resume their livelihoods, and therefore reduce their vulnerability. In areas where this access exists, then targeting should be considered. However, it is important to remember that for some communities, the access situation is fluid, with the ability to farm only a few kilometers out of the LGA center, and often with military escorts required. When a security incident occurs, the access to the farming areas may then be restricted, preventing households from engaging in livelihood activities.

In the beginning of the crisis, communal food distributions, where food was distributed within a community/camp and then divided by the community/camp was the norm. As the crisis progressed, and the level of humanitarian assistance began to increase, agencies moved toward status based targeting (targeting those displaced and considered to be IDPs). At the beginning of and at the peak of the North East crisis, humanitarian partners used the status based approach to target food insecure displaced populations.

With a high risk of famine and mortality, the objective was primarily to meet immediate lifesaving interventions and stabilize the food security situation in a fragile and complex environment. In practice this meant that all individuals, regardless of vulnerability, were eligible for assistance if they were Internally Displaced (IDPs). Agencies began a shift toward vulnerability, rather than status based targeting in early 2017. This was based on the ability of agencies to engage in assessments which found that some IDPs were not vulnerable and not at risk of engaging in negative coping strategies in order to meet their basic needs. Conversely, assessments indicated that some households that were hosting IDPs were engaging in negative coping strategies in order to assist those more vulnerable than them. As a result, agencies began to look at vulnerability, rather than status as a criteria for providing assistance.
Agencies approached understanding household vulnerability in both a similar and dissimilar approach. Agencies typically developed tools and questionnaires to understand vulnerability and how it impacted food security. All agencies worked with communities to develop targeting criteria based on that specific community, but went about it in different ways.

**Terminology Used in the Guidance**

**Community Based**
The formation of community committees to identify criteria that made households vulnerable, committee based identification of the most vulnerable, followed by verification exercise by the agency to look for inclusion and/or exclusion errors.

**Door-to-Door**
After understanding community identified vulnerability factors, some agencies assessed and registered every household in the area and then selected beneficiaries based on the outcomes of the assessment, followed by a verification exercise to look for inclusion and/or exclusion errors.

**Differences in Assessment Tools**
The type of tool to determine vulnerability used by agencies differed and the approaches used can be roughly divided into a “scored” approach or a “community identified vulnerability” approach.

**Scored**
For the “scored” approach, the assessment data allowed the agency to rank vulnerability within a community and then to select a cut off point for assistance.

**Community Identified Vulnerability**
For the “community identified vulnerability” approach, the community determined which characteristics made households vulnerable, and no ranking or scoring was done.

**Geographic Targeting**
Food Security Sector partners should use the most recent Cadre Harmonise Phase Classification and should prioritize working in areas identified as Phase 3-5. Analysis will be needed to justify working in Phase 2 areas, but it is important for partners to understand the drivers of food security in certain LGAs and wards, as some communities in Phase 2 may fall into Phase 3 or higher without assistance.

**Promoting Quality Programming**
Targeting and site selection by Food Security Sector partners should be informed by a context-and protection risk analysis so that food assistance supports the protection of conflict-affected populations. This includes, but is not limited to: (i) an increased emphasis on providing
assistance outside of IDPs camps or settlements to include affected host communities; ii) ensuring that risks such as forced recruitment of children and gender-based violence are prevented when large populations gather to receive food assistance; (iii) enabling the most marginalized and vulnerable groups to access assistance; and (iv) ensuring that food assistance does not exacerbate tensions between different social groups. The Sector should also continue to work to mainstream accountability to affected people.

Engaging the Community in the Process
While agencies involved in food assistance and cash transfer have different approaches to vulnerability targeting, there are commonalities that can be found across the majority of implementing agencies. Agencies all begin with the Community Sensitization Process, which includes the steps below.

Community Sensitization Process
The community sensitization process generally includes the following steps:
- Meet with LGA Chair, communities, and other stakeholders to discuss ward accessibility
- LGA Chair links NGOs with community leaders in the wards
- Conduct community meetings within communities to sensitize on the project and obtain population information for the area
- Meetings with community leaders to explain the program and the process that will be followed for identification of beneficiary households
- For NGOs that work through village committees, NGO staff either work through existing committees or form a committee with key community stakeholders, such as an IDP leader, elder, female representative, host community representative, or youth representative.
- A meeting is held to discuss the criteria for inclusion into the program
- Community volunteers are identified to support the whole process
- Community volunteers receive orientation and briefing on their roles and responsibilities.

Community Feedback and Accountability Mechanisms (CFAM)
Agencies also have multiple feedback mechanisms and channels, which includes toll-free hotlines where there are mobile networks, community feedback boxes, agency staff in the community serving as focal points, and community volunteers. At distributions, agencies also have complaints and feedback desks staffed by male and female staff to receive complaints and feedback. There are also mechanisms for Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) as accountability mechanisms. Agencies with offices in the communities where they work also accept walk-in complaints and feedback.

It is important to note that Community Feedback and Accountability Mechanisms should start at the beginning of the process to enable affected populations to receive information, including why their location has been selected, how households will be selected, how those who have not been selected can raise a complaint, and how complaints will be addressed.

Several agencies use one team for targeting and selection, and a separate team for verification and post distribution monitoring, to ensure accountability throughout the process.
Agencies also hold Post Distribution Monitoring Focus Groups with staff that are not involved in the project to receive feedback and complaints on the process. Additionally, agencies hold community meetings and meet with community leaders following each step of the process to receive feedback and ensure accountability.

Agencies are encouraged to understand the languages being spoken and to take into account minority groups in their areas of intervention and ensure that staff with the right language are available for feedback and accountability. Additionally, staff should be comprised of both men and women.

Protection Issues to Consider in Targeting
As part of the Targeting Task Force, additional consideration was given to provide guidance on protection issues to consider in targeting. When considering protection in targeting, agencies must work closely with their protection and gender colleagues to ensure that if questions are asked that pertain to sensitive protection issues, adequate referral and support services exist. Sensitive protection questions should not be asked unless referral and support services exist and can be supported by trained staff.

Proxy Questions
Agencies may find that proxy questions may be more appropriate to use when trying to determine the most vulnerable in a community. Based on agencies understanding of potential vulnerabilities within the community, proxy questions could include:

- Female headed households, Male headed households without a Female, Child headed households
- Certain age groups (such as adolescent girls, adolescent boys and young men\(^1\), the elderly, single and widowed caregivers)
- Certain status groups (such as IDPs, returnees including unaccompanied/separated children, the most vulnerable from the host community)
- People with disabilities, people living with HIV/AIDS, chronic illnesses
- The time required by a household to fetch water, collect firewood or cooking fuel
- Given that some bulamas have been recently appointed and are not necessarily from the same community of all beneficiaries, asking if the household feels represented by the traditional authority
- Asking what language the household speaks and then comparing it to the majority language in the area
- Perceptions of safety
  - For women, men, boys, and girls for visiting and/or using the market and attending public events
  - In fetching water and accessing firewood or cooking fuel
  - In attending school for children of all genders, ages, and abilities

As part of the Targeting, consideration should be given to protection and gender mainstreaming. Good targeting should take into account the dynamics of the local context,

---

\(^1\) Adolescent boys and young men are particularly vulnerable to recruitment by armed actors.
including gender, age, ethnicity, religion, disability and any other specific vulnerability, through Socio-Economic and Gender Analysis (SEAGA) and gender-sensitive Comprehensive Food Security and Vulnerability Analysis (CFSVA).

Please see Annex 1 in this document – Guiding Principles for Protection and Gender Mainstreaming in Targeting for further information.

Gender Based Violence
It is the responsibility of the entire humanitarian community to work within a protection framework and understand the safety risks that women, girls, men and boys face, in order to reduce GBV survivors’ stigma. GBV survivors should not be targeted as a specific group during the targeting processes. That means that there should be no distinction between those who have experienced violence and those who have not. Involving GBV survivors needs to be done in respect of GBV guiding principles of safety, confidentiality, respect, and non-discrimination.

Please see Annex 2 in this document – Gender Based Violence Sensitive Targeting for further information.

Snapshots of Agency Targeting Processes

Community Identification of Beneficiaries
Save the Children
Save the Children works with the community to define the selection criteria based on wealth ranking, where the community identifies the characteristics of the very poor, poor, middle, and better off households. Those households meeting the criteria of poor and very poor are identified by community committees and selected for inclusion in the program. Household characteristics include household size, land cultivated, livestock, and productive assets. The agency utilizes existing community committees, including village/IDP elders, women and youth representatives and local authorities who facilitate the beneficiaries selection processes but does not actually carry out the actual selection and registration of households who will benefit from the program. This is mainly intended to minimize the risk of nepotism based on lessons learned during the intial phase of the program. Instead SC will conduct house to house registration using the registration team who will independently carry out registration without the influence of the community committees. The house to house registration is meant to help validate and verify that the registered HHs are the actual settlers/residents in that community and also to collect additional economic and demographic data that will help determine the

---

2 The SEAGA is an approach to development and emergencies, based on a participatory identification and analysis of the socio-economic factors (economic, environmental, social and institutional patterns) that determine women’s, girls’, boys’ and men’s priorities and potentials. The main objective of this tool is to close the gaps between what people need and what development delivers, to contribute to effective and sustainable development. A gender-sensitive Vulnerability and Food Security Analysis informs programme design and implementation, by identifying and contextualizing the different vulnerabilities and capacities of women, men, girls and boys. Cfr. FAO. Protection from gender-based violence in food security and agriculture interventions A guide for FAO and partner staff to build resilient livelihoods. 2017.; https://resources.vam.wfp.org/sites/default/files/VAM%20Gender%20Analysis%20Guidance%20Note.pdf; http://www.wfp.org/food-security/assessments/comprehensive-food-security-vulnerability-analysis
3 UNFPA Minimum Standards for Prevention and Response to Gender-Based Violence in Emergencies. 2015.
wealth categories of the HHs. Where there are no formal community structures due to displacement, a committee with similar characteristics will be formed to facilitate the identification of vulnerable households.

Those households selected for inclusion in the program are then registered and a baseline of those households is conducted that includes collecting data on Food Consumption Score (FCS), Household Hunger Score (HHS), Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS), and reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Household Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recent widows and female-headed households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Families with additional vulnerability such as high dependency ratio (large number of malnourished children) and who are unable to meet their food needs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. IDP household with acutely or moderately malnourished children, children under five years of age and/or with pregnant and lactating mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vulnerable female and child headed households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Poor households headed by an elderly person or person with disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Pregnant and lactating IDP mothers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Poor host families with limited assets in terms of land and animals owned, and/or who are hosting displaced families or fostering children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Households with no external assistance (remittances, etc)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional HEA Wealth Group Criteria**

| VP & P |
| HH size: 5-10; 0 acres cultivated; no livestock; limited productive assets |

World Food Programme (WFP)

Targeting is the central element of all WFP food aid operations. Targeting should be a conscious and integral management activity at all stages of the programme cycle. As an emergency develops and population needs change, target groups, targeting methods and WFP practices must also evolve. Successful targeting requires regular, systematic analysis of a multiplicity of factors, including the gender dimensions of an emergency.

The selection of programme and delivery mechanisms that ensure that food reaches those who need it is an equally important aspect of targeting. The constraints inherent in emergencies will inevitably lead to targeting errors. The main targeting objective of WFP in emergencies is to achieve a balance between targeting exclusion errors, which can be life-threatening, and potentially disruptive or wasteful inclusion errors. In acute emergencies, inclusion errors are more acceptable than exclusion errors. Targeting costs increase in proportion to the level and detail of targeting. WFP should analyze benefits and budget for costs associated with different targeting approaches, keeping in mind that cost-efficiency for WFP may imply increased transaction or opportunity costs for recipients.

Following the training of community registration volunteers and the completion of community sensitization, WFP and the Cooperating Partner works with the community to set up a targeting
committee. The targeting committee supports the registration volunteers to conduct household census. The community targeting committee also defines the characteristics of wealth groups (very poor, poor, middle and better off) in the community and ultimately identifies the criteria to be used for household targeting based on the food security and livelihood characteristics of very poor and poor households. The criteria used to select households varies from one community to another depending on the context and livelihood circumstance of the households involved. Therefore, the primary and secondary criteria outlined below are generic.

**Primary criteria**
- Households with few productive assets
- Main income source from self-employment (cap-knitting, firewood sales), or domestic work
- Main income source from semiskilled casual employment (construction, carpentry)
- Living in thatch hut/tent or within informal settlement
- Families with many orphans
- Families without any form of support and reliant on begging

**Secondary criteria**
- Household with head of household who are disabled
- Household with head of households who are chronically sick members
- Household with no assets, no employment, no livestock, poor purchasing power
- Female headed household (widows, not part of a polygamous HHs or HHs where the husband has moved to other areas for labor)
- New IDPs (less than 3 to 6 months) in a camp and not integrated with communities.

The following exclusion criteria is never used alone as primary criteria, but must be used in combination and following a selection through primary criteria.
- Household owner of middle size shop to large shop (not petty trade stales) or other business
- Household owners of trucks, warehouses, etc.
- Household owners of property rented out to others (vehicles, oxen, ploughs, land, houses, other farming equipment etc.)
- Household taking care of children of relatives
- Household having one or more members fully employed in government service and other regular paid jobs (none casual labor)
- Household in urban setting having livestock which are cared for by paid employees
- Household receiving food assistance (CBT or in-kind) from other organization

**Spot-check verification**
- WFP recommends that spot-check verification be carried out in at least 15% of the households in the community. For every household selected for verification from the targeted list, ensure that:
  - The household is also on the census list
  - The household head is part of that community and
  - Physically verify whether the wealth ranking on the targeted list is consistent with the reality on the ground

Where there is an inclusion/exclusion error of more than 10%, the targeting committee need to re-sit to review the targeting exercise.

During SCOPE registration, live spot-check verification is conducted in order to reduce inclusion error.
Oxfam
Oxfam applies a comprehensive community based approach for targeting the most vulnerable affected population in intervention areas. The process involves conducting broad-based community meetings to ensure the participation of maximum number of community members. During those meetings, Community committees are formed including the representation from Bulamas, Community elders (from different tribes), religious leaders, teachers, youth, and the representation of woman and IDPs.

The main purpose of this Broad-Based Community Meeting (BBCM) is to address the community at large; making the targeted communities understand the purpose and type of intervention to be carried out, at the same time determining eligibility criteria and beneficiary’s identification which includes gender, protection, and socio-economic vulnerability factors of target communities. Special emphasis focuses on guiding communities to ensure involvement of the most vulnerable households in different activities of the project. Extra efforts are made to ensure inclusion of women as direct beneficiaries of the project as well as in decision making process.

Beneficiary Identification
The Committees will provide the initial list of the most vulnerable beneficiaries in accordance with the set criteria. Complaint mechanism system is have been put in place through which community members channel their feedback regarding overall targeting process and any requested changes in the process. This ensures all targeting and implementation processes are more effective and transparent.

Eligibility Verification and Registration
Following the initial beneficiary identification, the M&EL team conducts door to door eligibility verification; either through direct interviews of beneficiaries or indirect verification from community. Beneficiaries fulfilling the six (6) eligibility indicators out of ten (10) will be considered eligible for cash grants. Once the list is completed, it will be posted in several public places. Further, the community meetings will be held to explain the selection process and the reasons why those beneficiaries are selected. The challenge with this process that it is very laborious and time consuming, especially if the number of beneficiaries to be verified is big. Oxfam has also tested the weighted score in Madagali, but it is currently being piloted. This will include verification of a sample of the beneficiaries registered through community targeting, but a lot of awareness is needed to let the community leaders know that if a certain percentage of false inclusions is found then the whole registration will be nullified.

The eligibility verification process is combined with data collection for beneficiary registration process using Mobeni devices.

Please see Annex 3 in this document – Oxfam’s Targeting Approach; Households Eligibility Criteria for Cash for Work Support (Maiduguri); and Households Eligibility Criteria for Livelihood Recovery Grants (Gwoza/Pulka) for additional information.

Weighted/Scored Identification of Beneficiaries
Catholic Relief Services (CRS)
CRS holds community discussions and focus groups to better understand vulnerability in the target community, as well as discussions with other NGOs working in the area to understand their programming criteria. The selection criteria is then reviewed with representatives of key
community stakeholder groups and revised based on feedback. The NGO then developed a weighted criteria scoring system based on three measures of household food security (rCSI, FCS, HHS) and social factors (see below) that compound vulnerability by requiring additional resources to meet essential household needs or limiting household members’ ability to engage in food production or income-generating activities.

Each household in the community was enumerated in a door-to-door process and assigned a score for overall food security and level of social vulnerability, with the two scores summed. All households in the target area were then ranked based on their household score. A final criteria score was then calculated and graphed for all households. The NGO looks at how different cut-off scores will relate to both need and available funds, and identify a score that responds to the needs of the community, within the available funding limits.

The social criteria was developed with the community and included demographic and household characteristics such as,
- female-headed household;
- elderly headed household;
- household headed by minor aged 18 or younger;
- household has a member with a disability;
- household with a pregnant woman;
- household contains a child under the age of two;
- household contains two children under the age of six;
- household has no access to land for farming or gardening; and
- household is displaced (IDP)

Please see Annex 4 for CRS’ Draft Standard Operating Procedures; Draft Registration Exercise; and Draft Sensitization Guidance.

Annex 4a CRS Draft Gubio Selection Criteria
Annex 4b CRS Draft SOP Registration
Annex 4c CRS Draft SOP Registration Questionnaire
Annex 4d CRS Draft SOP Sensitization

Action Against Hunger (ACF)

ACF conducted a beneficiary vulnerability assessment to update vulnerability scoring criteria. They also drew upon program evaluations and recent assessments. The beneficiary vulnerability assessment engaged community members in focus group discussions to verify vulnerability criteria. From this, the agency developed a brief gender-sensitive questionnaire that contained questions on household biodata, economic data, food consumption, nutrition, and water access. Secondary questions were incorporated to limit bias responses. Beneficiary responses were then scored. Each household in the community was enumerated in a door-to-door process and assigned an overall score.

ACF drew upon protection assessments, as individuals that have been victimized are often already highly vulnerable and in need of additional support. While cash and food assistance is
not sufficient to address psycho-social needs, assistance can decrease the burden on the household. ACF also chose to prioritize those affected in informal camps.

In scoring, ACF used HHS and FCS, but added additional criteria that included protection, nutrition, levels of debt, expenditure data, dependency ratio, and access to water and sanitation.

**Head of Household vulnerability criteria included:**
- Single adult-headed household (18+)
- Child Headed (Under 18)
- Person with Disability (PwD) Headed (Physical, Sensory—deaf, blind, mute, Mental, Chronically Ill)
- Elderly Headed (Over 65)
- PLW Headed

**Protection criteria** included identifying households with members who had been traumatized, including SGBV⁴. Criteria included:
- Severely traumatized through physical risks preventing productivity, including the following incidents: attacks or bombings, killings of civilians by military/armed groups, other physical violence (abuse, torture, mutilation), tensions/hostility with host community, arbitrary arrest/detention, release from abduction (under Armed Opposition Group)
- SGBV issues include rape/sexual abuse and sexual exploitation and domestic violence/abuse/neglect.

ACF also included a weighted **dependency ratio**. Additionally, a scoring element was included for People with Disabilities that were not assisted by anyone.

For **income**, the NGO developed a score based on the proportion of income expended on non-productive items. Non-productive items included food, rent, and health, with the understanding that a high proportion of income spent on non-productive items can lead to underinvestment in livelihood, which can lead to higher risk.

The organization’s vulnerability assessment which found over 30% of IDPs were in **debt** and calculated the average debit in Naira per household, which was then assigned a scoring criteria.

Given the high levels of malnutrition, the NGO added **identification of malnourished household members** as an indicator for vulnerability. During beneficiary identification, all households with children under 24 months and pregnant and lactating women were screened for Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) and Moderate Acute Malnutrition (MAM) through measuring Mid-Upper Arm Circumference (MUAC). Households with presence of MAM and/or SAM were weighted in

---

⁴ Action Against Hunger started with vulnerability criteria which included protection criteria and WASH criteria. As the tool evolved, the version used for the last year did not include these and highlighted the others which was deemed to focus on vulnerability. Action Against Hunger values highly and continues to mainstream protection in operations. The tool continues to evolve as it is improved with experience and discussion with appropriate sectors and understanding of the evolving context.
the scoring process.

Based on assessments that indicated inadequate access to water points increasing vulnerability, particularly among women and children, ACF included weighting for amount of time required to fetch water.

Please see Annex 5 for ACF’s Beneficiary Selection Criteria

Mixed Approach in Identifying Beneficiaries

Premiere Urgence International (PUI)

PUI has tried both utilizing community identification of beneficiaries and a scored/weighted approach. Initially, the agency used house-to-house registration and then scoring of registration data to select and enroll beneficiaries. The benefit of this approach was the precise data that was collected, and local leaders were not under pressure to identify beneficiaries. However, the challenge was the time and resources that were required in this approach. It took the agency three weeks to register 10,269 households, with 30 enumerators. Additionally, following the registration and beneficiary selection, community feedback indicated that the process raised expectations of community members that they would receive assistance. The exercise was a full census of the population in the targeted area, and thus, a low percentage were included as beneficiaries, which contributed to the disappointment.

In a subsequent project, the agency planned for more than 54,000 beneficiaries, and revisited their targeting process building on previous lessons learned to develop a mixed approach. In the mixed approach, the agency works with the community to identify socio-economic vulnerability criteria, as with the initial methodology through focus group discussions comprised of community members and leaders. The weighting of the socio-economic criteria is decided on by community leaders. Community volunteers are then trained on the criteria.

PUI works through the bulamas to identify community volunteers from within the community. The community volunteers are then appointed by the bulama and mandated to identify the vulnerable households within the community.

The community volunteers identify vulnerable households within the community, and all vulnerable households are registered. PUI staff then visit the identified households to observe household assets as an exclusion criteria. For households without exclusion criteria, PUI conducts questionnaires encompassing FCS, CSI and socio-economic criteria. From registered households, the data from the vulnerability assessment is then ranked and scored, most vulnerable households are then enrolled to receive assistance.

The agency has found that the mixed approach of community identification and scoring is a faster process to identify a larger number of beneficiaries, average 2,000 households registered in three days by 45 enumerators. Based on lessons learned, they revised the enumerator
training for the mixed approach. Additionally, the close relationship with the community helps facilitate the process.

Please see Annex 6 PUI Beneficiary Selection Process for more detailed information on PUI’s targeting.

Advantages and Disadvantages
Based on the experience of one agency that has tried both approaches, there are benefits and disadvantages to both approaches and it is important to choose your approach based on programmatic constraints. While one agency found that house-to-house enumeration raised expectations in the community that assistance would be provided, which was a negative outcome; a different agency found that a potential benefit to house-to-house enumeration is that the community itself does not have to select the beneficiaries for the program, which some communities preferred, citing that it is difficult to select from among themselves who should benefit and should be excluded. All agencies agree that it is important to engage the community in determining what targeting and selection process is most accepted by the community.

The following were identified as Pros and Cons to each approach:

Census Based Approach
- **Pros to Census Based approach**: Community leaders in some instances liked not having to identify the beneficiaries from among the community; useful for multi-sectoral programs
- **Cons to Census Based approach**: Takes a lot of time and resources, raised expectations of the communities. Since it takes so much time with census based approach, the community knows the questions. Also gives time for word to get out to come into the area to get registered.

Community Based Approach
- **Pros to Community Based approach**: Speed of identifying beneficiaries, involvement of the community, community acceptance, able to engage with the community to build relationship, easier to scale the number of beneficiaries in the program
- **Cons to Community Based approach**: Risk of community leadership influencing negatively beneficiary list, potential of high exclusion errors.

Next Steps
The table below is a snapshot of data being collected by agencies. Based on this information, a next step for the Food Security Sector Working Group would be to gather FCS data from agencies (baseline and monitoring) and to map over the intervention area by month to show a complete picture of the food assistance response and outcomes over time. Please note that not all data is used for targeting, some data is used during monitoring.
### Table 1. Monitoring Indicators Collected by Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Food Consumption Score (FCS)</th>
<th>Household Dietary Diversity Score (HDDS)</th>
<th>Household Hunger Score (HHS)</th>
<th>Reduced Coping Strategy Index (rCSI or CSI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACF</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>CSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRS</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>rCSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxfam</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUI</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Save the Children</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>rCSI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Food Programme</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additionally, the Food Security Sector should work with partners engaged in SO2 – Agricultural Livelihoods in advance of Rainy Season interventions to develop an accompanying document that outlines best practices in targeting for agricultural based interventions.
Annex 1. Guiding Principles for Protection and Gender Mainstreaming in Targeting

- Understanding the local context and building on women’s, girls’, boys’ and men’s strengths and assets: Build upon the local capacities and services and respect local cultures without perpetuating stereotypes and discrimination. The context analysis will contribute to understanding the cultural, practical and security-related obstacles that women, girls, boys and men could be expected to face in accessing services.

- Safety, dignity and avoid causing harm: Prevent and minimize any unintended negative effects of the targeting process that can increase people’s vulnerability to both physical and psychosocial risks. It’s important to be flexible and adjust working times or information sessions to suit beneficiaries’ availability and minimise distance and time to walk/travel to the meeting place. In many places in North East Nigeria, it is particularly difficult to engage women, girls and other at-risk groups due to safety issues, mobility restrictions, religious sensitivities, cultural taboos or their lack of time (due to other responsibilities). For this reason, targeting processes need to be planned well in advance, and relevant staff will need to make adjustments to ensure equal participation from men and women.

- Targeting processes should be guided by respect for the choices, wishes, rights and dignity of the communities.

- Non-discrimination: Communities should receive equal and fair treatment regardless of their age, gender, race, religion, nationality, ethnicity, or any other characteristic.

- Inclusive access: Pay attention to access issues (e.g. disability, discrimination or stigma) preventing people in need from being included in the targeting process. Make arrangements to facilitate access, ensuring to leave no-one behind.

- Participation: Ensure the composition of teams (assessors and translators) who are part of the targeting process includes women to ensure great access to females. Include female key informants, especially those likely to have information on immediate food security needs of women, girls, boys and men, this may include community leaders, leading market women, midwives, nurses and teachers. Targeting committees should consist of not less than 50 percent active representation of women and older girls.

- Empowerment: Empower women, girls, boys and men by ensuring targeting is based upon sound analysis of the context and social dynamics. Women, girls, boys and men and all vulnerable groups must be informed about objectives of the targeting process and their participation ensured throughout the process. It is critical to bear in mind that women often have limited power in household and community decision-making, as well as limited access to and control over resources relative to men, which trends to influence access to food, both for them and for members of their household. For instance, in general food distribution interventions, entitlements are often issued in women’s names, but women do not always retain control over the food after leaving the distribution site. This affects targeting efforts in a range of ways, as the recipient no longer is the household member making decisions on how distributions will be used. The WFP 2009 Gender Policy specifically underlines that “issuing ration cards in women’s names does not necessarily give them control over household rations because control over is determined by the capacity to negotiate and decide the use of food”. Food assistance can be a direct protection tool for women. By putting the food into women’s
hands, and encouraging women’s active participation in food distribution mechanisms WFP helps empower women and addresses unequal access to basic goods.

▪ Coordination and Partnerships: Promote and maintain strong and respectful partnerships with other sector specialists, in particular, those with protection and GBV expertise, including GBV sub-sector and other coordination bodies, for knowledge sharing and to ensure that the targeting process is in line with and complements other agencies’ efforts. Agencies must work closely with their protection and gender colleagues to ensure that if questions are asked that pertain to sensitive protection issues, adequate referral and support services exist. Sensitive protection questions should not be asked unless referral and support services exist and can be supported by trained staff.

▪ Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP): Our first accountability is to food insecure people who should and must be the primary actors in their own survival and protection. AAP is about engaging affected people in the processes and decisions that affect their lives, by ensuring there is an ongoing, two-way communication and dialogue throughout all stages of the project cycle. Operationally, AAP focuses on three areas that are core to these commitments: (1) information provision; (2) consultation; and (3) complaints and feedback mechanisms (CFMs). Set-up appropriate mechanisms for affected populations to actively participate in the targeting process and provide feedback throughout implementation. The targeting process should be reactive to feedback, concerns and complaints in a timely manner.
Annex 2 – Gender Based Violence Sensitive Targeting

GBV sensitive targeting should:

▪ Include specific GBV vulnerability-related indicators (specific to women, men, girls and boys) among targeting criteria (e.g. women at risk of transactional sex and/or other types of exploitative situations; girls at risk of abduction).

▪ Consider whether the active targeting of women and/or girls contributes to empowerment and equality or rather triggers a negative backlash (e.g. misunderstanding and frustration among men and boys, domestic violence). Ensuring equal participation by women and men in decision-making bodies gives women an opportunity to influence decisions that affect them and a voice in forums previously closed to them. Food assistance provided to women living in extreme poverty can prevent them from adopting harmful and negative coping strategies, such as transactional sex and early marriage.

▪ Target individuals and groups most at risk of GBV for livelihood, economic and life skills support. Identify at-risk groups through consultation with different segments of the population (e.g. women, adolescents girls, persons with disabilities, teenage boys, separated and unaccompanied children, orphans, community elders).

▪ Avoid negative reaction that could lead to tension in the household by discussing the rationale behind targeting with both men and women and try to reach a mutual understanding with the community.

▪ Ensure open dialogue with women, girls, boys and men throughout the project cycle to ascertain what impacts targeting specific groups, such as women, as beneficiaries, participants and food entitlement holders have on household and community dynamics and respond accordingly.
Annex 3 – Oxfam Resources

Annex 3a. Oxfam Targeting Approach – Emergency Food Security and Vulnerable livelihoods

Formation of Community Committees
Oxfam applies a comprehensive community based approach for targeting the most vulnerable affected population in intervention areas. The process involves conducting broad-based community meetings to ensure the participation of maximum number of community members. During those meetings, Community committees are formed including the representation from Bulamas, Community elders (from different tribes), religious leaders, teachers, youth, and the representation of woman and IDPs. The main purpose of this Broad-Based Community Meeting (BBCM) is to address the community at large; making the targeted communities understand the purpose and type of intervention to be carried out, at the same time determining eligibility criteria and beneficiary’s identification which includes gender, protection, and socio-economic vulnerability factors of target communities. Special emphasis focuses on guiding communities to ensure involvement of the most vulnerable households in different activities of the project. Extra efforts are made to ensure inclusion of women as direct beneficiaries of the project as well as in decision making process.

Beneficiary Identification
The Committees will provide the initial list of the most vulnerable beneficiaries in accordance with the set criteria. Complaint mechanism system is being put in place and channelized where community members will be able to provide their feedback regarding overall targeting process and any requested changes in the process. This would ensure all targeting and implementation processes are more effective and transparent.

Eligibility Verification and Registration
Following the initial beneficiary identification, MEAL team will conduct eligibility verification through door to door assessment; either through direct interviews of beneficiaries or indirect verification from community. Beneficiaries fulfilling the six (6) eligibility indicators out of ten (10) will be considered eligible for cash grants. Once the list is completed, it will be posted in several public places. Further, the community meetings will be held to explain the selection process and the reasons why those beneficiaries are selected.

The eligibility verification process is combined with data collection for beneficiary registration process using Mobeni devices.
Annex 3b. Oxfam Households Eligibility Criteria for Livelihood Recovery Grants – Gwoza/Pulka

Brief Target Beneficiaries Description
Households affected by the conflict who lost or have been heavily damaged in their livelihood assets, reducing their capacity to recover and carry out their productive activity in a sustainable manner, providing for their essential basic needs.

Household Prerequisites and Recommendations for Participation
- Being inhabitant and living in the selected community affected by the Conflict;
- One Household can benefit only from one Livelihood asset recovery grant;
- Willing to apply to the grant for Livelihood asset recovery and willing to participate to the monitoring for this activity
- Not currently getting (one of their members) any CFW or Unconditional Cash Support for Food Security or Livelihood: no duplication is admitted;
- Women participation is highly encouraged to apply to the Livelihood asset recovery grant, to participate to group supervision and meetings;

Objectives of the Eligibility Criteria
- The following Household Eligibility Criteria are meant to minimize beneficiary exclusion and inclusion errors and should be used to prioritize households with members willing to apply to the grant.
- The same criteria and thresholds will be used to verify the correctness, transparency and increase accountability of the beneficiary selection during the Verification Process.
- The Eligibility Criteria Table can also be used to provide guidance for disputes that arise on the selection process.

Eligibility threshold
To be Eligible for the Livelihood Asset Recovery Grant a minimum of 6 of the below listed criteria must be fulfilled/verified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.N.</th>
<th>Small Business</th>
<th>Agriculture farming</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>No access to land for farming; poor (damaged) or no access to irrigation</td>
<td>Land size = 1 Fegi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Those who have no other source of income</td>
<td>Smallholders who has Agriculture as main source of food and income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Woman headed households</td>
<td>Woman headed households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Family/HH income less than 20,000 NGN a month</td>
<td>Family/HH income less than 20,000 NGN a month</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Traditional skill based business (Ironsmith, Bamboo basket, leaves, pickle, bee keeping, etc.)</td>
<td>Who lost tools and assets during EQ (physical losses and sold asset to fulfill basic needs)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>High dependency ratio ≥ 5 one active adult (between 18 and 60) for each 5 dependents: children, elders, chronically ill or severely disabled</td>
<td>High dependency ratio ≥ 5 one active adult (between 18 and 60) for each 5 dependents: children, elders, chronically ill or severely disabled</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Owning a very limited number of livestock (0-5 chickens,0-5 goats and 0-1 cattle’s)</td>
<td>Owning a very limited number of livestock (0-5 chickens,0-5 goats and 0-1 cattle’s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Households having one of their members abroad for less than six months (no remittances or receiving less than 12,500 per month)</td>
<td>Households having one of their members abroad for less than six months (no remittances or receiving less than 12,500 per month)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Without a member receiving a pension and remittance</td>
<td>Without a member receiving a pension and remittance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Traditional skilled based business (ironsmith, bean cake making, cap making, ground nut oil cake, tailoring small food shop etc)</td>
<td>Who holds debts and don't have capital to buy necessary farming tools and inputs.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Criteria 11 can be proposed / added by the community if there is a need to better identify and prioritize who is eligible for the LRG.

*The land indicator means irrigated cultivatable land and will be based on calculation of crop production/yield.
Annex 3c. Oxfam Households Eligibility Criteria for Cash for Work Support – Maiduguri

Brief Target Beneficiaries Description
Conflict affected households unable to fully meet essential needs, without a reliable livelihood but able to engage in productive activities, depending from external support, with high dependency ratio, at risk of marginalization.

Household Prerequisites and Recommendations for Participation
- Being inhabitant and living in the selected community;
- Only one adult member (18 to 60 years) of the Household is entitled to participate to the Cash for Work scheme;
- Not currently getting (one of their members) any CfW or Unconditional Cash Support for Food Security or Livelihood (no duplication);
- With a member Able and Willing to work in the CfW scheme for the established and duly communicated daily wage [1000 NGN/day];
- Households without any able and adult member but fulfilling the following eligibility criteria, will be eligible for compassionate cash transfer in line with the CfW amounts (a maximum of 10% of CfW beneficiaries);
- Women participation is highly encouraged both in works, group supervision, meetings and cluster committees (minimum 33.3%, ...);

Objectives of the Eligibility criteria
- The following Household Eligibility Criteria are meant to minimize beneficiary exclusion and inclusion errors and should be used to prioritize households with members willing to participate to the CFW program.
- The same criteria and thresholds will be used to verify the correctness, transparency and increase accountability of the beneficiary selection during the Verification Process.
- The Eligibility Criteria Table can also be used to provide guidance for disputes that arise on the selection process.

Eligibility threshold
At least 5 Eligibility criteria need to be met to trigger the eligibility. Eligibility doesn’t ensure the provision of support from Oxfam if the number of eligible households exceeds the planned number of beneficiaries, it should help in prioritizing the most needy and vulnerable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Household Eligibility Criteria Description</th>
<th>Threshold/ Indicator</th>
<th>Verification</th>
<th>Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. No access to land for farming; engaging in Sharecropping; Low productivity land: poor (damaged) or no access to irrigation.</td>
<td>No access to land</td>
<td>Community witnesses</td>
<td>Community witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Without formally employed member (not receiving a regular salary: public or private sector)</td>
<td>0 regular employed members (salary)</td>
<td>Direct interview</td>
<td>Community witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Without a member receiving a pension scheme</td>
<td>0 household members with a pension</td>
<td>Direct interview</td>
<td>Community witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Owning a very limited number of livestock</td>
<td>0 to 5 Chicken</td>
<td>Direct observation</td>
<td>Community witnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 5 Goats</td>
<td></td>
<td>Community witnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 to 1 Cattle</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Criteria</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Family/HH income</td>
<td>less than 20,000 NGN a month</td>
<td>Direct observation, Community witnesses, Cluster members</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6. | Limited asset ownership or severely damaged by the conflict, living in temporary shelter | – Damaged stone/mud house/shelter;  
– Few manual agricultural tools;  
– Borrows equipment for work;  
0 bicycle, sewing machine, ox plough, oxen, processing machinery, motorbike, tiller machine, shop | Direct observation, Community witnesses, Cluster members |
| 7. | High household dependency ratio: ≥ 5 one active adult (between 18 and 60) for each 5 dependents: children, elders, chronically ill or severely disabled | Direct observation, Local leaders /Cluster members |
| 8. | Women headed household                                                    | 1 (widow, divorced, single parent women)                                 | Direct observation/interview |
| 9. | Remittances received from relatives working out of the community (Abroad or from within country) | 0 Remittances received in last 3 months                                  | Community witnesses, Direct interview |
| 10. | Criteria 10 can be proposed / added by the community if there is a need to better identify and prioritize who is eligible for CfW. Proposed additional criteria must be added in agreement and coordination with Oxfam. | | |