UNHCR
The UN Refugee Agency

WFP
World Food Programme



© WFP/Hugh Rutherford

JOINT GUIDANCE

Targeting of Assistance to Meet Basic Needs


UNHCR
The UN Refugee Agency


WFP
World Food
Programme

CONTENTS

List of annexes 5

List of Text Boxes 5

List of case studies 5

List of figures 6

List of tables 6

List of abbreviations 7

1. INTRODUCTION 8

1.1 Purpose and scope of these guidelines 8

1.2 Guiding principles 10

1.3 Measuring vulnerability and needs 11

1.4 Prioritization 11

1.5 Accountability to affected populations 13

1.6 Ensuring protection 13

1.7 Protection of personal data of persons of concern 14

1.8 Coordination and partnership 14

2. STEPS TO TARGETING 16

2.1 Step 1 – Registration of the population 17

2.2 Step 2 – Assessment and analysis 18

2.2.1 Multisectoral basic needs assessments 20

2.3 Step 3 – Deciding whether targeting is appropriate 29

2.4 Step 4 – Selecting the targeting methodology 31

2.5 Step 5 – Defining eligibility criteria 38

2.6 Step 6 – Validating the targeting method 40

2.6.1 Definition of inclusion and exclusion errors 41

2.6.2 Data requirements and validation steps 43

2.7 Step 7 – Communications, appeals and feedback mechanisms 47

2.7.1 Communication with communities 47

2.7.2 Establishing a complaints- and feedback mechanism (CFM) 50

2.8 Step 8 – Identification 52
2.8.1 Apply eligibility criteria to up to date registration database 52
2.8.2 Identifying lists for community-based targeting 53
2.9 Step 9 – Monitoring targeting processes and outcomes 54
2.9.1 Assessing the outcomes of assistance and prioritization 54
2.9.2 Monitoring inclusion and exclusion of targeted assistance 56
2.9.3 Monitoring of targeting processes 56
2.9.4 Conducting regular contextual analysis and targeting reviews 56

ANNEX 1: Joint Principles for Targeting Assistance to Meet Food and Other Basic Needs to Persons of Concern 58

ANNEX 2: Feedback and response mechanisms 59

ANNEX 3: Example of survey consent form 61

ANNEX 4: Example Terms of Reference for Joint UNHCR/WFP coordination mechanism in Kenya 62

ANNEX 5: Data sets for registration – minimum sets of data to be collected at different phases of registration 63

ANNEX 6: Example of joint Standard Operating Procedures: New Food Assistance Collection Procedures for Refugees in Uganda 66

LIST OF TEXT BOXES

Box 1: How refugee registration by UNHCR differ from WFP's enrolment of refugees in need of assistance 17

Box 2: Key secondary data resources to inform needs assessments 20

Box 3: Aligning with national social safety nets – lessons from cash programming 36

Box 4: Principles for eligibility criteria 38

Box 5: Example of protection risks – Serious medical conditions and disability as eligibility criteria for targeting basic assistance 40

Box 6: Calculating inclusion/exclusion errors and coverage 44

Box 7: UNHCR/WFP Data Sharing Addendum to the Global Memorandum of Understanding 2011 53

LIST OF CASE STUDIES

Case study 1: **East, Horn, and Central Africa (2016)**
WFP/UNHCR Joint Refugee Targeting Technical Advisory Group (RT-TAG) 15

Case study 2: Lebanon (2013-2018)
Annual multisectoral household survey to track wellbeing of Syrian refugees 21

Case study 3: Bangladesh (2017)
Rohingya Emergency Vulnerability Assessment (REVA) 22

Case study 4: Malawi (2017)
Socio-economic and food security classification of refugees 24

Case study 5: Kenya (2015)
Using household surveys for evidence-based decision-making 30

Case study 6: Lebanon (2013-2018)
Targeting assistance in Lebanon – an evolving approach 36

Case study 7: Syrian refugees in Turkey (2018)
Vulnerability analysis and refinement of targeting criteria 42

Case study 8: Cameroon (2017)
Joint qualitative validation of eligibility criteria among refugees from CAR 45

Case study 9: Afghanistan and Turkey (2016-)
Mechanisms to ensure Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) 49

Case Study 10: Chad (2018)
Appeals process in refugee camps following profiling exercise 51

Case Study 11: Jordan and Lebanon (2015)
Pre-post studies to assess impacts of assistance cuts following the 2015 funding crisis 55

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1: Targeting steps in relation to Programme Management Cycle 16

Figure 2: Steps of a needs assessment 21

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: UNHCR & WFP joint targeting principles 10

Table 2: Example of protection risk analysis matrix 26

Table 3: Factors to take into account when selecting a targeting methodology 31

Table 4: Overview of targeting methods 33

Table 5: Applicability and requirements of different targeting methods – quick overview table 35

Table 6: Targeting methods and potential eligibility criteria 39

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AAP	Accountability to affected populations
CFM	Complaints- and feedback mechanism
FCS	Food Consumption Score
FGD	Focus Group Discussion
IASC	Inter-Agency Standing Committee
JAM	Joint Assessment Mission
JPA	Joint Plan of Action
KII	Key informant Interview
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MEB	Minimum Expenditure Basket
NGO	Non-governmental organization
PDM	Post-distribution monitoring
PMT	Proxy means testing
PoC	Persons of Concern
proGres	Profile Global Registration System
PSN	Persons with Specific Needs
SGBV	Sexual and Gender-Based Violence
SOP	Standard Operating Procedures
UNHCR	United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
VAM	Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping
WASH	Water, Sanitation and Hygiene
WFP	World Food Programme

1.

INTRODUCTION

United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and World Food Programme (WFP) recognise that individuals in crisis situations have distinct needs and capacities. Ideally humanitarian assistance should be provided according to an individual's needs and in support of their protection. Undertaken properly, targeting of assistance ensures that the right individuals receive the most appropriate support to address their needs and reinforce their capacities. It thereby also contributes significantly towards a more effective use of resources.

UNHCR and WFP have signed Joint Principles on Targeting Assistance to Meet Food and Other Basic Needs, which commit the two agencies to work collaboratively on targeting refugees and other Persons of Concern (PoC) based on needs.[1] Food assistance and assistance to meet other basic needs are complementary, and if one is provided but not the other, a gap remains and basic needs will not be met. UNHCR and WFP therefore consider assistance as a multi-sector package for which a joint targeting process should be established, and anchored in *do no harm* and humanitarian principles.

UNHCR and WFP should consider the possibility of targeting assistance in all contexts. Targeting should be integrated into Joint Assessment Missions (JAMs) and resulting Joint Plans of Action (JPAs). Where appropriate, targeting should be designed and implemented based on a careful and systematic assessment of its feasibility, including inputs from the population of concern and host community. Targeted assistance should consider not only basic needs but how it can contribute to supporting refugee self-reliance in line with the Joint UNHCR/WFP Strategy on Self-Reliance in Food Security and Nutrition.

The two agencies recognize that resources are not always available to meet all needs and that prioritization of those *most* in need is often required. These guidelines therefore provide considerations for resource shortfalls. In line with the Global Compact on Refugees[2] and the Sustainable Development Goals to 'leave no one behind', UNHCR and WFP commit to design targeted assistance programmes with an understanding of the national social protection programmes, aligning where relevant and feasible.

Targeting and prioritization of basic assistance involves a range of activities and require increased collaboration and new ways of working between both agencies. These technical guidelines aim to support country offices jointly identify the most appropriate, protection-sensitive approaches for targeting and prioritization of basic assistance.

1.1 Purpose and scope of these guidelines

These guidelines are designed to support UNHCR and WFP country offices in collaboration with partners,[3] to collectively assess and adopt a people-centred, protection-focused, evidence-based approach to targeting in-kind and/or cash assistance to meet basic needs in a transparent, accountable and coherent manner.

---

1 Food assistance is a set of interventions designed to enable food-insecure populations to access sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. Other assistance to meet basic needs includes in-kind assistance such as utensils, cooking pots, fuel, and soap and/or cash to meet these needs and complements a range of services and activities designed to ensure access to life-saving and essential health care; water, sanitation and hygiene; education, livelihoods and access to shelter. Food and other basic assistance can be provided in-kind or as cash in support of sector-specific interventions and services depending on the context.

2 Global Compact on Refugees, 2018

3 This can include local or national government, and national or international (I)NGOs



They are written for 1) UNHCR technical and programme staff including the multi-functional teams who support the targeting process in UNHCR's operations, 2) WFP Vulnerability Analysis and Mapping (VAM) staff, monitoring and evaluation (M&E) officers and programme staff, 3) technical and management staff from both agencies involved in protection and assistance, 4) government and partners involved in the assessment, programme planning/ design, implementation and monitoring in operations and activities supporting refugees, and others of concern.

Basic needs comprise basic services and assistance in health, nutrition, water, sanitation and hygiene (WASH), food, shelter, energy, education, as well as domestic items and specialized services for persons with specific needs (PSN). This guidance focuses on the basic needs that can be delivered through in-kind and/ or cash assistance, and not through services. However, close coordination and collaboration between agencies and partners is required to ensure referral to services throughout the programming process. The guidelines do not specifically detail the targeting of livelihoods support and programmes to improve self-reliance; however, the targeting of both basic assistance, livelihoods support and other forms of assistance should be designed in a coordinated manner and communicated holistically in line with the Joint Strategy on Self-Reliance in Food Security and Nutrition.

Various approaches to targeting exist and there is a growing body of experience on the subject[4]. These guidelines provide key considerations to ensure that the most appropriate approach is selected based on the context, in a protection-sensitive manner. They cover all settings, including urban, rural, camp and host settings. They aim to put people at the centre of the response, considering their situation from a holistic, basic-needs perspective, and not through a piecemeal approach, dividing their needs between food and non-food.

The experience of UNHCR and WFP in jointly targeting (and prioritizing) assistance to meet food and other basic needs is growing. Recognizing that there is still much to learn, UNHCR and WFP welcome feedback, learning and experiences from country operations and partners on joint targeting efforts. These guidelines will be updated accordingly.

[4] See for example Armstrong, P and Jacobsen, K (2015); MacAuslan, I. and Farhat, M. (2013); Patel, R et al (2016)

1.2 Guiding principles

UNHCR and WFP signed the *Joint principles for targeting assistance to meet food and other basic needs to persons of concern* in January 2018. This document outlines key principles and a joint process to target assistance to those in need. The principles are as follows (see Annex 1 for full document).

Table 1: UNHCR & WFP joint targeting principles

Principle	Guidance
Protection-focused	Targeting must promote and reinforce the protection of PoC and contribute to livelihood and solutions outcomes as feasible, in line with a rights-based approach. Accordingly, targeting should be informed by an analysis of protection risks and benefits and by continuous monitoring of protection results, as well as by taking measures to identify and mitigate possible negative consequences.
Collaborative	UNHCR and WFP will coordinate and work collaboratively with governments and partners to jointly decide on the most appropriate approach, eligibility criteria and implementation methods for targeting assistance in each context. The agencies will share knowledge and information to support these processes within the framework of a global agreement on data sharing.*
Participatory	Participation of PoC must be ensured at all stages of targeting in an inclusive, timely, systematic and transparent manner.
Inclusive	Targeting must not be discriminatory and should take into account specific needs and risks related to age, gender, disability and diversity. Targeting processes, criteria and outcomes need to reflect this inclusive approach at all stages and respond adequately to the specific needs and risks identified.
Evidence-based	The food-insecure, economically vulnerable and individuals/groups with specific protection risks shall be identified and targeted for assistance to meet their food and other basic needs based on objective information and practical eligibility criteria.
Relevant	In-depth and contextual analyses of risk, food security and vulnerability are the bedrock for defining needs and subsequent relevant assistance for PoC and should inform targeting decisions. The agreed targeting approach should be designed and actioned jointly for the specific context in question.
Accurate	The objective of the targeting process is to include all eligible PoC while excluding those not eligible, and provide appropriate levels of assistance to households and individuals based on their identified needs. Eligibility criteria must be reviewed and periodically adapted according to the context, and in light of feedback and monitoring.
Coherent	The targeting of assistance for food and other basic needs should be coordinated to ensure that needs are met in a coherent and balanced manner. Failure to meet the other basic needs of populations of concern could result in food assistance not being used as intended, thus potentially compromising food security. The food security situation of the host community should also be reviewed and considered, to avoid potential conflict between the two groups.
Proportionate	The agencies should aim to transfer the adequate quantity/value of assistance to meet the needs of PoC. The total financial costs to carry out a targeting exercise should be weighed against the costs to provide assistance to all and overall protection outcomes of targeting.
Accountable	Accountability to PoC must be ensured through communication, participation, transparent processes, feedback, and complaints mechanisms that help to identify unmet needs, detect errors and correct targeting as necessary. Information on targeting – including eligibility criteria – must be discussed with PoC.
Monitored	The targeting process, eligibility criteria, protection risks, risk mitigation mechanisms and food security outcomes should be monitored across the population of concern and the approach adapted as necessary.

* See UNHCR/WFP Data Sharing Addendum, 2018.

1.3 Measuring vulnerability and needs

The targeting of assistance to meet food and other basic needs of PoC to ensure their survival and a minimum level of physical and mental well-being should be grounded in a robust analysis of the food security and socio-economic vulnerabilities and the protection risks faced by the population. This will determine who can and cannot meet their basic needs and what can be done to address those needs.

In the humanitarian context there are differing ways to assess vulnerability depending on the mandates of the humanitarian agencies, the intended impact of assistance and the definition of the population to be assisted. UNHCR and WFP are working jointly to target and prioritize assistance for refugees, so it's vital to understand how each agency measures vulnerability.

How WFP measures vulnerability

WFP measures food security through a composite indicator defined in the widely used Consolidated Approach for Reporting Indicators of Food Security (CARI methodology).[5] It considers two dimensions: food consumption (in terms of frequency and dietary diversity) and the capacity to cope (measured through economic vulnerability and livelihood coping). In refugee situations food and cash assistance often plays a major role, so the assessment methodology has to be slightly adjusted in order to measure the actual needs for assistance.

In addition WFP carries out multisectoral Essential Needs Assessments with partners to ascertain what constitute the basic needs of a population of interest and which needs (such as food, shelter, education, or water) are met or unmet, how people meet them (or why people are unable to), in addition to identifying who and how many people are unable to meet these needs.

How UNHCR measures vulnerability

UNHCR measures indicators of refugee well-being including health and nutrition status, water and sanitation, shelter, socio- economic poverty and protection vulnerabilities to guide assistance and solution strategies. Analysis of individual protection vulnerabilities is guided by the Specific Needs approach, which guides case management. UNHCR Specific Needs codes are outlined in Annex 2. In addition UNHCR promotes the inclusion of refugees into National Poverty Assessments so as to be able to generate comparable data between refugees and host communities. Comparable socio-economic data is increasingly important to ascertain the level of assistance needed and to inform regional area-based development programs implemented by development and private sector partners together with National Governments as part of the Global Compact for Refugees.

1.4 Prioritization

Prioritization is resource-driven and occurs when funding shortfalls mean that not all needs can be met with the available resources. Most operations will, at some point, have to prioritize assistance due to funding shortfalls. Which prioritization strategy to choose depends on the context, resource gaps, length of time expected for the resource shortfalls, and other support/programmes available. In such situations, lifesaving activities are often priority number one. Prioritization options normally fall into **three** categories:

❶ Reduce the amount of food or value of cash assistance per beneficiary, while keeping the total number of people stable

❷ Reduce the number of beneficiaries, while keeping the assistance value stable

❸ A combination of reducing the amount of food or value of cash assistance and reducing the number of beneficiaries

[5] The CARI guidance will be updated in 2020 to reflect this consideration.


©WFP/Saikat Mojumder

If, for example, funding is only available to meet 100% of the needs of 50% of households, then an operation could decrease the value of assistance per household and still provide to all, recognizing that this will not meet all the needs of the households assisted. Or put in place a selection process to differentiate those most in need, while "deprioritizing" others.

Depending on the context, agencies may follow similar steps and procedures for both targeting and prioritization – but it is important to clearly distinguish between the two when communicating to the people affected, partners and donors. When resources are prioritized objectives cannot be met resulting in significant unmet needs that could have an impact on a population's welfare and protection situation. Joint evidence-based advocacy, regular donor meetings and alerts can increase awareness and resource levels and reduce the need for prioritization.

When food and other basic assistance have to be prioritized, nutrition programmes should be strengthened (blanket supplementary feeding programmes for 6-24 month olds and pregnant and lactating women, continued provision of fortified blended foods in the general ration if in-kind) to mitigate the potential negative nutritional impact of a shortfall in food and other basic assistance.

Livelihood support and programmes to improve self-reliance are often implemented in tandem with food/non-food assistance. The targeting/prioritization of this support should be designed (and communicated) in coordination with the targeting/prioritization of food and other basic assistance, even though eligibility criteria may differ.

Where prioritization is necessary, it is important to closely monitor the food security, economic and protection outcomes of those receiving and not receiving assistance. In addition, negative implications of cuts should be mitigated (where possible), documented and used for advocacy for additional support (See monitoring section 8).

1.5 Accountability to affected populations

UNHCR and WFP are both signatories of the Inter-Agency Standing Committee (IASC) Commitments of Accountability to Affected Populations (AAP) – leadership/governance; transparency; feedback and complaints; participation; design, M&E. The Joint Targeting Principles include the principles of accountability. WFP also has a strategy for AAP and UNHCR a policy on Age, Gender and Diversity.

Accountability to affected populations (AAP) can be understood as an active commitment by humanitarian actors and organizations to use power responsibly by taking account of, giving account to and being held to account by the people they seek to assist.

Affected people have a right to be actively involved in the decisions that affect their lives. Ensuring that programmes are accountable to affected people is therefore a key aspect of rights-based programming. Engaging affected people in programme decisions, including the targeting process, ensures that assistance aimed at meeting food and other basic needs is more effective.

Sharing information with affected communities (including eligibility criteria) in a systematic manner creates transparency, improves community acceptance of approach and contributes to mitigating tensions and mistrust among targeted groups when unexpected changes occur, e.g. reduced assistance as a result of funding shortfall

It is vital that affected populations or PoC participate from the outset of targeting i.e. at assessment stage, in order to:

- Understand socio-economic vulnerability, food insecurity and protection risks within a certain context
- Identify all vulnerable segments of the population
- Ensure the process is inclusive.

An age, gender and diversity lens must be applied in the participatory assessment and targeting processes.

A functioning complaints and feedback mechanism (CFM) is a key component of an AAP strategy. See section 2.7 on CFMs.

1.6 Ensuring protection

The protection situation of PoC must be taken into account when planning and implementing targeted assistance to meet basic needs.

A protection risk analysis should be conducted prior to targeting assistance. Mapping the access of refugees and others of concern to basic rights is a key step in this analysis. Such rights relate to, but are not limited to, documentation, access to land and employment, freedom of movement, access to education, and financial and other services. In contexts where refugees and others of concern do not enjoy equal rights to nationals, they may be in need of a different level and kind of support than the host population.

Other key areas of a protection risk assessment include, for example, the refugee population profile (including population movement, specific protection concerns, and conditions and safety in the place of asylum), child protection, education, Sexual and Gender-Based Violence (SGBV), Age, Gender and Diversity analysis, and relocation and integration needs. For tools and guidance, please information on protection analysis under section 2.2.1.

Many PoC may need protection interventions and support; these guidelines do not address the targeting of protection support.

It is not recommended to include refugee status as part of the targeting consideration, i.e. asylum-seekers should not be deprived of access to assistance only because they are not officially recognized as refugees yet. All too often, operations however have introduced this requirement when funds are limited and when refugee status determination has developed an overwhelming backlog. Similarly, not all recognized refugees are in need of food and other basic assistance. All decisions should be made on vulnerability analysis.

1.7 Protection of personal data of persons of concern

UNHCR and WFP are committed to ensuring the protection of personal data of all PoC (see UNHCR's *Policy on the Protection of Personal Data of Persons of Concern 2015* and WFP's *Guide to Personal Data Protection and Privacy 2016*). A Global Data Sharing Addendum to the 2011 Memorandum of Understanding (September 2018) outlines what data will be shared, when and how, for different purposes, including to support the targeting process.

1.8 Coordination and partnership

These guidelines represent a new era in the collaboration between UNHCR and WFP through the commitment to collaborate on joint targeting processes for refugees and others of concern.

A coordination structure

While recognizing that each context is different, the starting point for a joint targeting process is the clear commitment by UNHCR and WFP senior management in operations and the elaboration of the coordination arrangement around targeting.

The coordination structure for targeting will often go beyond UNHCR and WFP, involving a wide range of relevant stakeholders that can add valuable insight and experience, including host governments and other humanitarian actors.

A working group/ steering committee should be established at the onset of the targeting process, often co-led by UNHCR and WFP, with the aim of defining and agreeing on the targeting steps and the associated responsibilities of each agency.

CASE STUDY 1

East, Horn, and Central Africa (2016) – WFP/UNHCR Joint Refugee Targeting Technical Advisory Group (RT-TAG)

WFP/UNHCR regional offices jointly established the RT-TAG in June 2016 to support targeting and prioritization decisions in the country operations in this region. It was agreed that targeting required a deeper understanding and perspective of different disciplines, and needed to move beyond a solely assessment- and data-oriented approach. Following preliminary meetings and a global literature review, a shared understanding of key questions and concerns in the region was reached, forming the basis for the RT-TAG.

The Joint RT-TAG currently includes WFP and UNHCR colleagues working in protection, registration, nutrition, food security, health, HIV, VAM, livelihoods, emergency preparedness and response, cash and programmes. The focus has been two-folded: 1) to develop field-based context-specific tools and guidance to support targeting and/or prioritization exercises in the region and 2) to have a convening group to support and provide technical inputs on assessments and discussions leading to country-level targeting and prioritization exercises.

The RT-TAG meets monthly, either the full group or the chairperson from each organization. Moving forward the RT-TAG seeks to broaden engagement on targeting beyond the WFP/UNHCR perspective by involving NGOs, government partners and regional entities including the Regional Durable Solutions Secretariat (ReDSS), based in Nairobi.

The Joint WFP/UNHCR RT-TAG has been a positive example of collaboration and coordination between the two agencies as well as between different experts within the organizations. It has allowed for richer and more inclusive tools that better meet the needs of the PoC as well as both organizations. One of the positive outcomes has been the improved preparation for and communication of the refugee food pipeline, and breaks in it, that require rapid decisions around prioritization.

The terms of reference (see Annex 4 of an example TOR) for this mechanism should at country-level include a review of the resources necessary for the targeting exercise and the decision-making responsibilities of the group.

It is important to identify a focal point for targeting within each agency. Due to different organizational structures and mandates, the focal point for targeting may vary and it is therefore important to establish who the focal point(s) for targeting should be at the outset.

Engaging with governments: National and local government authorities should contribute to the design of the targeted assistance from the outset. National development programmes can provide information and data that can inform the identification of geographically vulnerable areas (flood plains, low rent districts and areas of displacement in urban areas) and eligibility criteria used in national social protection programmes. The design and implementation of the targeted assistance will benefit from an understanding of existing social assistance programmes, which ideally will eventually be expanded to include PoC – though in the short-term alignment where possible such as utilizing the same criteria or distribution mechanism can facilitate synergy (see box 3 on page XX). Insert page number during design.

Other humanitarian actors: Since multiple actors provide assistance, agencies need to harmonize their approaches for targeting. Food security and cash working groups can support coordination of assistance and targeting, or a separate coordination body can be set, such as the example in in Box 1.


2.

STEPS TO TARGETING

These guidelines introduce targeting as a nine-step process within the programme management cycle. While the sections that follow present each step in a sequence, in practice they may not always occur in this order and may take place simultaneously.

Step 1: Registration of the population
Step 2: Assessment and analysis
Step 3: Deciding whether targeting appropriate
Step 4: Selecting the targeting methodology
Step 5: Defining eligibility criteria
Step 6: Validating the targeting method and criteria
Step 7: Communication, appeals and feedback systems
Step 8: Identification of eligible individuals or households
Step 9: Monitoring

Figure 1: Targeting steps in relation to Programme Management Cycle



2.1 Step 1 – Registration of the population

KEY POINTS

4. Registration data is a key secondary source to understand the population of concern
5. Registration data can be used to identify a sample of households for assessment
6. Once the targeting approach and criteria are agreed, registration data can be used to identify those eligible for assistance

Registration is the individual recording, verifying and updating of information on PoC by UNHCR and/or governments to enable protection, assistance and movement towards a durable solution. Registration data includes information about each individual and each household that has claimed asylum in the host country. It can provide a profile of the population of concern and understanding of their needs and vulnerabilities. It can also be used to identify individuals for the delivery of assistance.

The registration process is confidential and collects personal data. The extent of the data collected depends on the situation and the level of detail varies accordingly. UNHCR collects the following five standard datasets:

❶ Household pre-registration

❷ Individual emergency registration

❸ Individual basic registration

❹ Individual comprehensive registration

❺ Individual enhanced registration

Additional data elements may be built in to any pre-defined dataset as needed. See UNHCR registration guidance for details on the standard datasets collected.

BOX 1:

How refugee registration by UNHCR differs from WFP's enrolment of refugees in need of assistance

There is often some confusion between agencies over the term 'registration'. 'Registration' to UNHCR is the process of recording individuals' identity data to ensure international protection and/or to deliver protection interventions, assistance and services. WFP **enrols** beneficiaries for assistance whereas UNHCR supports governments to **register** refugees in order to ensure international protection in line with its mandate.

UNHCR registers PoC in *proGres*, its registration and case management system, and groups them into 'registration groups' to support individual and family protection. SCOPE is WFP's digital beneficiary identity and transfer management platform.

Many UNHCR operations conduct continuous registration, which involves updating and verifying records as part of day-to-day registration and case management activities over time in a defined area and/or for a specific population and, as appropriate, collecting additional information. In general, continuous registration is preferable to verification exercises as a methodology for updating records. There are however situations in which a verification exercise is required.

The inclusion of socio-economic data in registration and/or verification exercises to support targeting of assistance may be possible in some contexts. Please contact UNHCR's Identity Management and Registration Section (imrs@unhcr.org) in Copenhagen for more details on feasibility.

The quality of registration data may vary depending on the context. When reviewing data for use in targeting, consider:

- What data is available
- When the data last was verified or updated

RESOURCES:

- UNHCR Guidance on Registration and Identity Management
- UNHCR Registration
- UNHCR Registration Data Sets

2.2 Step 2 – Assessment and analysis

KEY POINTS

1. Good targeting depends on robust needs assessment data and analysis
2. Where possible, assessment and analysis should be conducted jointly (UNHCR/WFP) with a multisector focus to understand if/how the population meets basic needs. Where relevant sector-specific assessments exist, results should be jointly reviewed and analyzed
3. Assessments should be conducted on a sample of households. A census (assessment of every single household) is not recommended due to the time and resources required.

Not all individuals and households are equally affected by displacement. A comprehensive understanding of their needs is required in order to target basic assistance appropriately. This understanding is also increasingly important given the shift of the humanitarian community towards a more holistic, beneficiary-centric approach to assistance, built on understanding beneficiaries' needs and priorities. Needs may already be understood through previous assessments, registration and other secondary data. However, if not, multisectoral basic needs assessments can fill the gap and complement existing information to provide a broader understanding of the population's basic needs and capacities.

A household assessment based on a representative sample seeks to identify the level of needs of a population and to establish common characteristics of vulnerable households that can be used to define eligibility criteria for assistance.

In the humanitarian context, the term 'basic needs' refers to essential goods, utilities, services or resources required by households for ensuring survival and minimum living standards, including, but not limited to, food, water, shelter, clothing, health care, sanitation, protection and education. Households unable to meet these needs are considered socio-economically vulnerable. These guidelines focus on the basic needs that can be delivered through in-kind and/ or cash assistance, and not services.

The use of multisectoral basic needs assessments is encouraged as it can help to prevent duplication of work across agencies/clusters and to understand synergies across sectors. This is also true for multisectoral market assessments that look at supply and demand of not only commodities, but also basic services.


© WFP/Rein Skullerud

To further improve efficiency and coherence in analysis and response, UNHCR and WFP should advocate for the inclusion of refugees into government-led country-wide surveys, such as Household Income and Expenditure Analysis (HIES) or Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS). This can facilitate advocacy for their inclusion into government social protection schemes.

Assessments can be **quantitative**, based on a statistically representative sample or **qualitative**, gathering in-depth information on a specific topic (e.g. protection, gender issues) from key informants and focus group discussions (FGDs) that represent different groups in the community. Often, assessments use both methods to triangulate information.

As mentioned, a desk review should be done prior to an assessment to identify relevant secondary data sources – including reports or datasets from previous assessments – that provide information about the given context and the situation of the population of interest. A thorough literature review should reveal key basic needs information gaps that the assessment could or would need to fill. Both these pieces of information will inform the adaptation of the tools and questionnaires.

Similarly, if any sectors have recently been assessed in an adequate manner, the assessment may draw upon those sector-specific findings, rather than duplicating efforts through a multisectoral assessment. Therefore, a desk review also serves the interest of using resources efficiently.

In certain situations, time constraints or the lack of other information (e.g. immediately after a sudden-onset emergency) will make this step impossible, and therefore the process for potential targeting should rely on primary data collected through key informants to gather an overview of the situation. When a multisectoral assessment is required, UNHCR and WFP will jointly decide on its design and implementation. In situations of sudden population movements, this step may happen prior to or in parallel with registration.

BOX 2:

Key secondary data resources to inform needs assessments

- Participatory assessments, consultation reports and analysis of complaints and feedback mechanisms (CFMs)
- Food security/socio economic/livelihood assessments
- Nutrition surveys
- JAM reports
- Markets assessments
- Post distribution monitoring of existing assistance programmes
- Programme reports/evaluations
- Food security monitoring systems
- National social safety net programme information
- The private sector may have knowledge of the population and supporting data e.g., systems in place for receiving remittances and population groups accessing financial services

Household assessments and analysis are supported by WFP's VAM officers, UNHCR programme and technical staff (nutrition, food security, cash-based intervention experts in collaboration with the multi-functional team) and partner organizations/institutes.

2.2.1 Multisectoral basic needs assessments

As mentioned, close collaboration between WFP and UNHCR on multisectoral assessments allows for a common, holistic analysis and understanding of needs, given the cross-sectoral components that can influence socio-economic vulnerability. Socio-economic, food security and protection-related indicators (where relevant) are integral to the assessment.

Assessment objectives and planning

A needs assessment seeks to understand the degree to which people are able to meet their specific needs and to estimate how many are unable to do so. Assessments aim to answer the following key questions:

1. **How many** are vulnerable and in need of assistance? (this includes vulnerability related to food insecurity, socio-economic situation or protection risks)
2. **Why** are they vulnerable?
3. **Who** are they and **where** do they live?
4. **What assistance do they need** to meet their basic needs and support self-reliance?
5. **What** are the different **protection needs and priorities**?

In designing a needs assessment, a balance should be struck between the need for detailed data and the constraints imposed by time, capacity, resource and access restrictions, to provide a 'good enough' understanding of needs and vulnerability. It is often not appropriate to include detailed protection questions because of sensitivities: information on protection risks and vulnerabilities should be analyzed based on data in UNHCR's *proGres* database as well protection monitoring systems and reports.

CASE STUDY 2

Lebanon (2013-2019) – Joint multisectoral household survey with Syrian refugees

The first Vulnerability Assessment of Syrian Refugees (VASyR) conducted in 2013 was the first of its kind vulnerability assessment conducted jointly by UNICEF, UNHCR and WFP. The multisectoral household survey has since been conducted every year. It has allowed for trend analysis in the well-being of Syrian refugees in Lebanon and informed system-wide humanitarian and development response.


VASyR results are shared with and used by national and international partners operating in Lebanon. It has become an essential tool for strategic and operational decision-making, programme design and informing the annual Lebanon Crisis Response Plan. Key objectives are to assess the severity of food insecurity and poverty and, as a result, refine the agencies' targeting criteria to reach the most vulnerable Syrian refugees (see example in case 8).

The VASyR has continuously been scaled up to meet the demand for more granular data. While the first edition in 2013 was representative at country-level only, the 2018 results are representative at national, governorate and district level. Thematic areas cover income and expenditure, food consumption, coping strategies, access to basic services, education, health, shelter, protection, water and energy.

Joint multisectoral assessments are increasingly used to form a shared understanding in crisis contexts and to ensure that the subsequent response is coherent and well-coordinated.

The diagram below illustrates further the steps to pursue when planning and conducting an assessment.

Figure 2: Steps of a needs assessment



In addition to a comprehensive needs assessment **a seasonal analysis** may be useful to understand threats and opportunities to livelihoods at certain times as food and water availability may be different across seasons.

Market analyses provide information on the access and availability of goods and services during different times of the year, which are essential to consider in targeting.

Care should be taken to ensure that the sampling is appropriate and has the desired accuracy for each stratum to inform decision-making. A census of all households is not necessary to understand general characteristics of the population of concern; it is time-consuming, costly and thus not the best use of resources.

For more info on sampling, please see 'Resources' box at the end of this section.

CASE STUDY 3

Bangladesh (2017) – Rohingya Emergency Vulnerability Assessment (REVA)

Between 25 August and 31 December 2017 an estimated 655,000 Rohingya refugees escaping violence in Myanmar settled in camps, settlements and within host communities in Cox's Bazar district. Joining refugees who have escaped previous waves of violence over the past three decades, it has put the impoverished area under considerable stress. In response to the crisis, in December 2017 WFP VAM and the Food Security Cluster conducted the Rohingya Emergency Vulnerability Assessment (REVA)* to understand the priority needs of the displaced Rohingya refugees and the Bangladeshi host communities.

The objectives of the assessment were to: 1) assess the severity of food insecurity and other basic needs of the displaced Rohingya and host communities; 2) profile the food insecure and most vulnerable groups; 3) provide recommendations for addressing priority needs and targeting; 4) inform the setup of a food security and nutrition monitoring system; 5) inform the Minimum Expenditure Basket for market-based interventions.

Many partners, including UNHCR, UNICEF, FAO, IOM, UNICEF, ACF, and Save the Children, across all relevant sectors (food security, nutrition, shelter, health, education, protection) contributed to the design and implementation of the assessment. More than 2,000 households were interviewed, covering new and earlier arrivals as well as the host community population. A follow-up REVA was conducted in 2018 and released in May 2019.

* REVA, 2017; REVA, 2018

Designing the questionnaire

Questionnaires should be designed carefully based on agreed indicators and linked to an analysis plan that clearly shows how each indicator will be used and what essential information it will provide. Only questions with a clear purpose and use should be included in the questionnaire. Terminology used and translations should be pilot-tested with the population before administering the questionnaire to ensure accurate understanding. A questionnaire that covers a wide range of modules will require spending significant time with each household and can become a burden, therefore it is highly recommended to limit questions to those needed to meet the objectives of the assessment. Also, the longer a questionnaire, the higher the risk of unreliable answers and poor-quality data. WFP has a rule of thumb that an assessment should not exceed 60 minutes for a multisectoral assessment and less than 45 minutes for a food security assessment.

Questions that do not require responses from an entire sampled population, can be asked during FGDs. Furthermore, this data could be collected from key informants through ad-hoc interviews.

All questionnaires should begin with a consent question that clearly asks whether the household agrees to being interviewed. It should also include whether the household agrees to having their data, although anonymous, shared with others (see example of a survey consent form in Annex 4).

Given that basic needs cover a wide range of sectors, in order to capture whether or not vulnerable households are able to meet their basic needs, the collection of sector-specific indicators (e.g. Food Consumption Score (FCS) for food security, Crowding Index for shelter, etc.) is required.

The following areas of information, where relevant, may be considered in multisectoral assessments in a refugee setting, focusing on the overlapping socio-economic, food insecurity and protection risks:

- Household composition/demography, gender and education
- Migration/movement, displacement status
- Household assets ownership
- Shelter type and housing materials
- Sources of drinking water
- Access to sanitation
- Fuel (including electricity)
- Livelihoods/sources of income
- Food consumption and sources
- Food and livelihood coping strategies
- Access to remittances
- Expenditures (food and non-food)
- Access to credit, indebtedness
- Access to agriculture
- Livestock ownership
- External assistance (food and non-food)
- Exposure to shocks (insecurity/violence)
- Maternal and child health and nutrition
- Disability
- Access to services (health, education, legal)
- Market functionality
- Protection

Specific indicators and questions should be discussed and agreed with relevant technical sector experts and be adapted to the context.

UNHCR and WFP have conducted joint multisectoral vulnerability assessments in several countries (including Jordan, Lebanon, Iraq, Malawi, Chad and Kenya). Reports are available at the following link: http://vam.wfp.org/

Analysing the data

The analysis should identify the profile and characteristics associated with food insecurity and/or economic vulnerability of households and individuals, and identify those vulnerable to protection risks. The analysis should provide information on proportion of households / individuals that are meeting their basic needs and the ones who are not, and are therefore in need of assistance. Where possible, analysis should consider individuals' capacities where support for livelihoods and self-reliance activities/assistance is also provided, so that the targeting of assistance is aligned across programme areas to the extent possible (recognizing that eligibility criteria may be different but communications and processes coordinated).

The multisectoral analysis requires a whole set of analytical skills, experience, and knowledge in the following sectors and relevant technical experts should be engaged in the process:

- Food security
- Health
- Nutrition
- Living conditions (including shelter and WASH)
- Education
- Livelihoods
- Protection

As mentioned above, sector-specific indicators with established thresholds for each indicator are required to interpret which basic needs are unmet and which ones have been met through interventions. The analysis can then be used to design or adjust the intervention as necessary.

The analysis of a needs assessment should calculate the proportion of the sampled households that are food insecure, and/or socio economically vulnerable and/or facing serious protection risks. This should inform policy-makers and operational staff about the proportion of households needing assistance and what kind of assistance they require.

CASE STUDY 4

Malawi (2017) – Socio-economic and food security classification of refugees


Malawi has been hosting nearly 40,000 refugees mainly from DRC, Rwanda and Burundi who are residing in Dzaleka Refugee Camp. Providing the protracted humanitarian support for more than two decades, UNHCR and WFP decided to conduct a targeting exercise in line with the Joint Targeting Principles signed in late 2017.

WFP and UNHCR jointly analyzed data on poverty, food security and demographic data from the UNHCR's Household Socio-Economic and Livelihoods Assessment (HSELA, 2017).

The following indicators were used to classify the households into three vulnerability groups:

1. Food consumption based on the WFP standard indicator Food Consumption Score
2. . High risk coping mechanisms, defined as any of the following: child labour, engagement in high-risk activities and/or begging. The rationale behind including the livelihood coping dimension in the analysis was (i) the potential long-term consequences of the use of high-risk coping strategies and the likely effect on households' vulnerability, and (ii) protection concerns raised by the use of particular strategies, which can put the most vulnerable members of the household at risk.
3. Economic vulnerability defined as per the per capita expenditure (discounting the value of assistance) below a given threshold (usually a Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB), but in this case the national poverty and ultra-poverty lines as no MEB had been developed yet)

As a result, the vulnerability classification indicated that 76 percent of the refugee population were highly vulnerable and in urgent need of continued assistance, 16 percent were moderately vulnerable and 8 percent less vulnerable.



Ensuring that protection analysis informs the targeting process

It is crucial to analyze the protection risks alongside a populations' vulnerability to food insecurity and economic poverty to inform the targeting process and eligibility criteria. Legal and regulatory frameworks rarely allow refugees to access their right to work, freedom of movement and access to services and thus their situation and needs are often very different to local, national populations. Protection risks relate to the political environment, socio-cultural norms and economic insecurity, and there is often a high degree of interplay and reinforcement between socioeconomic and protection-related vulnerability.

Protection risks can contribute to socio-economic vulnerability

- Prevalence of security threats including harassment, mugging or violence (including sexual violence) can deter households from accessing markets, labour and education, negatively affecting their present and future economic and social engagement
- Discrimination and harassment can mean that vulnerable groups are deterred from accessing civil documentation, services, employment and assistance.

It is important to analyze the impact of this limitation on their access to basic rights, including documentation, land and employment, education, financial, health and other services. Denied freedom of movement, refugees cannot fetch food or water from outside a refugee camp, for example. Denied the right to work, a refugee (or other PoC) cannot earn additional income. The lack of documentation can restrict access to basic social and financial services and incur additional fees for education or health care, for instance.

Socio-economic factors can increase exposure to protection risks, most notably through employment of negative coping strategies

- When households cannot access enough food and/or other basic needs they resort to negative coping strategies such as removing children from school, child labour and transactional sex.
- Sharing overcrowded dwellings can increase protection risks for women, girls, and boys.
- The inability to sustain rental payments leading to eviction increases protection risks for households.
- Refugees and others of concern may end up living in unsafe housing with insecure tenancy because of their inability to access decent terms and conditions.
- Insufficient income pushes people to consider risky forms of employment and other unsustainable coping mechanisms.

UNHCR usually identifies risk profiles and protection vulnerabilities through the Specific Needs approach, which informs response through case management. UNHCR registration data in *proGres* indicates households/individuals with specific needs. An analysis of demographic and specific needs data in *proGres* should complement the analysis of the needs assessment data.

In addition, needs assessment data, including data on coping strategies, should be analyzed for the population as a whole as well as for vulnerable sub-groups (to be determined based on analysis of specific needs).

Information on power relationships within the refugee community and between refugees and host community should also be reviewed and inform the analysis. The annual UNHCR planning exercise is based on a comprehensive protection risk analysis (as part of the Age, Gender, Disability analysis) which should inform this process.

The following is an example of a risk analysis matrix from UNHCR Cash Based Interventions.

Table 2: Example of protection risk analysis matrix

Protection risk	Potential implications	Impact	Likelihood	Risk classification	Mitigation measures/ comments	Responsibility
Limitation in freedom of movement	No possibility of earning additional income	Inability to meet basic needs resulting in health issues	High	High	1) Assess the needs to top-up assistance 2) Advocate with government for freedom of movement	UNHCR and WFP

Population profiling

Profiling aims to identify the key characteristics of those who are food insecure and/or socio-economically vulnerable, also taking into account the protection analysis. Profiling is an analytical exercise that identifies common characteristics among the most vulnerable households, as well as among those who can meet their own needs.

Assessment data should be analyzed to understand which of the following characteristics are associated with food insecurity and socio-economic vulnerability:

- **Location:** Urban, rural, admin level e.g. district
- **Residential status:** Resident, IDP, refugee, returnee, host community, etc.
- **Head of household:** Information about sex, age, marital, health and education status
- **Household composition:** Size of household, gender and age of all members, dependency ratio
- **Income/expenditure sources:** Sources of household income/expenditure and engagement in different livelihood activities
- **Markets:** Physical access to markets, constraints in terms of availability and access
- **Coping strategies:** Employment of negative food and livelihood coping strategies to access food and basic needs
- **Health/disability:** Status of household members
- **Health:** Physical access to health services, constraints to health care access
- **Water access:** Quantity and quality of households' water sources, distance(s)
- **Sanitation:** Access to, use of and type of sanitation facilities, handwashing practices etc. among household members
- **Shelter:** Type and quality of housing, protection (from heat, cold, rain, wind, etc.), overcrowding
- **Assets:** Productive and non-productive assets owned by households

The purpose of identifying the key characteristics is to inform the selection of eligibility criteria (step 5 – see section 2.5)

NEEDS ASSESSMENT RESOURCES:

- WFP Essential Needs Guidelines, 2018;
- WFP Interim Guidance on Minimum Expenditure Baskets, 2018;
- For guidance on how to calculate a minimum expenditure basket, see the Cash Learning Partnership *Operational guidance and toolkit for multipurpose grants*;
- UNHCR's Protection in emergencies toolkit provides guidance on protection assessments;
- UNHCR Accountability frameworks for age, gender, and diversity mainstreaming and targeted actions;
- UNHCR Needs assessment handbook;
- UNHCR Needs assessment for refugee emergencies (NARE) checklist;
- UNHCR/WFP Joint assessment missions (JAMs);
- UNHCR Guide to participatory assessments;
- UNHCR's Policy on the protection of personal data of Persons of Concern;



© WFP/Claire Nevill

- WFP Comprehensive food security and vulnerability analysis (CFSVA);
- Emergency Food Security Assessment (EFSA);
- Joint UNICEF/WFP Food security & Nutrition Guidelines (JANSFA);
- WFP Seasonal Livelihood Programme (SLP) Guidance;
- Emergency Nutrition Assessment software for SMART surveys.

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES ON SAMPLING:

- WFP EFSA Guideline sampling chapter;
- UNHCR sampling decision assistant tool;
- Food and Nutrition Technical Assistance (FANTA) Sampling tool.

2.3 Step 3 – Deciding whether targeting is appropriate

KEY POINTS

1. Targeting is not appropriate in all contexts.
2. In certain settings the costs of needs-based targeting may be higher than providing assistance to all.

To determine whether it is appropriate, relevant and operationally feasible to target assistance to meet food and other basic needs (in-kind and/or cash) key considerations include:

- Political context and legal environment for refugees – including freedom of movement, access to land and livelihood opportunities; access to labour, markets and services that influence refugee households' food security and economic vulnerability
- Physical access to the persons of concern
- Social cohesion among the refugee population and between them and host communities
- Protection risks that may result from targeting assistance (to ensure refugee wellbeing will not be negatively affected – a 'do no-harm' approach)
- Capacity and available resources of UNHCR, WFP and partners to conduct assessments, analyze data, and implement (and maintain) a targeted approach

Economic context and ability of refugees to access food and income to cover their own basic needs

Knowing the economic context and vulnerability of the host population to cover their basic needs and the assistance available to them (as humanitarian assistance and/or through national social protection systems including social safety nets) is very important in order to not create conflict. Advocacy to improve conditions for host communities is essential in situations where they are not able to meet their needs

Assistance to all may be more appropriate than targeted assistance

A review of the above could suggest that targeting is not feasible or cost effective, resulting in the decision to provide assistance to all (often referred to as the provision of 'blanket assistance'). It is largely recognised that in the immediate aftermath of a crisis, where needs are very high and affecting most of the population, targeting is not appropriate. Similarly, new arrivals (asylum seekers) require a standard basket of assistance to cover food and other basic needs. In some situations, targeting is also not methodologically or practically feasible. For instance, where capacity or time is limited, there is a lack of available data, or there may be access restrictions. However, despite being quick and easy to design, distribution to all carries the risk of inefficient use of resources in the medium-long term and requires carefully planned exit strategies, one of which is the introduction of targeted assistance.

The inter-agency coordination mechanism should determine whether there is sufficient evidence to suggest that targeting assistance is appropriate, feasible and relevant.

The Kakuma Camp (Kenya) case study below is an example of how an assessment and profiling exercise was used to determine that targeting was not appropriate.

CASE STUDY 5

Kenya (2015) – Evidence-based decision not to conduct a targeting exercise

In September 2015, WFP and UNHCR commissioned a joint assessment of livelihood activities and vulnerability profiles in Kakuma, Kenya. The refugee camp was established in 1991 and hosts 182,000 refugees. The aim of the assessment was to examine the feasibility of targeting food and non-food assistance. The assessment included an analysis of the context, consultations with the community, and a household survey.

The study used a cut-off point of the calculated value of minimum food and non-food basket of 77 Kenyan shillings per person per day to determine which families could meet food and other essentials without assistance.

Results showed that only four percent of the refugee population would be able to meet all their basic needs without assistance. The study considered various possible targeting methods – categorical targeting, proxy means testing (PMT), self-targeting and community-based approaches – and concluded that none of them would identify the four percent with a sufficient degree of accuracy to avoid doing harm to those who would be wrongly excluded, and thus targeting was not implemented. In addition, the cost of trying to correctly identify four percent of the population would be higher than to simply including them in the assistance.

Shifting from blanket assistance to targeted assistance

If the context is a protracted crisis where blanket assistance has been provided to all for years, transitioning to a targeted (or prioritized) distribution will require communications, planning and consultation with the community. Targeting some people and not others with assistance in a population that is used to receiving blanket assistance can create mistrust and unrest if not properly communicated and understood.

In protracted situations, life-saving assistance should be gradually phased out as and when households become more self-reliant. Key to this transition is the crucial investment in appropriate livelihoods assistance, which should be provided based on needs and capacities in addition to linkages and inclusion of refugees to national social protection systems and assistance where appropriate and feasible. A joint strategy on how to support self-reliance, gradually shifting from food assistance to livelihoods support is required and should identify ways to support households that have additional capacities/skills and could become self-reliant with tailored assistance. This is in line with the global Joint UNHCR/WFP Strategy to Enhance Refugee Self-Reliance to Food Security and Nutrition.

Strong communication with communities is required to ensure that communities understand the reasoning behind the targeted assistance as well as eligibility criteria, appeals and feedback mechanisms. Systems are required to update beneficiary lists based on appeals mechanisms and track who receives what assistance. Other programmes and services must take account of the shift from blanket to targeted distribution and appropriate community and field staff must be informed about the process, eligibility criteria, distribution mechanisms, appeals and referral systems, so that they can appropriately answer questions and refer individuals to the correct channels when approached about assistance or targeting issues.

2.4 Step 4 – Selecting the targeting methodology

KEY POINTS

1. No targeting method is perfect. A combination of approaches is usually the most appropriate and effective.
2. There is a range of different targeting methods that are commonly applied to target and prioritize assistance to those in need, for both humanitarian assistance to meet basic needs and as part of national safety net programmes.

This section provides an overview of factors to consider when selecting the most appropriate method/s. By its nature, targeting is an imperfect science and the following factors should be taken into consideration.

- **There is no one best or perfect way to conduct targeting** and each targeting mechanism has strengths and weaknesses, including accuracy, transparency, feasibility, speed, data requirements, ease, cost and human resource requirements.
- There is **no "one-size fits all" targeting method**. Decisions around targeting have to be driven by knowledge of the **local context** and carried **out jointly with other key stakeholders**, in particular the host government, UNHCR and, to the extent possible, the refugee community."
- The aim should be to identify a **'good enough' approach** to ensure that needs are met as quickly, fairly and transparently as possible. This means ensuring a balance between accuracy, timeliness and cost, while acknowledging limitations and seeking to mitigate risks where possible.
- Applying a **mixed approach** can mitigate the limitations of each targeting method as well as reduce errors.
- Finding the **right balance** between exclusion errors, which can be life-threatening, and inclusion errors that can be potentially disruptive and wasting limited resources.

The selection of the most appropriate targeting method will largely depend on the following factors outlined in the table below.[6]

Table 3: Factors to take into account when selecting a targeting methodology

Programme objective	What are the programme objectives and which targeting method is the most appropriate to achieve the objectives?
Accuracy	What is the probability that the method will exclude those who are vulnerable and should be eligible for assistance? Can these errors be mitigated?
Timeliness	How quickly can households or individuals be identified through the method or combination of methods?
Resources required	How complex is the method to implement? What is required in terms of data, staff numbers, expertise and logistical support, to identify beneficiaries through each of the mechanisms?
Data availability	Which registration and assessment data exist? (including data quality and relevance in terms of scope and time)

[6] Adapted from Smith. G., Mohiddin. L., Phelps. L., (2017) Targeting in urban displacement contexts. Guidelines for humanitarian practitioners. IIED, London.

Context and alignment to existing systems	Is the context urban/rural?, camp/off-camp?, small population/large population? What are the existing targeting methods in place – including those of national government safety net programmes for the local population?
Risk of harm	Will the method put certain targeted households or individuals at risk? Is it possible to mitigate this risk?
Security and access	Are there any political and security concerns that can restrict mobility of targeted groups and cause access issues on programmes? How will these affect implementation of the targeting method?
Dynamism of the contexT	How often will it be necessary to update targeting processes and criteria? How easy will this be through the respective method?
Accountability	How consistently can the method be applied? How easy is it to explain to the affected communities and will they perceive it to be fair?
Community engagement	What is the potential to engage communities in the targeting process?
Local authority engagement	What is the potential to engage local authorities in the targeting process?
Inclusion of invisible groups	What is the potential to ensure inclusion of invisible or highly marginalized groups?

There is no one method applicable in all contexts. The table below provides an overview of the common targeting methods applied, their pros and cons, and the contexts where they are most applicable. Often, a mixed approach is opted for, in order to maximise the benefits and mitigate the shortcomings of the various methods involved.

Table 4: Overview of targeting methods

Targeting method and description	Pros	Cons	Context where most applicable
Geographic: Assistance is targeted to areas or settlements hardest hit by a crisis and/or most in need as defined by the agency. Beneficiaries are therefore selected based on their geographical location	• Relatively easy to implement • Easily explicable to targeted population and other stakeholders • Useful where access challenges make household data collection difficult	• Risks excluding vulnerable households living outside the targeted area • High inclusion error within targeted areas • May exert a pull factor for people to move	When vulnerable households are concentrated in defined geographic areas (e.g. camps, poor urban neighbourhoods)
Community-based: Community leaders and/or members are responsible for defining/validating eligibility criteria and identify those eligible for assistance	• Can work well in smaller and cohesive communities • Suitable where there is low administrative capacity and strong sense of community • Enhances ownership and buy-in of the affected population	• Challenging in urban or new refugee populations as the community is not well known • Could be perceived as unfair and partial or reinforce existing power imbalances within the community • Risks marginalizing stigmatized individuals or groups • May create difficulties for community members involved in selection processes • Not possible to implement in insecure contexts	In rural context, communities with high level of cohesion

Targeting method and description	Pros	Cons	Context where most applicable
Proxy-means testing (PMT): this uses proxy indicators for income and economic vulnerability. Typically a score is generated for each case based on proxy indicators of economic vulnerability using statistical models. It requires a representative survey with information on expenditure (proxy for income), food security indicators and a variety of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics as well as a registration database containing relevant variables.	• Relatively cost-efficient for large-scale operations (only a sample of households needs to be visited) • Reduced respondent bias as based on observable characteristics • Used by World Bank and many governments for the targeting of social welfare programmes	• Associated with high exclusion errors • Requires modelling econometric expert • Statistical model difficult to communicate to beneficiaries • Difficult for humanitarian practitioners to understand, critique, engage with • Requires an effective validation process and agile appeal system • Requires regular updating in dynamic environments	• In rural and urban context • Larger refugee populations where household visits and community-based targeting not feasible but a complete registration database exists
Self-targeting/self-exclusion: Households apply for assistance if they consider themselves needy and fall into pre-defined criteria. Some activities such as food-for-assets programmes may have self-targeting elements by providing incentives that are lower than the minimum wage. Self-exclusion refers to campaigns where better-off households are asked to remove themselves voluntarily	• Directly involves the targeted population and offers individuals the choice to enrol or not to enrol in a programme Works better when people are opting into assistance, rather than opting out • If implemented properly low rate of exclusion errors	• Requires a very strong communicating with communities (CwC) strategy informing them about the criteria, entitlements and registration processes • People with protection risks may find it difficult to access the registration/ enrolment • Data provided not easily verifiable, risk of inclusion errors – requires further screening • Risk of stigmatisation of particular vulnerable groups if targeting is highly visible	• New assistance programmes with new entries • Conditional programmes such as food-for-assets
Categorical targeting (individual-based): Individual-based targeting according to easily observable categories – such as gender, age, disability, employment status	• An easy way to reach most vulnerable individuals in a population, such as young children, elderly, disabled • Often used for national social safety net targeting • Easy to communicate	• Economically vulnerable households without vulnerable members will be wrongly excluded • Requires comprehensive and reliable information, which is not always collected during registration	• Works in rural and urban programmes, small and large groups, camp and non-camp • Special programmes targeting vulnerable groups (e.g. nutrition or education programmes)
Categorical targeting (household/ case level-based): Household-based targeting according to easily observable categories – such as sex of household head, sex of principal applicant, dependency ratios, household size, etc.	• An easy way to reach most vulnerable groups • Easy to communicate	• Unclear how to weight different indicators • Leads to high inclusion and exclusion errors • Requires comprehensive and reliable information, which is not always collected during registration	Works in rural and urban programmes, small and large groups, camp and non-camp
Score-card: based on multisector vulnerability score. Indicators and weights are defined jointly by relevant stakeholders. Usually requires household visits of the entire population. Criteria require validation to check for relevance	• Buy-in from partners who participated in the scoring exercise • Useful for including socio-economic criteria • Does not require econometrics specialist, just experienced field staff	• High human and financial resources to undertake census • Selection of criteria and weights not fully transparent • Contingent on the relevance of indicators and coverage & consistency of household data collection • Difficult to validate • Requires the collection of data from each household, which can be expensive and time-consuming • More difficult to communicate to community than CBT but easier than PMT	• Small populations where all households can be visited • When multisector vulnerability data is available

As mentioned above, methods are often combined to reduce associated errors and achieve better results overall. For example, PMT may be combined with categorical targeting to ensure that specific vulnerable groups are not excluded from assistance. The most common methods are geographic, community-based, categorical or PMT. Geographic targeting may serve as a first-cut, followed by other targeting methods within prioritized areas (e.g. community-based targeting).

Self-exclusion (often referred to as 'self-targeting') is when people are asked to opt out of receiving assistance, recognizing that there are others more in need. This may be an option if there is an attractive alternative – for example, in lieu of receiving continued food assistance, they may access livelihood assistance such as training and loans, or a livelihood package – livestock, or access to lands along with seeds and tools – that can act as a support to generate income.

UNHCR and WFP, along with relevant partners, should jointly review the pros and cons for each method before agreeing on the most appropriate one or mixed-methods. The method should aim to minimize the numbers included in assistance, who are not in need (inclusion error), as well as minimising the numbers of people who are in need, but excluded from assistance (exclusion error), while also considering operational feasibility, timeliness of implementation, cost implications and considering the preferences expressed by the refugees during community-based consultations. Review of the national targeting systems should feed into this decision (see box 3 below). Engagement with the community is crucial in deciding which method is most appropriate. Table 5 presents a summary of the main targeting methods in terms of context and setting, population size, costs, technical requirements and level of accuracy:

Table 5: Applicability and requirements of different targeting methods – quick overview table

Targeting method	Preferred setting			Population size	Cost	Technical requirement	Accuracy
	Urban	Rural	Camp				
Geographic	X	X		Small to large	Low	Low	Low
Community-based		X	X	Small to medium	Low	Low	Medium to high
PMT	X	X		Large	Medium to high	High	Low to medium
Self-targeting/self-exclusion	X	X	X	Small to large	Low	Low to medium	Depends on outreach and capacity of the population
Categorical (individual-based)	X	X	X	Small to large	Low to medium	Low to medium	Medium to high
Categorical (household-based)	X	X	X	Small to large (if records with all relevant data exist)	Low to medium	Low to medium	Medium
Score-card		X	X	Small	Very high	High	Medium



The targeting method should be designed based on a well-informed joint technical analysis and include the WFP VAM experts in country supported by the RB/HQ and the UNHCR technical experts supported by the in-country multi-functional team and UNHCR regional office or HQ. Depending on the choice of method, external technical expertise may be required (see the Lebanon example in box below). Regardless of the method, people with high protection risks (identified by UNHCR, WFP or others) should be prioritized for assistance if the impact on their food security is deemed worse than for others (see also next section).

RESOURCES:

- A community-based approach in UNHCR Operations, 2008
- Aligning Humanitarian Cash Assistance with Social Safety Nets in Refugee Settings, UNHCR, 2019
- Mohiddin, L and Smith, G (2016) A review of needs assessment tools, response analysis frameworks, and targeting guidance for urban humanitarian response. IIED, London.
- Mohiddin, L, Smith, G, Phelps, L (2017) Targeting in urban displacement contexts – Guidance Note for Humanitarian Practitioners. IIED, London.

CASE STUDY 6

Lebanon (2013-2018) – Targeting assistance in Lebanon – an evolving approach

The Syrian refugee crisis in Lebanon presented WFP, UNHCR and partners with the challenge of having limited resources to deliver humanitarian assistance to the people most in need. As early as mid-2013, UNHCR, WFP and other partners began to deliver targeted food and basic needs assistance. It is important to note that context and an unfolding humanitarian emergency drove the targeting programme in Lebanon. Between 2012 and 2015 Lebanon received over 1 million Syrian refugees, representing 25% of the country's population, the highest concentration of refugees per capita in the world. The initial targeting was based on a 'burden score' generated by UNHCR's proGres database. The burden score predicted welfare using family composition, dependency ratio, and disability. The cut-off point for continued inclusion in food and non-food assistance was derived from the first joint UNICEF/WFP/UNHCR Vulnerability Assessment for Syrian Refugees (VASyR) that showed that approximately 72% of the population could not meet their needs without assistance.

VASyR results showed that the burden score had reasonable predictive power, but it also had a relatively high rate of inclusion and exclusion errors. The introduction of targeting produced a large number of appeals, which were followed up with a household visit to conduct an interview using a questionnaire based on the most sensitive indicators in the VASyR. This exercise resulted in re-inclusion of approximately 25% of the excluded households.

To improve the accuracy of targeting, an inter-agency task force was established, and a set of indicators to predict food insecurity and socio-economic vulnerabilities were created. As a result, the food security and basic needs sector shifted to PMT and food security scoring, to identify those in need of assistance. Between December 2014 and December 2015, over 70,000 households were visited to determine the eligibility status for food and basic needs assistance. This, however, turned out to be too resource-demanding, and a more efficient approach had to be found.

In late 2015, WFP contracted the American University in Beirut (AUB) to investigate whether it could develop a PMT approach to predict socio-economic vulnerability, using information available in proGres. AUB used the most updated proGres database, data from the 2015 VASyR and the data from the appeals and verification process that had followed the initial targeting exercise. The variables identified by AUB included household size, arrival date, gender, disability and age score across the household, level of education, district of arrival, and district of origin in Syria.

Based on VaSYR data, the targeting formula continuously improved, and WFP and UNHCR annually update their beneficiary lists and validates the approach for inclusion and exclusion, taking into account both food security socio-economic vulnerability.

BOX 3

Aligning with national social safety nets – lessons from cash programming

With an increase in the frequency, complexity and duration of humanitarian crises, the capacity of the humanitarian system to respond to them has reached its limits. In many countries problems are compounded: chronic poverty is combined with conflict, natural disasters and displacement, whether internal or cross-border refuge. These developments underline the need for closer collaboration between humanitarian, national and development systems and the strengthening of long-term support measures to both displaced communities and nationals alike.

UNHCR, WFP and partners targeting and prioritization of assistance to meet basic needs in displaced populations must consider potential alignment with existing social protection systems where possible. The elements of programme alignment may differ from context to context. In some settings, alignment of the transfer value and the targeting approach may be appropriate while the transfer mechanism is not and vice versa. The starting point should be to align – or use the existing mechanisms – to the extent possible, taking into account the specificities of each context.

Contexts with weak social safety nets:

- Even where the national social safety nets are weak, alignment of cash assistance – and ideally inclusion – should be considered at the onset of the interventions.
- Targeted, limited and time-bound cash assistance should be considered, ideally through transitional cash that mirrors the national social safety nets, coupled and adapted with other services provided by development or humanitarian actors. Investment in livelihoods is key in order to avoid protracted refugee crises. As an example, review a summary here of how the transitional safety networks, which was set up by UNHCR Cameroon in 2018.
- Aligning targeting approaches can be challenging as the system in place may be costly and require significant capacity, data and resources, which humanitarians may not have.
- Lessons learned from humanitarian cash assistance, such as transfer mechanisms or the use of innovative technologies, can be transferred to the national system in situations where it is being developed or strengthened.

When social safety nets are available but need expansion:

- Alignment of cash assistance should always be considered in these situations as it may enhance opportunities for future inclusion and the start of a transition from aid to development and self-reliance.
- Alignment must be gradually introduced and implemented hand in hand with clear communication strategies targeting the communities to avoid abrupt changes to their household economy. Cash assistance to host communities should be considered.
- Even where inclusion of refugees in the national social safety net is possible, the coverage of vulnerable refugees is often limited, and continued cash assistance as a transition by humanitarian actors should be considered.
- Advocacy efforts towards donors and development actors should be foreseen to secure additional funds allowing for increased numbers of refugees accessing the national system.

When social safety nets are available for nationals:

- Always consider alignment (if inclusion is not possible), in situations where the social safety nets are available, to an extent, to non-nationals.
- Be prepared to assist refugees in the inclusion process. Social assistance is often applied for in these situations; a process in which non-nationals may require support from humanitarian or development actors, or the authorities themselves.
- Advocate for non-nationals' access to recognised identity credentials. A main challenge for refugees to be included in national social protection systems relates to the lack of recognition of their ID cards; a common obstacle also to financial inclusion.
- Recognise that inclusion is a time-consuming activity, requiring a significant amount of advocacy. Social policies, in particular in relation to non-nationals, are often held hostage by political agendas and their implementation is subject to change when a new government is elected.
- In situations where non-nationals do not yet access the national social safety net, humanitarians should not completely design parallel structures due to the difficulties to adapt when the inclusion opportunity presents itself. In these situations, try to align – even if it is only one of the cash assistance elements.
- The work on the alignment of cash assistance with the national social protection systems requires close partnership and coordination with all relevant stakeholders, notably the government, donors, and humanitarian and development actors.
- For more information see UNHCR's Aligning Humanitarian Cash Assistance with Social Safety Nets in Refugee Settings.

2.5 Step 5 – Defining eligibility criteria

KEY POINTS

1. Ensure community participation in defining and validating eligibility criteria
2. Ensure criteria are simple, fair, well-understood and transparent

Eligibility criteria for targeted assistance should be developed based on an assessment and profiling analysis (see step 2) and depend on the targeting method (see previous section). Eligibility criteria are context-specific and represent common characteristics of those in need to determine whether an individual or household will be considered to receive or not to receive assistance.

BOX 4

Principles for eligibility criteria

Eligibility criteria for targeted food and related non-food assistance should be context-specific and feasible to implement and updated on a fairly regular basis. They should follow the below principles:

- Informed by vulnerability assessments, monitoring exercises and reviews
- Informed by community consultations (where feasible)
- Associated with socio-economic, food insecurity and protection related vulnerability
- SMART (specific, measurable, agreed, relevant and timely)
- Objectively verifiable (through assessment, monitoring and validation exercises)
- Operationally practical and based on existing data where possible (e.g. demographic indicators captured in *proGres*, UNHCR's registration)
- Transparent, easy to communicate and as easy as possible for the affected population to understand
- Protection-sensitive (e.g. do not contribute to stigmatization, marginalization or exclusion of vulnerable groups and individuals)
- Aligned with existing criteria, where possible. For example, in contexts where a national social safety net system is in place for the local population, criteria and processes should be harmonized as much as possible, but also take different vulnerabilities into account
- Embedded in the overall programme context to ensure synergies and avoid duplication (basic needs assistance, nutrition actions, livelihood programming)
- Regularly updated and valid for a period of time

UNHCR and WFP will jointly interpret information from assessment data and other secondary sources to inform the selection of eligibility criteria. The aim is to identify the best criteria to classify the most vulnerable households and exclude those that tend to be better-off.

If a household assessment and profiling exercise were conducted, the characteristics identified for the various groups should be translated into practical, protection-sensitive eligibility criteria on which to target assistance. In the ideal scenario, these indicators are already captured in an existing refugee registration database (e.g. household size, dependency ratio, number of working members, etc.). However, targeting should not be solely a data driven exercise. Community engagement in the decision-making and acceptance of eligibility criteria is crucial (see section 2.7 on communication with communities section).

The targeting method influences possible eligibility criteria (see Section 4 and Table 5 below). PMT and categorical targeting have a distinct advantage in that they can be based on data from a sample of the population (rather than having to visit all households) and can therefore be updated on a regular basis without the need to re-assess every single household. However, such approaches do require that the selection criteria be based on information that exists for the population, such as in UNHCR's *proGres* data (see Annex 5 which outlines what type of information is typically collected during registration). Ultimately a combination of targeting methods is likely most appropriate.

Table 6: Targeting methods and potential eligibility criteria

Targeting method	Examples of eligibility criteria
Geographic	Camps, poor neighbourhoods, areas particularly affected by hazards such as high levels of displacement, flooding, drought, etc.
Community-based	Criteria defined based on community consultations (e.g. wealth ranking), such as access to land and ownership of livestock or other productive assets but also demographic factors (e.g. single parents, widows)
Self-targeting	Criteria based on own perception of wellbeing or informed by specific programme objectives
PMT	Data that is captured by *proGres* and associated with socio-economic vulnerability and food insecurity: e.g. household size, sex of principal applicant, dependency ratio, crowding index, current residence, households with members with special needs, etc.
Categorical (household-based)	
Categorical (individual-based)	Pregnant and lactating women, persons with specific needs (PSN), age, etc.
Vulnerability score-card	**Score composed of sector-specific vulnerabilities, for example:** Food insecurity and socio-economic vulnerability: income, expenditure, asset ownership, food consumption, coping, etc. Protection cases identified by social/protection staff Education: literacy of household head, school enrolment/retention, etc. Health: access to health services, disabilities/chronic diseases, etc.

Eligibility criteria should be protection-sensitive and developed with community participation and the support of protection experts. UNHCR, WFP or designated partners may add cases of people with specific high protection risks to the list of those eligible for assistance.

BOX 5

Example of protection risks – Serious medical conditions and disability as eligibility criteria for targeting basic assistance

Eligibility criteria to identify socio-economically poor or food-insecure households will depend on the context. Not everybody with a chronic or severe medical condition or disability is by default socio-economically vulnerable and food insecure. However, some are. In some contexts, having an individual with a serious medical condition / disability increases household expenditures (due to added health costs) while potentially reducing the income due to a lower number of able-bodied persons in the household.

If assessment results or the analysis of health data confirms that having one or more individuals with a serious medical condition increases a household's socio-economic vulnerability or risk of food insecurity, serious medical conditions/ disability should be part of the set of eligibility criteria for targeting basic assistance. The case is the same for all other protection-related indicators, such as female-headed households, single-parent households, elderly-headed households, etc.)

Practical steps in the design of protection-related criteria for joint targeting

1. Analyze and understand the drivers of protection risks and the overlap between socio-economic and protection-related vulnerability as part of the assessment steps
2. Ensure protection experts are consulted in the contextualization of eligibility criteria
3. Where protection vulnerability criteria and socio-economic vulnerability criteria overlap, prioritize these criteria in targeting, to ensure that basic assistance also contributes to protection benefits.

There is no standard list of eligibility criteria; they should be determined based on analysis and context (see step 2), carefully validated (see step 6), and regularly monitored over time (see step 9). In addition, it is very important to identify the criteria in consideration of the overall programme context (what other types of assistance are being provided and how, criteria for inclusion in national social safety net programmes, and eligibility criteria for livelihoods assistance and programmes) and not in isolation. A holistic view is key to ensure alignment and build synergies between programmes, with an aim to facilitate refugee self-reliance.

Should UNHCR and WFP country offices lack the required capacity to be able to develop and agree on a joint targeting method or eligibility criteria, they should engage the respective regional bureau or headquarters for technical support and facilitation.

2.6 Step 6 – Validating the targeting method

KEY POINTS

1. Before implementing a targeted approach to assistance, the targeting method and criteria must be validated in order to select the best method among the various alternatives and to identify strategies to mitigate potential targeting errors
2. Validation of eligibility criteria should include both quantitative and qualitative components. The quantitative component allows potential design targeting errors to be identified. The qualitative component captures the views and perceptions of the criteria of the affected populations.
3. Validation of criteria should be repeated on a regular basis as vulnerability profiles can change over time.

There will be certain levels of inclusion and exclusion errors in all contexts. The aim of the validation exercise is to identify the best targeting methods among the various alternatives and also identify strategies to mitigate potential targeting errors. It is best to conduct this exercise prior to implementing the targeting process to ensure that the best methods can be chosen. Ideally, the validation contains both quantitative and qualitative methods. It is recommended to repeat the exercise on a regular basis as vulnerability profiles can change over time (e.g. annually, in a very dynamic setting, every to two to three years in a more stable environment).

The main objectives of validating the targeting methods are to:

- **Estimate errors:** Estimate the expected inclusion and exclusion errors associated with the chosen targeting method and criteria
- **Compare effectiveness:** Compare the effectiveness of different targeting methods/criteria with the objective to minimise targeting errors
- **Assess appropriateness:** Assess the appropriateness of the chosen method for the specific context (Will it be accepted by the community? Will it create unwanted negative impacts, such as encouraging population movement or encouraging households to have more children, etc.?)
- **Inform the programme:** Guide mitigation strategies such as eligibility criteria, re-inclusion criteria or referral strategies into other programmes, and design of a complaint and feedback mechanism (CFM).

2.6.1 Definition of inclusion and exclusion errors

An **inclusion error** refers to the receipt of benefits by people who should not be receiving them, while an exclusion error refers to people who do not receive benefits, but should. However, there is a need to differentiate between two sources of error. One is associated with the targeting **design**, the second one is related to actual **implementation** of the targeting process.

Errors at design stage:

- **Design exclusion error:** The proportion of the population in need of assistance but are not included in the targeted group.
- **Design inclusion error:** The proportion of programme beneficiaries who do not need assistance but still are identified as in need in the targeting process.

Errors at implementation stage:

- **Implementation exclusion error:** The proportion of the affected population who meet the defined eligibility criteria but do not receive benefits.
- **Implementation inclusion error:** The proportion of programme beneficiaries who do not meet the eligibility criteria but receive benefits.

In humanitarian operations where lives and livelihoods may be at risk, priority is usually given to **minimizing exclusion errors**.

CASE STUDY 7

Syrian refugees in Turkey (2018) – Vulnerability analysis and refinement of targeting criteria

In 2018, the WFP VAM unit conducted a 'vulnerability profiling' to inform the technical design of the Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) programme for Syrian refugees in Turkey. The objective was to provide evidence to refine the existent targeting criteria used to identify people in need of ESSN assistance, allowing WFP to conduct evidence-based decision-making for the selection of eligible households. The analysis built upon a large amount of data collected through the ESSN, such as Pre-Assistance Baseline (PAB), Post-Distribution Monitoring (PDM) and Comprehensive Vulnerability Monitoring Exercise (CVME). Three dimensions were used to estimate households' vulnerability:

Table 1: Vunerability criteria

Food Consumption	High-Risk Coping	Economic Vulnerability	Vulnerability Classification
Acceptable	Low	Not Economically Vulnerable	Less Vulnerable
	Low	Economically Vulnerable	Highly Vulnerable
	High	Not Economically Vulnerable	Highly Vulnerable
	High	Economically Vulnerable	Highly Vulnerable
Borderline			Highly Vulnerable
Poor			

- Food consumption: households are classified as having a poor/borderline/acceptable food consumption based on the results of their Food Consumption Score (FCS);
- Livelihood coping: households are classified as resorting to high or low use of negative coping based on the maximum severity of livelihood coping strategies adopted;
- Economic vulnerability: households are classified as being economically vulnerable/not economically vulnerable if they are, respectively, below or above the Minimum Expenditure Basket (MEB) of 294 Turkish lira monthly per person.

The interaction between these three dimensions (Table 1), allowed households to be categorized into two vulnerability groups: (1) less vulnerable and (2) highly vulnerable.

As a result of this classification, a high level of vulnerability was assigned to:

- Households with poor/borderline food consumption (regardless of the coping and economic dimensions)
- Households resorting to high use of negative coping strategies
- Economically vulnerable households

On the opposite end, the less vulnerable classification was assigned to:

- Households with acceptable food consumption, not economically vulnerable and with low levels of negative coping strategies.

This vulnerability classification was used as the base for validating existing targeting criteria. As a result, these were reviewed and refined in a way to minimize both inclusion and exclusion errors. Already existing criteria were kept in order to minimize the operational burden. In this regard, the analysis found that one new vulnerability criterion (households with five or more members) would have increased the precision of targeting while, at the same time, reducing errors. The final outcome of the analysis (Table 2), resulted in a slightly higher cumulative inclusion error, which increased from 21% to 23%, compensated by a cumulative exclusion error of less than half (from 31% to 15%).

	Rank	Targeting criteria	Cumulative # of vulnerable individuals meeting criteria	Cumulative Coverage	Cumulative Inclusion Error	Cumulative Exclusion Error
Existing	1	Households with 4 or more children	790,427	48.4%	11.5%	51.6%
NEW	2	Households with 5 or more members	1,333,246	81.6%	20.1%	18.4%
Existing	3	Single parents with no other adults in the family and at least one child under 18	1,362,398	83.4%	20.8%	16.6%
Existing	4	Households with higher than 1.5 dependency ratio	1,376,241	84.3%	21.1%	15.7%
Existing	5	Households with more than 1 verified disabled person	1,384,490	84.8%	22.6%	15.2%
Existing	6	Households consisting of one female	1,386,640	84.9%	22.6%	15.1%
Existing	7	Elderly people with no other adults in their family	1,386,640	84.9%	22.6%	15.1%
		Household meeting above criteria	**1,386,640**	**84.9%**	**22.6%**	**15.1%**

To summarize, by including one additional criteria (households with five or more members), the ESSN programme in 2019 increase the coverage of highly vulnerable refugees from 69% to 85%, with lower errors compared to the previous targeting approach, which translates into a more efficient use of resources. To fully capture protection concerns that contribute to increased vulnerability, additional analysis and mechanisms for inclusion into assistance are needed. In the Turkey case UNHCR conducted such analysis and provided cash assistance to households subject to protection risks not captured by the targeting criteria.

2.6.2 Data requirements and validation steps

In order to determine the inclusion and exclusion error, the following data is required for the quantitative validation:

For the **quantitative validation**, the following data will be required:

- A representative survey (e.g. needs assessment) of the entire population (eligible and non-eligible), which contains the vulnerability status related indicators (e.g. household expenditure, food consumption, coping strategies)
- The eligibility status (yes/no) by household
- When demographic targeting or PMT is used, the eligibility criteria used or proposed (e.g. household size, sex of household head, number of livestock, etc.) should be captured in the same database or derived from other sources (e.g. by linking the assessment with registration data)[7]
- Relevant protection information based on country context, e.g. access to land, employment, social assistance and services

In addition to quantifying potential targeting design errors, it is important to conduct a **qualitative validation** exercise to assess the acceptability of the chosen targeting method by the affected population. This step should include interviews with both eligible and non-eligible households and can take the form of KIIs or FDGs and should for example include questions on the perceived fairness, transparency and understanding of the targeting criteria.

[7] Note that for community-based targeting, this data is actually not required as the community committees determine the eligibility status.

If the targeting design is outsourced to a third partner, as in the case of the Lebanon (see case study 6 above), it is recommended that the actual validation of the methodology is carried out by another entity to avoid any conflict of interest, for example UNHCR and WFP.


Data is often already available from either needs assessments or post-distribution monitoring exercises (if the entire population of interest is captured). If data is recent enough and reliable enough, any additional quantitative data collection should be avoided.

Once the data is prepared and merged into one dataset, a data analyst can calculate the design targeting errors as described in the below text box. It is also possible to compare different eligibility criteria and assess how adding or removing certain criteria will affect the targeting efficiency (see case study 7 on Turkey above).

BOX 6

Calculating inclusion/exclusion errors and coverage

The example below provides a practical scenario of how to calculate key statistics to prove the efficiency and effectiveness of the targeting strategy, namely inclusion/exclusion errors and coverage. The first can occur both in the design or implementation phases, as shown in the figure below:



- The **(design) inclusion error** is the number households eligible to assistance according to the targeting criteria despite not being in need of assistance (B) divided by the total number of eligible households (A + B);
- The **(design) exclusion error** is the number of not eligible households that however are in need of assistance (C) divided by the number of households in need of assistance (A + C).

Scenario: A refugee camp with a population of 1,000 households has been targeted to receive assistance. In order to estimate the needs in the camp a food security assessment has been conducted, which shows that 30 percent of the households (A+C=300) are in need of assistance. Based on the identified criteria 40 percent of the households (A+B=400) are eligible, thus resulting in 150 not needy households (B) being included among those to be targeted (inclusion error). At the same time, of the total number of 300 needy households, 50 (C) do not comply with the identified criteria and therefore wrongly excluded from the provision of assistance (exclusion error).

	In need	Not in need	TOTAL
Eligible based on criteria	250 (A)	150 (B)	**400 (A + B)**
Non-eligible based on criteria	50 (C)	550 (D)	**600 (C + D)**
TOTAL	**300 (A + C)**	**700 (B + D)**	**1,000 (A+B+C+D)**

Inclusion error = B/(A + B)
Exclusion error = C/(A + C)

In this example, the inclusion error is 150/(250 + 150), which equals 37.5%. The exclusion error is 50/(250 + 50), which equals 16.7%.

Implementation errors are calculated using the same logic.

Coverage is the number of eligible households (A) divided by the total number of needy households (A+C). The estimation of the coverage is strictly linked to the exclusion error. In other words, if the exclusion error is estimated to be at 30 percent, the coverage will result in 70% of the needy population being correctly assisted. In the above-mentioned example, the coverage is 83.3%.

The initial validation to choose the best targeting method focuses on the design targeting errors. Implementation errors should be picked up during post-distribution monitoring (PDM) exercises as well as through the CFM (see steps 7 and 9).

CASE STUDY 8

Cameroon (2017): Joint qualitative validation of eligibility criteria among refugees from CAR

Due to limited resources, food and cash assistance had to be severely prioritized for CAR refugees in Eastern Cameroon. Refugees are based in camps and in the communities along the border, marked by challenging access. In 2017 UNHCR and WFP developed a joint targeting approach based on analysis of existing data sets which resulted in a list of eligibility criteria. Due to gaps in data contained within the data sets analyzed, some basic demographic indicators (including single headed households, elderly) could not be reliably analyzed and thus could not be used as eligibility criteria. Though UNHCR and WFP engaged the communities to discuss the vulnerability analysis, targeting process, and explain eligibility criteria throughout the process, the final selection criteria were met with strong resistance. Communities perceived the elderly and single-headed households to be the most vulnerable. UNHCR had data on this but it had not been possible to link it to socio-economic vulnerability or food insecurity with the existing data. To address this UNHCR and WFP engaged in qualitative validation including further discussions with the community on their perceptions of vulnerability. Based on this, vulnerable households who had not been included on the original lists were identified by the community and verified by teams of HCR/WFP and partner staff. These additional households were then referred onto distribution lists. With community participation, there was a process of adjusting the lists so that vulnerable single-headed households and elderly were included.

This experience underscores the importance of understanding the perceptions of vulnerability, engaging with the community from the outset and conducting qualitative validation of eligibility criteria so that the population feels they are part of the process and the resulting criteria are accepted.

Based on these lessons learnt, in 2019 UNHCR and WFP conducted a joint vulnerability assessment (JAM) that included a more robust list of indicators so that the vulnerability of single-headed households and elderly could be adequately assessed to inform the second round of targeting.

Community-based targeting requires a slightly adjusted validation approach. Its successful implementation requires a cohesive social structure and trust among community members. One potential risk is that specific minority groups in the population may be excluded due to the opinion of the majority. This may include, but is not limited to, ethnic or religious minorities. Therefore, community-based targeting is not recommended when there is tension or conflict between ethnic, religious, and social groups within the community.

The following key questions can help to validate whether there is a conducive environment for implementation of community-based targeting and can inform mitigation measures to reduce potential bias:

- What is the community composition? What are some of the main protection risks faced by different groups within the community?
- Is decision-making within the community participatory and inclusive of gender and minority groups?
- Are there existing decision structures in the community to act as the selection committee? Are they generally trusted and how could they be strengthened? If they do not yet exist, what would be the best way to establish them?
- Is there known bias or conflict within the community that may lead to exclusion of specific vulnerable groups? Is it possible to provide additional supervision/guidance?
- Does community-based targeting increase community ownership of the targeting process or does it put certain groups at risk (including the decision-makers who may be accused of being biased)?

RESOURCES:

- Coady, David; Grosh, Margaret; Hoddinott, John (2004): "Targeting of Transfers in Developing Countries : Review of Lessons and Experience." Washington, DC: World Bank
- Devereux, Stephen, et al. (2015): "Evaluating the Targeting Effectiveness of Social Transfers: A Literature Review" Institute of Development Studies. IDS Working Paper 460.
- Hoddinott, J. (1999): "Targeting: Principles and Practice." In J. Hoddinott, ed., Food Security Practice: Methods for Rural Development Projects. Washington, D.C.: International Food Policy Research Institute.
- Kidd, S.; Wylde, E. (2011): Targeting the poorest: An assessment of the proxy means test methodology." Canberra, Australian Aid.
- Sabates-Wheeler, R., Hurrell, A., and Devereux, S. (2015) Targeting Social Transfer Programmes: Comparing Design and Implementation Errors Across Alternative Mechanisms. J. Int. Dev., 27: 1521–1545

2.7 Step 7 – Communications, appeals and feedback mechanisms

KEY POINTS

1. Timely communication around the targeting process and eligibility criteria is essential.
2. An appeal mechanism for persons of concern who are not identified as eligible for assistance but feel they should be included, can help ensure that the 'excluded but in need' receive assistance.
3. A feedback loop is required to review eligibility criteria and revise as appropriate.

People have a right to complain or provide feedback on the decisions that affect them. An effective complaints and feedback mechanism (CFM) can indicate barriers to assistance or targeting errors while also promoting a culture of transparency and accountability.

Feedback is information shared by a beneficiary to the organization and/or involved partners. Feedback can come from different sources (for example social media) and can be about an information that is unclear about a disease or rumour, myths and misconceptions that are circulating in communities and people are asking/talking about.

Complaints are a formal expression of dissatisfaction or discontent with something, and/or someone's misconduct, that requires a response.

Before the actual implementation of targeting, three key steps are required: 1) Develop and implement a communication strategy for the community, government and partners; 2) establish a CFM, and 3) and where appropriate establish an appeal process.

2.7.1 Communication with communities

Communication with communities is an essential component of operational effectiveness, security, stability, and accountability to affected populations (AAP). The emphasis should be on consistency, coherence, and transparency when communicating all aspects of the targeting process with the population. Communication with communities should be ongoing throughout the targeting process and not seen as a separate 'step', though for the purpose of these guidelines, information on how to engage with communities is included here.

Consultations should be held with the leadership, key informants and community members to understand needs and perceptions and triangulate information as part of assessment and profiling. It is important to explain the process of how eligibility criteria were selected and why individuals were eligible for assistance as part of a wider communication strategy (and essential for a complaints mechanism to work properly).

The development and implementation of the communications strategy should be done before any assistance is provided to the population. A communication strategy outlines the two-way process of how information will be shared about the programme/assistance with communities and how feedback will be received by the agencies. It should be adapted to the social and political context; respect the nature of relations between refugee and hosting communities; and consider the level of community solidarity.

Communication is essential throughout the targeting process to ensure wide understanding of the process and eligibility criteria as well as to reduce errors (especially exclusion errors). It also reduces misunderstandings which could lead to potential hostility between the community and key stakeholders. UNHCR and WFP should collaboratively design a communications strategy when implementing targeting and prioritization decisions, leveraging existing communication mechanisms. Roles and responsibilities of who communicates what information

to whom should be included in the strategy. Experienced community services and protection staff should oversee this process.

The communication strategy should ensure that:

- Community members understand how to: communicate with programme staff for information, flag potential errors in targeting or programme implementation, and complain about exclusions.
- Community members understand the process and results of their targeting discussions with programme teams. If there is understanding among non-beneficiaries of why they have been excluded and others included, then they can better identify cases where errors may have been made. Good communication can reduce the risk of misunderstandings and the resultant volume of complaints.

There are multiple channels for communication depending on the context, all of which have different implications for time, cost, communication coverage and human resources. A few options include:

- **Community meetings:** Explain how and why beneficiaries were selected and why others were ineligible. In some contexts, publishing beneficiary lists in communities may still be appropriate.
- **Social media:** Post information in relevant social media forums explaining how and why beneficiaries were selected and not others.
- **Phone calls:** Call households that were visited and surveyed explaining why they are non-eligible. But note that PoC are often mobile and change their mobile phone numbers and/or share phone numbers with family and friends so this is not always a reliable method of guaranteed communication.
- **Information and complaints hotlines:** Publicize the numbers widely and ensure all visited and surveyed households are given it.
- **Demand-driven meetings:** Individuals can visit programme offices or an acting service provider to register queries and complaints

Case study 9 below provides real examples from Turkey and Afghanistan on systems for ensuring greater accountability to affected populations (AAP) including complains and feedback.

CASE STUDY 9

Afghanistan and Turkey (2016-) – Mechanisms to ensure AAP

A key component of any AAP strategy is the implementation of contextually appropriate and accessible means of communication between affected populations and the organizations serving them. As exemplified by Awaaz Afghanistan and the Emergency Social Safety Net (ESSN) for Syrian refugees in Turkey, there is great potential to make life easier for refugees while achieving synergies for organizations through joint AAP mechanisms.

Awaaz Afghanistan is a collective accountability and community engagement initiative that functions as a toll-free, countrywide hotline number affected populations can dial to access information and register feedback on assistance programmes. As a two-way communication channel, needs and priorities from the community are circulated to partners to help improve the quality of programming in Afghanistan.

Awaaz's eight multi-lingual operators (50% of which are women) have handled more than 73,500 calls since Awaaz took its first call in May 2018, speaking directly with people from across Afghanistan. Referral pathways are clearly articulated and cases requiring attention are shared (in agreement with the affected person) in a timely manner, helping the humanitarian response to swiftly align its delivery to actual needs.

Awaaz is implemented by the United Nations Office for Project Services (UNOPS) with financial support from the Afghanistan Humanitarian Fund (AHF), the European Humanitarian Aid and Civil Protection (ECHO), WFP and UNHCR. For more information, visit awaazaf.org.

In Turkey, a toll-free 23-operator call centre was established in order to serve the affected population, in six languages, in relation to the ESSN programme. It aimed to provide information, collect feedback and also to register, refer and respond to complaints. An ESSN Facebook page was set up to quickly provide up-to-date information and respond to queries and complaints. A refugee facing website in four languages contained all relevant information on the programme including an animation, FAQs, addresses for key offices, application and assessment process information, and also a contact page for asking questions, providing feedback and registering complaints. The vast majority of complaints (73%) received through these mechanisms related to the selection process.

To dispel increasing rumours and misinformation regarding the selection process, ESSN targeting criteria were made public for the affected population eight months into the programme. This did not significantly change the reasons behind affected populations' complaints, but allowed refugees to make informed decisions on whether to apply or not for the ESSN.

The ESSN also used SMS to inform applicant households about: the outcome of their application; uploads; changes in eligibility status; application/data errors; uncollected cards and dormant accounts; and how to contact the programme (call centre number, Facebook and website links).

The solutions combined contributed to mitigate the major challenge of distributing accurate and timely information in a context (urban environments, cash-based transfers, redemption through local markets etc.) where WFP and its main partner, the Turkish Red Crescent, had very few direct contact points with assisted and non-assisted populations.

2.7.2 Establishing a complaints- and feedback mechanism (CFM)

CFMs are an essential component of any targeted assistance programme. They can highlight problems and gaps in the targeting mechanism and inform protection and assistance programming and increase effectiveness. Feedback also ensures that incidents of corruption, misconduct and sexual and gender-based violence (SGBV), and incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse are reported and addressed.

A formal CFM system must include established procedures for recording, referring, acting and providing feedback to the complainant. The mechanisms should be transparent, independent, accountable, accessible, safe and easy to use. It is vital that personal and sensitive information is treated confidentially in the follow-up, investigation, and response to complaints received.

UNHCR and WFP ensure that all formal and informal communications, both positive and negative, inform protection, assistance and solutions, and that corrective action is taken as appropriate. In addition, the agencies should develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) for handling complaints and feedback with roles, responsibilities, actions and the decision-making process identified.

An appeal process for managing the spike of complaints related to the implementation of targeting decisions (see step 8) is also required. The timeframe for submitting appeals must be clearly communicated, and after which the bulk of cases are run against the eligibility criteria. This will for example give refugees the opportunity to update their demographic data in *proGres*, in case it is outdated. Regardless if the decision stands or if the appeal leads to inclusion, the outcome must be communicated to the individual household.

The resources referenced at the end of this section provide more detailed information on mechanisms for AAP and practical steps to establish them. Case study 10 below describes the appeals process in a refugee camp in Chad:

RESOURCES:

- Inter-agency Operational Framework on AAP, IASC Task Team on AAP, 2013
- Guideline: Inter-agency community-based complaint mechanisms – Protection against Sexual Exploitation and Abuse, IASC Task Team on AAP, 2016
- WFP's Strategy for AAP, 2016
- UNHCR Policy on Age, Gender and Diversity, 2018

CASE STUDY 10

Chad (2018) – Appeals process in refugee camps following profiling exercise

In Chad, a complaints and appeals mechanism was set up shortly after the publication of the results of a profiling exercise and the subsequent prioritisation of the most vulnerable households in all refugee camps across the country in 2018. The temporary mechanism included two main committees established at local level, and one coordination body:

- The Community Complaints Committee, mainly composed by well-respected refugees;
- The Technical Committee for Complaints Management (TCCM), comprised of technical staff from the government counterpart (Commission Nationale pour l'Accueil et la Réinsertion des Réfugiés et des Rapatriés – CNARR), UNHCR, WFP and NGOs. For the sake of transparency, the Central Refugee Committee also designated a representative to be part of the TCCM; and
- The Coordination Committee made up of the heads of the various institutions at the field represented in the TCCM.

The Community Complaints Committee ensured that the complaints mechanism and process was widely publicized and understood within the community, while selected secretaries transcribed complaints and reasons for appeal on designated forms. These forms were then passed on to the TCCM, which oversaw the verification visits to households who filed a complaint. In the exercise of its functions, the TCCM was assisted by WFP/UNHCR staff at national level for vetting cases of excluded refugee households due to absence during the original profiling survey, and to conduct analyses for reclassification claims.

The Coordination Committee validated the results of the TCCM's recommendations and dealt with appeals that required additional consideration. In case of unsolved disputes, a Regional Task Force comprising heads of agencies at regional level and a delegate from the government would act as final arbiter.

The complaints and appeals mechanism in Chad was set-up in the three weeks following the publication of the profiling results, and all appeals were addressed within 6 to 8 weeks. Training sessions were organized for all committee members to become acquainted with their mandate, duties, tools and context of operation. All appeals submitted were reviewed. Once all decisions were made, new distribution lists were prepared for food assistance.

2.8 Step 8 – Identification

KEY POINTS:

1. With the initial objective to generate a list of beneficiaries, the process of implementing targeting decisions varies with the chosen methodology
2. Targeting criteria can either be applied to an up-to-date registration database, or in the case of a community-based approach, through the community selection committee

The process of implementing the decisions around a targeted assistance largely depends on the methodology. Implementing targeted assistance based on a data-driven targeting approach (demographic/categorical or Proxy Means Testing (PMT)), where individuals are identified for assistance from a database based on specific characteristics, differs from a community-based approach where the community in collaboration with partners select those most vulnerable and in need of assistance. Yet regardless of methodology, a list for those eligible must be developed.

2.8.1 Apply eligibility criteria to up to date registration database

In a refugee context developing the list of targeted beneficiaries is typically done using data from *proGres*. The list should be developed based on the application of the jointly agreed eligibility criteria on the full list of registered refugees. The list should be shared in a timely manner to allow for distribution/transfers of assistance. Recognizing changes in the population, updated lists should be produced and shared on a regular basis (often monthly). Technically, producing lists can be a relatively quick process, but if the number of beneficiaries on the list exceed budget allocations (for example, due to new arrivals or pipeline breaks), both agencies need to agree on a way to prioritize among the targeted population.

Once lists of eligible households have been produced, eligibility should be communicated to individual refugee households as early as possible. In cases where households are removed from assistance, e.g. as a result of a prioritization decision or because of demographic changes that leads to non-eligibility, this should ideally be communicated jointly three months in advance of the change taking effect. This will allow households to plan their economy without the assistance. Alternatively, changes can be made on an annual basis, following assessment and monitoring of data. Engaging community-based protection colleagues is crucial in this to ensure that those targeted off of assistance are linked to and referred to other available services and assistance based on their needs. Refugees should be made aware that lists will be updated periodically. A clear process for adding cases must be in place linked to the referral and appeals system.

Common steps for producing the beneficiary list:

- Cut-off date is agreed upon and the *proGres* database is consolidated from that date (i.e. it consists of all refugees registered before that date – any refugees registered after that date are considered as new arrivals).
- Agreed eligibility criteria are applied to the updated *proGres* data set
- List of eligible refugees is produced (with total number of refugees indicated)
- Review list for accuracy and verify (see verification step above for details)
- Final list of beneficiaries agreed by both agencies

The sharing of data between UNHCR and WFP should be guided by Annex 1 of the Data Sharing Addendum (see text Box 7 below).

BOX 7:

UNHCR/WFP Data Sharing Addendum to the Global MoU 2011

On 17 September 2018 the Executive Director of WFP and UNHCR's High Commissioner signed an Addendum on Data Sharing to the January 2011 Memorandum of Understanding. This document supports enhanced collaboration at all levels between the organizations to collectively meet the basic needs of all persons of concern. It also mitigates the need for both agencies to duplicate data collection and data-related activities between the agencies.

With this Addendum, WFP and UNHCR commit to share data and information for specific purposes (detailed in Annex 1 of the Addendum) in line with Data Protection Principles and robust Information Security. Key points:

- A data sharing request for personal and non-personal data should follow a simplified request form (detailed in Annex 2 and 3 of the Addendum).
- Data sets requested and shared for analysis, including to inform targeting, should be anonymized.
- Risks of sharing are to be analyzed in comparison with the benefits.
- There is a commitment to support interoperable systems and data access, instead of data transfer, where possible.
- A formal escalation process is articulated in case a resolution is not reached at a country level, with escalation first to regional and then to HQ officials.
- A joint data sharing support group has been established to support country offices to address issues or challenges before moving to an escalation process.

New arrivals are generally considered highly vulnerable and are in many cases automatically eligible for food and other basic assistance upon arrival. Both agencies should agree on the length of time for which new arrivals are eligible for assistance, depending on the context, and before their vulnerability is assessed or re-assessed.

Changes to the lists may occur over time due to changes in household composition, for example, continuous registration of births, deaths, family reunification and departures (as reflected in *proGres* through continuous registration). Permitted corrections to lists could be based on changes in the *proGres* registration database, complaints or referrals and verification of household vulnerability on a case-by-case basis. Country offices can agree on a contingency for "exceptional cases". It is important that the number of exceptional cases are reported and rationales provided (for the sake of transparency but also to facilitate learning and improve targeting over time).

In conclusion, SOPs for targeting implementation should be agreed upon prior to the new lists being operationalised (see example of joint SOP for New Food Assistance Collection Procedures for Refugees in Uganda, in Annex 6). These SOPs should lay out which changes are permissible on a rolling basis (for example adding new arrivals, births, family reunification, removing 'no shows', deaths, departures) and outlining which agency is responsible for making these changes. The SOPs should also state the expected validity of current lists.

2.8.2 Identifying lists for community-based targeting

Once the community has been sensitised about the intentions for targeting, the following steps are recommended for implementing a community-based targeting scheme:

1. Reiterate the criticality of the targeting exercise and the goals of reaching the most vulnerable
2. Use existing community-based protection mechanisms where possible to identify or form a selection committee which is inclusive of male and female members and represents all households, including minority viewpoints and with strong messaging that the exercise can be refused by UNHCR and WFP if marginalised groups are not appropriately represented

3. Agree with community (ensuring engagement of vulnerable groups) on eligibility criteria, after discussions on available evidence, such as findings from recent vulnerability assessments and their perceptions.
4. Community members propose individuals and households to consider. Each proposal is reviewed discussed by the committee, and upon agreement, a list of proposed beneficiary households is compiled
5. WFP/UNHCR and/or their cooperating partners visit randomly selected communities and households to jointly validate the beneficiary list leveraging community-based protection mechanisms

Following the selection process, UNHCR and WFP need to ensure the presence of functioning, accessible and responsive CFMs that have been designed in consultation with the community (see section 2.7), and facilitate extraordinary inclusion as per an agreed appeals mechanism.

Regular monitoring (see step 9) at process and outcome levels will be key to continuously validate targeting decisions and to facilitate re-targeting exercises as required.

Mechanisms for identification and verification of eligibility at distribution or redemption must be identified based on the context and in line with global commitments to greater data sharing and increased inter-operability of systems (see full Data Sharing Addendum to Global MoU in the below Resources).

RESOURCES:

- UNHCR: A Community-Based Approach in UNHCR Operations, 2008
- WFP: "Community-Based Targeting Guide", WFP Kenya Country Office (2016)
- Data Sharing Addendum to Global UNHCR/WFP Memorandum of Understanding, 2018

2.9 Step 9 – Monitoring targeting processes and outcomes

KEY POINTS

1. Regular monitoring of targeting outcomes for assisted and non-assisted populations is required to ensure the effectiveness of the method, and to provide a basis for necessary adjustments
2. Monitoring of targeting processes is crucial to ensure that decisions are operationalized as intended, and that implementation inclusion an exclusion errors are minimized
3. Regular targeting reviews, including contextual analysis, qualitative aspects and quantitative re-validation, are important to a robust targeting monitoring system

A strong monitoring system is required to monitor the efficiency of the actual targeting processes, the relevance of targeting methods and criteria, and the outcomes on the targeted and non-targeted populations.

2.9.1 Assessing the outcomes of assistance and prioritization

Monitoring the outcomes of assistance on targeted and non-assisted populations is essential. This should happen through regular outcome monitoring surveys: in medium to large size operations, at least twice per year, in smaller operations, at least annually. A representative sample should cover both assisted and non-assisted populations (or those who receive different values of assistance). Key indicators to be monitored include all relevant outcome indicators (food consumption, coping, expenditure), the eligibility criteria, and context-specific protection indicators.


It is also important to monitor the impacts of prioritization on the excluded groups in order to respond quickly to any worsening of the situation. The data collected will also assists in building an evidence base for the continued advocacy for necessary funds to ensure assistance is provided for everyone in need. It is crucial to have a responsive monitoring system that is able to run quick longitudinal monitoring exercises where the same households are followed over time, i.e.; before and after the prioritization or reduction of assistance (e.g. when half rations are introduced). These longitudinal studies provide concrete evidence regarding the impact of prioritization. One example is illustrated in the case study below:

CASE STUDY 11

Jordan and Lebanon (2015) – Pre-post studies to assess impacts of assistance cuts following the 2015 funding crisis

Following significant resource shortfall in refugee operations in Jordan and Lebanon, a rapid pre-post study to assess the food security impact of changes in assistance levels. In Jordan, the study was conducted with the same households before and after they were excluded from assistance. In Lebanon, the same households were interviewed during the cuts, and then again when assistance returned to previous levels. Unlike the regular Food Security Outcome Monitoring exercise, this method is not representative for the entire beneficiary population but presents an important indication of the impact caused by the changes in assistance levels due to temporary funding shortfalls.

In Jordan, about 299,000 persons from vulnerable households had their assistance cut. Findings revealed that those with a borderline and poor food consumption score increased by 43 percentage points, while 75% of households engaged in more frequent and severe coping strategies. Alarmingly, 34% families withdrew their children from school, and 29% sent children to work compared to five percent before the cuts. Around 13% of families were forced to send at least one household member to beg to meet their basic food needs compared to 4% prior. In addition, more than 80 percent of families, compared to 55% before, had to borrow money to pay for their basic food needs, a worrying trend as this increased their level of indebtedness.



The report proved to be a useful tool for advocacy. Assistance to these vulnerable groups resumed, but it took several months before previous outcome levels were achieved again.

2.9.2 Monitoring inclusion and exclusion of targeted assistance

Conducting a random re-screening of a sample of assisted and non-assisted refugees is a good way to monitor implementation and ensure that those who are eligible are actually receiving assistance, and if those eligible are those most in need. The re-screening process should be undertaken directly by UNHCR/WFP or an independent partner to avoid bias. If re-screening reveals a mismatch, i.e. the original screening marked a household as included but the re-screening marked the same household as excluded, further investigation is required. The mismatch may be due to an error committed by an individual or by a more systemic issue, such as a broad misinterpretation of the targeting criteria. Troubleshooting the issue and communicating necessary changes to the process is imperative to minimize targeting errors.

Normally screening can be done on a sub-sample of the population. However, in some cases, a verification exercise covering the entire population might be required (for example, in situations with high mobility or if there is general distrust in the reliability of existing data).

See section 2.6 on validation of targeting criteria, and specifically Box 6 on calculating inclusion and exclusion errors, for more details.

As a more dynamic approach, many countries are using multiple "no-shows" (e.g. at least three-times that assistance has not redeemed/collected) to deactivate households from being eligible for assistance. Where possible, reasons for no-shows should be further investigated.

2.9.3 Monitoring of targeting processes

Targeting processes should be monitored during regular post-distribution monitoring (PDM) activities and spot-checks. Aggregated information from complaint and feedback mechanisms (CFM) is also an important data source. The following key questions should be answered as part of monitoring:

- Has the targeting method been implemented according to jointly agreed procedures?
- Do beneficiaries receiving assistance meet the agreed eligibility criteria?
- Are there groups that meet the eligibility criteria but are excluded from assistance?
- Are there any groups that are left behind that require special attention? What are their characteristics?
- Are there any protection risks associated with targeting processes and how could these risks be mitigated?
- Were targeting decisions timely and appropriately communicated prior to the implementation?
- Are beneficiaries aware of entitlements and the eligibility criteria?
- What are the key complaints raised in the CFM and are these due to the targeting approach or eligibility criteria?
- Do persons of concern know about the CFM? How many individuals/households appealed their eligibility decision? Does this proportion seem appropriate?

2.9.4 Conducting regular contextual analysis and targeting reviews

In addition to routine monitoring, regular targeting reviews should be conducted to re-visit the methods and criteria, ideally using up-to-date needs assessment data. The reviews should be conducted at least annually in highly dynamic contexts (e.g. with large number of new arrivals, or where refugee situations transition from the original emergency response to a more protracted situation; or where the vulnerability context changes). In more stable contexts, targeting reviews should still be conducted every two to three years and could also be integrated

into ongoing JAMs.[8] The overall question to answer is whether the context has changed in a way that warrants a re-targeting exercise. In order to arrive at the answer to that question, the following sub-set of questions can in addition to up to date assessment data be helpful to answer:

- Are eligibility criteria for targeted assistance based on up to date evidence?
- Was the targeting method validated before its implementation?
- Is the targeting method the most relevant for the current context and practically feasible to implement?
- Is registration data available and up to date?
- Were relevant stakeholders consulted during the design stage?
- How does the targeting method align with national social safety net systems?
- Was the community of the affected population consulted during the selection of the method, beyond its most influential segments?
- Were protection risks considered when deciding on the targeting approach/criteria?
- Is a communication strategy in place and were decisions to target/prioritize communicated in an appropriate and timely manner?
- Are eligibility criteria clearly understood by affected populations?
- Is administrative capacity of agencies and partners sufficient to implement targeting method?
- Are effective CFM mechanisms in place and do they capture suggestions/complaints that relate to targeting?
- Are effective appeal mechanisms in place? Are affected populations aware of and able to appeal effectively?
- Is there an appropriate mechanism in place to monitor the targeting processes and the outcomes of targeted assistance (including monitoring households that have been excluded and receiving less assistance than required)?
- Is there a prioritization strategy in place in case of resource shortfalls or pipeline breaks?
- Is the sharing and use of personal data in the process of identifying and distributing assistance following the Data Sharing Addendum and Data Protection Policies and Guidance?
- Do appropriate multi-stakeholder coordination mechanisms to guide targeting processes exist and are they functional?
- Is the targeted assistance harmonized with other programmatic responses (livelihoods, education, etc) by UNHCR, WFP, and other partners to ensure synergies and complementarities?
- Is the targeting system linked or aligned to national social protection schemes (in terms of similar criteria, utilization of the same distribution mechanism). If not, would there be scope to do so?

Relevant data sources useful to answer these questions include PDM, outcome monitoring, onsite monitoring, aggregated data from CFM, in addition to primary data collection, in particular KIIs and FGDs with the affected populations.

Targeting reviews should also include the re-validation by assessing **targeting design and targeting implementation errors** (described in section 2.6). The main source for the periodic re-validation of targeting methods and criteria are recent needs assessments or households surveys, sometimes also PDM or outcome monitoring surveys where they cover both assisted and non-assisted populations.

---

[8] UNHCR and WFP conduct JAMs every two years in an operation to guide the country Joint Plan of Action. A JAM is a good opportunity to get feedback on the targeting/prioritization process, methods, outcomes and perceptions of targeted assistance or understand the potential for targeting assistance. A review of the coordination mechanisms, referral mechanisms, appeal processes and feedback to the community should be included in the JAM.

ANNEX 1:

JOINT PRINCIPLES FOR TARGETING ASSISTANCE TO MEET FOOD AND OTHER BASIC NEEDS TO PERSONS OF CONCERN

I. PURPOSE

UNHCR and WFP (hereafter "the Agencies") agree that individuals caught in different crisis situations have distinct needs and capacities. Humanitarian assistance delivered for their benefit can thus be differentiated on the basis of these needs while ensuring that their protection is not put at risk. Undertaken properly, targeting of assistance ensures that individuals receive the most appropriate support to address their needs and reinforce their capacities[1]. It thereby also contributes significantly towards a more effective use of resources.

Under UNHCR's overall protection and solutions strategy for persons of concern, WFP and UNHCR provide assistance to ensure that food and other basic needs[2] are met. Recognizing the complementarity between this assistance and the increased use of cash as a modality, UNHCR and WFP commit to collaborate on targeting in-kind and/or cash assistance to those most in need based on rigorous analysis to ensure a protection-focused, collaborative and evidence-based approach in support of the humanitarian principles.

This document sets out joint principles that UNHCR and WFP have agreed for targeting assistance to meet food and other basic needs[3] of refugees, asylum - seekers, returnees and stateless persons, (hereafter referred to as "persons of concern"). These principles are also relevant for targeting livelihoods assistance to support self-reliance in food security and nutrition objectives[4]. It also outlines how UNHCR, WFP, governments, partners and other stakeholders will collaborate throughout the targeting process.

Funding and resource constraints faced by many operations today may compel prioritization of assistance. Prioritization is driven by inadequate resources to meet the needs whereas targeting of assistance aims to meet the established needs. Depending on the context, the two processes could intersect and even follow similar procedures. In either case, all efforts will be made to ensure that

[1] *Capacities* refers to the human, natural, physical, economic and social capital of persons of concern that influences their livelihoods opportunities.

[2] Food assistance is a set of interventions designed to enable food-insecure populations to access sufficient, safe and nutritious food to meet their dietary needs and food preferences for an active and healthy life. Other Basic Needs assistance includes utensils, cooking pots, fuel, and soap and complements a range of services and activities designed to ensure access to life-saving and essential health care; water, sanitation and hygiene; education, livelihoods and access to shelter. Food and other basic assistance can be provided in-kind or as cash in support of sector-specific interventions and services depending on the context.

[3] The principles have been elaborated bearing in mind the scope of collaboration between the two organizations set out in their Global Memorandum of Understanding of 2011.

[4] As per the UNHCR/WFP Joint Strategy for Enhancing Self-Reliance in Food Security and Nutrition in Protracted Refugee Settings (September 2016)

ANNEX 2:

FEEDBACK AND RESPONSE MECHANISMS

This annex highlights key considerations in the design and implementation of feedback and response mechanisms, which are vital to ensure AAP:

- A feedback mechanism places people of concern at the centre of programming and provides them with the ability to share perceptions and information on the situation. Analysis of data and information from feedback mechanisms provides useful information on whether protection and assistance needs and agreed commitments are met.
- Feedback should be used for monitoring, and as such, can better inform programming, increase effectiveness and aid in making adjustments.
- Feedback also ensures that incidents of corruption, misconduct and SGBV, and incidents of sexual exploitation and abuse are reported and addressed.
- UNHCR and WFP are alerted to any serious protection issues that need to be addressed.
- Organizational learning and institutional memory can be enhanced through reporting on community feedback.

Irrespective of the forms, procedures and channels for handling feedback and complaints, the mechanisms should be transparent, independent, accountable, accessible, safe and easy to use. It is important to note the distinction between negative comments or suggestions for improvement and complaints. An important part of staff accountability is the confidential treatment of personal and sensitive information in the follow-up, investigation, and response to complaints received.

Considerations for the design of feedback and response mechanisms:

- Establish and maintain effective feedback (including comments, suggestions, and complaints) systems with multiple communication channels accessible to all, which can cater to sensitive and non-sensitive feedback;
- Allocate human and financial resources to ensure that feedback is systematically collected, acknowledged, assessed, referred, and responded to in a timely, confidential, and effective manner;
- Collaborate with partners in feedback referral and response processes, where appropriate;
- Analyze the different methods of communication that identified populations use for communication;
- Consider common or collective mechanisms, to avoid parallel systems;
- Involve PoC in the design of the CFM: affected people (across age, gender, and other diversity characteristics) should be consulted on the design of the CFM and their feedback should be reflected in the implementation of the mechanism. It is important that the mechanism is based on community preferences and cultural norms to ensure that it is safe to access and use;
- Define the purpose of the CFM: prior to the design of a CFM, identify the objectives of the mechanism, clarify what type of complaints the mechanism can and should handle, and determine who the mechanism is for e.g. beneficiaries and non-beneficiaries. Be aware that this may need to be adapted upon feedback from the community.

- Ensure sustainability of the mechanism: CFMs have costs attached to them. Prior to the implementation of a CFM, estimate the running costs, such as staff, training, communication material, phones, and computers, and ensure a budget is dedicated to the CFM. This is crucial to ensure that the CFM is sustainable and avoids raising expectations.
- Ensure that people understand and agree to how their complaint and/or feedback will be processed and the results feedback to them: People making a complaint should be informed of: a) who will review their complaint, b) when feedback will be provided, c) who they can contact if they have a concern with regards to their complaint, and d) if it is not possible to follow up on the complaint within the specified timeframe, what procedures will be put in place. People making a complaint should be asked if these points are well understood and acceptable to them.

A CFM is only effective and reliable if it can 'close the loop' by responding to the complaint received:

- Ensure that the CFM is accessible: the CFM has to be accessible for all or the majority of the people it aims to serve. It therefore needs to be designed in a way that takes the context in which it will be implemented into consideration. Understanding possible obstacles that affected people might have in accessing different types of CFMs, including economic, social, cultural and physical, can help prevent or mitigate these obstacles.
- Raise awareness of the CFM: affected people need to be informed about the CFM including how to use it, when they can use it, what they can use it for, and what kind of response they can expect. This can be done, for example, through community meetings, consultations with affected people, loudspeakers, radio and through publication material such as posters and leaflets that are issued in a language that is understood by affected people.
- Ensure confidentiality and professionalism: All complaints and feedback received need to be treated with confidentiality to safeguard personal data and respect people's right to privacy.
- UNHCR and WFP should jointly decide on the data collection tools for feedback (formal and informal), feedback analysis and reporting formats (based on users of data). Ensure feedback data is disaggregated by age and gender, and the timelines for collection and response and reporting on feedback are established.
- Feedback, particularly appeals, need to contain a set of specific information – case number (all case numbers if there is more than one case in a household), contact details for home visit or telephone call and date of appeal.
- Establish the SOPs, timeframe and scope of the feedback mechanism, with an emphasis on guidance for sensitive complaints. Communicate to PoC and partners what the system can and cannot do in order to manage expectations.
- Establish referral systems for protection related complaints.
- Clearly establish the internal process flow for feedback within WFP and UNHCR, including response timelines, and roles and responsibilities regarding referrals. Ensure a referral process exists for feedback in order to close the feedback loop.

ANNEX 3:

EXAMPLE OF SURVEY CONSENT FORM

EXAMPLE OF CONSENT FORM FOR FOOD SECURITY OUTCOME MONITORING IN LEBANON

We are working for a humanitarian organization and we would like to ask you some questions to understand the access of your family to basic needs. You are selected for this interview because the humanitarian organization wants to study the effect of its assistance on living conditions of Syrian communities. Your participation in the study and your answers will not influence the inclusion or exclusion of your family from assistance. The interview usually takes about 30 minutes to complete. Any information that you provide will be kept strictly confidential. This is voluntary and you can choose not to answer any, or all, of the questions. However, we hope that you will participate since the information you will provide is important to evaluate the methodology and effectiveness of our assistance. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask; if not, may I begin?

ANNEX 4:

EXAMPLE TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR JOINT UNHCR/WFP COORDINATION MECHANISM IN KENYA

Technical Steering Committee (TSC) for the WFP / UNHCR

Refugee Household Vulnerability Study – for potential targeting

Terms of Reference

Objective

To manage and technically review the 2015 refugee household vulnerability study, ensure that it remains relevant with focus on operations, as well as meet information gaps. The TSC will ensure that the study process is done in a consultative manner with all members in agreement about the process at all stages of the study.

Membership

Mostly technical experts from USAID, ECHO, DfID, Swiss DC, CARE, World Vision, NRC, Refugee Consortium of Kenya, UNHCR, WFP, FAO

Main tasks

- Prepare and finalise a comprehensive Concept note of the study to be undertaken for WFP and UNHCR Management;
- Assist in identifying consultants/research institutes with relevant high level expertise;
- Support the first phase of the process in terms of providing and collecting relevant secondary data, reviewing documents, etc. (posted on an online dropbox folder);
- Review the proposed methodology presented by the short listed consultants or research institutes, including their work plan for primary data collection, and ensure that points raised by TSC members are duly included in the final methodology;
- Provide Recommendation to WFP and UNHCR Management for contract of suitable institutes/consultants;
- Prepare a work plan, including all phases of the studies (inception, briefing, survey design, field work, data treatment/cleaning/analysis, stakeholders consultations, report writing and final debriefing);
- Review the selected consultants' team or research institute's inception package[9];
- Identify selected members being present or active during critical steps (field work, stakeholders' discussions, etc.);
- Review and comment on the report, results, analysis and recommendations produced by the assessment team;
- Ensure quality assurance throughout the whole process;

[9] This package focuses on methodological and planning aspects that will be considered in the study, based on the concept note finalized by the TSC. It will present a detailed analysis plan, timeline, preliminary analysis of the context, the study's methodology, data collection tools, etc.

- Facilitate all stakeholders' discussions and organise a final debriefing workshop and dissemination of findings of the study;
- It is envisaged that the engagement of the TSC will be needed throughout 2015.

Specific roles of Secretariat (UNHCR and WFP)

- Overall coordination
- Write NFR, call meetings
- Logistical arrangements for primary data collection
- Liaison with Government and partners
- Fund holders entrusted with the management of the tender.

ANNEX 5:

DATA SETS FOR REGISTRATION – MINIMUM SETS OF DATA TO BE COLLECTED AT DIFFERENT PHASES OF REGISTRATION

Registration is the individual recording, verifying and updating of information on persons of concern to UNHCR with the aim of protecting and documenting them and of implementing durable solutions. Initial registration refers to the collection of personal data at first contact with UNHCR's registration processes. Continuous registration refers to the updating and verifying of records that takes place as part of day-to-day case management activities over time. The data set collected at initial and continuous registration therefore vary depending on operational need and context. The following outlines the minimum data set to be collected at registration, depending on the operational context. .

Group Pre-registration (former Level 1)

Group pre-registration is the collection of core data on a group level. Group pre-registration is primarily used in very large and sudden emergency influxes, to organize movements of populations, to facilitate initial assistance distribution and scheduling for individual registration. Information collected at the group level is not accepted as formal registration given that information required to determine whether an individual may be inadmissible for registration is not adequately collected at this level. A group pre-registration interview with a family of five is estimated to take approximately 3 minutes.

The following information is collected for every group

- Group size
- Age cohorts/sex breakdown
- Name of group focal point
- Country of origin of group focal point
- Specific needs within group
- Unique group identifier
- Pre-registration date
- (optional) GPS coordinates

Individual Emergency Registration

Individual Emergency Registration is the collection of a core data set for each individual within a group. IER can be used during the initial onset of a large refugee influx, for the purposes of facilitating protection and programming in an emergency. IER data collection should generally not be conducted in non-emergency situations. An IER interview with a family of five is estimated to take approximately 15 minutes. Collection of biometrics (iris only) for a family of five takes an additional 4 minutes, while collection of both irises and fingerprints takes an additional 10 minutes.

Group Focal Point (also applies to all individuals)

- Date of arrival
- Registration date
- Group identifier number
- Legal status
- Current CoA address (if available)
- Phone number (if available)
- Consent/prohibition to share information

All Individuals

- Individual names (full name)
- Sex
- Date of birth
- Relationship to focal point
- Marital status
- Country of origin
- Specific needs
- Photo
- Biometric

Individual Basic Registration (former Level 2)

Individual basic registration is the collection of basic biographical data on each individual within a group. IBR can be used in situations where individual comprehensive registration cannot be completed due to lack of capacity or where case management is not being conducted in the operation. An IBR interview with a family of five is estimated to take approximately 25 minutes. Collection of biometrics (iris only) for a family of five takes an additional 4 minutes, while collection of both irises and fingerprints takes an additional 10 minutes.

Individual Core Data Registration

- Individual names (full name)
- Name of father and mother
- Sex
- Date of birth
- Country of birth
- Relationship to focal point
- Marital status
- Country of origin
- Citizenship(s)
- CoA address (current)
- Date of arrival
- Registration date
- Specific needs
- Legal status
- (Highest) Education level
- (Last) Occupation
- Religion
- Ethnicity
- Photograph
- Biometrics
- Consent/prohibition to collect, process, use and share information

Individual Comprehensive Registration (former Level 3)

Individual Comprehensive Registration is the collection of the complete set of biographical data on each individual within a group. ICR is the preferred data set to be collected in registration, and used in registration for case management, including processing RSD and resettlement activities. An ICR interview with a family of five is estimated to take approximately 50 minutes. Collection of biometrics (both irises and fingerprints) takes an additional 10 minutes.

All Individual Basic Registration Data + information below

- Additional names
- Place of birth
- Complete education information
- Complete occupation and skills information
- Complete languages information
- Reasons for fight (for RSD only)
- Reasons for unwillingness/inability to return
- Complete relatives information (spouse and children first, followed by other relevant relatives)
- Complete documents information (Government-issued, UNHCR-issued, others)
- Address details (CoA, CoO, others as relevant)
- Travel-related information (for RSD only)

Individual Enhanced Registration

Collection of data in addition to individual registration data elements for the purposes of facilitating specific protection case management and/or programming interventions, that <u>does not result</u> in a recognition of refugee status. Individual enhanced registration (IEhR) may include, additional questions relevant for processing RSD[1], durable solutions or protection intervention; or additional questions to determine eligibility for targeted assistance or programming. An IEhR interview with a family of five is estimated to take anywhere between 60 to 90 minutes depending on the amount of additional data to be collected.

[1] Distinguished from the "merged Registration-RSD" process, that aims to capture, in addition to biographical data collected in individual registration, information relating to the eligibility of the applicant for international protection, with the aim of recognizing an individual's refugee status on the basis of one interview only.

ANNEX 6:

EXAMPLE OF JOINT STANDARD OPERATING PROCEDURES: NEW FOOD ASSISTANCE COLLECTION PROCEDURES FOR REFUGEES IN UGANDA

Signature Page

The New Food Assistance Collection Procedures for refugees in Uganda were jointly agreed between OPM, UNHCR and WFP. This document builds on the lessons learned from the roll-out of these procedures since March 2018. As the roll-out is ongoing and all Parties involved are learning in the process, a need for modifications will likely arise in the future. Any amendments to the current version will have to be discussed between all Parties and addressed in the Amendments Tracking Sheet on page XX of this document.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned, being duly appointed representatives of OPM, UNHCR and WFP, have on behalf of the Parties signed the New Food Assistance Collection Procedures for refugees in Uganda.

Signed for and on behalf of
Office of the Prime Minister

Name:

Title:

Signature & Stamp:

Date:

Signed for and on behalf of WFP
Representation in Uganda

Name:

Title:

Signature & Stamp:

Date:

Signed for and on behalf of UNHCR
Representation in Uganda

Name:

Title:

Signature & Stamp:

Date:

1. Purpose and scope

The purpose of the new food assistance collection procedures is to improve accountability and service delivery to refugees by standardising good practices in general food assistance across all settlements.

The procedures establish a minimum standard for:

- controls to ensure assistance is provided to only those who are eligible to receive it,
- dignified and equitable food assistance distributions,
- protection of persons with specific needs and extremely vulnerable households, and
- accountability to refugees and to donors.

The principles of the new procedures are binding on all WFP, UNHCR, OPM, and partner staff involved in general food assistance (cash and food) in the refugee settlements.

The procedures do not cover processes and procedures that are internal to WFP, UNHCR, or OPM, nor to procedures established bilaterally between WFP and distribution partners or financial services providers. Internal or bilateral procedures are covered in their own agency-specific SOPs.

Nothing in the new procedures will be interpreted to contravene WFP's rules, regulations, or corporate guidelines. The procedures respect the agreements that WFP has in place with its cooperating partners, financial services providers, and the commitments that WFP makes to its donors.

2. Principles

In principle, general food assistance is provided to fill the 'food gap' between what refugee households need to live healthy lives, and what they are able to provide for themselves without adopting negative coping strategies. General food assistance is a temporary safety net, provided to refugees until they are able to rebuild their lives and find meaningful livelihoods to support themselves and their families. General food assistance should not substitute for provision of non-food items, social services, or support to refugees for establishing sustainable livelihoods.

In Uganda, all registered refugees and asylum-seekers living in difficult settlements established by the government of Uganda are entitled to receive general food assistance. Refugees residing outside of settlements should be made fully aware that they will not lose their status or any opportunities for consideration for durable solutions if they chose not to return to the settlement to collect general food assistance.

Refugees who have specific needs should not in any way be disadvantaged by the new procedures, indeed the opposite. These procedures are designed to protect all refugees, and include special measures for: people living with disabilities (mental or physical), elderly persons, child-headed households, pregnant women and nursing mothers who are single parents, unaccompanied minors among others.

Protection of the personal data of refugees is a key principle guiding these procedures, as is the importance of quality and timely data about refugees and the assistance they receive. Only refugees and asylum-seekers enrolled and verified in UNHCR's *proGres* and BIMS database are eligible to receive general food assistance, and the information in the database will be kept secure, accurate and up-to-date through continuous registration and enrolment services offered by OPM and UNHCR in each settlement.

3. Roles and responsibilities in relation to general food assistance

OPM is responsible for:

- Registering all refugees and asylum-seekers in Uganda, based on the Refugee Act 2006 and Registration of Persons Act 2015
- Keeping up-to-date and accurate data on refugees in *proGres*, with the assistance of UNHCR
- Issuance, management and accounting for ration cards, with the assistance of UNHCR
- Ensuring refugee welfare committees are in place and functioning well in all settlements,
- Ensuring appropriate locations for food assistance centres are officially allocated to WFP and that assets constructed at the centres are protected from vandalism and theft, and
- Facilitating law and order and the safety and security of refugees and humanitarian workers during general food assistance distribution.

UNHCR is responsible for:

- Identifying vulnerable households in conjunction with other protection partners, and identifying alternates to collect food on their behalf, with the assistance of OPM;
- Providing and maintaining the system necessary to access *proGres* data for assistance management through the manifest and digital tools at the food assistance centres,
- Resolving any complaints related to inaccurate refugee data during distributions and provide litigation services during distribution to beneficiaries, with the assistance of OPM.
- Inactivating the ration cards of households that have not collected food assistance for three cycles in a row and reactivating them should the households return to request assistance.

WFP is responsible for:

- Generating the food and cash manifests using the Global Distribution Tool
- Delivering food assistance on time to all settlements,
- Using data from *proGres* and BIMS to verify the identities of all persons coming to collect food assistance on terms laid out by the data sharing MoU between WFP and UNHCR,
- Determining the transfer modality (cash, food, or a combination of these) following consultations and assessments, and the ration composition and/or transfer value,
- Setting the date of each cycle,
- Establishing and maintaining the food assistance centres,
- Ensuring robust communication and feedback mechanisms for information and complaints are in place,
- Issuing daily system-generated reports on who has and has not collected food assistance,
- Accounting for the commodities or cash provided to refugees, and
- Monitoring and reporting on the processes, outputs, and outcomes of general food assistance.

Where WFP outsources some or all of these responsibilities to one or more cooperating partners, WFP will remain accountable for ensuring these SOPs are strictly adhered.

4. Coordination

All policy-level matters related to food assistance are coordinated in Kampala between WFP, OPM, and UNHCR, with information sharing through the regular interagency coordination mechanisms and technical working groups. All implementation-level matters are coordinated at the field level between WFP, OPM, and UNHCR with information sharing through interagency coordination mechanisms and technical working groups. Implementation issues requiring a policy decision are escalated by WFP's head of area/field office to WFP's head of programme in Kampala, who is responsible for getting a timely decision made at the appropriate level and communicating that decision back to the field.

Any changes to the Food Distribution Points (FDP) and the way refugees are assigned to specific FDPs has to be communicated to UNHCR in Kampala and area level two weeks prior to a distribution in order for such changes to be implemented in a timely manner.

5. Eligibility

5.1 Persons eligible to receive general food assistance

All refugee and asylum-seeker households registered in a settlement and enrolled in *proGres* are entitled to receive general food assistance, if they are on the manifest and they send an authorised food assistance collector to distribution on the designated day. A household's eligibility for general food assistance and authorised food assistance collectors are determined by UNHCR and OPM during registration. Food assistance will only be provided to members of the household enrolled in *proGres*, whose fingerprints and iris scan match the biometric information in the system. Individuals who cannot be biometrically enrolled due to a physical handicap will be verified by UNHCR litigation staff.

Five days before the beginning of distribution, WFP will download the manifest from *proGres* using the Global Distribution Tool (GDT).

The manifest will contain:

(i) *proGres* household number

(ii) RIMS household number

(iii) Household size

(iv) Ration card number

WFP will review the manifest, propose necessary changes to OPM and UNHCR and, when satisfied with the changes, generate the final version.

Once WFP has approved the manifest, no further changes will be made, and any households who are not on the manifest will not receive general food assistance that cycle, except in exceptional cases identified through UNHCR's litigation services together with OPM in the respective settlement.

In settlements where beneficiaries have the option to choose cash assistance, WFP will download the manifest ten days before the beginning of distribution. This will allow WFP to release the payment to its designated financial service provider (FSP).

For synchronization purposes, WFP will share with UNHCR the beneficiaries' personal data collected by the FSP. This will help align the OPM/UNHCR and FSP registration data sets, as well as minimize human error in the manifest.

The information shared with UNHCR will include:

(i) First, middle and last name of the primary account holder

(ii) RIMS Household number of the primary account holder

(iii) First, middle, last name and individual ID number (if available) of the alternative cash collector

(iv) Bank account number

(v) Transfer value

UNHCR will duly update the *proGres* database, insert the transfer value and link the existing account numbers to the household ID numbers. After successful synchronization of the data sets, WFP will download the manifest through the GDT and share the accounts to be credited with the FSP.

The final manifest will contain the following data:

(i) RIMS household number of the primary account holder

(ii) *ProGres* household number of the primary account holder

(iii) Household size

(iv) Ration card number

(v) Bank account number

(vi) Transfer value

New arrivals will continue to receive an in-kind "settling in ration" upon arrival at the settlement, which they will use to bridge the gap until the next cycle when their household will be included on the cash manifest.

5.2 Extremely vulnerable households (EVH)

According to a set of criteria agreed with WFP, UNHCR designates certain households as extremely vulnerable during enrolment (refer to Annex I). An EVH is a sub-set (agreed between WFP and UNHCR) of UNHCR's category of persons with specific needs (PSN). EVH designation is time-bound. For example, an unaccompanied minor is considered extremely vulnerable until s/he turns 18. A single mother who is pregnant is considered extremely vulnerable until six months after birth, allowing time for her to finish an appropriate period of exclusive breastfeeding. A household that is caring for a severely disabled child can be permanently designated as extremely vulnerable.

During enrolment, EVH's have the option to nominate an alternate food assistance collector, a trusted person who can come to collect food assistance on their behalf.

5.3 Authorised food assistance collectors

No one is allowed to collect food unless they are enrolled in *proGres* as an authorised food assistance collector.

Authorised food assistance collectors can include:

- Any member of the registered and eligible household, age 18 or over.
- Any member of child headed and single parents households, age 14 or over.
- An alternate food assistance collector (who must be an adult) officially nominated by an EVH.
- A designated staff member of a protection partner nominated by UNHCR as an alternate for unaccompanied minors or EVH.
- A one-time alternate food assistance collector granted permission by UNHCR to collect food on behalf of a household for a single cycle when the only adult member of the household has, for example, suddenly fallen ill, been hospitalized, or been incarcerated. In order to be authorised to collect food on behalf of the household, one-time AFCs will need to provide proof of the illness of the household representative in the form of a letter from a medical doctor (or in the case of incarceration, a police officer) and consent of the household to designate an alternate.

Authorized cash assistance collectors can include:

- Alternate Cash Collector (ACC) include the main account holder of the household and one registered alternate within the same household, both of whom are above 18 years of age.
- Only EVHs are authorized to have an alternate outside of the household. In order to register an ACC the individuals are required to personally attend distribution together with their alternate (also biometrically registered in *proGres*). Registration of the ACC must take place both at the UNHCR litigation desk (*proGres*) as well as in the PostBank system. UNHCR is required to issue a written certification (see annex II.) of the EVI's eligibility to have an alternate cash collector outside the household. This is a mandatory requirement from PostBank.
- For unaccompanied minors in child headed households, the head of household is eligible to open an account with PostBank, however will not be eligible to collect cash assistance until he/she turns 18. The account holder will have to designate an ACC, or a designated staff member of a protection partner nominated by UNHCR as an alternate for unaccompanied minors.
- There will be no possibility to nominate a one-time ACC in case unforeseen events restrict the primary collector to attend the distribution. Only pre-registered ACCs may collect their assistance.

Only a refugee can be nominated as an alternate food or cash assistance collector for an EVH, and any individual refugee can act as an alternate for only one EVH.[10] Alternates are officially nominated by the EVH head of household during registration and the litigation desk at distribution.

Protection partners officially nominated by UNHCR and with biodata captured in *proGres* can collect food for more than one unaccompanied minor or person with specific needs.[11] UNHCR will take responsibility for monitoring that the food assistance collected by the protection partner is provided to the refugees on whose behalf they have collected it.

---

[10] Note that the functionality for ensuring an alternate acts only one EVH does not currently exist in *proGres*. A temporary work-around will be put in place until this functionality becomes available.

[11] Note that functionality for capturing biodata of protection partners does not currently exist in *proGres*. A temporary work-around is recording such assistance events within the GDT litigation module.

5.4 Deactivation of no-shows

Households that do not send an authorized food assistance collector to collect their monthly entitlement for three (3) cycles in a row will have their ration cards automatically deactivated by UNHCR in *proGres* and will not appear on subsequent manifests until they present themselves in person to UNHCR for reactivation. Any appeals during food assistance distributions will be handled by UNHCR's litigation staff.

On a regular basis, UNHCR will share the telephone numbers (if available) of beneficiaries who missed one or more distribution cycles. WFP will use this information to reach out, inform, and counsel beneficiaries on their rights under the new food assistance collection procedures.

6. Transfer

6.1 Transfer modality

WFP will determine the general food assistance transfer modality (cash, food, or a combination of cash and food) based on evidence about which modality is most appropriate, feedback from refugees about their preferences, and available resources, in-line with WFP's global cash transfer guidelines and cognizant of UNHCR's protection guidelines. WFP will consult with UNHCR and OPM about transfer modalities through the regular interagency coordination meetings and technical working groups in Kampala and the field. Transfer modality is considered a policy decision so following consultation the final decision will be made by and communicated by WFP.

6.2 Ration composition and cash transfer value

The entitlement for all households eligible to receive general food assistance will be equivalent (in cash or in-kind) to a balanced food basket that provides 2,100 kcal per person per day. Whenever possible, WFP will aim to provide commodities that meet the dietary preferences of refugees. Cash transfer values will be pegged to the cost of a balanced diet of food available in the local markets.

6.3 Resource shortfalls and pipeline breaks

When WFP does not have sufficient resources to provide all eligible households with their full monthly entitlement of general food assistance, available resources will be prioritized to extremely vulnerable households (EVH) and the ration sizes of other household will be reduced.

WFP will communicate about the implications of any resource shortfalls and pipeline breaks as soon as possible with UNHCR, OPM, and cooperating partners through the regular coordination channels, and will aim to communicate with refugees no later than 2 weeks before the reductions take place.

7. Food assistance distribution process

Upon entering the food assistance centre, beneficiaries wait in an enclosed waiting area. When it is their turn, food assistance collectors are invited into the verification area and present their ration card to one of the WFP verifiers. The verifier scans the barcode into the GDT to check if the ration card is on the manifest and is eligible for collection. The food assistance collector's iris or fingerprint is then scanned and compared with the record stored in the system. The system returns an automated decision – yes or no – on eligibility. All eligible food assistance collectors then walk into the distribution area to collect their food or cash.

People who do not pass the first level verification are directed to the UNHCR litigation desk. A litigation staff interviews the claimant based on more detailed information available in *proGres* and makes a second-level decision on eligibility. If the person is deemed eligible by the litigation staff, s/he can move on to collect food or cash. If deemed ineligible, the person is ushered out of the verification area through a separate exit leading directly out of the centre.

Following verification, food assistance collectors who are receiving a cash transfer proceed through the cash withdrawal process established by its designated FSP. Food assistance collectors who are receiving in-kind food proceed into the food distribution corridors to receive an individual household ration. After receiving their cash or food, when exiting the centre, the barcode on the ration card is scanned in GDT to confirm that the household has collected their assistance. If after scanning the ration card, the status reads "Admit", it means the food collector was probably not verified and should be referred to litigation.

Trained ushers are stationed at various points in all centres to direct and help people, and specifically to help any food assistance collectors with specific needs (elderly, disabled, parents with small children).

7.1 Distribution modalities

7.1.1 Food transfers

For in-kind food distribution, each household is required to bring bags and/or containers to collect their food ration. In the distribution corridor, scoopers will measure the correct ration for the household of each commodity. WFP's cooperating partner will use calibrated weigh scales at the exit to the corridor to double-check that each food assistance collector has received the correct amount, and adjusts for over or under scooping as needed. When exiting the centre, the barcode on the ration card is scanned to confirm that the household has collected their assistance. (Ref WFP's food distribution SOP.)

7.1.2 Cash transfers

For cash distribution, eligible food assistance collectors who are also account holders or designated alternates on the account, proceed through the cash withdrawal process agreed between WFP and its designated FSP (Ref WFP's cash transfer SOP.) When they first register for the cash program, beneficiaries will be required to carry their ration card and proof of verification and/or registration.

7.2 Reporting and reconciliation

Dashboards generated using system data from *proGres* summarizing the number of people who have received general food assistance in each centre will be made available through the Uganda Refugee Response Portal (uganda.refugees.org).

Detailed system-generated reports from GDT will be generated by WFP staff and made available to relevant personnel and WFP's cooperating partners for the purposes of reconciling food assistance releases and returns.

The design, content, and frequency of these reports will be agreed between WFP and UNHCR.

8. Food sales

Purchase and/or sale of WFP-provided food inside or in the vicinity of the food assistance centre is strictly forbidden. On the other hand, food retailers are welcome and encouraged to sell quality, locally produced food to refugees near centres where WFP is distributing cash.

9. Complaints and feedback mechanisms

In the third week of every month, WFP will call a food assistance committee meeting in each settlement to seek feedback from the current cycle, and to walk through the preparations for the upcoming cycle.

The food assistance committee quorum will require: an appropriate staff member from WFP, UNHCR, OPM and WFP's cooperating partner(s), along with 3-5 elected members of the refugee welfare committee of whom at least 50% will be women. (Ref WFP Food Assistance Committee Terms of Reference.)

Each food assistance centre will have an information and complaints desk in the waiting area staffed at all times during the distribution day by WFP's cooperating partner and a member of the refugee welfare committee. WFP will provide key messages to equip partners and refugee welfare committee members with the information they need to answer questions accurately.

Posters advertising WFP's Helpline and a depiction of the ration/transfer for the month will be prominently displayed throughout the centre, as will evacuation procedures for staff and beneficiaries in the event of an emergency.

10. Minimum infrastructure at food assistance centres

Food assistance centres will be located in optimal locations in each settlement, with a maximum catchment radius of 10 km (no refugee should have to travel more than 10km to collect food assistance). The centre will be enclosed by a perimeter fence, and will have infrastructure that supports the new food assistance collection procedure, including:

- a sheltered waiting area for food assistance collectors with seating, and a help desk
- an enclosed area for verification and litigation with work stations for staff, and chairs for food assistance collectors
- an enclosed area for distribution
- a generator
- a storage unit for locking up equipment
- latrines and handwashing stations for staff
- Internet connectivity to be established at FDP sites to facilitate litigation

WFP will establish a separate SOP for safety and security of staff and beneficiaries at the centres.

ANNEX I

1. If a household contains one or more of the following categories of Persons with Specific Needs (PSN) at the time of registration, they shall be categorized by UNHCR as an Extremely Vulnerable Household (EVH) for WFP's food distribution. This means should there be ration cuts, such households will, in so far as possible, be protected from the ration cut.

   - **SC-UC** Unaccompanied child:
   - **CR-CC** Child carer
   - **CR-CP** Child Parent
   - **SC-FC** Child in foster care
   - **SC-SC** Separated child
   - **ER-NF** Single older person:
   - **ER-MC** Older person with children:
   - **ER-FR** Older person unable to care for self
   - **WR-WR** Woman at risk
   - **WR-SF** Single woman at risk
   - **SP-PT** Single HR – parent
   - **SP-GP** Single HR- grandparent
   - **SP-CG** Single HR- caregiver
   - **DS** Disability
   - **SM MI** Serious medical condition-mental illness
   - **SM CI** Serious medical condition-chronic illness
   - **SM CC** Serious medical condition-critical medical condition
   - **SM OT** Serious medical condition-other medical condition
   - **LP-BN** Unmet basic needs
   - **LP-NA** No access to services
   - **LP-AN** Violence, abuse, or neglect
   - **LP-MS** Marginalized from society or community
   - **TR-PI** Psychological or physical impairment due to torture

   NOTE: In order to preserve confidentiality of the survivors of SGBV who may be affected by the trauma, such affected survivors shall also be categorized under WR-WR, or SM MI for WFP's purposes, to ensure they are protected from ration cuts while respecting the survivor's right to confidentiality

2. For the below categories of PSN they shall be designated as EVH on a temporal basis, subject to re-assessment which shall occur on the following timelines.

   - **Pregnant Women** – until 6 months after delivery date
   - **WR-LC – Woman at risk Lactation** – Covered until 6 months after the child's birth and then reassessed to see if they fall into another PSN category
   - **CR-TP – Child at Risk-Teen pregnancy** – until 6 months after due date and then reassessed to see if fall into another PSN category

- **SM-DP – Difficult Pregnancy** – until 6 months after due date and then reassessed to see if fall into another PSN category
- **SC-CH – Child Headed Household** – Household to be re-verified when head of household turns 18 to see if they fall into another PSN category
- **SM-MN – Severe Malnutrition** – To be removed once treatment stops

3. When UNHCR conducts re-verification of PSNs, they shall confirm to WFP that the household still contains one or more of the above categories of PSN denoted in 1 or 2 above to confirm the household still qualifies for WFP's EVH status.

4. UNHCR shall provide to WFP on a periodic basis (to be agreed upon), the updated list of EVH (based on the criteria above), including the household number, name and size of the household, and the PSN code that shows eligibility. The list will reflect any new PSNs identified through registration and results of any PSN verification that is conducted in the settlement prior to producing the list. Protection of personal data will be a key principle guiding this procedure.

   NOTE: During the verification exercise that was launched on 1 March 2018 only the specific needs are collected in the Emergency Registration Database

   - **DS – Disability**
   - **ER – Older Person at Risk**
   - **FU – Family Unity**
   - **SC – Unaccompanied or separated child**
   - **SM – Serious medical condition**
   - **SP – Single Parent or Caregiver**
   - **WR – Women at Risk**
   - **CR-CC – Child Carer**
   - **CR-CP – Child parent**
   - **CR-CS – Child Spouse**
   - **ER-MC – Older person with children**
   - **FU -TR – Tracing required**
   - **SC-UC – Unaccompanied child**

   In *ProGres* the full list of specific need codes will be activated and can be subsequently updated during PSN verification exercises through on-going protection activities.

ANNEX II

Certification of eligibility for alternate assistance collector for PostBank

Name:

Individual number:

RIMS Household number:

This letter is to certify that the above listed individual is categorized as someone with recognized specific needs, and is thus eligible to designate an alternate food assistance collector (AFC) outside of his/her household.

The designated alternate cash assistance collector for this household is:

Name:

Individual number:

RIMS Household number:

Date:

Location (settlement):

Signed by:

Name: _____ Beneficiary: _____

UNHCR Uganda

Amendments Tracking Sheet

Date	Changes Agreed	Initials



UNHCR
The UN Refugee Agency

WFP
World Food Programme