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#### Purpose of this tool

This tool provides practical guidance on different participatory approaches and techniques to agree selection criteria with the community and to identify who should receive support, including do no harm considerations. Managing selection processes with care, respect, and transparency is critical to ensuring we meet the fundamental principles of humanity, impartiality, and independence by reaching those most in need of support.

This tool does not address issues of geographical targeting, but instead focuses on community level selection criteria and targeting.

This tool draws on a number of sources, including [Groupe URD’s Participation Handbook for Humanitarian Field Workers’](https://www.urd.org/en/publication/participation-handbook-for-humanitarian-field-workers/) and the [British Red Cross Cash in Emergencies toolkit](https://cash-hub.org/guidance-and-tools/cash-in-emergencies-toolkit).

#### Why are participatory and transparent approaches to selection criteria and targeting important?

**Risks of not engaging communities during selection criteria and targeting:**

* Lead to the perception in the community that the National Society is corrupt or biased and only helps certain groups, which damages our reputation and can lead to security incidents, affecting the safe access of staff and volunteers
* Damage social relations and create tension in the community because people do not understand why some people receive support, and others do not
* Put those who receive support at risk of violence, harm, or stigmatization
* Add to existing power imbalances, by increasing the power and legitimacy of leaders and decision-makers
* Damage the relationship and trust between the National Society and the community, which limits their willingness to engage in the programme or response.

**Benefits of engaging communities in agreeing selection criteria and targeting:**

* The community can help the National Society to identify and reach the most vulnerable and at-risk members of the community, and reduce the number of errors in who is included or excluded during targeting
* Helps to manage expectations in communities, as they understand the National Society has limited resources and so cannot help everyone
* Contributes to a smoother programme, as community involvement in the process improves understanding and acceptance
* Builds community ownership as they participate in making difficult decisions about who should be supported and who should not. Depending on the type of programme or response, this can also encourage communities to provide resources or solutions to cover gaps in what the National Society can provide
* Transparent selection processes help prevent potential corruption by community leaders or National Society staff and volunteers
* Participation and transparency help prevent rumours and misinformation

**Despite these benefits and risks, data shows aid agencies often fail to ensure communities understand and are engaged in selection processes:**

**Iraq and Kenya:**
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*From* [*Ground Truth Solutions, ‘Improving user journeys for humanitarian cash transfers’, December 2018*](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/5caf3033ed915d02829b8f23/User_Journeys_Summary-Report_2018.pdf)*.*

**Somalia:**
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*From Ground Truth Solutions ‘*[*Perceptions of survey of aid recipients in Somalia’, December 2020*](https://groundtruthsolutions.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/GTS_Somalia_Report_2021.pdf)

**Northeast Nigeria:**
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*From Ground Truth Solutions ‘*[*The key to fairness is inclusion’, Northeast Nigeria 2021*](https://groundtruthsolutions.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/GTS_Cash_barometer_Nigeria_qualitative_report_June_2021-1.pdf)

#### Step 1: Agreeing selection criteria with communities

**What are selection criteria?**

If a programme or response has limited resources or is trying to help a specific group of people (e.g., very vulnerable households), it may need to move from providing blanket support (everyone in the community receives the same) to targeting a limited number of households or individuals. To do this, the programme will need to agree a set of selection criteria with the community that can be used to identify which households or individuals are eligible for support.

In general selection criteria should:

* **Support the programme or response to achieve its aims** by targeting the right people for support i.e., people who have lost their livelihoods after a disaster
* **Be understood and accepted by the community**. In some cultures, only helping some members of the community may be socially unacceptable as those with resources are expected to share with those who do not. In this case, it is even more important to explain why selection criteria is needed and the agree the most acceptable way to do this with that community
* **Align with the available resources.** If there are very limited resources, then choosing a broad selection criteria will not help you narrow down who to support and will lead to frustration in the community as people will not understand why they have met the criteria but not received support
* **Be easily measured and checked.** It should be easy to identify and confirm if people meet the selection criteria, otherwise it can lead to lots of mistakes in targeting and fuel confusion and rumours in the community about why some people received support and others did not.

**Types of selection criteria**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **TYPE** | **WHAT** | **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS** |
| **Physical criteria** | * Based on physical characteristics e.g., level of malnutrition, pregnant women * Most used in health programmes and responses * Usually based on fixed health protocols | * Because these are fixed, there is less room for communities to change them so explaining why these criteria have been chosen and why they can’t be changed is very important * Allow some flexibility – for example, add additional groups to the criteria if people feel strongly that they meet the aims of the intervention and are equally vulnerable * Be aware of social norms, e.g., providing food rations to malnourished children may not work if food is commonly shared among the family, or male children are prioritized over females * Consider if selection criteria could cause stigma, e.g., targeting people with HIV |
| **Context-specific** | * Based on the current situation e.g., households that have lost 50% of their crops, or had their homes destroyed * Commonly used after a disaster * Can also be based on financial situation e.g., houses with debts more than X | * Important to discuss and define with the community as they may have different views of who is most vulnerable i.e., a wealthy household whose home has been destroyed may be seen as less vulnerable than an elderly woman whose home has only been damaged but has no means to repair it * Will require clear definitions and cut-off points, i.e., when is a home damaged versus destroyed? These can be difficult to explain clearly to communities and people can get frustrated and feel unjustly treated if they feel they meet the criteria but were not included for support, or just missed meeting the criteria by a small margin * Can require a lot of resources to check and verify who meets the criteria i.e., visiting each home to determine if it is destroyed or damaged |
| **Social criteria** | * Targeting specific social groups e.g., female-headed households, refugees, large households, or people with disabilities * Commonly used in any type of programme or response | * Must be discussed and agreed with the community, who may have different ideas about what is makes someone vulnerable. You may have to compromise with the criteria to gain community acceptance i.e., including additional groups to ensure the initial targeted group can be reached * Be aware of power dynamics and existing prejudice e.g., if a group is already marginalized, those in power may fight against them receiving support * Can cause problems for those who are targeted, either by stigmatizing them or leading to resentment against them * Will require clear definitions and cut-off points, i.e., when is a household a large household or what qualifies as a disability? These must be explained well to the community otherwise it can lead to frustration if people feel they met the criteria but were not included. * Be aware people may find it difficult to accept some cut off points, for example if the cut-off point is more than four children, families with four children are likely to feel disgruntled that their neighbour who has six children receives support and they do not * Can be difficult and require checks to verify who meets the criteria i.e., visiting each home to determine if they qualify as a large household, or are female-headed etc. |

**Steps to agree selection criteria with communities**

1. **Build understanding and acceptance that selection criteria is needed**

* Start by explaining why selection criteria is needed and be prepared that communities may not understand or agree with this approach, especially in cultures where people are expected to share resources or where everyone has been affected by a disaster or crisis. Explain:
  + The National Society does not have enough resources to help everyone in the community so needs to provide support where it is most needed and can have the biggest impact
  + What the aims of the response or programme are, and why this means specific groups need to be targeted
  + The community will be consulted and involved in agreeing what criteria should be used and who meets it
  + If there is support that will be provided to everyone, for example through a borehole, or hygiene promotion activities etc, you can explain that the programme or response will try to provide at least some support to everyone in the community
* Explain the need for selection criteria as openly, widely, and transparently as possible. For example, through large community meetings or meetings with different community groups, committees, and representatives
* Ensure National Society staff, community-based volunteers, and the community committee (if one exists), can also clearly explain why selection criteria is needed so they can answer questions from the community consistently and accurately.

1. **Discuss and agree what selection criteria should be used with a wide range of groups**
   * Even if selection criteria are pre-determined by the programme, response, or donor it is important to discuss these with a wide range of groups and make compromises where possible to gain acceptance. If there is widespread disagreement with the selection criteria to be used, this will need to be addressed before the programme or response can move ahead or it could lead to security issues for those being targeted and for National Society staff and volunteers
   * If it was not conducted during the assessment phase, a context analysis is critical to understand who the different groups are in the community and the power dynamics between them, and how this could impact people’s suggestions on selection criteria and targeting. This will help ensure the selection criteria used will not contribute to existing vulnerabilities or power imbalances and protects the impartiality of the National Society
   * Use participatory planning approaches (see pages 52-53 of the [CEA Guide](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/ifrc-cea-guide/)) to discuss and agree what selection criteria should be used. For example, hold focus group discussions (FGDs) with different groups including, the community committee and community volunteers, women and men of different age ranges, leaders and representatives, community associations and groups, people with disabilities, and any marginalized or minority groups. This includes speaking to those who are likely to be targeted and those who will not, to ensure both groups can contribute to the process
   * Issues to discuss during FGDs:
     + Explain the aims of the programme or response and ask participants based on this, who is most in need of support in the community? i.e., if the support being provided is shelter, discuss who has had their home damaged and would find it most difficult to repair or rebuild it without outside support
     + Ask participants to discuss who the most vulnerable people are in the community, specifically in relation to the risks being addressed by the programme or response. For example, if the programme is providing cash or voucher assistance for basic needs, ask which groups in the community find it hardest to buy enough food or cover their expenses. This is similar to the question above, but provides another way to approach the issue
     + An open or private voting process can be used if needed. For example, have images of the different selection criteria (e.g., pregnant woman, large family, destroyed house etc) and give people tokens they can use to vote for which group they feel should be prioritized. See the hygiene promotion pocket chart tool for an example of how to do this - <https://watsanmissionassistant.org/emergency-hygiene/> with links to the pocket chart tool in different languages under Step 3
     + Ask what challenges the choice of selection criteria might cause in the community and how these can best be addressed
   * Once agreement has been reached on selection criteria in FGDs, ask what type of targeting approach is suitable, acceptable, and safe for that community. Discuss:
     + How to identify who meets the criteria, i.e., should this be done by leaders, or publicly with the whole community? What are the benefits and/or risks of different approaches?
     + How information should be communicated to the wider community?
     + How would people feel most comfortable asking questions or raising concerns?
     + What are the best approaches to address the frustration of those not targeted?
   * Most importantly, discuss targeting approaches with groups who meet the selection criteria and ask them how this can be done in a way that protects their safety and dignity. This includes discussing if recipient lists can be posted publicly as a means of improving transparency, or this could threaten people’s safety and dignity
   * Ensure the selection criteria agreed on can be practically and fairly used to identify who should receive support i.e., if criteria becomes very complicated it may be hard to put into practice and could lead to challenges during the targeting process.
2. **Communicate the final selection criteria widely and respond to questions** 
   * Once confirmed, communicate selection criteria widely and clearly, using a range of different means and channels. Being transparent about which groups are receiving support and why helps to build understanding and acceptance and prevent rumours, misunderstanding and frustration from spreading. Use [CEA Tool 19: Communication methods matrix](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/cea-toolkit/)
   * Ensure National Society staff, community-based volunteers, and the community committee (if one exists), can clearly explain the selection criteria
   * Be ready to respond to feedback and complaints by having a community feedback mechanism in place. This can be the existing National Society feedback mechanism if one is in place, or a new feedback mechanism established for the programme or response. See [module 6 (p.103) in the CEA Guide](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/ifrc-cea-guide/) or [Tool 15: Feedback Kit](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/cea-toolkit/) for more guidance. However key points to note about feedback mechanisms for selection criteria and targeting:
     + Ask community members how they would feel most comfortable raising concerns or questions about the targeting process
     + Use a range of different channels to receive feedback so everyone in the community has a channel they can access and feel comfortable and capable to use e.g., consider literacy, physical mobility, access to phones etc
     + Ensure there are confidential channels people trust they can use to report concerns about corruption or nepotism
     + Advertise the feedback mechanism widely and frequently, alongside communication about the selection criteria and targeting process
     + Ensure National Society staff and volunteers also know about the feedback mechanism, how it works, and how it can be accessed.

**Examples of approaches to agree selection criteria with communities**

**Mozambique Cyclone Idai response – finding out if leaders can be trusted**

During FGDs with communities as part of recovery planning after Cyclone Idai in Mozambique, teams wanted to understand how well people trusted their community leaders and if they could lead on targeting. When asked ‘are the community leaders here good?’ most people said yes. However, when the facilitator then asked if people would be happy for the Red Cross to leave it to community leaders to distribute any aid items, people reacted strongly that this would not work, and they would prefer the Red Cross to determine who should be supported.

**Community resilience committees in Nigeria lead selection criteria and targeting**

When Nigeria Red Cross Society (NRCS) responded to floods with unconditional cash grants, they worked with communities to establish Community Resilience Committees (CRCs) who would help develop the selection criteria and carry out targeting. NRCS visited communities to explain the objectives of the cash grants and the need for selection criteria. During these visits, the CRC members were democratically elected by the community and then trained on their roles and responsibilities and the aims of the program. The selection criteria was then developed by the CRCs, with the support of Red Cross branch staff and volunteers. Local authorities were also consulted, before a community meeting was held to present the criteria and ask for their input and approval. The CRCs then identified who in their community met the criteria, through a mapping exercise.

**Ensuring people understand selection criteria in Madagascar**

When cash and voucher assistance (CVA) was used for the first time in Madagascar following a cyclone, data collected during the assessment was used to formulate messages that could be shared with the general community to raise awareness of the CVA purpose, process, and selection criteria. Information was shared through house-to-house visits and posters were placed throughout the community. Volunteers were also trained on the project purpose and aims and the messages that needed to be disseminated to community members and how these could be communicated well. In fact, the valuable knowledge the community volunteers had of the local environment greatly helped in the formulation of these messages. This ensured community volunteers could talk confidently and accurately about the project, including answering difficult questions about selection criteria. Read the [full case study](https://communityengagementhub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/04/CEA-in-CTP_Madagascar-Case-Study_DRC-IFRC-FINAL-1-1.pdf).

#### Step 2: Participatory approaches to targeting

**What is targeting?**

Targeting is the process of identifying which households or individuals should receive support based on the selection criteria agreed in the previous stage. Participatory targeting can help build acceptance, ensure the right people are reached, reduce the risk of corruption, and save time. However, it also comes with risks. The table below outlines the different approaches to targeting, with varying degrees of community participation, including the pros, cons, and community engagement considerations.

**Options for targeting**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TYPE** | **PROS** | **CONS** | **COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT CONSIDERATIONS** |
| **Community leaders or local authorities identify who should receive support based on selection criteria** | * Often the fastest and easiest option for the National Society * Respects and recognises the role of local leaders, which facilitates good working relationships between them and the National Society * Encourages shared ownership with local leaders and authorities, which can improve sustainability * If local leaders and authorities are trusted and respected by the community it can legitimise and build acceptance for the selection criteria and targeting decisions * Good community leaders can help ensure the right people are reached, as they know their community best | * If local leaders or authorities are not trusted or prone to nepotism or corruption, this can damage community trust in the National Society’s and mean the programme does not reach those most in need * Community members may fear retaliation if they raise concerns about how leaders or authorities have carried out targeting * Can reinforce existing power imbalances in the community, by giving even more decision-making power to leaders and authorities * If some people are marginalized or discriminated against within the community, this may be reflected in leaders’ targeting decisions | * Ensure community leaders fully understand the selection criteria and who they should be targeting * It’s important to verify the lists by checking a percentage to make sure they do meet selection criteria * Communicate selection criteria frequently and widely so the community can hold leaders to account for targeting decisions * Have a feedback mechanism communities can use to report any errors in targeting safely and confidentially i.e., that does not go through leaders or authorities |
| **A range of community groups and representatives identify who should be targeted based on the selection criteria** | * More participatory than relying only on leaders or authorities and supports better representation of potentially marginalized groups * Can identify where there is consensus on who meets the criteria, and where there is not * Builds ownership across a wide range of community groups * The more groups represented in making targeting decisions, the more likely there will be broad acceptance of the choices made | * Groups may self-select those they represent for targeting * Risk of no consensus across groups over who should be selected, meaning a different approach would need to be adopted * Could be time consuming to engage with lots of different groups depending on the number of communities being covered | * Ensure groups and representatives fully understand the selection criteria and who they should be targeting * Lists will still need to be verified by checking a percentage to make sure they do meet selection criteria * Communicate selection criteria widely so the community can identify any errors in targeting * Have a feedback mechanism, communities can use to report any issues confidentially, separate from groups and representatives |
| **Full community participation in deciding who meets the selection criteria – for example through a community meeting or voting exercise** | * Less questions or complaints over targeting as the community made the decisions themselves * Builds full community ownership over the programme as everyone feels they have been part of the decision-making process * More accurate targeting and less abuse of the system if everyone is involved in targeting choices | * Risk of creating tension or even conflict in the community if they do not agree on who meets the criteria * Community decision-making may be influenced by existing gender, diversity, and social hierarchies i.e., women may be considered less important than men, or ethnic minorities less deserving of support * To have the whole community pick out who meets the selection criteria publicly could be damaging to people’s dignity, or lead to further stigmatization or discrimination | * The National Society should facilitate the targeting exercise to ensure it is carried out fairly and marginalized groups are not excluded * If the selection criteria targets marginalized or at-risk groups, ask them how it should be done to avoid stigma or risk of harm * This approach will only work in communities with good social cohesion and trust between groups * A feedback mechanism will allow people to raise concerns confidentially |
| **Survey to identify which individuals or households meet the selection criteria** | * Very objective, impartial approach to targeting as people/households are individually assessed to see if they meet the criteria * Less risk of corruption or nepotism because targeting decisions are based on survey data | * Not very participatory and if the community do not understand why some people have been selected and others not, it can lead to a high level of questions and complaints * Large surveys can be expensive and time-consuming | * Lists will need to be verified with community representatives and groups to check the survey data has been interpreted accurately * The survey should be conducted before discussing selection criteria, in case it influences people’s answers * Communicate selection criteria frequently and widely so people will understand why they are not being supported and others are * A feedback mechanism will be critical to answer questions and identify any eligible people who have been missed during targeting |

**Communication and feedback on targeting**

* + Once recipient lists have been finalised, posting these in a public place can build trust in the process, promote transparency, and identify any mistakes in who has been included or excluded, based on the agreed selection criteria. However, this must be discussed in advance with the community, especially those whose names will appear on the list, to ensure it does not put people at risk of stigmatization, theft, or violence
  + Even if recipient lists are not shared publicly, it is important to communicate clearly and widely again about the selection criteria used, why it was used, and how people who meet the criteria were identified. This can help to build community trust in the process, and reduce the risk of rumours of corruption, nepotism, or discrimination in how people were selected
  + Don’t only communicate with recipients, but with the whole community to reduce tensions and build acceptance for why some are receiving support and not others
  + A safe, confidential, and trusted community feedback mechanism is critical to allow people to ask questions if they don’t understand how targeting decisions were made, or to report cases of people being wrongly included or excluded from recipient lists. No matter how great the selection and targeting process, people will still have questions and complaints that need to be addressed Providing people with an avenue to raise their concerns, including if they feel they have been unfairly excluded, can help prevent frustration with the process boiling over into security incidents. Consider in advance how to deal with serious complaints, such as allegations of corruption in the process or sexual exploitation and abuse. See module 6 (p.103) in the [CEA Guide](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/ifrc-cea-guide/) or [Tool 15: Feedback Kit](https://communityengagementhub.org/resource/cea-toolkit/) for more guidance
  + The most common complaint is likely to be from people who feel they have been unfairly missed from the recipient lists, so plan as a team in advance how these cases will be investigated and responded to. This can help address potential frustration in the community amongst those who are not selected, by ensuring their concerns are listened to, investigated fairly, and a timely response provided. An appeals process could be as simple as asking the community leader, committee, or trusted volunteer, to decide if the person should be included or having a series of questions to ask the person to assess if they should be added to the lists. The appeals process for investigating complaints should also be clearly and widely communicated to build trust in the process.

**Examples of approaches to agree selection criteria with communities**

**Engaging local authorities in targeting in Madagascar**

Local authorities are very important in Malagasy society, especially in informal settlements like the ones targeted for the Cyclone Enawo CVA response. By engaging with the local authorities and ensuring they fully understood the selection criteria, the CVA team were able to ask for their help to identify and verify recipients, many of whom did not have formal identity cards or proof or residence. Recipient lists were then posted publicly in the local authority offices, where community members could examine and challenge them if necessary. These local structures also played a major role in explaining the selection criteria to the community, managing rumours, and collecting and responding to complaints.

However, the Red Cross team also recognized that the power held by local authorities and community volunteers can be a double-edged sword, in that it can also open the project up to the risk of corruption. The team limited this risk through training of volunteers, being clear about the Red Cross principles with local authorities, cross-referencing recipient lists and detailed monitoring in the field. The project team also refused any preferential treatment towards these people and did not hesitate to exclude those who broke the rules to protect integrity and transparency with the community. Read the [full case study](https://communityengagementhub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/04/CEA-in-CTP_Madagascar-Case-Study_DRC-IFRC-FINAL-1-1.pdf).

**Responding to complaints about being left off the list in Haiti**

As part of an earthquake recovery response in Haiti, IFRC provided transitional shelters in the capital Port-au-Prince. Assessments were carried out in an internally displaced persons’ (IDP) camp and anyone living in the camp at the time of the assessment was registered to receive a shelter. As the shelters were being built, more families moved into the IDP camp and contacted the Red Cross feedback telephone line to ask to be added to the list to receive a transitional shelter. Unfortunately, there was not enough available land in the camp to build more shelters and so these people could not be added to the lists, despite the fact they were living in tents.

To address this challenge, IFRC engaged several approaches. First, all those who called the feedback hotline were asked a series of questions to determine if they were living in the camp at the time of the assessment. If they were not, the hotline staff explained why they were not eligible and offered them alternatives, such as access to a cash grant to pay for rental accommodation. If they were in the camp at the time of the assessment, the Red Cross team would visit them and confirm their details and eligibility with the camp committee. By taking the time to investigate each case, and providing alternative options, the IFRC shelter team were able to prevent peoples’ frustrations leading to tension and violence in the camp, which would have limited their access and slowed the rate of shelter construction.

**Tackling corruption by community leaders in Malawi**

When distributing shelter construction materials and water and sanitation items after flooding in Malawi, the National Society wanted to minimize the risk of community leaders replacing the names on recipient lists with those of their relatives, as had happened in a previous response. To address this, Malawi Red Cross Society (MRCS) implemented three simple measures;

1. All community volunteers were trained on community engagement and accountability approaches, including people’s rights, what information to share with communities and how to collect and respond to feedback and complaints.
2. Awareness sessions were organised in all camps to explain the objectives of the response and who would be supported, the items being distributed and how people could confidentially share any complaints or concerns. This information was also shared tent to tent by the community volunteers.
3. Feedback and complaints systems were set up including suggestion boxes, an anonymous telephone line and face to face with the MRCS community development facilitators. Help desks were also established during all distributions so that any problems on the day could be captured and resolved quickly.

By adopting a more systematic and deliberate approach to engaging communities, MRCS was able to prevent several cases of corruption or intimidation by community leaders and ensure the most vulnerable, such as female-headed households, were able to receive the support they needed. Read the [full case study](https://communityengagementhub.org/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2020/04/MRCS-fighting-corruption-case-study.pdf).

**Community-based targeting in Kenya**

Kenya Red Cross Society (KRCS) used a community-based targeting (CBT) approach to identify who should receive cash assistance following a drought. The selection process involved the engagement of all stakeholders (general community members, chiefs and religious leaders) at community level through Barazas (town-hall meetings), which are led by selected community members to both prepare or verify recipient lists. An evaluation of the drought response found the approach was effective in identifying the most vulnerable community members and led to very low levels of inclusion and exclusion errors. During FGDs for the evaluation, both those who received cash assistance and those who did not, felt the CBT approach was fair and transparent, despite many feeling that more people should have been supported. For example, one woman commented: “KRCS involved all community members during beneficiary selection to the satisfaction of all of us. However, we feel the KRCS caseload was low and didn’t accommodate all vulnerable food insecure HH in our community”. In the endline survey, 92.4% of respondents interviewed in the endline survey believed those selected to receive cash were the most vulnerable. The CBT approach also fostered a sense of ownership of the project among community level stakeholders. As one chief in Isiolo said: “I am very thankful of KRCS because they have been helping our people especially when they have involved all the stakeholders. We have been working with the volunteers hand-to-hand. Red Cross is very transparent. Beneficiaries are elected in the public and it has to be an agreement between KRCS and the community.”

KRCS staff also adjusted the targeting approach to be sensitive to potential issues in each context. In Garissa and Wajir, to counter the influence of clan-based selection, KRCS ensured the village committee, which makes the initial selection, included an Imam who is considered as fair by the community. The community was then involved in verification of the selected list of recipients. In Isiolo County, to counter the powerful influence of chiefs in targeting, KRCS staff excluded them from the initial selection process. The community would undertake the initial selection with the chiefs asked to then verify the lists. However, this did lead to the chiefs feeling excluded from the project, which reduced their ownership over the activities. An alternative could have been to include KRCS volunteers or staff in the village committees that carry out targeting to curtail the chief’s influence in the process. Read the [full evaluation](https://www.redcross.org.uk/-/media/documents/about-us/international/evaluation-of-the-drought-cash-transfer-programme-in-kenya.pdf).