# Annex 2: Beneficiary Selection and Prioritisation Criteria

Due to the limitations of funding, it is not always possible to reach all people in need. Therefore, it is crucial to use available resources to target and prioritise the most vulnerable. This will require targeting geographically and, within those identified areas, targeting the most in need based on a vulnerability and capacity analysis that includes a gender and diversity analysis.

In the selection and prioritisation of beneficiaries of humanitarian or emergency assistance, we must ensure an independent needs-based and a gender and diversity-sensitive principled approach, as well as appropriate targeting of beneficiaries.

The beneficiary selection and prioritisation criteria should be developed in consultation with the affected community. Once developed, the criteria must be widely disseminated to the affected population. Clear and understandable justification must be provided for any targeting of aid to a specific group or for the exclusion of a specific group.

In the development of the beneficiary selection and prioritisation criteria, it is important to take into consideration pre-existing social, cultural and political dynamics or practices that may marginalise or exploit certain groups. **It is important that a working definition of vulnerable persons is developed, that is:**

***Persons who are exposed to a combination or risks and have a limited ability to cope in the face of those risks.***

This working definition should be developed in consultation with the affected community.

Some persons or groups to consider may include, but are not limited to: ethnic minorities, women, female-headed households, children, child-headed households, older persons, persons living with disabilities, persons with chronic diseases or serious medical conditions, the illiterate, the chronically poor, landless persons, un-documented nations, migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and stateless persons.

* In many cases, the most vulnerable are persons or families who have a combination of these characteristics. Identification of the most vulnerable will be influenced by local dynamics.
* Vulnerability is influenced by displacement, geographic location, specific cultural and social power dynamics, access to information and education, access to material and financial resources including livelihoods, access to services, facilities and social support networks, and specific characteristics of the group, family or individual.

**Sample beneficiary selection and prioritisation criteria**

* The following beneficiary selection and prioritisation criteria has been adapted from a model used in the Philippines/Typhoon Haiyan by the IFRC-led Shelter Cluster.
* Responding as the Cluster was to a large-scale disaster involving multiple national and international actors, this model is comprehensive.
* For smaller emergencies, to which a National Society is responding through its local staff and volunteer base, the criteria should be simplified significantly.
* It is suggested that those households that score the highest are prioritised within the context of available resources.
* Please note that this model is based on households. It does not address individuals that live outside of households and, therefore, are at risk of being omitted from humanitarian assistance. Nor does it address those marginalised within households that do not benefit from intra-household re-distribution. These are context-specific issues and Red Cross Crescent responders must bear this in mind beyond this model.

**All statements marked with an asterisk (\*) will have to be considered carefully as they are heavily context-specific and relative. These statements should be either re-written or omitted.**

|  |
| --- |
| Household characteristics  |
| Number of individuals in household is greater than five  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household includes an elderly person(s)\*, a pregnant or lactating woman, a person(s) with a disability and/or chronic illness, orphan(s) and or/a teenage mother (i.e. under 18 years). | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The head of household is elderly person(s)\*, a woman, a child (under 18 years) or a man with no spouse/partner supporting children | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household identifies as indigenous, minority group etc.  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| Other known vulnerabilities. Adapt this section for context-specific issues, which might include people who identify as LGBTI, trafficked women and children and women and children subjected to violence. *Note that these are not issues that can be routinely screened for and/or information collected in standards household assessments and should therefore only be taken into account if information is known; this information must not be specifically sought for the purposes of compelling this prioritisation tool*  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| Total score this section (maximum 25)  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Economic situation  |
| No one in the household is currently engaged in employment  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household is not in receipt of financial support from relatives | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household has little to no significant assets\* | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household has not received a humanitarian assistance card\* | If yes, score 5 |  |
| Total score this section  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Sector-specific issues (Example here is for shelter – housing conditions) |
| The household has no formal land tenure or secure occupancy | If yes, score 5 |  |
| Children of school-going age have no access to education  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| Accommodation is too small\* (i.e. less than 3.5m² per person, as per Sphere) for the size of the household | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The accommodation is exposed to hazards\*  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| Total score this section  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Access to services  |
| The household has little/no access to health facility/services | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household has little/no access to water and /or water quality is poor\*  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household has little/no access to sanitation facilities and/or sanitation conditions are poor\*  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household has little/no electricity or fuel supply\*  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| Total score this section  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| Coping mechanisms/resilience[[1]](#footnote-1) |
| The household reports a reduction in the quantity/quality of meals | If yes, score 5 |  |
| Children are working where they did not before the emergency  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household reports having had to sell assets since the emergency  | If yes, score 5 |  |
| The household reports having had to take loan(s) since the emergency | If yes, score 5 |  |
| Total score this section  |  |  |

|  |
| --- |
| **TOTAL SCORE FOR ALL SECTIONS** |

1. In some contexts it may be hard to receive accurate information about the range of coping mechanisms people employ. For example, early marriage, survival sex, and migration (which can often lead to situations of trafficking) are often resorted to in emergency contexts however they are all extremely sensitive issues that are rarely openly discussed. Interviewers should avoid specifically seeking this information. Instead the questions above can be adapted to ensure the general vulnerability factors that can result in these strategies are captured. This should be triangulated with your analysis of other sources of information. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)