



HuMEL 4th Meeting: Selection and Targeting in Northeast Syria

Monday January 25th, 2021 | 9:00-10:30am ET

Reminder: Please turn off video and mute your microphone



HuMEL Community

HumanitarianMonitoringEvaluation &Learning

Community meetings every quarter, hosted by implementers

Discourse.FSNnetwork.org → Communities



Agenda

- Selection and Targeting Presentation (10 min)
 - Q&A (5 min)
- Data Driven Service Delivery Presentation (10 min)
 - Q&A (5 min)
- Discussion Rooms by presentation (30 min)
- Wrap up and hear from presenters (10 min)

Q&A for Panelists Instructions

Stay muted for now

If you have a question, click the "raise your hand" button and the facilitator will call on you. Unmute and activate your video and ask your question!

Additionally, ask questions in the chat!

Syria Emergency Food Security Program (SEFSP)

Food for Peace Program

Context for Targeting & Selection

Main reference points a NES FFP program were the Whole of Syria FSL Cluster Guidelines for Food Security Selection Criteria and the FFP Emergency Guidance documents

- Stage #1: Geographical Targeting
 - Starts with the PIN-based severity rankings of each sub-district
 - Followed by the selection of locations to conduct vulnerability assessments at the village/community level within each sub-district in coordination with local authorities
- Stage #2: Selection of HHs inside villages/communities based on assessment surveys of vulnerability criteria



Blumont's Program: SEFSP IV

- Bread & Bakery Programming:
 - Geographic targeting is possible but targeting at the community/village level is restricted and selection at the HH-level is not possible
 - Biggest element of geographic targeting happens with a bakery selection survey in identified sub-districts, and inclusion of camps/CCs
- SEFSP IV's other three interventions:
 Supplementary Food Vouchers, Household Vegetable Gardens (HVGs), Agricultural Inputs to Small Farmers
 - Process is geographic targeting followed by HH selection based on a HH vulnerability assessment selection survey
 - The selection tool was weighted between FSL technical indicators (70%)
 + HH vulnerability & socio-economic factors (30%)
 - Several additional criteria for HVGs & Ag Inputs were required to verify
 & eliminate HHs without appropriate land & irrigation, etc for planting



HH Survey: Food Security Indicators

- Weighted 70% in the overall scoring for the Vulnerability assessment selection survey (52 out of 97 total possible points)
- Included five main indicators: FCS, rCSI, HHS, LCS, FES
- FCS & rCSI are recommended by both the Cluster & FFP
 - Used NES WG categories for FCS Scores:
 0-28 "poor", 28.5-42 "moderate", 42.5+ "adequate"
- HHS emphasized in the FFP guidelines only
- Livelihoods Coping Strategies requested in the WOS guidelines
 - NES scale uses 15 questions, incl. 4 "stress", 3 "crisis", 3 "emergency" + 5 strategies specifically identified for NES partners
 - Emphasis on HHs who employed "crisis" or "emergency" strategies
- Income/Expenditure Share requested in the WOS guidelines
 - 65%-75% "moderately food insecure"
 - +75% "severely food insecure"

HH Survey: Vulnerability & Socio-economic criteria

- Weighted 30% in the overall scoring for the Vulnerability assessment selection survey (45 out of 97 total possible points)
- Criteria assessed in HH surveys included:
 - Head of Household Vulnerability
 - Dependency ratio & vulnerability status of HH members
 - Large family size
 - Recent displacement or return, multiple
 - Socio-econom

m	No access to formal/informal credit	Low household income or no income
	High levels of debt	No formal savings
	Not receiving other sources of assistance	Non-permanent type of accommodation
	Loss of production, agriculture or livestock assets	Loss of labour opportunities



Data Driven Service Delivery

Food Security and Livelihood Programming

Purpose

- Relationships between household sociodemographics measures and household food consumption score (FCS).
- Predictors of FCS
- Program areas in need of further study/exploration.





Introduction

HVG

- December 2018
- 234 Respondents
- Program Assessment
- Sample of <u>current beneficiaries</u>
- Do households with higher FCS and/or female heads eat healthier diets than those with lower FCS and/or male heads? (HVG)

Cash Voucher

- November 2019
- 1,574 Respondents
- Beneficiary Selection Survey
- Sample of potential beneficiaries
- Do households receiving certain assistance types have higher FCS? (Cash Vouchers)



Cash Voucher Findings

- Households with both male and female adult shoppers have substantially higher mean FCS.
- Number of months displaced does not correspond with a decrease in mean FCS among households.
- Aid should be targeted to households with household heads who are younger than the age of 18, that have fewer working members, and are in Deir-ez-zor and Kisreh.
- Food basket assistance is particularly effective with households that have only one adult shopper and lower mean FCS

Homestead Vegetable Gardens Findings

- Additional HVG support for IDP households and Al-Malikeyyeh (Derik).
- HVG kits can progressively increase with household composition (size and age).
- Exploration needed:
 Relationship between FCS and disabled persons and unaccompanied minors.





Conclusions

- Inferential modeling can inform both pre- and ongoing intervention programming decisions.
- Explore/plot your data and continuously refine the model.
- Close coordination between field and HQ is vital for successful execution.
- Share findings with program teams with clear suggestions for programmatic improvement.
- Programmatic suggestions must be realistic to both the award contract and contextual realities.

questions:

Please contact Gary Glass Jr. and Laura

Padgett with additional comments and

gglass@blumont.org

lpadgett@blumont.org



- Two small groups with each presenter
 - Select your own group by clicking on "Breakout Rooms" at the bottom of your window
 - If you don't see that option, send Chris your preference in the chat
 - Switch rooms after 15 minutes if you like







Thank you!

http://www.ideal.events/humel

This presentation is made possible by the generous support of the American people through the United States Agency for International Development (USAID). The contents are the responsibility of the Implementer-led Design, Evidence, Analysis and Learning (IDEAL) Activity and do not necessarily reflect the views of USAID or the United States Government.