Geographic targeting template

This tool lists some of the key elements to be considered when selecting intervention areas for a CTP in emergencies. All your decisions on targeting will need to be clearly communicated with internal and external actors as well as the affected population in your BCA plan. They will also have to consider the local markets and intended beneficiary access to them, as well as coverage and access to potential cash transfer delivery agents and methods.

Geographic targeting in an emergency refers to the identification of specific administrative units or livelihood zones or similar boundaries for your emergency response. You will have identified these during module 2 when planning your assessment. The geographic locations affected by an emergency are identified primarily through secondary data and information on where the affected population is.

Geographical targeting is usually the first level of targeting required. In an emergency response operation, you will need to have identified the affected population and area to be able to narrow down your intervention area based on multiple factors such as:

* the scale of the emergency,
* absolute and relative numbers of affected and vulnerable population
* logistics and financial resources
* presence of other actors
* presence of existing National Society or Movement responses in addition to CTP
* Movement added value (going to areas where other actors cannot easily go)

These last two factors are particularly important for the Movement, as geographical targeting will be influenced by existing programming areas and the capacity to expand to new areas.

### Selecting large administrative units

The first selection can focus on large administrative units (regions, provinces or districts) and be based on criteria such as:

* absolute and relative numbers of the affected population (e.g. number/percentage of people displaced; number/percentage of houses damaged; etc.)
* absolute and relative numbers of vulnerable groups within the population (e.g., poor, food insecure, vulnerable to future disasters, etc.)

This information can be obtained from government sources (population censuses, poverty surveys and disaster updates), relief actors’ assessments and situation analysis monitoring systems. You will have administrative boundaries and information about the emergency affected areas. You will also need to factor in population movements as people may leave the conflict or disaster area in search for safety, including crossing international borders.

Rapid onset scenarios

Geographical targeting is easier for rapid onset scenarios, where the affected area is usually identified. Recently, the Philippines Red Cross has used a ranking table to target flood-affected provinces. Each affected province was ranked according to three criteria:

* total affected population,
* percentage of the population affected, and
* poverty incidence

No weight was given to these criteria.

Such a table can help you understand better which the most affected and worst-off areas are but, with three different ranks, it might be difficult to choose a priority province. To establish a final rank you could, for instance, sum the ranks of each province for each criterion. The lower the rank sum, the higher the final rank. The table below reflects the suggested rationale.

### Ranking table example

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Province** | **Pop** | **Affected population** | **Poverty** | **Rank sum** | **Final rank** |
| **#** | **Rank** | **%** | **Rank** | **%** | **Rank** |
| Bulacan | 2,934,433 | 821,794 | 1 | 28 | 3 | 6.7 | 6 | 10 | **2** |
| Pampanga | 2,014,019 | 682,131 | 2 | 34 | 2 | 6.4 | 7 | 11 | **3** |
| Ilocos Sur | 658,687 | 92,441 | 7 | 14 | 4 | 17.1 | 2 | 13 | **5** |
| La Union | 741,906 | 18,397 | 10 | 2 | 8 | 19.8 | 1 | 19 |  |
| Pangasinan | 2,779,862 | 327,685 | 4 | 12 | 5 | 17 | 3 | 12 | **4** |
| Bataan | 687,482 | 420,750 | 3 | 61 | 1 | 7.3 | 5 | 9 | **1** |
| Cavite | 3,090,691 | 266,479 | 5 | 9 | 6 | 4.1 | 9 | 20 |  |
| Laguna | 2,669,847 | 78,870 | 8 | 3 | 7 | 6.3 | 8 | 23 |  |
| Rizal | 2,484,840 | 52,858 | 9 | 2 | 8 | 7.6 | 4 | 21 |  |
| NCR | 11,855,975 | 234,884 | 6 | 2 | 8 | 3.8 | 10 | 24 |  |

When making the final decision, it is crucial to consider not only the final rank as established above, but also the expected gaps in the response. An early coordination meeting with key response actors is recommended to understand the response plans and gaps.

Slow onset scenarios

Geographical targeting for slow onset and protracted emergencies may be more complex as the directly affected population usually covers a bigger geographical area so you will need other information to narrow down intervention areas. Looking at tools from the food security sector is a useful way of identifying livelihood zones. One particular useful source is related to food security classification systems, which uses multiple indicators to classify the severity of food insecurity at national level (see IPC box).

|  |
| --- |
| **Food security integrated phase classification (IPC)** Existing early-warning and situation analysis classification systems can be very helpful to identify the areas that are the most affected and that have the greatest needs. These systems are more or less regularly updated and are commonly used to prioritize regions or provinces in slow onset emergencies. The IPCis a widely used categorisation system that classifies areas into five phases according to their levels of food insecurity: minimal, stressed, crisis, emergency and famine. IPC is based on international standards and makes it possible to compare the severity of the food security situation in different areas. Updated IPC maps for different countries can be found at: [http://www.ipcinfo.org](http://www.ipcinfo.org/)  |

The choice of the criteria and how to weight them will depend on the specific context, the type of emergency, and the objective of the intervention.

### Narrow down the selection (municipalities, villages, communities)

Depending on the context and the resources available, it might be necessary to narrow down the geographical targeting. To do that, you can use a similar approach, adapting the table presented above to your context and needs (see the geographical selection ranking table below for an example). You will use basically the same criteria to which you can add:

* access to market and services (under-served areas)
* quantified losses (e.g., number of houses damaged or flooded, livestock lost, etc.)
* the capacity of local authorities and communities to respond
* your own experience in the area and capacity to mobilize resources and staff locally

At a lower administrative level, it is very important to involve local authorities and sometimes community representatives. A meeting with them can help you agree on context-relevant criteria and have access to information that is not available easily otherwise.

|  |
| --- |
| **Efficiency versus needs**When selecting intervention areas, a balance must be sought between efficiency and needs. Selecting villages that are contiguous instead of scattered or disperse can increase the efficiency of the response by minimizing operational costs and enhancing the speed of community mobilization and assistance delivery. On the other hand, scattered and dispersed villages should not be overlooked, as their needs are likely to be greater. |

### Blanket targeting

Once you have narrowed down your geographical area of operation, your next decision will be to decide whether a blanket approach where everyone in the community is targeted is appropriate. This means providing CTP to all the population in that geographical area. This is especially appropriate to meet immediate needs after a rapid onset disaster or when access to the population is constrained by security issues and markets are functioning to supply the goods and/or services. Blanket targeting can speed up the response and is suitable for shelter, food security, WaSH and nutrition needs. It suits both one off distributions and repeat distributions.

In CTP, decisions on blanket targeting at lower-level geographical administrative units must consider markets, services, level of losses, local and organisational capacity to respond. This type of targeting is appropriate for meeting immediate needs while further assessments are carried out.

Geographic targeting is complemented with household/individual targeting, which involves developing targeting criteria.

The process will involve identifying areas that have been particularly affected or where needs are greatest. You should rely primarily on the assessment findings and information available from early warning and monitoring systems.

### Geographical selection ranking table (smaller administrative units)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Area** | **Total number HHs** | **Affected HHs** | **% affected HHs** | **Losses (houses, income, livestock)** | **Local capacity** | **Agency capacity** | **Rank sum** |
| **#** | **Rank** | **%** | **Rank** | **#** | **%** | **Rank** | **Rank[[1]](#footnote-1)** | **Rank[[2]](#footnote-2)** |
| 1 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 2 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 3 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 4 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 5 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 6 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 7 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 8 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| 9 |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |

1. Rank the lowest local capacity to respond as 1 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Rank the highest agency capacity as 1* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)