



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

Food for Peace Act, Development Funding Report

Fiscal Year 2015



Cover Photograph: Nagele Boru cuts grass from a community enclosure to feed her calves. She and her husband worked on the enclosure as part of the Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP), a large-scale, Government of Ethiopia-implemented, multi-donor-funded program that aims to help people escape food insecurity in Ethiopia. USAID is the program's largest bilateral donor. Credit: Kelley Lynch

This report may be found online: [DEC.usaid.gov](https://dec.usaid.gov) and at www.usaid.gov/open/reports-congress.

Table of Contents

I.	Overview	4
II.	Regional Highlights	6
	Ethiopia	6
	Guatemala.....	7
	Zimbabwe.....	8
III.	FY 2015 Funding Tables	9
	FY 2015 Development Program Funding.....	9
	FY 2015 Section 202(e) Development Funding.....	16
	FY 2015 Feed the Future Indicators.....	17

I. Overview

This report is submitted pursuant to Title V of Division A of the Explanatory Statement accompanying the FY 2016 Consolidated Appropriations Act ([P.L. 114-113](#))¹. This report describes how the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) met minimum levels of nonemergency food assistance (i.e. development food assistance) to assist the world's hungry, as specified in Section 412(e)² of the Food for Peace Act (FFP Act).

Through Title II of the FFP Act, USAID provides development food assistance to address the underlying causes of hunger and malnutrition. USAID development food assistance, programmed through the Office of Food for Peace (FFP), is primarily designed to:

- Reduce chronic malnutrition among children under five years of age and pregnant and lactating mothers;
- Increase and diversify household income; and
- Strengthen and diversify agricultural production and productivity.

Taken together, these activities build the resilience of vulnerable communities. Resilience building is a high priority of USAID's food assistance programs. Section 201(7) of the FFP Act states that, the provision of agricultural commodities to foreign countries on behalf of the United States is intended to "build resilience to mitigate and prevent food crises and reduce the future need for emergency aid."

In addition to commodities, the FFP Act authorizes the provision of resources to support both development and emergency programs under Section 202(e) of the Act. Section 202(e) funds can be used for administrative, management, personnel, transportation, storage and distribution costs for Title II in-kind food assistance programs. As of 2014, the FFP Act also gives USAID additional flexibility within Section 202(e) to replace funding previously generated by monetization³ and enhance Title II programming, including through the purchase of locally or regionally-grown food and the provision of food vouchers to beneficiaries. USAID calls funding for these new uses of 202(e) "Impact Funds."

As part of the President's Feed the Future (FTF) Initiative, Title II development funds are complemented by Development Assistance (DA) funds, which USAID refers to as **Community Development Funds (CDF)**, authorized separately under Section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. USAID's Bureau for Food Security provides CDF to the Office of Food for Peace to support community-level development activities aimed at increasing the resilience of the rural poor and accelerating their participation in agricultural development and food security programs. CDF funds do not displace the use of commodities within the overall

¹ [Title V of Division A of the explanatory statement](#), published on December 17, 2015, requested a report on "the use of authorities under 7 U.S.C. 1736f(e) of the Food for Peace Act during FY 2015 and planned uses for FY 2016. The report shall include amounts broken down by commodities and alternative methods of delivery (cash, vouchers, etc.) spent on all types of activities including the Community Development Fund, Section 202(e) of the Food for Peace Act, conditional transfers of food aid, and monetization. The report shall also detail the amount of funds broken down by commodities and other methods of delivery for emergency activities originating from the Community Development Fund and Section 202(e)."

² Section 412(e) of the FFP Act is codified at [7 U.S.C. 1736f\(e\)](#) and stipulates that nonemergency food assistance (i.e. development food assistance) should represent 20 to 30 percent of food assistance provided under Title II of the FFP Act and be no less than \$350 million per fiscal year.

³ Monetization is the sale of Title II commodities overseas to generate currency for development programs

Title II program as they are additional resources, separate from the Title II account. CDF supports similar development objectives as Title II and, much like 202(e) Impact Funds, allow FFP to fund development activities directly rather than engage in the inefficient practice of monetization. Taken together, 202(e) Impact Funds and CDF have enabled Food for Peace to end monetization in all but one country, Bangladesh, a program which by itself allows FFP to meet the Congressionally-mandated monetization requirements in Section 203(b) of the FFP Act.

In an effort to build the resilience of families and communities to future shocks, USAID's development food assistance projects have continued to make positive changes in the lives of the chronically hungry and most vulnerable. **In FY 2015, USAID development food assistance reached 7.7 million people through 35 projects.** In FY 2015, USAID used 22 percent of the total Title II funding (\$354.1 million, including \$25 million in Impact Funds⁴) and \$76 million in CDF to support these development programs. The tables in Section III provide a breakdown of development funding.

Results from these projects also contribute to the achievements of Feed the Future as tracked by a number of key indicators, improving the quality and uniformity of our representative surveys in order to better identify and report results. Food for Peace FY 2015 contributions to the FTF indicators are outlined in Section III. Some FFP development program highlights include:

- 550,000+ children under five reached with nutrition activities
- 430,000+ people supported in productive safety nets
- 300,000+ farmers taught to apply improved technologies or management practices;
- 300,000+ farmers received short-term agricultural or food security training,
- 1,200+ kilometers of road improved or constructed

To support our development programming, Food for Peace recently issued technical guidance chapters by sector (nutrition, agriculture, water and sanitation, gender, etc.) to document and link applicants to current best practices that should inform development program designs. This has allowed for a streamlined and shorter annual solicitation, (e.g., the FFP Request for Applications, RFA). FFP also supports capacity building and improved technical approaches of development partners through its Technical and Operational Performance Support (TOPS) program – a Save the Children-led consortium of private voluntary organizations, academics and others that facilitates a partner-led food security community of practice. TOPS has a Small Grants Program that allows FFP partners to pilot innovations, including the design, testing and sharing of promising practices, tools, and guidance that can help others in the food security community deliver stronger results. In FY 2015, the program funded 42 small grants, implemented by 24 organizations⁵.

In FY 2015, FFP also had a number of ongoing research activities. These included a multi-year “preventing malnutrition in children under two” (PM2A) study in Burundi and Guatemala to

⁴ A more detailed report on USAID's use of FY 2015 Impact Funds is available at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pa00m7ph.pdf.

⁵ A more detailed report on the FY 2015 TOPS Small Grants Program is available at <http://www.fsnnetwork.org/sites/default/files/Small%20Grants%20Big%20Impact%20A%20Retrospective%20of%20the%20TOPS%20Small%20Grants%20Program%202010-2015%20November%202015.pdf>

examine different types of nutritious foods and duration of their use affect stunting. A sustainability study was also conducted, in which researchers returned to project sites one and two years after project closures in Bolivia, Honduras, Kenya and India to determine what results remained and what factors most influenced sustainability of results. FFP published the sustainability study results in FY 2016⁶ and the PM2A research will be released in 2017.

In FY 2015, Food for Peace ended one development program in Guatemala, three programs in Bangladesh and four in Ethiopia, and began one new development program in Mali, three programs in Bangladesh and two programs in Nepal. FFP is conducting independent baseline and final evaluations for all development programs.

Section II, below, highlights specific examples of USAID's FY 2015 development food assistance programs. In future iterations of this report, USAID plans to include statistical data analysis from baseline and endline evaluations to accompany these more qualitative examples.

II. Country Examples

ETHIOPIA

In Ethiopia, more than three-quarters of the population live in rural areas and rely on their own agricultural production to meet their food needs, making land rehabilitation and access to markets crucially important to ensuring their sustained food security. USAID and its partners are improving the food security of millions of Ethiopians by rehabilitating degraded land to improve productivity of farm land as well as repairing roads to enhance access to markets and social services centers.

Through four partners (Catholic Relief Services (CRS), Food for the Hungry, Relief Society of Tigray (REST) and Save the Children), USAID works with communities to improve their resilience to shocks, helping to reduce chronic food insecurity among more than 1.64 million people in 47 districts. In FY 2015 alone, USAID's development food assistance partners in Ethiopia improved more than 27,000 hectares of degraded land, repaired 925 kilometers of roads and helped more than 5,000 landless youth receive farm land for the first time. For the last 10 years, USAID has supported partners under the umbrella of the Government of Ethiopia-led Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) -- a program that the World Bank estimates has lifted 1.5 million people out of poverty⁷. Over the last five years, USAID has provided approximately \$500 million toward the PSNP, including over \$91 million in FY 2015.

Using Title II development funds, USAID partners provide PSNP participants with predictable, seasonal food rations or cash transfers in exchange for their work on public infrastructure improvements or building community assets such as improved watershed and community

⁶ The findings, published as "Sustaining Development: A Synthesis of Results from a Four-Country Study of Sustainability and Exit Strategies among Development Food Assistance Projects is available at

https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/1866/FFP_Sustainability_Exit_Strategies_Study_Synthesis_Report_Dec2015_Final.pdf

⁷ "Poverty in Ethiopia Down 33 Percent Since 2000" (January 20, 2015). <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2015/01/20/poverty-ethiopia-down-33-percent>

roads. In FY 2015, USAID provided more than 132,000 metric tons of Title II in-kind food assistance to support food-for-assets (FFA) programming through the PSNP.

In FY 2015, PSNP launched a new public works program for landless-youth in the Tigray region, implemented through REST. This activity provided more than 50,000 landless youth with food and cash transfers in exchange for their work on a massive watershed management project. Through a conservation technique called bench terracing, these youth were able to recover 1,625 hectares of degraded hillsides. This helped youth fill immediate food needs while combatting land degradation in their dry, highlands communities. After transforming large tracts of land into cultivatable plots, more than 5,000 workers were apportioned plots and provided with improved seeds and fruit seedlings to start farming high value crops as a sustainable means of earning income and meeting their own food needs. Through these plots of rehabilitated land, youth have the opportunity to invest in their future and contribute to the improved food security of their communities.

GUATEMALA

In Guatemala, one out of every two children suffers from chronic malnutrition, leading to high levels of stunting and lasting negative impacts on future productivity. In 2013, 67.4 percent of children under five were stunted, but in regions where USAID and other U.S. initiatives under Feed the Future are taking action, that percentage will hopefully decline by 12 percent by 2017. One way USAID is working to reach that goal is by helping indigenous women of the country's western highlands to empower themselves and their neighbors by growing and selling their own foods as well as preparing healthy, nutritious meals to improve the well-being of their families.

USAID and CRS have partnered to change behaviors related to health and nutrition across Totonicapán, Guatemala, through a development project that combined \$2 million in Title II funding with a \$5 million CDF contribution. Guatemalan mothers learn to build home gardens filled with chard, spinach, carrots and other crops as well as improve health and nutritional behaviors to ensure their children grow up healthy and strong.

Before the project, mothers throughout the community had struggled to grow crops and mainly spent their money on staple foods like rice. Like many mothers, a beneficiary named Catalina was not familiar with growing vegetables or improving the quality of the soil. "We didn't know a lot of things before," she said. "Now we have home gardens and grow spinach, beets, carrots and other vegetables. Our children eat better now."

Since the project began, mothers like Catalina have seen significant improvements in their home gardens, including increased access to nutritious foods and improved soil conservation. They have also increased their household incomes through the sale of vegetables. In Catalina's case, this has helped to cover her children's school fees. Today, Catalina teaches other women in her community agricultural techniques such as contour farming and irrigation to replicate in their own home gardens.

From October 2013 to September 2014, more than 10,000 households received support in establishing home gardens. As a result of the project, mothers in Totonicapán have recognized

their value and potential as strong, influential leaders in their communities. In addition to learning new agriculture and nutrition practices, many community members attribute the success of home gardens to a strong belief and confidence that positive change in their family's overall health and income is possible.

ZIMBABWE

For many years, Zimbabweans have been caught in a cycle of drought, inadequate harvests and poor health. To help break the cycle, USAID and World Vision have focused on increasing small-holder productivity by strengthening farmers' knowledge and skills, and using climate-smart approaches that leverage the resources they have available or that can be obtained locally. In FY 2015, nearly \$16.5 million in Title II development programming benefitted more than 80,000 men, women and children in Zimbabwe.

In the Buhera district of eastern Zimbabwe, the project promotes fertility trenches – a trench filled with organic manure in which farmers grow kale, cabbage and other vegetables. Off to the side, in the soil removed to excavate the trench, farmers plant sweet potatoes, beans and legumes. Farmers also use crop residues from maize, sorghum and grass to trap moisture in the soil, control weeds and maintain cooler soil temperatures.

“We have managed to produce far higher yields of vegetables than before by using the fertility trenches,” said Benso Manjokota, chairman of the Buhera producers.

In the southern community of Mahazu, new irrigation tools are bringing sustainable agriculture and resilience to the farming community despite continued cycles of drought. Over a five-month period, the community built a dam, just in time to catch the first rains. This dam (like 20 others that will be operating soon in the project area) provides a way for farmers to trap water for irrigating beans, tomatoes, groundnuts and other nutritious crops even after the rains cease. This in turn increases household access to nutritious food and income year round.

In Mahazu alone, 60 farmers using the dam to grow crops earned over \$5,000 from their first-harvest sale of tomatoes in local markets. In total, in 2015, improvements in infrastructure and farming practices, as well as training in business and financial services helped 3,100 participating farmers make sales totaling over \$670,000. With El Niño moving through the region, and farmers bracing themselves for another year of poor rains and dry soil, these tools will be especially important to ensure that communities have access to the food, markets and livelihoods they need.

III. FY 2015 Funding Tables

FY 2015 Development Program Funding

Country	Awardee	Commodity	Conditional Transfer	Monetization	Metric Tons	Commodity & Freight Cost	Title II ITSH (000s)	Title II 202(e) (000s) ⁸	Title II FY 2015 Sub-total (000s)	Title II FY 2015 Funds Obligated In FY 2016 (000s) ⁹	CDF	Total (000s)
Bangladesh ¹⁰	ACDI/VOCA	--	Yes	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Bangladesh ¹¹	CARE	--	No	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Bangladesh ¹²	SCF	--	Yes	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Bangladesh ¹³	CARE	Soft white wheat	No	Yes	32,480	\$ 9,544.7	\$ -	\$ 2,000.0	\$ 11,544.7	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,544.7
Bangladesh ¹⁴	HKI	Soft white wheat	No	Yes	11,000	\$ 3,232.1	\$ -	\$ 819.5	\$ 4,051.6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,051.6
Bangladesh ¹⁵	WVUS	Soft white wheat	No	Yes	31,610	\$ 9,288.0	\$ -	\$ 2,000.0	\$ 11,288.0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,288.0

⁸ This includes both 202(e) administrative and 202(e) Impact funds.

⁹ A portion of FY 2015 development funding was obligated in the first quarter of FY 2016.

¹⁰ In FY 2015, Bangladesh had three Title II Development programs (ACDI, CARE, Save the Children) that closed out during the course of the fiscal year, but still reached beneficiaries with previous funds. Additionally, three Title II Development programs (CARE, Helen Keller International, World Vision-US) received initial funding during FY 2015, but had not yet reached beneficiaries.

¹¹ See footnote 10.

¹² See footnote 10.

¹³ See footnote 10.

¹⁴ See footnote 10.

¹⁵ See footnote 10.

Country	Awardee	Commodity	Conditional Transfer	Monetization	Metric Tons	Commodity & Freight Cost	Title II ITSH (000s)	Title II 202(e) (000s) ⁸	Title II FY 2015 Sub-total (000s)	Title II FY 2015 Funds Obligated In FY 2016 (000s) ⁹	CDF	Total (000s)
Burkina Faso	ACDI/VOCA	Corn soy blend 14, Super cereal plus, Ready-to-use-supplementary food (RUSF)	No	No	1,743	\$ 1,667.7	\$ -	\$ 2,310.6	\$ 3,978.3	\$ -	\$ 4,990.0	\$ 8,968.3
Burkina Faso	CRS	--	Yes	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,300.0	\$ 1,300.0	\$ -	\$ 4,990.0	\$ 6,290.0
Burundi	CRS	Soy-fortified bulgur, corn-soy blend plus, vegetable oil, yellow split peas	Yes	No	4,690	\$ 4,805.9	\$ 1,331.3	\$ 6,506.5	\$12,643.7	\$ -	\$ -	\$12,643.7
Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC)	ADRA	Corn-soy blend, cornmeal	Yes	No	360	\$ 335.5	\$ 1,113.0	\$ 7,372.1	\$ 8,820.6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,820.6
DRC	FHI	Cornmeal, split green peas, vegetable oil	Yes	No	2,500	\$ 2,379.2	\$ 2,841.4	\$ 6,660.6	\$11,881.2	\$ -	\$ -	\$11,881.2
DRC	MCI	Cornmeal, vegetable oil, yellow split peas	Yes	No	1,320	\$ 561.18	\$ 280.6	\$ 1,620.2	\$ 3,339.13	\$ 1,090.6	\$ -	\$ 4,429.7

Country	Awardee	Commodity	Conditional Transfer	Monetization	Metric Tons	Commodity & Freight Cost	Title II ITSH (000s)	Title II 202(e) (000s) ⁸	Title II FY 2015 Sub-total (000s)	Title II FY 2015 Funds Obligated In FY 2016 (000s) ⁹	CDF	Total (000s)
Ethiopia¹⁶	CRS	Bulgur, corn-soy blend plus, hard red winter wheat, vegetable oil, yellow split peas	No	No	51,090	\$ 23,477.0	\$ 13,099.5	\$ 5,531.8	\$ 42,108.4	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 42,108.4
Ethiopia	FHI	Hard red winter wheat, yellow split peas	No	No	27,080	\$ 11,637.4	\$ 3,200.0	\$ 3,174.1	\$18,011.5	\$ -	\$ -	\$18,011.5
Ethiopia	REST	Hard red winter wheat, yellow split peas	No	No	55,680	\$ 24,598.6	\$ 3,591.1	\$ 8,738.0	\$36,927.7	\$ -	\$ -	\$36,927.7
Ethiopia	SCF	Hard red winter wheat, sorghum, yellow split peas	No	No	26,920	\$ 12,763.6	\$ 4,964.6	\$ 2,653.5	\$20,381.6	\$ -	\$ -	\$20,381.6

¹⁶ Title II Development Assistance to Catholic Relief Services (CRS) in Ethiopia includes funding toward the Joint Emergency Operation (JEOP) and the Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP). In Ethiopia, the JEOP has always been designed to protect development gains made through investment in the PSNP, as part of a resilience strategy. In FY 2015, the roll out of the new PSNP design occurred nationwide in Ethiopia. This involved absorbing 2.5 million JEOP beneficiaries within the PSNP as these populations suffer from chronic food security needs that are best addressed with a timely and predictable development response like the PSNP to help build resilience. Furthermore, due to PSNP funding constraints, the JEOP is covering food assistance needs in some PSNP areas in calendar year 2016.

Country	Awardee	Commodity	Conditional Transfer	Monetization	Metric Tons	Commodity & Freight Cost	Title II ITSH (000s)	Title II 202(e) (000s) ⁸	Title II FY 2015 Sub-total (000s)	Title II FY 2015 Funds Obligated In FY 2016 (000s) ⁹	CDF	Total (000s)
Guatemala	CRS	Corn-soy blend plus, pinto beans, rice, vegetable oil	Yes	No	2,710	\$ 2,284.6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 2,284.6	\$ -	\$ 5,000.0	\$ 7,284.6
Guatemala	SCF	Corn-soy blend plus, pinto beans, milled rice, vegetable oil	Yes	No	3,130	\$ 2,732.8	\$ -	\$ 896.8	\$ 3,629.6	\$ -	\$ 5,000.0	\$ 8,629.6
Guatemala ¹⁷	MCI	--	No	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Haiti	CARE	Black beans, bulgur, corn-soy blend plus, vegetable oil	No	No	3,820	\$ 2,761.6	\$ 1,875.1	\$ 2,000.0	\$ 6,636.7	\$ -	\$ 12,000.0	\$ 18,636.7
Kenya ¹⁸	WFP PRRO		Yes	No	28,000	\$ 15,028.6	\$ 13,969.8	\$ 2,623.6	\$ 31,622.0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 31,622.0
Liberia	ACDI/VOCA	--	No	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,900.0	\$ 4,900.0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,900.0
Liberia ¹⁹	OICI	--	Yes	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

¹⁷ In FY 2015, Mercy Corps International closed out its Title II Development Program in Guatemala. It received no new funding in FY 2015, but still reached beneficiaries.

¹⁸ The World Food Programme's (WFP) Protracted Relief and Recovery Operations (PRRO) provide longer-term support to disaster-hit communities as they re-establish livelihoods and stabilize food security when it becomes clear that the 24-month assistance provided under an Emergency Operation (EMOP) will not be enough. Food for Peace re-categorized PRROs funded in FY 2015 - Kenya, Niger and Zimbabwe - to reflect their development orientation and the investments made in resilience building activities.

¹⁹ In FY 2015 OICI closed out its Title II Development Program in Liberia, but still reached beneficiaries.

Country	Awardee	Commodity	Conditional Transfer	Monetization	Metric Tons	Commodity & Freight Cost	Title II ITSH (000s)	Title II 202(e) (000s) ⁸	Title II FY 2015 Sub-total (000s)	Title II FY 2015 Funds Obligated In FY 2016 (000s) ⁹	CDF	Total (000s)
Madagascar	ADRA	Corn-soy blend plus, great northern beans, rice, vegetable oil	No	No	3,790	\$ 2,060.7	\$ 1,540.7	\$ 211.3	\$ 3,812.7	\$ 1,070.2	\$ -	\$ 4,882.9
Madagascar	CRS	Corn-soy blend plus, yellow split peas, rice, vegetable oil	Yes	No	5,760	\$ 4,565.5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,565.5	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,565.5
Malawi	CRS	Corn-soy blend plus, vegetable oil	Yes	No	3,470	\$ 2,364.0	\$ 303.0	\$ 680.5	\$ 3,347.5	\$ 2,566.5	\$ 8,000.0	\$ 13,914.0
Malawi	PCI	Corn-soy blend plus, pinto beans, vegetable oil	Yes	No	1,530	\$ 1,552.3	\$ 1,000.0	\$ 1,100.0	\$ 3,652.3	\$ -	\$ 4,000.0	\$ 7,652.3
Mali	CARE	--	No	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,000.0	\$ 9,000.0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,000.0
Nepal ²⁰	MCI	--	No	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,600.0	\$ 5,600.0

²⁰ Programs using Community Development Funds (CDF) in Nepal began late in FY 2015 and no beneficiaries had been reached at the time of reporting.

Country	Awardee	Commodity	Conditional Transfer	Monetization	Metric Tons	Commodity & Freight Cost	Title II ITSH (000s)	Title II 202(e) (000s) ⁸	Title II FY 2015 Sub-total (000s)	Title II FY 2015 Funds Obligated In FY 2016 (000s) ⁹	CDF	Total (000s)
Nepal ²¹	SCF	--	No	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,400.0	\$ 5,400.0
Niger	CRS	Corn-soy blend plus, vegetable oil	Yes	No	2,120	\$ 2,156.6	\$ 770.4	\$ 999.2	\$ 2,670.5	\$ 1,899.5	\$ 3,000.0	\$ 75,700.0
Niger	MCI	Corn-soy blend plus, lentils, soy-fortified bulgur, vegetable oil	Yes	No	560	\$ 477.6	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 477.6	\$ -	\$ 2,554.5	\$ 3,032.1
Niger	SCF	Corn-soy blend plus, soy-fortified bulgur, vegetable oil, yellow split peas	Yes	No	1,990	\$ 1,329.8	\$ 1,040.7	\$ 1,659.9	\$ 4,470.3	\$ 439.9	\$ 1,660.6	\$ 6,570.8
Niger ²²	WFP PPRO	Bulgur, corn-soy blend, lentils, rice, vegetable oil, yellow split peas	Yes	No	18,740	\$ 17,249.9	\$ 6,575.3	\$ 2,273.0	\$ 26,098.2	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 26,098.2
Sierra Leone	ACDI/VOCA	--	No	No	--	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,900.0	\$ 4,900.0	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,900.0

²¹ See footnote 20.

²² See footnote 18.

Country	Awardee	Commodity	Conditional Transfer	Monetization	Metric Tons	Commodity & Freight Cost	Title II ITSH (000s)	Title II 202(e) (000s) ⁸	Title II FY 2015 Sub-total (000s)	Title II FY 2015 Funds Obligated In FY 2016 (000s) ⁹	CDF	Total (000s)
Uganda	ACDI	Corn-soy blend plus, cornmeal, lentils, vegetable oil	No	No	1,530	\$ 1,559.5	\$ -	\$ 696.6	\$ 2,256.1	\$ -	\$ 7,837.1	\$ 10,093.2
Uganda	MCI	Corn-soy blend plus, cornmeal, lentils, vegetable oil	No	No	1,350	\$ 1,478.4	\$ 1,190.6	\$ 1,245.5	\$ 3,914.5	\$ 1,240.4	\$ 2,114.3	\$ 7,269.2
Zimbabwe	CNFA	Rice, Corn-soy blend plus, vegetable oil	Yes	No	2,940	\$ 2,149.8	\$ 168.4	\$ 7,572.9	\$ 9,891.1	\$ 559.3	\$ -	\$ 10,450.4
Zimbabwe ²³	WFP PRRO	Sorghum, vegetable oil, yellow split peas, yellow whole peas	Yes	No	6,640	\$ 4,005.0	\$ 2,569.1	\$ 1,440.3	\$ 8,014.2	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,014.2
Zimbabwe	WVUS	Corn-soy blend plus, sorghum, lentils	Yes	No	8,910	\$ 4,950.9	\$ 1,423.4	\$ 6,008.3	\$ 12,382.6	\$ 1,411.6	\$ -	\$ 13,794.20
N/A	TOPS	--	No	No	--	--	--	\$ 9,037.0	\$ 9,037.0	--	--	\$ 9,037.0
TOTAL					343,463	\$ 173,595.1	\$ 63,128.6	\$ 107,931.8	\$ 343,839.4	\$ 10,278.0	\$ 76,000.1	\$ 430,117.5

²³ See footnote 18.

FY 2015 Section 202(e) Development Funding

In addition to the activities noted below, 202(e) funds were also used by development partners to implement a wide range of development activities that would have otherwise been funded through monetization. In addition, 202(e) Impact Funds were used to inject emergency dollars into development programs in Liberia, Sierra Leone, Malawi and Zimbabwe in 2015. These emergency funds, used to procure foods locally or regionally or for cash based transfers, were vital to our response to Ebola in West Africa and El Niño-related drought in southern Africa. 202(e) funds have allowed for this kind of rapid reinforcement of development programs when unexpected crises hit.

Country	Awardee	Modality	Section 202e
Burkina Faso	ACDI/VOCA	Tufts research	\$ 2,310,566 ²⁴
Ethiopia	Relief Society of Tigray	Cash transfers	\$ 1,858,249
Liberia	ACDI/VOCA	Program extension	\$ 4,900,000
Kenya	U.N. World Food Program	Evaluation	\$ 200,000
Malawi	Catholic Relief Services	Local and regional procurement	\$ 377,515
Mali	CARE	Multiple modalities, including vouchers	\$ 9,000,000
Sierra Leone	ACDI/VOCA	Program extension	\$ 4,900,000
Zimbabwe	U.N. World Food Program	Cash transfers	\$ 882,000
Zimbabwe	Cultivating New Frontiers in Agriculture	Cash for assets	\$ 708,000
TOTAL			\$ 25,136,330

A report on USAID's use of FY 2015 202(e) funding for both emergency and development programs is available at http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pa00m7ph.pdf

²⁴ ACDI/VOCA supported research looking at the cost effectiveness of different nutritious foods on the treatment of moderate acute malnutrition in children.

FY 2015 Feed the Future Indicators

In 2013, Food for Peace adopted applicable Feed the Future Indicators; this table shows FFP's contribution to Feed the Future Results for FY 2015.

Food for Peace Contributions to Feed the Future Results	FY 2015
3.1.9(1): Number of people trained in child health and nutrition through USG-supported programs	296,796
3.1.9(15): Number of children under five reached by USG-supported nutrition programs	578,877
3.3.3(15): Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets	430,566
4.5(2): Number of jobs attributed to FTF implementation	12
4.5.2(2): Number of hectares under improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	76,423
4.5.2(5): Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	300,578
4.5.2(7): Number of individuals who have received USG supported short-term agricultural sector productivity or food security training	306,814
4.5.2(11): Number of food security private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and CBOs receiving USG assistance	10,503
4.5.2(13): Number of rural households benefiting directly from USG interventions	612,405
4.5.2(14): Number of vulnerable households benefiting directly from USG assistance	931,883
4.5.2(27): Number of members of producer organizations and CBOs receiving USG assistance	2,412
4.5.2(29): Value of Agricultural and Rural Loans	\$ 903,482
4.5.2(23): Value of incremental sales (collected at farm-level) attributed to FTF implementation	\$519,431
4.5.2(30): Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving USG assistance to access loans	12,815
4.5.2(34): Number of people implementing risk-reducing practices/actions to improve resilience to climate change as a result of USG assistance	10,281
4.5.2(37): Number of MSMEs, including farmers, receiving business development services from USG assisted sources	1,930
4.5.2(42): Number of private enterprises (for profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and CBOs that applied improved technologies or management practices as a result of USG assistance	11,022
4.5.1(17): Kilometers of roads improved or constructed	1,213.40