



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



MORGANA WINGARD. USAID

EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM

FY 2016 REPORT TO CONGRESS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

BACKGROUND	I
PURPOSE AND PROGRAM OBJECTIVES	I
EFSP MODALITIES	I
EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS	3
FISCAL YEAR 2016 GRANTS	3
KEY HUMANITARIAN RESPONSES	4
EL NIÑO	4
SUDAN	5
SYRIA	5
ECUADOR	6
NIGERIA	6
MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGIES	7
MONITORING	7
EVALUATION	8

USE OF INTERNATIONAL DISASTER FUNDS FOR LOCAL AND REGIONAL PROCUREMENT, CASH AND VOUCHER PROGRAMS UNDER THE EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM FY 2016 REPORT TO CONGRESS

This report is submitted pursuant to the statutory requirement established by the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (P.L. 114-195), which amended Section 492(e) of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2292a(e)).¹ The report describes how USAID used FY 2016 International Disaster Assistance funding through the Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP) to address food insecurity in emergency situations through market-based mechanisms such as local and regional procurement (LRP), cash transfers for food, and food vouchers.

BACKGROUND

PURPOSE AND PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The U.S. government is the largest donor of food assistance in the world. USAID, through the Office of Food for Peace (FFP), leads these food assistance activities in an effort to reduce hunger and malnutrition - using all available means to respond quickly in emergencies and ensure that people affected by crises have access to sufficient, nutritious food.

In addition to U.S. in-kind food assistance authorized in Title II of the Food for Peace Act, FFP uses market-based food assistance including local and regional procurement (LRP), cash transfers for food, food vouchers and complementary services as important tools for providing food assistance in emergency settings. USAID has implemented such activities using International Disaster Assistance (IDA) funding and authorities since FY 2010, but in FY 2016 EFSP was codified in law as part of the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (Section 7 of P.L. 114-195).² This new authorization stipulates that the purpose of EFSP is “to mitigate the effects of manmade and natural disasters by utilizing innovative new approaches to delivering aid that support affected persons and the communities hosting them, build resilience and early recovery, and reduce opportunities for waste, fraud, and abuse.”

EFSP MODALITIES

USAID uses funds in different ways, offering the greatest possible flexibility to address disaster-related food security needs as they arise. The principal modalities are:

I. Local and Regional Procurement³

¹ Prior to enactment of the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (GFSA) on July 20, 2016, USAID was required to report by October 30, 2016 on International Disaster Assistance funds used for emergency food security during Fiscal Year 2016. The GFSA authorized the Emergency Food Security Program as a form of international disaster assistance in Section 491(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act, and required the submission of an annual report no later than March 1 of each fiscal year.

² Food for Peace Information Bulletin 16-01: Award Requirements for Source and Origin of Local, Regional, and International Procurement. Available at: <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ195/PLAW-114publ195.pdf>

³ In rare instances, FFP will allow international procurement, commodities sourced outside the continent of distribution, but it requires approval by the FFP Director.

- a. **Local procurement** is the purchase of food commodities in the same country where it will be distributed.
 - b. **Regional procurement** is the purchase of food commodities typically sourced within the same continent as the country where they will be distributed.
2. **Cash Transfers** are a resource transfer for food purchases by households in local markets which is denominated as a cash value. Cash can be delivered conditionally or unconditionally, but it is always unrestricted.⁴
3. **Food Vouchers** are paper, token or electronic cards that can be exchanged for a set quantity or value of goods, denominated either as a cash value (e.g. \$15) or predetermined commodities or services (e.g. 5 kg maize; milling of 5 kg of maize). They are redeemable with preselected vendors or in ‘fairs’ created by the USAID or its partners.
4. **Complementary Services**⁵ are services that would complement the primary mechanisms for providing food assistance and are directly supporting the modalities noted above. Based on their potential to contribute to the stabilization of household and community access to adequate nutritious food, interventions may include:
 - a. Agriculture and food security, including support for agricultural inputs such as seeds, tools, fodder, as well as agriculture-related training
 - b. Livelihoods, including support for community-level savings and restoration of livelihoods
 - c. Nutrition, including support for community-based services such as community-based management of acute malnutrition, integrated management of acute malnutrition, promotion of appropriate infant and young child feeding practices in emergencies and/or other social and behavior change communication, or distribution of locally/regionally procured nutrition products

USAID clearly articulates criteria for use of IDA funds in program solicitations for applications as well as the Food for Peace Information Bulletin 16-01.⁶ Criteria used when considering the best modality to address emergency food security needs include:

1. **Timeliness** - When in-kind food assistance cannot arrive in a sufficiently timely manner through the regular ordering process or when prepositioned stocks are unable to address emergency needs either because of a new emergency or an increase in needs for an ongoing emergency (e.g., increased displacement during an existing conflict);
2. **Appropriateness** - When local and/or regional procurement, cash transfers, and/or food voucher programs, due to market conditions, are more appropriate than U.S. in-kind food assistance due to market conditions to address emergency food security needs; or
3. **Cost Effectiveness** - In certain cases, significantly more beneficiaries can be served through the use of local procurement, regional procurement, cash transfers and/or food vouchers than U.S. in-kind commodities.

⁴ A conditional transfer is a transfer with a set of conditions that must be met prior to the transaction. Conditions may relate to attending trainings or health clinics, labor towards a livelihoods project or completing a stage of construction in an asset project.

⁵ Given the specific mandate of EFSP to provide emergency food assistance pursuant to Section 491(c) of the Foreign Assistance Act, USAID draws on the broader authority to provide IDA pursuant to Section 491(b), to carry out many of these activities. Such use of IDA is consistent with United States policy in Section 492(d) of the Foreign Assistance Act, which states that IDA funds “are intended to provide the President with the greatest possible flexibility to address disaster-related needs as they arise and to prepare for and reduce the impact of natural and manmade disasters.”

⁶ http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/PA00M7N3.pdf

Local and regional procurement have additional restrictions on the source and origin of commodities to ensure that FFP activities are reinforcing markets for commodities produced within the regions where USAID works.

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Studies have demonstrated that market-based mechanisms can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of providing life-saving food assistance. Both a Government Accountability Office (GAO)⁷ study and an independent study from Cornell University⁸ found that LRP could save both cost and time in the delivery of U.S. in-kind food aid. These findings were consistent with USAID's internal analysis of FY 2013 LRP programs, which found approximately 30 percent savings on commodity and freight costs when compared to in-kind food assistance from the United States.⁹ For food voucher and cash transfer programs, where cost effectiveness was a primary goal, USAID's analysis found that savings ranged from 18 to 40 percent compared to the commodity and freight costs of U.S. in-kind food assistance.

Another 2013 study found that, in most cases, vouchers and cash transfers are also a cost effective and efficient way of diversifying diets where local markets are functioning.¹⁰ In 2016, an independent think tank conducted a rigorous review on cash transfers - examining 165 studies from 2000 to 2015 - to provide a comprehensive analysis of the impacts of cash.¹¹ The analysis found that cash transfer programs can help diversify diets, reduce stunting in children and improve beneficiary investment in agricultural products and livestock.

EFSP interventions such as these can promote market recovery, strengthen and expand market linkages, and stimulate an appropriate production response among developing country farmers. When strategically assessed to be the most effective intervention, LRP, cash transfers for food, and food vouchers provide an effective means for responding to food insecurity needs.

FISCAL YEAR 2016 GRANTS

FY 2016 was a year of large-scale, protracted crises. Four of the five Level-3 (L3) emergencies¹² in FY 2015 carried over into FY 2016: Syria, South Sudan, Iraq and Yemen. In addition, a global El Niño weather event caused extreme droughts and heavy rain throughout the year. While a few sudden onset

⁷ Government Accountability Office. "International Food Assistance: Local and Regional Procurement Can Enhance the Efficiency of U.S. Food Aid, but Challenges May Constrain Its Implementation". GAO 09-570: May 2009. Available at: <http://www.gao.gov/assets/300/290226.pdf>

⁸ Lentz, Erin C. et al. "The Impacts of Local and Regional Procurement of US Food Aid: Learning Alliance Synthesis Report". Cornell University, 2012. Available at: <http://barrett.dyson.cornell.edu/Papers/LRP%20Ch%201%20Lentz%20et%20al%2011Jan2012Update.pdf>

⁹ Commodities that did not have a comparison commodity available through Title II (e.g., ready-to-use foods that were not on the Title II commodity list in the United States at the time) were omitted from the analysis.

¹⁰ Hoddinott, John, et. al. 2013. "Enhancing WFP's Capacity and Experience to Design, Implement, Monitor, and Evaluate Vouchers and Cash Transfer Programmes: Study Summary" Available at: <http://www.ifpri.org/publication/enhancing-wfps-capacity-and-experience-design-implement-monitor-and-evaluate-vouchers>

¹¹ Bastagli, Francesca, et. al 2016. "Cash transfers: what does the evidence say? A rigorous review of impacts and the role of design and implementation features" Available at: <https://www.odi.org/publications/10505-cash-transfers-what-does-evidence-say-rigorous-review-impacts-and-role-design-and-implementation>

¹² According to the humanitarian community, a Level 3 emergency is a major sudden onset humanitarian crisis triggered by natural disasters or conflict which requires system-wide mobilization. http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/resou_rces/wfp264770.pdf

disasters occurred in FY 2016, including an earthquake in Ecuador and a tropical cyclone that impacted Fiji, the majority of the crises FFP responded to were conflict-driven or complex emergencies.

For the fifth year in a row, conflict throughout the globe continued to increase the record high numbers of refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons. In 2016, there were 65 million people displaced - a number that surpasses the estimated 60 million displaced during World War II. Increased conflict and displacement put significant strains on food assistance budgets, which provide regular, monthly rations to many conflict-affected populations.

Altogether in FY 2016, USAID provided 115 EFSP grants, totaling approximately \$941 million for work in 41 different countries. Regional procurement and local procurement of commodities accounted for the majority of EFSP funding at 42 and 23 percent respectively. FFP utilized food vouchers and cash less frequently, at 16 percent for vouchers and 14 percent for cash, while complementary services and other activities accounted for five percent of EFSP funds.

These grants reached more than 22.8 million people in need through local and regional procurement of commodities, cash transfers for food, and food voucher programs addressing emergency food security needs. The following countries and regions received EFSP grants to address high priority, immediate emergency food security needs in areas where markets were functioning and EFSP programs were timely, cost-effective, or most appropriate: Afghanistan, Algeria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Ecuador, Fiji, Guatemala, Guinea, Haiti, Iraq, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Nepal, Niger, Nigeria, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Uganda, Ukraine, West Bank and Gaza, Yemen, Zimbabwe and in Central America, Southern Africa and West Africa.

For a detailed list of all EFSP activities for FY 2016, see Appendix A.

KEY HUMANITARIAN RESPONSES

EFSP funds enable USAID to respond quickly to emergencies around the world. This section offers a snapshot of five programs in different regions and their success in improving the lives of people affected by natural disaster and conflict.

EL NIÑO

In March 2015, the USAID-funded Famine Early Warning System Network (FEWS NET) predicted that an El Niño weather event would fuel both extreme drought conditions and heavy rains in many parts of the world - including Central America and Haiti. After minimal rainfall resulted in poor harvests, more than three million people faced food insecurity in the region. FFP's response in Latin America and the Caribbean was funded through EFSP market-based modalities because droughts were more localized and markets nearby continued to function.

As a result of El Niño, USAID supported food assistance through the U.N. World Food Program (WFP) to more than 260,000 vulnerable, drought-affected people in Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador and Nicaragua. This assistance also included community asset-building activities, such as road rehabilitation and soil and water conservation projects. In El Salvador, for example, 517 hectares of degraded hillsides were rehabilitated with soil and water conservation methods.

In Guatemala, communities struggling to recover from consecutive years of drought, faced conditions exacerbated by El Niño, poor harvests and coffee rust, and a fungus that has devastated coffee production throughout the region. In areas with functioning markets, USAID provided \$3.7 million in cash transfers to WFP and \$5 million to Catholic Relief Services in Guatemala's Dry Corridor. Additionally, USAID provided \$2 million to Project Concern International to provide food vouchers to the most food insecure populations in the department of Huehuetenango.

In Haiti, USAID also supported WFP cash transfers to 200,000 people for immediate food assistance. Efforts also included cash-for-assets activities aimed at rebuilding livelihoods of drought-affected households, including water conservation and agricultural production enhancement and meals for children in schools and orphanages in areas worst hit by the drought.

SUDAN

Sudan is one of the least developed nations in the world, with 5.8 million people in need of humanitarian assistance in FY 2016. Conflict, El Niño drought effects in the first half of the year, higher than average food prices, poor pasture conditions, and a major influx of South Sudanese refugees led to increased food insecurity in the country. More than 4.2 million people were projected to be food insecure during the peak of the July-to-December lean season, especially among displaced populations.

In FY 2016, USAID targeted 2.5 million food insecure Sudanese and South Sudanese refugees who fled to Sudan. USAID provided \$37.4 million in EFSP funding, including \$10 million for food vouchers to WFP, because of advantages in timeliness, cost savings, protection and beneficiary preference. These vouchers provided market access to internally displaced persons (IDPs) within Darfur as well as populations in North Kordofan - enabling beneficiaries to select purchases among 14 different items, including fresh meat and eggs. By working with pre-selected vendors to provide a wide variety of food items, FFP improved the diversity of diets and utilized existing, functioning markets.

USAID's EFSP contributions also supported UNICEF's purchase of more than 1,120 metric tons of specialized nutrition products to prevent and treat malnutrition in 40,000 children under the age of 5. Altogether, this assistance was timely, cost effective and served as a lifeline for hundreds of thousands of families.

SYRIA

Six years of ongoing conflict in Syria has left 13.5 million Syrians - roughly 73 percent of the population inside Syria and 4.9 million Syrians displaced in neighboring countries in need of humanitarian assistance. In FY 2016, USAID provided more than \$330 million to continue its efforts to provide food assistance to the most vulnerable populations both inside Syria and to Syrian refugees in surrounding countries. The flexibility of EFSP funds enabled USAID to provide life-saving assistance to five million Syrians every month including four million beneficiaries inside Syria and one million refugees in Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon and Turkey.

USAID, through implementing partners including WFP and nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), has been providing families across Syria with locally and regionally procured food or food vouchers where markets are functioning. The conflict has driven record levels of displacement within Syria and throughout the region. In 2016 alone, there were 900,000 rapid onset IDPs. Partners rapidly responded

to newly displaced persons as the battle lines moved - providing families without homes or the utensils to cook, food baskets that were lighter, easier to carry and ready to eat.

USAID sponsored innovative programs to provide bread - the staple food of the Syrian diet - to food insecure populations throughout the country. By providing wheat flour and yeast through partners, local bakeries are able to increase the production of bread and sell it at a stable and affordable price to the community, mitigating the high price inflation that has affected many other items inside the country. As a result, millions of food insecure Syrians have access to bread and bakeries are able to stay in business, pay workers and purchase additional supplies in local markets, encouraging stability, providing sustenance and providing a sense of community to the victims of war.

Over the course of FY 2016, USAID provided WFP with \$26 million to support its food voucher program, enabling Syrian refugees to buy familiar grocery items in local supermarkets and prepare meals with nutritious ingredients, including fresh foods. In addition, the food voucher program has a secondary, crucial benefit of injecting more than \$1.7 billion into the economies of Syria's neighboring countries and has created employment, with more than 1,300 new jobs since it began.

ECUADOR

On April 16, 2016, a 7.8 magnitude earthquake struck Ecuador's northern coast and left two-thirds of the population food insecure in Esmeraldas, Santo Domingo, Manabí, Guayas, Los Ríos and Santa Elena provinces. USAID quickly provided \$500,000 in EFSP funding to WFP, which began providing urgently-needed food vouchers to earthquake-affected people within 72 hours.

For the first time in Latin America, WFP used the country's pre-existing national social safety net program as a delivery platform through which to respond to an emergency. This platform structure with seven banking networks and associated financial institutions, allowed WFP to reach wide coverage of those in need and provide them emergency assistance. Beneficiaries received vouchers by presenting their national identification card at their preferred financial institution. This timely response ensured that earthquake-affected populations received food and that local economies were able to recover quickly from the devastation.

Two weeks after the crisis, FFP staff visited affected coastal areas to assess the food needs among severely impacted communities. While tourism and fishing industries had been damaged, FFP found that food needs were largely being met and communities were on the path to recovery.

NIGERIA

Despite favorable rainfall levels in 2016 and an improvement in agricultural conditions in most of Nigeria, food security conditions remained poor in Boko Haram-affected areas of the country's northeastern states. According to the USAID-funded Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), this was due to continued insecurity and conflict, high food prices, livelihood disruptions, and market constraints.

According to the Cadre Harmonisé,¹³ in FY 2016 4.6 million people in northeastern Nigeria experienced acute food insecurity and malnutrition - including 65,000 experiencing extremely critical levels of malnutrition. Conflict has displaced over 1.7 million people, prevented them from planting crops or accessing food, prevented markets from operating, and limited humanitarian assistance.

Responding to those affected by conflict, USAID partnered with NGOs, UNICEF and WFP to provide emergency food assistance to more than 500,000 people in northeastern Nigeria. In FY 2016, FFP increased funding to programs, encouraging partners to expand their operations to reach newly accessible areas - supporting IDPs and vulnerable host community members, resulting in more than \$102.6 million in emergency food assistance to Nigerian refugees in the Lake Chad Basin region (Niger, Cameroon and Nigeria), including \$50.8 million IDPs in northeastern Nigeria.

In FY 2016, FFP primarily provided food vouchers to displaced persons and host community members in Adamawa, Borno and Yobe States. Favorable rainfall and an expansion of cultivated land resulted in average or above average harvests in much of Nigeria, so this market-based assistance facilitated access to food while supporting local markets. Where markets were not functioning, FFP supported WFP distribution of food procured in Nigerian and regional markets.

Food for Peace also supported complementary nutrition programming that helped families use locally available foods to meet nutritional requirements. Activities included radio messaging, small group meetings and cooking demonstrations that promoted improved infant and young child feeding practices, use of nutrient-dense recipes and the importance of dietary diversity.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGIES

Since 2010, USAID has required applicants to include a monitoring and evaluation plan. Beginning in 2015, funding applicants also needed to plan and budget for a baseline survey and a final evaluation survey for projects that propose an implementation period of greater than 12 months. FFP staff in Washington, DC are responsible for reviewing partner reports and FFP field staff verify the information provided.

MONITORING

Monitoring tracks progress throughout the life of a project and ensures that commodities, cash transfers and food vouchers are delivered according to standard procedures, for the stated purposes, and to targeted beneficiaries.

ESFP Partners monitor conditions throughout the life of the award and FFP staff verify this information through visits to distribution and project sites. Market conditions can change quickly due to price spikes, inflation, seasonality and other factors, and activities can be adjusted to better respond to current conditions. Monitoring also helps USAID stay apprised of other problems that hinder food assistance efforts including loss, damage, or theft to equipment or agricultural commodities. To support these efforts, FFP's Monitoring and Evaluation team develops tools and trainings for staff and partners to

¹³ Cadre Harmonisé is a food security tool used throughout West Africa for the classification, analysis and reporting of food insecurity. The tool is funded by USAID, the European Union, the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) member countries, the European Union and the French Agency for Development (AFD).

monitor projects that use local or regional procurement, cash transfers or food vouchers. When the mobility of U.S. Government staff and partners is limited due to security constraints, USAID can contract third-party monitoring. In FY 2016, FFP procured third-party monitoring jointly with the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance to improve accountability as well as monitoring activities in Somalia and Yemen.

Occasionally, FFP also conducts special assessments. In FY 2016, for example, FFP staff traveled to Uganda to see if markets in the Karamoja region were strong enough to support modalities like cash transfers or food vouchers. The 10 day analysis conducted 38 interviews in 14 locations, speaking to households, traders and government officials, as well as 10 market visits in order to holistically capture the state of markets.

EVALUATION

All EFSP partners are required to submit quarterly performance reports, annual results reports and final programmatic reports as part of the award agreement. In FY 2016, USAID updated the indicators to measure the timeliness, cost effectiveness and appropriateness of emergency food assistance interventions. These indicators will be used in awards made under the FFP FY 2017 Annual Program Statement for International Emergency Food Assistance.

To further improve the overall quality and consistency of activity reporting, USAID is also in the process of revising the Annual Results Report guidance. In addition to measuring gender integration and environmental factors, the guidance requires reporting on the use of cash, voucher and/or local and regional procurement. Finally, the guidance requests an analysis of direct participants who benefit from multi-sectoral approaches integrated at the household or individual level, since evidence suggested that individuals and households achieve a higher level of food and nutritional outcomes when they participate in multiple interventions that address availability, access and utilization.

In FY 2016, the GAO and USAID's Office of the Inspector General (OIG) published four reports evaluating EFSP activities. Two reports, one from GAO and the other from the Inspector General¹⁴, focused on USAID's emergency response inside Syria¹⁵ and a third from the OIG focused on FFP's response to Ebola.¹⁶ The fourth report from GAO examined FFP's monitoring and evaluation of emergency cash and voucher activities.¹⁷ This last report acknowledged that systems are in place that are good, but it recommended stronger implementation of these systems. FFP is already working to carry out GAO's recommendations.

While these studies provide an objective perspective and help ensure that activities are as efficient and effective as possible, they primarily assess specific process issues or questions without setting market-based programming in the context of the wider array of food assistance tools that FFP uses, including

¹⁴ Barr, Ann Calvaresi. USAID Inspector General. "Fraud Investigations Expose Weaknesses in Syria Humanitarian Aid Programs". July 14, 2016. Available at: <https://oig.usaid.gov/node/2017>

¹⁵ Government Accountability Office. "Syria Humanitarian Assistance: Some Risks of Providing Aid inside Syria Assessed, but U.S. Agencies Could Improve Fraud Oversight". GAO-16-629; Jul 14, 2016. Available at: <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-16-629>

¹⁶ Gueye, Abdoulaye. Regional Inspector General, Dakar. "Audit of Select Activities from the USAID/Food for Peace Response to the Ebola Crisis in West Africa". March 16, 2016. Available at: <https://oig.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/audit-reports/7-962-16-003-p.pdf>

¹⁷ Government Accountability Office. "International Cash-Based Food Assistance: USAID Has Established Processes to Monitor Cash and Voucher Projects, but Data Limitations Impede Evaluation". GAO-16-819; Sep 20, 2016. Available at: <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-16-819>

supporting multiple modalities for a single response. Therefore, in FY 2016, FFP commissioned TANGO International to review its use of EFSP funds over the last five years (2010-2016). This body of work will contribute to improving internal technical competency as well as the larger, global community of practice for cash transfer programming. This review will be available in FY 2018 and findings will help to refine USAID's efficient use of funds and effective programming under EFSP.

APPENDIX A: TABLE OF FY 2016 EFSP AWARDS

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁸	TOTAL FUNDING LEVEL	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFER	FOOD VOUCHER	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁹	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Afghanistan	Conflict/Earthquake	WFP	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000						
Afghanistan	Conflict/Earthquake	WFP	\$14,000,000	\$14,000,000						
Algeria	Conflict	WFP	\$2,000,000	\$936,161	\$1,063,839					Algeria, Turkey
Burkina Faso	Disaster	UNICEF	\$999,540	\$999,540						
Burkina Faso	Conflict	WFP	\$2,400,000			\$2,000,000		\$400,000		
Burma	Conflict/Disaster	WFP	\$2,500,000	\$699,314		\$1,800,686				
Burma	Conflict/Disaster	WFP	\$5,000,000	\$3,576,760	\$273,037	\$1,150,203				Malaysia, Indonesia
Burundi	Conflict	WFP	\$8,000,000		\$2,671,848		\$4,807,845	\$520,307		Rwanda, Tanzania
Central America Regional	Conflict	WFP	\$5,000,000	\$200,000		\$4,800,000				Nicaragua
Central America Regional	Shocks/Droughts	WFP	\$5,000,000			\$2,076,492	\$2,923,508			
Chad	Conflict/Refugees	WFP	\$4,400,000			\$4,400,000				
Cote d'Ivoire	Ebola Recovery	WFP	\$3,300,000	\$503,423	\$1,825,873	\$835,884		\$134,820		Burkina Faso, South Africa
Democratic Republic of Congo	Conflict	WFP	\$650,000						\$650,000	
Democratic Republic of Congo	Conflict	WFP	\$2,350,000	\$2,350,000						
Democratic Republic of Congo	Conflict	WFP	\$5,000,001	\$4,771,522	\$228,479					Kenya
Democratic Republic of Congo	Refugees	WFP	\$17,750,000	\$12,891,758	\$4,858,242					Kenya, Namibia
Democratic Republic of Congo	Refugees	WFP	\$4,500,000			\$4,500,000				
Democratic Republic of Congo	Conflict	CRS	\$2,280,149	\$456,034		\$1,824,115				
Democratic Republic of Congo	Conflict	Samaritan's Purse	\$3,149,997				\$3,149,997			

¹⁸ The identities of several partner organizations are withheld for safety and security reasons but additional information can be provided on request.

¹⁹ Other activities include international procurement, milling, twinning, and supporting Humanitarian Coordination & Information Management

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁸	TOTAL FUNDING LEVEL	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFER	FOOD VOUCHER	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁹	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Democratic Republic of Congo	Conflict	ACTED	\$2,058,804	\$2,058,804						
Ecuador	Refugees	WFP	\$2,099,974				\$2,099,974			
Ecuador	Disaster	WFP	\$500,000			\$500,000				
Fiji	Disaster	WFP	\$1,000,000				\$1,000,000			
Guatemala	Disaster	CRS	\$5,026,258			\$1,109,222	\$3,577,757	\$339,279		
Guatemala	Disaster	PCI	\$1,968,127	\$100,311			\$1,719,829	\$147,987		
Guinea	Ebola Recovery	CRS	\$1,927,693				\$1,407,216	\$520,477		
Haiti	Drought	World Vision	\$2,118,783				\$2,118,783			
Haiti	Disaster	World Vision	\$855,991				\$855,991			
Haiti	Drought	CARE	\$5,868,890			\$5,868,890				
Haiti	Conflict	WFP	\$11,135,936			\$11,135,936				
Iraq	Conflict/Disaster	WFP	\$25,000,000	\$470,752	\$22,893,734				\$1,635,514	Turkey
Iraq	IDP/Conflict	WFP	\$20,000,000		\$20,000,000					Turkey
Iraq	Conflict	WFP	\$41,000,000	\$1,640,002	\$31,160,061	\$8,199,937				Turkey, Iraq
Liberia	Ebola Recovery	Mercy Corps	\$4,668,089			\$4,012,558		\$655,531		
Malawi	Drought	WFP	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000						
Malawi	Drought	WFP	\$10,000,000	\$5,109,322	\$4,890,678					Malawi
Malawi	Drought	WFP	\$8,000,000	\$6,575,366	\$1,424,634					Malawi
Malawi	Conflict	UNICEF	\$1,072,834	\$1,072,834						
Mali	Conflict/Disaster	CARE	\$1,950,000			\$1,950,000				
Mali	Conflict	IRC	\$2,100,000			\$2,100,000				Mali
Mali	Disaster	Handicap International	\$5,949,878			\$3,852,687	\$917,323	\$1,179,868		
Mali	Refugees	WFP	\$8,000,000	\$3,686,958			\$4,313,042			
Mauritania	Conflict	OXFAM Intermon	\$1,000,000			\$1,000,000				Mauritania

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁸	TOTAL FUNDING LEVEL	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFER	FOOD VOUCHER	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁹	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Mauritania	Conflict	AAH-Spain	\$837,097			\$493,749	\$218,669	\$124,679		Mauritania
Nepal	Refugees	WFP	\$1,000,000	\$1,000,000						
Niger	Conflict	Partner 21	\$2,700,000				\$2,700,000			
Niger	Drought	WFP	\$5,000,000	\$3,048,758	\$506,892	\$1,444,350				Senegal
Niger	Drought	UNICEF	\$1,500,000			\$1,500,000				
Niger	Conflict/Disaster	Partner 11	\$1,993,615			\$1,993,615				
Nigeria		WFP	\$2,000,000						\$2,000,000	
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 23	\$6,500,000	\$773,825		\$2,609,115	\$2,609,115	\$507,945		
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 7	\$5,506,476				\$5,506,476			
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 11	\$4,000,000				\$4,000,000			
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 11	\$2,500,000				\$2,283,577	\$216,423		
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 19	\$5,000,000			\$199,286	\$4,791,897	\$8,817		
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 19	\$3,000,000				\$2,994,689	\$5,311		
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 23	\$4,300,000			\$1,926,575	\$1,926,574	\$446,851		
Nigeria Regional	Conflict/Refugees	WFP	\$180,000						\$180,000	
Nigeria Regional	Conflict	WFP	\$10,000,000	\$10,000,000						
Nigeria Regional	Conflict	WFP	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000						Chad
Nigeria Regional	Conflict	WFP	\$7,000,000	\$3,273,273	\$2,003,278	\$1,723,449				Niger, Senegal
Nigeria Regional	Conflict	WFP	\$6,000,000			\$6,000,000				
Pakistan	Drought	WFP	\$16,000,000	\$5,164,234	\$2,312,401			\$6,818,306	\$1,705,059	Malaysia
Pakistan	Conflict	WFP	\$7,500,000	\$1,083,130	\$318,739				\$6,098,131	Malaysia
Pakistan	Shocks	WFP	\$18,475,650	\$18,475,650						
Papua New Guinea	Refugees	WFP	\$1,100,000	\$668,790				\$431,210		
Papua New Guinea	Disaster	WFP	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000						
Rwanda	Refugees	WFP	\$5,000,001	\$1,990,786	\$631,140	\$2,378,075				South Africa

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁸	TOTAL FUNDING LEVEL	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFER	FOOD VOUCHER	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁹	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Rwanda	Conflict	WFP	\$4,300,001	\$2,767,537	\$171,167	\$1,361,297				Rwanda, Kenya, South Africa
Sierra Leone	Conflict	Save the Children	\$3,192,877			\$3,163,020		\$29,857		
Sierra Leone & Liberia	Conflict	AAH - CaLP	\$694,028					\$694,028		Sierra Leone & Liberia
Somalia	Conflict	Partner 16	\$1,103,576						\$1,103,576	
Somalia	Conflict	Partner 5	\$2,474,179			\$2,474,179				
Somalia	Conflict	Partner 14	\$2,500,000				\$2,500,000			
Somalia	Disaster	Partner 8	\$3,000,000			\$3,000,000				
Somalia	Drought/Disaster	Partner 11	\$2,500,000				\$2,465,376	\$34,624		
Somalia	Conflict	Partner 4	\$1,600,000			\$1,600,000				
Somalia	Conflict/Disaster	Partner 9	\$8,000,000			\$8,000,000				
Somalia	Conflict	Partner 13	\$11,036,379				\$11,036,379			
South Sudan	Conflict	WFP	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000						
South Sudan	Conflict	WFP	\$13,000,000		\$13,000,000					
South Sudan	Conflict	WFP	\$40,000,000		\$38,000,000		\$2,000,000			Rwanda, South Sudan, Sudan, Tanzania, Uganda
South Sudan	Conflict	WFP	\$4,000,000		\$4,000,000					Uganda
Southern Africa Regional	Drought	WFP	\$20,000,000		\$14,285,386				\$5,714,614	South Africa, Zambia
Sudan	Conflict/Disaster	WFP	\$10,000,000				\$10,000,000			
Sudan	Conflict	UNICEF	\$1,431,000	\$1,431,000						
Sudan	Conflict	Partner 1	\$17,499,656		\$17,499,656					Uganda
Sudan	Conflict	Partner 2	\$4,000,000		\$4,000,000					South Sudan
Sudan		Partner 3	\$3,000,000			\$3,000,000				
Syria	Conflict	IMMAP	\$2,074,286						\$2,074,286	
Syria	Conflict	FAO	\$2,100,000						\$2,100,000	

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁸	TOTAL FUNDING LEVEL	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFER	FOOD VOUCHER	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁹	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Syria	Conflict	WFP	\$5,700,000		\$5,700,000					Logistics Air
Syria	Conflict	WFP	\$10,000,000		\$10,000,000					Logistics Air
Syria	Conflict/Refugees	WFP	\$26,000,000			\$26,000,000				
Syria	Conflict/Refugees	WFP	\$57,000,001	\$24,195,398	\$30,445,467	\$2,359,136				Turkey
Syria	Conflict/Refugees	WFP	\$4,775,165		\$4,775,165					Turkey
Syria	Conflict	Partner 7	\$36,328,496		\$33,487,902		\$2,840,594			Turkey
Syria	Conflict	Partner 19	\$21,152,072	\$5,050,558	\$14,148,681		\$1,952,833			Turkey, Syria, India
Syria	Conflict	Partner 19	\$9,405,361		\$6,213,098		\$3,192,263			Turkey
Syria	Conflict	Partner 17	\$17,679,340		\$17,679,340					Jordan
Syria	Conflict	Partner 22	\$11,600,000		\$11,600,000					Iraq
Syria	Conflict	Partner 22	\$39,999,999		\$38,553,819		\$1,446,180			Jordan
Syria	Conflict	Partner 18	\$5,800,000	\$188,267	\$1,365,058		\$4,095,168	\$151,507		Turkey
Syria	Conflict/Refugees	Partner 20	\$47,980,926	\$34,852,425			\$13,128,501			
Syria	Conflict	Partner 20	\$19,878,990		\$19,878,990					Turkey
Syria	Conflict	Partner 21	\$6,139,876		\$2,727,348		\$3,073,539	\$338,989		Iraq, Turkey
Uganda	Refugees	WFP	\$1,229,223	\$1,229,223						
Uganda	Conflict/Refugees	WFP	\$3,000,000	\$2,109,177		\$640,823		\$250,000		
Uganda	Conflict	WFP	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000						
Uganda	Refugees	WFP	\$8,770,777	\$8,770,777						
Ukraine	Conflict	WFP	\$5,000,000	\$5,000,000						
West Bank and Gaza	Conflict	WFP	\$4,000,000	\$35,014	\$3,964,986					Turkey
Yemen	Conflict	WFP	\$5,000,000						\$5,000,000	
Yemen	Conflict	Partner 24	\$7,000,000				\$6,740,621	\$259,379		
Yemen	Conflict	Partner 11	\$5,000,000				\$4,692,364	\$307,636		

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁸	TOTAL FUNDING LEVEL	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFER	FOOD VOUCHER	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁹	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Yemen	Conflict	Partner 19	\$8,499,999				\$7,612,330	\$887,669		
Yemen	Conflict	WFP	\$16,000,000				\$16,000,000			
Zimbabwe	Drought	WFP	\$10,000,000		\$10,000,000					Zambia
TOTAL			\$941,119,990	\$215,206,683	\$398,558,938	\$134,983,279	\$148,698,410	\$15,411,500	\$28,261,180	