



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

U.S. Agency for International Development International Food Assistance Report

Fiscal Year 2018



Cover Photograph: A couple feed their young children following a community cooking and feeding demonstration as part of the Food for Peace Nobo Jatra project. This couple is actively striving towards a more equal division of caregiving and domestic tasks along with shared decision-making around food purchases, intra-household food distribution, and household budgeting. Photo by Farjana Ferdousi, World Vision Bangladesh.

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

Contents

I. Introduction.....	4
II. Latest Developments.....	5
A. Donor Engagement on Humanitarian Assistance.....	5
B. Food Assistance and the Nutrition Evidence Summit.....	5
C. Implementer-Led Design, Evidence, Analysis, and Learning.....	6
III. Regional Highlights	
A. Emergency Response: Republic of Yemen.....	6
B. Emergency Response: People’s Republic of Bangladesh.....	6
C. Non-Emergency Activities.....	7
IV. Appendices	
A. Legislative Framework.....	9
B. List of Abbreviations.....	11
C. List of Awardees.....	13
D. Graphs on Food Assistance Provided by USAID in FY 2018.....	14
E. USAID Title II Non-Emergency Activities: Summary Budget, Commodity, Beneficiaries, and Tonnage for FY 2018.....	19
F. USAID Title II Emergency Activities: Summary Budget, Commodity, Beneficiaries, and Tonnage for FY 2018.....	21
G. Food for Peace Title II Congressional Mandates FY 2018.....	23
H. Title II International Food Relief Partnership Countries FY 2018.....	24
I. Use of Section 207(f) Authorities of the Food for Peace Act.....	25
J. Monitoring and Evaluation.....	26
K. Monetization Rate of Return and Use of Proceeds.....	28
L. Food Aid Consultative Group.....	29

I. Introduction

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2018, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) Office of Food for Peace (FFP) within the Bureau of Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) continued to demonstrate the compassion and generosity of the American people through the provision of more than \$1.7 billion in food assistance overseas and the procurement of more than 1.4 million metric tons (MT) of food to serve a total of 35 million beneficiaries¹ in 30 countries. Authorized by Title II of the Food for Peace Act, these contributions not only saved lives, but also rebuilt livelihoods, generated income, increased literacy, improved nutrition, strengthened resilience, and mitigated the impacts of future crises. Even with this process, the world continued to face unprecedented levels of need—in 2018, 80 million required emergency food assistance, according to the USAID-funded Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET).

Global hunger was on the rise largely because of violent conflict. As a result, the world faced a second consecutive year of alarmingly high levels of emergency food needs. Over the last several years, the most vulnerable and chronically food insecure people have been in war-weary Syria, South Sudan, Somalia, Nigeria, and Yemen. In addition, new crises emerged in late 2017 and 2018. In Burma, more than 700,000 Rohingya fled persecution and crossed the border to Bangladesh. In Venezuela, a severe, regime-driven political and economic crisis has led to severe shortages of food and medicine that have caused approximately 2.6 million people to flee to neighboring countries. Looking ahead to 2019, none of these situations have seen a lasting resolution and some – notably Yemen – have deteriorated markedly.

To address these crises, USAID worked with dedicated partners to provide food assistance to save lives, reduce suffering, and support recovery for millions in both acute and chronic emergencies. Using a combination of approaches—including U.S.-sourced commodities; local and regional procurement of food; cash transfers for food; and food vouchers—appropriate to the local contexts, USAID was able to save lives, address the root causes of hunger, and build resilience and food security in local communities. The cases provided in the Regional Highlights section offer examples of the responses undertaken through USAID’s Title II investments.

In FY 2018, USAID spent more than 80 percent of its funding for USAID Title II food assistance on emergency response and roughly 20 percent for non-emergency programming. When combined with International Disaster Assistance (IDA) and Development Assistance funds provided as Community Development Funds (CDF)², USAID reached more than 76 million people in 62 countries with food assistance in FY 2018 with a total of \$3.7 billion dollars and almost 2.5 million MT of food. This report provides the highlights of trends and activities in food assistance for the year.³

USAID provides this report in pursuance to Section 407(f) of the Food for Peace Act, as amended by Section 3112 of the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (Public Law 115-334).

¹ USAID reports on both direct and indirect beneficiaries. USAID defines “direct beneficiaries” as those who come into direct contact with its program interventions. USAID defines “indirect beneficiaries” as those who benefit indirectly from the goods and services provided to the direct beneficiaries. For example, the head of household might be the direct beneficiary, but the dependent family members are considered indirect beneficiaries.

² Community Development Funds (CDF) are Development Assistance funds, authorized separately under Section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. USAID’s Bureau for Food Security provides CDF resources 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 supports similar development objectives as Title II, and provides funds directly to programs as an alternative to monetization of agricultural commodities.

³ Farmer-to-Farmer Title V will issue its own annual report separately.

II. Latest Developments

A. Donor Engagement on Humanitarian Assistance

In FY 2018, USAID led engagement with other donors to expand the humanitarian donor base and level of contributions from other governments. While the United States has typically been the largest donor to global humanitarian crises, USAID and the U.S. Department of State have consistently encouraged other donors to do their fair share.

The Grand Bargain, an agreement between the biggest governmental donors and humanitarian aid providers created out of the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit, highlighted the need for increased donor engagement to address the gap between humanitarian needs and funding provided. USAID has continually engaged with donors and other key groups to address the humanitarian funding gap, by strengthening the effectiveness and efficiency of the overall humanitarian system, with a concerted focus on reducing duplication and management costs and improving joint needs assessments. In FY 2018, USAID had success in Afghanistan and Pakistan with the use of “twinning,” an initiative that leverages U.S. contributions to food crises and pairs it with host government and other donor resources by supporting the cost of distributing the commodities.⁴

Additionally, in FY 2018, the United States completed its second consecutive term as chair of the Food Assistance Convention (FAC) and was succeeded by Japan. The FAC is a 16-nation convention that includes the United States, the European Union, Canada, Japan, Australia, and other nations committed to providing global food assistance. The FAC recently welcomed South Korea as a new member.

In FY 2018, the FAC’s 10th Session reviewed the global situation regarding hunger and malnutrition and current food emergencies. FAC members who participated in a second joint field mission trip gave a readout on their visit to Uganda to see both humanitarian and non-emergency programs first hand in areas where nearly 250,000 refugees from South Sudan reside. The situation presented a unique opportunity to explore the value of working across the spectrum of development and humanitarian activities to promote longer-term outcomes and build the resilience of both refugee and host populations.

B. Food Assistance and Nutrition Evidence Summit

In FY 2018, USAID’s Food Aid Quality Review (FAQR) project led by Tufts University’s Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy and its partners hosted the Food Assistance for Nutrition Evidence Summit. The goals were to examine the current state of research on food assistance for nutrition, have discussions on key policy and program-relevant findings, and identify priority areas for future investments. Over 250 researchers, policymakers and representatives from donors, industry, and implementing partners participated.

Continuing to demonstrate measurable impacts is still a top priority for the FAQR project. Several priority actions identified during the two-day summit included the need to invest in research that generates policy-relevant and cost-effective evidence, and advocating value for money for food assistance and nutrition programming. There is also a push for new metrics of nutritional status that go beyond a child’s physical growth, such as brain development, gut health, and body composition, to provide a physiological understanding of malnutrition and enhance multi-sectoral and multi-institutional collaboration, such as increasing private-sector investment in food aid.

⁴ Twinning is funded through International Disaster Assistance (IDA) funds and was \$22,698,438 in FY 2018.

C. Implementer-Led Design, Evidence, Analysis, and Learning

USAID's Technical and Operational Performance Support (TOPS) Program came to a close at the end of 2018. TOPS aimed to provide a community of practice among food security and nutrition actors, particularly USAID partners, to share best practices and knowledge across non-emergency projects. A new activity called Implementer-Led Design, Evidence, Analysis, and Learning (IDEAL) is now in place from 2019 to 2024. The activity works to support the U.S. Government's goal of improving food and nutrition security among the world's most vulnerable households and communities. IDEAL addresses knowledge and capacity gaps expressed by food- and nutrition-security implementing community to support them in design and implementation of effective non-emergency and emergency food security activities.

III. Regional Examples

A. Emergency Response: Republic of Yemen

Yemen is suffering the world's largest food crisis, as a multi-year conflict continues between government and Houthi opposition forces. According to the *United Nations Humanitarian Needs Overview* released in December 2017, 17.8 million of Yemen's 29 million people were food insecure in FY 2018, 8.4 million of whom were severely food insecure. Significant declines in commercial imports and conflict that cuts populations off from trade and humanitarian assistance for an extended period would likely lead to famine conditions in Yemen⁵, according to FEWS NET.

In FY 2018, USAID provided more than \$361 million (\$273 million in Title II and \$88 million in International Disaster Assistance (IDA) funds) in life-saving emergency food assistance to the country, which has historically imported 90 percent of its food and most of its fuel and medicines. In FY 2018, USAID provided 328,550 metric tons of Title II wheat, peas, and vegetable oil. This helped the World Food Program (WFP) scale up its operations to reach approximately 7 million people per month with life-saving food assistance countrywide during FY 2018.

USAID's funding also enabled non-governmental organizations to provide food vouchers to Yemen's most vulnerable populations, provided ready-to-use therapeutic food (RUTF) to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF) for the treatment of children who were suffering from severe acute malnutrition, and supported the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) as the lead coordinating body for the cluster of international organizations that are responding to food insecurity in Yemen.

B. Emergency Response: People's Republic of Bangladesh

In late 2017 and early 2018, more than 700,000 Rohingya fled violence in Burma and crossed the border into Bangladesh, where they formed the world's largest refugee settlement in a matter of months. They joined the more than 212,000 Rohingya who were living in the country prior to August 2017. Most of these refugees reside in temporary settlements near Cox's Bazar, where they experience high levels of malnutrition and completely rely on humanitarian assistance to meet their food needs. In FY 2018, USAID contributed more than \$6.5 million in Title II emergency funds to UNICEF to provide U.S.-sourced RUTF to treat vulnerable children in Cox's Bazar District under 5 years old who were suffering

⁵ Famine is categorized as Integrated Phase Classification 5, the fifth stage of food insecurity where at least one in five households face an extreme lack of food, more than 30 percent of children under 5 are suffering from acute malnutrition and at least two people of every 10,000 are dying each day.

from severe acute malnutrition. USAID's contribution to UNICEF also supported services to feed infants and young children and breastfeeding activities.

The speed and scale of the crisis nearly overwhelmed global humanitarian actors' ability to respond, and continues to place a heavy burden on local Bangladeshi communities. In FY 2018, USAID contributed roughly \$150 million, including \$101.4 million in IDA funds, to WFP in Bangladesh to provide locally and regionally sourced in-kind food aid and electronic food vouchers to Rohingya refugees, as well as for cash-based income-generating activities to host communities in Cox's Bazar and activities to prepare for the monsoon season. Roughly \$42.7 million in Title II funding went to non-emergency activities implemented by USAID's local partners. In-kind food assistance was needed to meet their basic nutritional needs and improve dietary diversity as refugees recovered from the grueling journey from Burma. USAID also funded nutrition activities to help women and children. Through WFP, children under 5 years old and pregnant and lactating women received specialized foods to prevent and treat acute malnutrition.

C. Non-Emergency Activities

Recognizing that repeatedly responding to emergencies will not end hunger and increase long-term food security, USAID plays a unique role in bridging the gap between crisis and stability by addressing the root causes of food insecurity; helping individuals and communities withstand future crises; and laying the foundation for stable, inclusive growth. Ultimately, USAID promotes a path to self-reliance to reduce the need for future food assistance. In FY 2018, USAID invested \$350 million in Title II resources in multi-year, non-emergency food assistance activities that build resilience among vulnerable populations by addressing the underlying issues of chronic hunger and poverty.

Republic of Guatemala

In Guatemala, Catholic Relief Services (CRS) completed a six-year USAID Title II non-emergency food assistance activity. The activity targeted the most vulnerable households, namely those that are landless or small landholders, and worked to increase access to food through improved agricultural production, diversification of income sources, establishing savings and internal lending community groups, and linking farmer groups to markets. The activity also targeted pregnant and lactating women and children under 2 years old to improve their health and nutrition. In the same geographic area, another non-emergency activity implemented by Save the Children promoted positive behavior change in nutrition, health, hygiene, sanitation and agriculture; involved women in the project's activities; and diversified livelihoods through livestock and savings and lending.

Agricultural Productivity

CRS provided training to participants so they could adopt sustainable agricultural practices and improve their households' food production. Overall, the proportion of farmers in the project's implementation area who used at least three sustainable agricultural practices—such as using improved seeds for beans, soil conservation practices, organic fertilization, household gardens, managing fruit trees, and producing native herbs—increased significantly, from 50.1 percent in 2013 to 63.8 percent in 2018. The project also supported farmers to establish production groups and link them to markets. The value chain activities focused on organizing and providing technical and marketing support to associations of producers around four value chains—coffee, honey, tomatoes, and potatoes. The percentage of farmers in the implementation area who practiced value chain activities that the project promoted increased twofold from 2013 to 2018, from 11.5 to 23.9 percent, and participants reported that profits were reinvested in part to growing their businesses.

For the project implemented by Save the Children, fruit and vegetable gardening as well as activities rearing goats, rabbits, and poultry directly improved households' nutrition through increased consumption, that is, increased physical access to food. Increased incomes from selling project-promoted crop and animal products also increased access to food. Evaluation results based on focus groups and in-depth interviews with participants and community members indicate that home gardening and poultry production are two activities they are likely to sustain.

Maternal and Child Nutrition and Health

In Guatemala, CRS' nutrition and health interventions included food transfers, providing health and nutrition information and training, growth monitoring of children under 2 years old, and the management of cases of acute malnutrition with the goal of contributing to moving the needle on reducing stunting. In fact, at the population level in the project's implementation area, the prevalence of stunting in children under 5 years old decreased from 79.6 percent to 72.2 percent, and the percent who were underweight decreased from 34.5 percent to 25.3 percent.

Another important achievement was reduction of diarrhea in children under 5 years old from 42.6 percent to 28.2 percent at the population level in the implementation area. This change significantly associated with increased access to improved sources of drinking water, as well as the use of improved sanitation facilities. CRS worked with local water management committees and municipal water and sanitation offices to improve water systems, repair infrastructure, and establish water chlorination systems. Increased access to piped water, combined with widespread chlorination, likely accounts for much of the reduction in diarrheal diseases.

To address nutrient gaps in women's diets, Save the Children promoted diverse diets, growing food at home, access to food resulting in statistically significant increases in women's consumption of foods the project promoted. Social and behavior change interventions, particularly around purchasing nutritious food, was an important driver of the success in the area of dietary diversity. The prevalence of a minimum acceptable diet for children 6–23 months old more than doubled, from 22.1 percent at baseline to 47.7 percent at endline, which far surpassed the project's goal. At the population level in the Save the Children implementation area, a statistically significant decline of 5 percentage points in stunting prevalence occurred from baseline to endline, from 74.7 percent to 69.7 percent over the life of the award.

V. Appendices

A. Legislative Framework

Since the passage of Public Law 83-480, or “P.L. 480” (the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954; re-named the Food for Peace Act by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, also known as the 2008 Farm Bill), U.S. international food assistance programs have evolved to address multiple objectives. USAID conducted programmatic operations during FY 2018 consistent with the policy objectives set forth in the Food for Peace Act, as amended.

- Combat world hunger and malnutrition and their causes;
- Promote broad-based, equitable, and sustainable development, including agricultural development;
- Expand international trade;
- Foster and encourage the development of private enterprise and democratic participation in developing countries; and
- Prevent conflicts.

U.S. International Food Assistance⁶

Several statutory authorities established U.S. international food assistance programs, which USAID and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) implement. USAID administers Titles II, III, and V of the Food for Peace Act. The list below provides a brief description of each activity.

I. Food for Peace Act

- **Title I (not active in FY 2018):** Economic Assistance and Food Security—concessional sales of U.S. agricultural commodities to developing countries and private entities.
 - **Title II:** Emergency and Private Assistance Programs—direct donation of U.S. agricultural commodities supplemented with flexible, cash-based assistance for emergency relief and development;
 - **Title III (not active in FY 2018):** Food for Development—government-to-government grants of agricultural commodities tied to policy reform; and
 - **Title V:** John Ogonowski and Doug Bereuter Farmer-to-Farmer Program—voluntary technical assistance to farmers, farm groups, and agribusinesses.
2. **Section 416(b) of the Agricultural Act of 1949 (not active in FY 2018)**—overseas donations of surplus eligible commodities owned by the USDA Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC).
 3. **Food for Progress Act of 1985**—commodity donations or sales on credit terms available to emerging democracies and developing countries committed to the introduction or expansion of free enterprise in their agricultural economies.
 4. **McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program** (Section 3107 of the Farm Security and Rural Investment Act of 2002)—donations of U.S. agricultural

⁶ Farmer-to-Farmer Title V will issue its own annual report separately.

products, as well as financial and technical assistance, for school feeding and nutrition projects for mothers and children in low-income countries.

- 5. Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (BEHT – not activated in FY 2018)**—reserve of funds administered under the authority of the Secretary of Agriculture to meet emergency humanitarian food needs in developing countries, which allows the United States to respond to unanticipated food crises. USDA makes the funds available upon the USAID Administrator’s determination that funds available for emergency needs under P.L. 480 Title II for a fiscal year are insufficient. This trust previously held commodities, but currently holds only funds to purchase commodities. At the close of FY 2018, the BEHT held more than \$261 million.

- 6. Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program (LRP)** (Section 3206 of the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008)—the Agricultural Act of 2014 (2014 Farm Bill) authorized funding of no more than \$80 million annually, to provide for local and regional procurement of food aid commodities for distribution overseas to complement existing food assistance programs and to fill in nutritional gaps for targeted populations or gaps in the availability of food generated by unexpected emergencies.

B. List of Abbreviations

BEHT	Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust
BFS	Bureau for Food Security within USAID
CCC	Commodity Credit Corporation
CDF	Community Development Funds
CFA	Cash for Assets
CSB	Corn Soy Blend
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
DCHA	Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance within USAID
EFSP	Emergency Food Security Program
FAC	Food Assistance Convention
FAO	United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization
FAQR	Food Aid Quality Review
FBF	Fortified Blended Food
FEWS NET	Famine Early Warning System Network
FFP	Office of Food for Peace within USAID/DCHA
FFPMIS	Food for Peace Management Information System
FY	Fiscal Year
GoB	Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
HEB	High Energy Biscuit
IDEAL	Implementer-Led Design, Evidence, Analysis and Learning
IDA	International Disaster Assistance
IPC	Integrated Food Security Phase Classification
LRP	Local and Regional Procurement
MAD	Minimum Acceptable Diet
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation

MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MT	Metric Ton
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OFDA	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance within USAID/DCHA
OIG	Office of the USAID Inspector General
PL	Public Law
PIO	Public International Organization
RUSF	Ready-to-Use Supplementary Food
RUTF	Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Food
SAM	Severe Acute Malnutrition
TOPS	Technical and Operational Performance Support
UN	United Nations
UNICEF	UN Children's Fund
USAID	U.S. Agency for International Development
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
WFP	World Food Program


C. List of Awardees

The following awardees implemented food assistance programs funded by USAID in FY 2018:


ACDI/VOCA	Agriculture Cooperative Development International / Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance
ADRA	Adventist Development and Relief Agency International, Inc.
AVSI	Association of Volunteers in International Service Foundation
CARE	Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc.
CNFA	Cultivating New Frontiers in Agriculture
CRS	Catholic Relief Services
FHI	Food for the Hungry International
HK	Helen Keller International
IRC	International Rescue Committee
Mercy Corps	Mercy Corps International
PCI	Project Concern International
REST	Relief Society of Tigray (Ethiopia)
Save the Children	Save the Children Federation
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
WFP	World Food Program
World Vision	World Vision U.S.

D. Graphs on Food Assistance Provided by USAID in FY 2018


FY 2018 USAID Title II Emergency and Non-Emergency Food Assistance, U.S. Dollars per Region




FY 2018 USAID Title II Emergency Food Assistance, Metric Tons (MT) per Region




FY 2018 USAID Title II Non-Emergency Food Assistance, Metric Tons (MT) per Region




FY 2018 USAID Title II Emergency Funding, by Region



FY 2018 USAID Title II Non-Emergency Funding, by Region



FY 2018 USAID Food Assistance Commodity Mix, Metric Tons (MT)




“Wheat/wheat products” include wheat flour, hard red winter wheat, and soft white winter wheat. “Grains and fortified/blended food products” include corn-soy blend, corn-soy blend plus, fortified rice, super cereal plus, cornmeal, and sorghum. “Pulses” include beans, peas, and lentils. “Others” include rice, Ready-to-Use Supplementary Food (RUSF) and Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Food (RUTF).

FY 2018 USAID Title II Commodity Mix

FOOD GROUP	COMMODITY	NON-EMERGENCY	EMERGENCY	TOTAL METRIC TONS
Grains and Fortified/Blended Food Products	Cornmeal, Bagged	4,890	11,630	16,250
	Corn Soy Blend (CSB) Plus, Bagged	7,770	34,839	42,609
	CSB Super Cereal Plus, Boxed	800	6,890	7,690
	Fortified Rice, Bagged	1,330	5,330	6,660
	Sorghum, Bagged	1,500	33,080	34,580
	Sorghum, Bulk	23,410	357,891	381,301
Subtotal		39,700	449,660	489,360
Other	RUSF	-	5,050	5,050
	RUTF	-	9,464	9,464
	Rice, Bagged	8,460	9,860	18,320
	Rice, Bulk	-	13,430	13,430
Subtotal		8,460	37,804	46,264
Pulses	Beans, Pinto Bagged	-	1,430	1,430
	Lentils, Bagged	2,300	22,175	24,475
	Peas, Green Split Bagged	890	31,620	32,510
	Peas, Green Whole Bagged	990	13,010	14,000
	Peas, Yellow Split Bagged	13,850	62,646	76,496
	Peas, Yellow Whole Bagged	420	12,530	12,950
Subtotal		18,450	143,411	161,861
Vegetable Oil	Vegetable Oil, Bottle	520	-	520
	Vegetable Oil, Can	6,220	80,578	86,797
	Vegetable Oil, Pail	70	210	280
Subtotal		6,810	80,788	87,597
Wheat/Wheat Products	Flour, All Purpose Bagged	-	6,050	6,050
	Wheat, Hard Red Winter Bulk	78,800	228,560	307,360
	Wheat, Soft White Bagged	2,030	-	2,030
	Wheat, Soft White Bulk	98,200	263,610	361,810
Subtotal		179,030	498,220	677,250
WORLDWIDE TOTAL		252,450	1,209,882	1,462,332

FY 2018 Use of USAID Title II Funds



Use of Funds	
Commodities	Cost to purchase commodities.
Ocean Freight	Cost to ship from the United States to the port of entry.
Inland Freight	Cost to move commodities from the port of entry inland to the destination (when commodities cannot be delivered to a port in the destination country), or to the border of a landlocked country.
Internal Shipping and Handling (ITSH)	Cost directly associated with the transportation and distribution of commodities, including storage, warehousing, and commodity distribution costs; internal transport via rail, truck, or barge transportation; commodity monitoring in storage, and at distribution sites; procuring vehicles; in-country operational costs, and others, for the duration of a program.
Section 202(e) Regular	Funds for meeting the specific administrative, management, personnel, storage, and distribution costs of programs.
Section 202(e) Enhanced	Cash resources made available to FFP partners for enhancing programs, including through the use of local and regional procurement and other market-based food assistance interventions.
Other	Includes funds for activities authorized under Section 207(f) of the Food for Peace Act, including FEWS NET and monitoring and evaluation; USAID’s general contribution to WFP; Mission support; rent for facilities, including prepositioning warehouses; and staff and administrative expenses. To provide a more complete picture of Title II resources available to FFP in FY 2018, this category also includes unobligated funds that USAID will carry into and invest in FY 2019.

E. USAID Title II Non-Emergency Activities: Summary Budget, Commodity, Beneficiaries and Tonnage for FY 2018

COUNTRY	AWARDEE	BENEFICIARIES	METRIC TONS	INTERNAL TRANSPORTATION, STORAGE, AND HANDLING (ITSH)	SECTION 202(e)	TITLE II TOTAL COST	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS (CDF)
AFRICA							
Burkina Faso	ACDI/VOCA	85,862*	-	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ -
	CRS	109,107*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	- †	2,020	\$ 247,450	\$ 901,637	\$ 3,472,668	\$ -
Burundi	CRS	300,461	-	\$ 858,151	\$ 11,526,812	\$ 12,384,963	\$ -
Democratic Republic of Congo	CRS	209,293	-	\$ -	\$ 9,610,193	\$ 9,610,193	\$ -
	Food for the Hungry	331,159	6,690	\$ 5,778,389	\$ 3,296,418	\$ 15,831,414	\$ -
	Mercy Corps	41,758	1,870	\$ 967,564	\$ 9,385,916	\$ 12,218,228	\$ -
Ethiopia	CRS	301,883	11,030	\$ 1,201,018	\$ 5,217,624	\$ 11,968,794	\$ -
	Food for the Hungry	330,412	14,990	\$ 2,941,429	\$ 9,597,080	\$ 19,791,169	\$ -
	REST	558,555	38,560	\$ 2,843,990	\$ 8,277,510	\$ 29,634,915	\$ -
	World Vision	329,596	24,670	\$ 2,886,698	\$ 16,883,744	\$ 31,697,868	\$ -
Kenya	WFP	1,022,582 ‡	29,660	\$ 9,215,599	\$ 12,164,711	\$ 34,616,702	\$ -
Madagascar	ADRA	301,652	720	\$ 46,660	\$ 3,781,048	\$ 4,468,336	\$ -
	CRS	180,278	-	\$ 735,285	\$ 3,825,630	\$ 4,560,915	\$ -
Malawi	CRS	192,877	1,680	\$ 884,270	\$ 812,884	\$ 3,681,246	\$ 9,398,906
	PCI	107,953	-	\$ 355,958	\$ 1,636,594	\$ 1,992,552	\$ 2,473,011
Mali	CARE	52,961	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,000,000
Niger	CARE	-	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,500,000
	CRS	414,354	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 15,500,000
	Mercy Corps	34,408	-	\$ -	\$ 283,957	\$ 283,957	\$ -
	Save the Children	- †	-	\$ -	\$ 10,000,000	\$ 10,000,000	\$ -
	WFP	524,266 ‡	14,420	\$ 7,291,764	\$ 2,033,650	\$ 24,691,761	\$ -
Uganda	AVSI	-	-	\$ -	\$ 7,617,127	\$ 7,617,127	\$ -
	CRS	-	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,724,135
	Mercy Corps	-	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 7,223,539
	Save the Children	-	-	\$ -	\$ 1,187,347	\$ 1,187,347	\$ -
Zimbabwe	CNFA	130,305	2,270	\$ 1,232,169	\$ 10,274,595	\$ 14,015,432	\$ -
	WFP	1,217,692 ‡	2,100	\$ 979,236	\$ 2,209,444	\$ 4,505,260	\$ -
	World Vision	104,474	770	\$ 2,830,651	\$ 10,111,032	\$ 13,737,911	\$ -
Sub-Total Africa		6,881,888	151,450	\$ 41,296,281	\$ 150,634,953	\$ 281,968,758	\$ 55,819,591
ASIA							

FY 2018 U.S. International Food Assistance Report

Bangladesh	CARE	307,614	46,300	\$ 1,284,800	\$ 3,974,800	\$ 18,084,846	\$ -
	HK	71,396	18,660	\$ 21,616	\$ -	\$ 7,682,374	\$ -
	World Vision	542,666	36,040	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 16,904,175	\$ -
Nepal	Mercy Corps	97,587	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 3,000,000
	Save the Children	135,853	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000
Sub-Total Asia		1,155,116	101,000	\$ 1,306,416	\$ 6,474,800	\$ 42,671,395	\$ 8,000,000
LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARRIBBEAN							
Guatemala	CRS	31,491	-	\$ -	\$ 6,288,500	\$ 6,288,500	\$ -
	Save the Children	14,471	-	\$ -	\$ 5,240,000	\$ 5,240,000	\$ -
Haiti	CARE	86,595	-	\$ -	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 13,179,184
Sub-Total Latin America and the Caribbean		132,557	-	\$ -	\$ 14,528,500	\$ 14,528,500	\$ 13,179,184
MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT							
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Technical Support	N/A	-	-	\$ -	\$ 5,808,713	\$ 11,465,419	\$ 3,001,225
Sub-Total Monitoring, Evaluation, and Technical Support Costs		-	-	\$ -	\$ 5,808,713	\$ 11,465,419	\$ 3,001,225
WORLDWIDE		8,169,561	252,450	\$ 42,602,697	\$ 177,446,966	\$ 350,634,073	\$ 80,000,000

*Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2018 from an award made in a prior FY.

†Denotes a new award that has not yet reached beneficiaries.

‡Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2018 with funding from FY 2017 and FY 2018.

F. USAID Title II Emergency Activities: Summary Budget, Commodity, Beneficiaries and Tonnage for FY 2018

COUNTRY	AWARDEE	BENEFICIARIES	METRIC TONS	INTERNAL TRANSPORTATION, STORAGE, AND HANDLING (ITSH)	SECTION 202(e)	TOTAL COST
AFRICA						
Burkina Faso	WFP	21,786	810	\$ 61,771	\$ 166,930	\$ 910,965
Burundi	UNICEF	25,200	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	213,521‡	5,050	\$ 954,308	\$ 1,812,288	\$ 8,077,474
Cameroon	UNICEF	15,120*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	225,932‡	9,590	\$ 3,081,894	\$ 3,759,451	\$ 14,376,768
Central African Republic	UNICEF	34,272‡	260	\$ 153,360	\$ 1,812,024	\$ 2,903,984
	WFP	430,322	7,490	\$ 4,400,327	\$ 3,150,840	\$ 15,089,665
Chad	UNICEF	132,520‡	600	\$ 268,272	\$ 773,609	\$ 2,959,441
	WFP	887,208‡	14,610	\$ 5,844,925	\$ 2,426,122	\$ 26,026,982
Djibouti	UNICEF	7,200*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	198,741‡	2,800	\$ 523,430	\$ 727,331	\$ 3,082,124
Democratic Republic of Congo	UNICEF	133,920‡	1,300	\$ 2,544,890	\$ 3,439,303	\$ 10,783,793
	WFP	1,312,812‡	31,505	\$ 16,560,676	\$ 11,982,272	\$ 62,424,949
Ethiopia	CRS	1,840,717	244,633	\$ 15,375,952	\$ 2,274,362	\$ 133,583,378
	IRC	- †	870	\$ 559,617	\$ 184,801	\$ 2,696,446
	UNICEF	40,320‡	910	\$ 324,000	\$ 1,091,504	\$ 4,362,994
	WFP	1,438,667	80,847	\$ 14,544,179	\$ 3,946,950	\$ 57,314,004
Kenya	UNICEF	17,280*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	500,384‡	35,500	\$ 10,846,447	\$ 2,635,688	\$ 31,380,148
Madagascar	CRS	59,429	9,580	\$ 1,401,005	\$ 358,014	\$ 7,618,014
	WFP	104,402	4,190	\$ 828,824	\$ 755,281	\$ 4,048,692
Mali	UNICEF	73,440‡	440	\$ 81,000	\$ 537,008	\$ 2,050,746
	WFP	144,107‡	4,820	\$ 1,603,814	\$ 2,041,970	\$ 11,024,317
Mauritania	UNICEF	22,320‡	120	\$ 16,200	\$ 120,722	\$ 496,463
	WFP	52,593‡	2,350	\$ 434,338	\$ 509,122	\$ 2,844,125
Mozambique	UNICEF	7,920*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	147,778	2,100	\$ 1,152,102	\$ 1,131,004	\$ 3,635,461
Niger	UNICEF	20,016*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	237,048	7,230	\$ 3,189,826	\$ 928,249	\$ 11,858,148
Nigeria	UNICEF	187,200	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	357,778‡	10,630	\$ 6,503,899	\$ 1,708,196	\$ 22,252,674

FY 2018 U.S. International Food Assistance Report

Republic of Congo	WFP	18,552	630	\$ 340,340	\$ 68,795	\$ 907,798
Somalia	UNICEF	130,320‡	800	\$ 410,400	\$ 4,062,444	\$ 6,848,044
	WFP	904,713‡	72,683	\$ 37,941,504	\$ 12,526,665	\$ 101,775,975
South Sudan	CRS	1,272,386‡	8,200	\$ 22,259,597	\$ 27,358,197	\$ 55,446,344
	UNICEF	215,280‡	1,170	\$ 3,127,485	\$ 7,119,015	\$ 14,206,264
	WFP	1,663,585‡	126,040	\$ 104,326,192	\$ 36,309,313	\$ 265,138,679
Sudan	UNICEF	72,720‡	922	\$ 1,003,726	\$ 1,254,472	\$ 4,990,453
	WFP	4,979,458‡	155,870	\$ 40,842,692	\$ 36,066,763	\$ 144,615,627
Tanzania	WFP	733,797‡	8,690	\$ 2,026,334	\$ 1,759,887	\$ 10,044,336
Uganda	WFP	199,533‡	18,960	\$ 1,775,035	\$ 2,284,380	\$ 21,604,899
Zimbabwe	UNICEF	17,280*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	- †	4,980	\$ 1,463,174	\$ 993,195	\$ 5,521,617
Sub-Total Africa		19,097,577	877,180	\$ 306,771,535	\$ 178,076,167	\$ 1,072,901,792
Asia						
Afghanistan	UNICEF	113,760‡	830	\$ 98,963	\$ 1,425,299	\$ 4,181,548
Bangladesh	UNICEF	66,168	690	\$ 43,200	\$ 4,378,818	\$ 6,512,904
Burma	UNICEF	10,080*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Pakistan	UNICEF	45,288‡	450	\$ 237,600	\$ 952,155	\$ 2,512,755
Sub-Total Asia		235,296	1,970	\$ 379,763	\$ 6,756,272	\$ 13,207,207
Latin America and the Caribbean						
Colombia	WFP	71,695‡	1,210	\$ 533,308	\$ 567,662	\$ 2,003,911
Haiti	WFP	8,388*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Sub-Total Latin America and the Caribbean		80,083	1,210	533,308	567,662	2,003,911
Middle East						
Yemen	UNICEF	129,744‡	972	\$ 270,000	\$ 486,418	\$ 3,643,064
	WFP	7,200,000‡	328,550	\$ 71,252,647	\$ 39,413,150	\$ 269,575,412
Sub-Total Middle East		7,329,744	329,522	\$ 71,522,647	\$ 39,899,568	\$ 273,218,476
Support Costs						
Support Costs	N/A	-	-	\$ -	\$ 93,502	\$ 67,550,654
Sub-Total Support Costs		-	-	\$ -	\$ 93,502	\$ 67,550,654
WORLDWIDE		26,742,700	1,209,882	\$ 379,207,253	\$ 225,393,171	\$ 1,428,882,041

*Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2018 from prior FY award.

†Denotes new award that has not yet reached beneficiaries.

‡Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2018 from FY 2017 and FY 2018 funding.

G. Food for Peace Title II Congressional Mandates for FY 2018⁷

	MINIMUM	SUBMINIMUM	MONETI-ZATION	VALUE-ADDED	BAGGED IN THE UNITED STATES	NON-EMERGENCY PERCENTAGE MAXIMUM
FY 2018 Target	2,500,000	1,875,000	15 percent	75 percent	50 percent	30 percent
Final FY 2018 Level	1,462,332	252,450	39 percent	21 percent	30 percent	20 percent

Minimum: Total approved MT programmed under Title II. MT grain equivalent used to report against the target.

Subminimum: MT for approved non-emergency programs through private voluntary organizations, community development organizations, and WFP. MT grain equivalent used to report against target.

Monetization: Percentage of aggregate amounts of commodities distributed under non-emergency Title II programs that must be monetized; the monetization floor applies to non-emergency program tonnage.

Value-added: Percentage of approved, non-emergency programs processed, fortified, or bagged.

Bagged in the United States: Percentage of approved non-emergency bagged commodities that are whole grain to be bagged in the United States.

Non-emergency percentage: Percentage of funds programmed under Title II for non-emergency food assistance programs.

Source: USAID’s FFP Program Team

⁷ Pursuant to Section 204 of the Food for Peace Act, the table above, along with USAID’s overview section, constitutes FFP’s report on the minimum and subminimum MT for FY 2018.

H. Title II-Funded International Food Relief Partnership Countries for FY 2018

The International Food Relief Partnership (IFRP) provides small grants to predominantly faith-based groups to distribute ready-to-use supplementary food and dried soup mix in primarily institutional settings, such as health clinics, schools, and community centers. Through these programs, the most vulnerable in their community receive supplementary food designed to address food insecurity.

**Title II-Funded
International
Food Relief
Partnership
(18 countries)**

CAMEROON

CHAD

DOMINICAN
REPUBLIC

EL SALVADOR

GEORGIA

GUATEMALA

HAÏTI

HONDURAS

KENYA

KYRGYZSTAN

NICARAGUA

NIGER

PERÚ

SIERRA LEONE

SOMALIA

SYRIA

TAJKISTAN

UZBEKISTAN

I. Use of Authorities under Section 207(f) of the Food for Peace Act

Section 207(f) of the Food for Peace Act authorizes funds that cover costs associated with overseeing, monitoring, and evaluating programs. Activities and systems include program monitors in countries that receive Title II assistance, country and regional food impact evaluations, the evaluation of monetization programs, and early warning assessments and systems, among others. In FY 2018, FFP invested more than \$16 million in Title II funds pursuant to the authorities of Section 207(f). These funds paid for the Office's Humanitarian Assistance Support Contract (HASC), the Food for Peace Management Information System (FFPMIS), FEWS NET, FAQR, and monitoring and evaluation tools, among others.

Section 207(f) authorities support a variety of checks and balances that help USAID and its implementing partners monitor food assistance programs and continue to improve their methodologies.

Section 207(f) authorities support activities including the FEWS NET. Created in 1985 by USAID, FEWS NET is a leading provider of early warning and analysis on acute food insecurity. It provides objective, evidence-based analysis to help relief agencies plan for, and respond to, humanitarian crises. USAID uses FEWS NET analyses—evaluations of needs, markets and trade conditions and anomalies—to inform decisions around food assistance programming. These data and analysis has been critical in enabling USAID to respond early and robustly in order to ensure our assistance is able to have maximum impact. FEWS NET has a presence in many of the countries in which FFP provides assistance.

Further, Section 207(f) funded FFP, which USAID is updating to support more effective and efficient operations. FFP is in the process of transitioning from the existing FFP system to a system called Abacus, used by USAID's Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA), also within DCHA. FFP is working with OFDA to integrate FFP to create a combined system that supports the programs of both offices. The Abacus program is designed to track programmatic activities, including initial budget allocations, budget tracking, the submission of applications, and the review and approval, and automatic generation of associated award documents. Initial budget capabilities are already part of the system, and full functionality to replace FFP, is expected by the end of September 2019.

FFP, in collaboration with OFDA, is developing a Pre-Positioned Commodities Warehouse Management Systems (PREPO), which will allow the two offices to manage and track commodities that are stored in USAID-funded pre-positioning warehouses more effectively. The initial system became operational in March 2019 with full functionality availability by the end of the calendar year.

Section 207(f) authorities also support a team at the Tufts University Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy that is working on the FAQR, a study that seeks to provide USAID and its implementing partners with recommendations on ways to improve nutrition among vulnerable populations. Building on the recommendations of the first and second phases of the FAQR (2009-2015), USAID is now in its third and final phase (2016-2019), which will advance an evidence-based approach through the production and testing of improved food products; packing and delivery methods; comparative studies of products' nutritional effectiveness and cost-effectiveness; implementation research and pilot projects; and facilitation of interagency and multi-sectoral coordination to improve food-aid products, programming, and processes. USAID also continues to strengthen its food safety and quality monitoring system, in partnership with USDA, to ensure the high-quality delivery of commodities.

J. Monitoring and Evaluation

USAID has a variety of ways in which it oversees, monitors, and evaluates its emergency and non-emergency food assistance programs including the following:

- **Abacus**—As noted above, FFP is in the process of transitioning from the existing FFP MIS system to Abacus, used by OFDA. FFP is working with OFDA to create a combined system that supports the programs of both offices. The Abacus program is designed to track programmatic activities, including initial budget allocations, budget tracking, the submission of applications, and the review and approval, and automatic generation of associated award documents. Initial budget capabilities are already part of the system, and full functionality to replace FFP MIS, is expected by the end of September 2019.
- **Baseline/ Final Evaluations**—In-line with recommendations in USAID’s 2011 Evaluation Policy, FFP contracts external evaluators to conduct baseline and final evaluations for USAID’s non-emergency investments to mitigate the potential for bias. Baseline and final evaluations are rigorously designed to be representative at the population level in FFP implementation areas and use both standard and customized indicators that also align with the U.S. Department of State metrics. In addition, both baseline and final evaluations collect qualitative data to complement and provide better operational nuance to quantitative findings. Since 2012, these studies have established baseline data for FFP’s activities areas across 11 countries. In FY 2018, FFP replaced the previous evaluation mechanism, called EVELYN, with a contract with ICF International, which has continued to implement the baseline and final evaluations of the office’s investments.
- **Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET)**—By providing a nine-month projection of food insecurity each month, FEWS NET helps USAID plan in advance and use its resources more efficiently in emergency and non-emergency contexts to reach people in need.
- **FFP’s Capacity for Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)**—FFP continued investing in strengthening its M&E capacity in FY 2018. Five FFP M&E Advisors are based in USAID regional offices in Africa, and six in Washington, D.C. The FFP M&E Team strives to improve the quality and effectiveness of programs through selecting and creating appropriate and operationally meaningful indicators for emergency and non-emergency activities; providing active engagement and oversight of projects to ensure accountability; developing training for FFP staff internally, and with partner staff, on topics that strengthen M&E capacity; leading midterm evaluations in selected countries; participating in the evaluations of projects; and developing M&E guidance for FFP staff and partners. As a result of the learning from the FFP-led midterm evaluations, technical support by the M&E team, and independently conducted final evaluations, FFP made substantive changes to its programmatic design, policy and guidance, and program oversight processes.
- **Third-Party Monitoring (TPM)**—FFP-funded third-party monitoring contracts help ensure food and other resources are reaching intended beneficiaries in countries where it is difficult for USAID staff to monitor safely. Often FFP works with OFDA to manage a TPM contract in countries where both have joint emergency investments.
- **Ongoing Monitoring**—At the pre-distribution phase, USAID identifies beneficiaries by using vulnerability criteria that allows USAID to target the poorest households, ensures the safety and quality of U.S. in-kind foods and regionally and locally purchased commodities, and conducts

internal and external market analyses to ensure food assistance does not disrupt local markets. During distributions or transfers of food, USAID partners use several tools to ensure targeted beneficiaries receive assistance; these include biometrics such as identification cards, fingerprints, or iris scans; the electronic distribution of transfers; the distinct marking of paper vouchers; and regular in-person and unannounced visits to beneficiary households, distribution sites, or vendor shops. USAID partners also periodically re-verify program beneficiaries to make sure they are still in need of food assistance. Post distribution, USAID partners track food purchased through vouchers or cash transfers, monitors the usage of voucher through banks' electronic systems, and conduct randomized follow-up phone calls or visits. In countries where it is difficult to directly monitor programs safely, USAID has also added TPM.

K. Monetization Rate of Return and Use of Proceeds

Monetization is the process of selling U.S. in-kind goods in local markets, then using the proceeds to fund development food assistance activities. Pursuant to Section 203(b) of the Food for Peace Act, for FY 2018 USAID must monetize 15 percent of all U.S. in-kind food shipped overseas as Title II commodities for development. Please see the breakdown of the costs below, pursuant to the reporting requirement in Section 403(m) of the Food for Peace Act:

	FY 2018 MONETIZATION FUNDS		METRIC TONS (MT)	Estimated Rate of Return	
Bangladesh	CARE	Commodity Costs	\$9,132,037	43,500 MT wheat	89.18 percent
		Freight Costs	\$2,100,180		
Bangladesh	World Vision	Commodity Costs	\$8,880,324	36,040 MT wheat	82.87 percent
		Freight Costs	\$5,523,851		
Bangladesh	HKI	Commodity Costs	\$4,417,259	18,660 MT wheat	80.94 percent
		Freight Costs	\$3,243,499		

L. Food Aid Consultative Group

Pursuant to Section 205 of the Food for Peace Act, USAID and USDA convene the Food Aid Consultative Group (FACG) biannually. FACG brings together stakeholders including partners, commodity groups, the maritime industry, and others with an interest in U.S. Government food assistance programs. FACG provides important updates on food assistance policies, procedures, and funding opportunities, and provides feedback to USAID on policies and guidance. In the spring and fall, the group convenes to discuss updates on food assistance programs and address topics of interest.

In FY 2018, FACG convened in December 2017 and June 2018 to hold in-depth discussions on USAID's food assistance programs. In December 2017, the agenda included sessions on commodity loss and a presentation by FEWS NET highlighted Yemen, Ethiopia, South Sudan, Nigeria, and Somalia as the five countries at risk for famine. In June 2018, the agenda began with updates on the crisis at the Burma/Bangladesh border.