

Conflict Integration

U.S. Government's Global Food Security Strategy Activity Design Guidance

This is one of several Activity Design Guidance documents for implementing the U.S. Government's Global Food Security Strategy. The full set of documents is at www.feedthefuture.gov and www.agrilinks.org.

Introduction

Why Conflict Integration Matters

Today's greatest food crises are all experiencing conflict and violence.¹ Conflict-affected places are the frontlines in the global fight against hunger, as hunger is on the rise for the first time in decades, with conflict as a key driver. Conflict-affected places are the frontlines in the global fight against hunger. Addressing food insecurity increasingly means addressing fragility, conflict, and violence (FCV). Conflict is the single largest global driver of food insecurity, but food insecurity is among the conditions that can lead to rising levels of conflict.

The U.S. Government's Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) adopts a multirisk approach that recognizes the interrelated and compounding impact of shocks, such as pests, COVID-19, drought, floods, and conflict. The inability to manage major shocks can create a negative feedback loop with conflict and violence. For example, food price spikes often trigger conflict, which in turn exacerbates poverty and food insecurity. Feed the Future investments manage risks associated with both conflict and food security, such as marginalization, lack of economic opportunities, or biased service delivery.

When conflict strikes, it severely disrupts agriculture and food systems. Farmers cannot plant or access markets. People are displaced from their homes, lose jobs, and cannot meet their basic needs. They often cope in harmful ways, such as by eating less or quickly selling off assets. Food insecurity can increase conflict risks by, for example, motivating rebel recruitment, increasing anger against ineffective government, and increasing tension between the haves and the have-nots. This cycle undermines prospects for both peace and agriculture-led growth.

Peacebuilding programming alone cannot address the complex challenges that create fertile ground for conflict. These efforts must be nested within a comprehensive, multisectoral strategy addressing issues such as political marginalization, reduced economic and educational opportunities, social cohesion, weak governance, and, of course, food security. Interrelated issues cannot be solved through siloed approaches, which is why the conflict-integrated approach is so critical.

By integrating conflict sensitivity and conflict prevention across the GFSS, Feed the Future brings a powerful set of development tools to the collective challenge of preventing, mitigating, and recovering from conflict and violence. Contributing to a more peaceful environment enables the GFSS and Feed the Future to better achieve the core goals around food security, resilience, and inclusive, agriculture-led growth.

Conflict Integration: Key Takeaways

Conflict integration recognizes that food security and conflict dynamics are inherently related, and in order to maximize the benefits of one, the other must be considered as well. Success in complex conditions requires deliberate thought and action to identify gaps, complementarity, and points where flexibility and adaptation are needed in order to maximize the beneficial effects; there is no plug-and-play solution. Effective conflict integration across Feed the Future investments requires several key steps. By understanding the connections between conflict and food systems, we can ultimately improve our sector goals and create opportunities for peace.

Key Takeaways:

1. **Always begin with conflict sensitivity.** It is crucial to carefully understand the context, because a two-way relationship between GFSS activities and that context is inescapable. Programs in any context, but especially conflict-affected and violent contexts, can cause unintended consequences.
2. **Identify windows of opportunity.** While conflict-affected areas present many operational challenges, there are still windows of opportunity: time periods or regions of relative stability in the midst of conflict and fragility where we can find creative ways to leverage what is working well, or people who have new motivations to work productively together, for example.
3. **Seek peace dividends.** Leverage food and agriculture investments toward opportunities for peace, which create a more productive environment for food and agriculture investments. Leveraging the opportunities requires a careful understanding of the context and a thoughtful eye for how we can maximize peace and security, such as collaborating with trusted local faith leaders, or supporting farmer field schools that include former combatants.
4. **Prioritize adaptive management.** Conditions within conflict-affected areas can change rapidly and without warning. It is critical to build operational plans and strategies that make sense within such unpredictable environments so that pivots can be made when necessary.
5. **Work with and through local systems and partners.** Localization improves buy-in and sustainability, and prioritizes local understanding and analysis. It helps to identify peace dividends and improve the systems around a given program, which also improves sustainability.
6. **Promote coherence across humanitarian, development, and peace (HDP) assistance.** People living amidst conflict and violence do not think about their life in terms of sectors or kinds of assistance. Strategically nesting a broader set of humanitarian and development investments around peacebuilding and stabilization efforts is key for bringing the full force of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) to the shared challenge of preventing, mitigating, and recovering from conflict and violence.

This Activity Design Guidance first overviews key concepts and terminology related to GFSS and conflict integration. It then shares key lessons learned on designing activities. Next, it provides promising programming examples and practices from Feed the Future investments to date. It concludes with tools and resources on conflict integration.

Terminology and Key Concepts

There are certain key terms that are used throughout this guidance document. These terms are defined below and will help the reader understand this guidance document.

Conflict: Conflict is present when two or more individuals or groups pursue mutually incompatible goals. “Conflict” is a continuum. When channeled constructively into processes of resolution, conflict can be beneficial; however, conflict can also be waged violently, as in war.

Conflict Integration: Conflict integration is the intentional effort to improve the effectiveness and sustainability of development and humanitarian assistance by addressing the collective dynamics that underpin peace, security, and core sectoral goals. Doing so can move programming beyond conflict sensitivity and the principle of *Do No Harm* to promote better development outcomes and sustain peace and prosperity.

Conflict Sensitivity: The ability of practitioners to:

- **Understand the context in which they are working.** Key dynamics include economic, social, and political factors and issues of gender, power dynamics, and access. Topics to examine include motives, how key actors might mobilize for peace or conflict, and which events or windows of opportunity could trigger conflict or create opportunities to build peace.
- **Recognize the interaction between the intervention and the context or conflict.** What is the interaction between the identified key elements of conflict and the intervention itself? This step includes the project, partners and stakeholders, and organizational setup, among other factors.
- **Act upon these changes to adapt programming direction and pivot when necessary.** Conflict sensitivity is as much about how you work as what you do. Is the community engaged so that practitioners understand local dynamics? Is it possible to modify a project mid-stream while keeping the goals the same? Making reflective, strategic adaptations in operations and implementation is crucial.

Fragility: A country's or region's vulnerability to armed conflict, large-scale violence, or other instability, including an inability to manage transnational threats or other significant shocks. Fragility results from ineffective or unaccountable governance, weak social cohesion, and/or corrupt institutions or leaders who lack respect for human rights.

Violence: The intentional use of physical force or power, threatened or actual, against another person, group, or community that results in or has a high likelihood of resulting in injury, death, psychological harm, maldevelopment, or deprivation.

Conflict Sensitivity, Conflict Analysis, and Theories of Change

Conflict sensitivity is the most important concept behind integrating conflict across Feed the Future activities. All USAID staff that touch Feed the Future programming will need to grapple with aspects of FCV in their daily work. Whether you are an agronomist working in the Sahel, a water engineer stationed in North Africa, or an agricultural value chain specialist based in Central American countries such as El Salvador, Guatemala, or Honduras, it is necessary to understand how FCV might interact with the food system, and vice-versa.

The first step in conflict sensitivity is to analyze the conflict context, and conflict analysis is key for this process. Strong conflict analysis is the bedrock to conflict-sensitive Feed the Future programming. USAID has updated its Conflict Assessment Framework (CAF) 2.0 to become the Violence and Conflict Assessment Framework (VCAF), which increases the amount of emphasis on forms of violence that still disrupt society and programming, but are not “overt” conflict between warring sides. The VCAF attempts to provide insight that can lead to understanding how key actors who organize others may promote conflict or peace, as well as identifying the potential trajectories of the conflict dynamics in a local system.

While the VCAF is USAID's flagship conflict analysis used to inform Country Development Cooperation Strategies (CDCS), there are other options. Depending on time, financial resources, and the scope of analysis needed, options include: conflict analysis from global sources, such as the International Crisis Group or the Armed Conflict Location and Event Data (ACLED); conflict analysis from local and

regional think tanks; new, population-based surveys and participatory data collection efforts; and secondary data from existing food system analyses, especially inclusive development analyses that will provide important insights relevant for a conflict analysis.

Developing a conflict-sensitive theory of change is the key step that links our understanding of the conflict context to what we will do differently in Feed the Future programming. Meeting GFSS goals requires analyzing if and how FCV disrupts, or could potentially disrupt, the food system; how changes to the food system could increase FCV; and where opportunities exist to maximize Feed the Future programming by creating greater avenues for peace. These could be, for example, explicitly building social cohesion, public trust, good governance, and psychosocial well-being. There are many options, but focusing on inclusive growth that includes all marginalized people, creating better linkages between citizens and their government, and promoting community-based approaches that foster social cohesion are all promising approaches for both Feed the Future success and peacebuilding that have successfully been incorporated into conflict-sensitive theories of change for Feed the Future activities. The table shows a series of examples of conflict-blind versus conflict-sensitive theories of change and programming approaches.

Table 1: Conflict-Blind and Conflict-Sensitive Theories of Change.

Conflict-Blind Theories of Change	Conflict-Sensitive Theories of Change
If new, state-of-the-art cattle livestock infrastructure is built, then the livestock market and economic opportunity will grow.	If portable assets and livelihood opportunities (e.g., poultry production) are developed, then economic opportunities will grow, even in a context of continual displacement.
If former combatants are provided with livelihood opportunities, then they will be productive members of society.	If livelihood opportunities are provided to former combatants and their fellow community members, then all community members will be productively employed, will strengthen social cohesion, and will not stigmatize former combatants.
If farmer field schools are developed, then farmers will share ideas and strengthen their technical agriculture knowledge, which results in higher crop yields.	If farmer field schools are integrated with psychosocial support services, including addiction support, then farmers will have support for a key barrier to their productivity while also sharing ideas, strengthening technical knowledge, and ultimately having higher crop yields.
If we invest in new, drought-tolerant seed, then we will have higher yields, even in the context of drier weather and failed rainy seasons.	If we invest in drought-tolerant seed and intentionally foster social cohesion among ethnic groups at seed markets and through women’s Village Savings and Loan Association (VSLA) groups, we can have higher yields in drier weather while also mitigating the ethnic tension and land use conflicts taking place in this region.
If we invest in agricultural extension services, then farmers and pastoralists will have access to the knowledge, vaccinations, and other services they need to be more productive.	If we invest in agricultural extension services while proactively engaging with communities on their needs, and ensure extension services are viewed as legitimate, trusted, and effective, we can strengthen public trust and the relationship between citizens and their state while also increasing productivity.

Resilience

Resilience is a core goal of the GFSS, and resilience efforts demand conflict integration. There are several key takeaways specific to thinking about resilience and conflict integration. First, the resilience framework focuses on shocks and stresses; it can be tempting to think about conflict and violence as a shock or stress, but it actually makes better sense to consider conflict or violence as a system (see the text box for an example). Second, it is important to identify how conflict and violence disrupt resilience capacities. For example, a business owner's access to capital might be stymied by rebel looting, or an elder might lose local authority after years in a refugee camp. In these settings, a range of factors often undermine resilience capacities. Understanding conflict and violence as part of a system—not just a shock—and what this means for resilience capacities will be crucial to ensuring that food security goals and objectives can be achieved and sustained.

Conflict and Fragility Viewed as a System

While it might be tempting to think of conflict as simply a shock or stress, it makes the most sense to consider conflict and fragility as a system. For example, gang violence might emerge because of weak local government, but then takes on a life of its own, with the complicity of local government, and lasts for years. A gang might deplete the assets—a key source of resilience—of a local taxi driver through weekly bribes. Gangs also start controlling streets, stoking fear, and taking bribes from people, which feeds poverty and disempowers people and social services, breaking down social and human capital—other key sources of resilience. The original shock—gang control of a neighborhood—is part of a broader system of violence and conflict that constrains sources of resilience and takes a tremendous toll on well-being as long as the gangs maintain power. Civil war can follow a similar pattern. A long-neglected region might experience the shock of rebel conflict. The rebels easily gain new recruits due, in large part, to the area's long-standing marginalization. Meanwhile, the conflict takes on a logic of its own with new war economies, repeated displacement, and the collapse of key markets and daily routines. A displaced woman can no longer farm her land and now depends on remittances from a cousin to survive. In both scenarios, the initial shock, capacities, and well-being are all conditioned by the broader system that triggered conflict and violence and now allow them to endure. Carefully understanding the conflict context and the two-way relationship between Feed the Future interventions and the context is essential for effectively strengthening resilience in fragile, conflict-affected, and violence contexts.

Designing Activities

Once we have analyzed the conflict context and identified an appropriate conflict-sensitive theory of change, there are a number of key lessons learned for designing activities with conflict integration in mind.

Key Lessons Learned

Keep these key lessons learned front and center as you move forward with designing and implementing Feed the Future programming in fragile, conflict-affected, and violent contexts. These steps are the cornerstone to conflict-sensitive programming that will be more impactful in the face of the compounding crises and challenges we face today.

Conduct a Conflict and Violence Assessment. The better we understand the connections between conflict and food systems, the better we can meet our Feed the Future goals. Carefully understanding the context is the first and most critical step to strengthening resilience and inclusive, agriculture-led growth in FCV contexts. Understanding the context includes, but is not limited to, understanding the history of a

place (and recognizing that the history will be understood differently by different groups), the causes and logic of violence, and opportunities for building peace. For Feed the Future programming, special attention is then needed for how the dynamics that fuel conflict interact with agriculture, the food system, and different groups (e.g., seeds, supply chains, crop management, storage, and markets). Since conflict-affected and fragile contexts are highly dynamic environments, conflict assessments may quickly go out of date. It is important to frequently collect information from multiple sources, including perception information from different segments of society, both within and outside of USAID.

Always Begin with Conflict Sensitivity. Conflict sensitivity is essential across all Feed the Future programming and it is a crucial first step in conflict integration. Conflict sensitivity builds on a fundamental best practice: it centers on carefully understanding the context and the two-way relationship between programming and the context. The goal of conflict sensitivity is to minimize potential harm and maximize opportunities for peace. There are always opportunities for food and agriculture investments to be leveraged toward peace. We can identify specific ways in which Feed the Future programming can create opportunities to bring communities together (or at least not exclude them), as well as ways in which planning programming might lead to diversion, substitution, or other conflict- and corruption-related consequences.

Recognize the Complex Risk Environment and Build Resilience. In addition to conducting conflict analysis, it is important to understand the multirisk environment in order to build resilience. Multisectoral resilience approaches can improve well-being and livelihoods in FCV contexts while also addressing conflict drivers and promoting peace. By managing multiple risks at once, programming can better respond to the problems and realities that people are facing in their day-to-day lives. Conflict-sensitive approaches that strengthen resilience through multisectoral investments are the best way to help people recover from current crises and ensure that they are prepared for the next, inevitable crisis as well.

Identify Windows of Opportunity and Peace Dividends. Even in violent contexts, there are almost always windows of opportunity; time periods up ahead where things calm down, or buffer regions of relative stability, where we can find creative ways to leverage what is working well and find opportunities for peace. For instance, the private sector can drive investment and job creation in even the most challenging contexts, and displaced people are often highly skilled and can contribute to the local economy.

Windows of opportunity emerge within the food system and across scale and time. For instance, programming can focus on the household level to maintain food security (e.g., storage and processing) when violence is rising or movement is restricted. When freedom of movement resumes, interventions can adapt again to focus on systemic impacts on the food system (e.g., land titling, water access, and social cohesion). Beyond windows of opportunity, Feed the Future investments can be leveraged for peace if we think creatively about how they can accomplish important goals, like strengthening social cohesion, reducing inequality and grievances, increasing trust, sharing information, and creating a positive relationship between citizens and their government. For instance, support for a community land trust can create new rules for sharing land between farmers and pastoralists, and demonstrate the benefits of collaboration for both parties. Investments in agricultural and livestock extension services can build trust between citizens and government around shared problems. By contributing to a more peaceful environment, Feed the Future programming will ultimately better contribute to its core goals.

Prioritize Adaptive Management. Conditions within conflict-affected areas can change rapidly and without warning. It is critical to build operational plans and strategies that make sense within such unpredictable environments so that pivots can be made when necessary. Feed the Future programming should leverage a Collaborating, Learning, and Adapting (CLA) approach. This includes pause-and-reflect sessions focused explicitly on climate implications and draft acquisition and assistance

(A&A) documents to incorporate shock-responsive and other adaptive management language to enable programming pivots in response to changing conflict dynamics, such as additional resources when a crisis strikes. Feed the Future activities can also develop scenario and contingency planning or different programming zones based on permissiveness. Doing so can ensure development gains are not lost since practitioners are remaining engaged however they can.

Work with and through Local Systems and Partners. Working with and through the local food system is more important than ever in fragile, conflict-affected, and violent contexts. Locally led development and direct partnerships with local leaders, networks, groups, and institutions are critical in fragile and conflict-affected places. It is also more complicated, especially when in some contexts USAID cannot formally partner with government actors. This might mean working with and through both formal and informal markets, informal governance, and nontraditional local actors, including private sector actors outside the usual suspects, and a diverse set of local partners—from farmers, community leaders, women, men, and youth to government officials, traders, and the private sector—with special attention given to strengthening social cohesion and the relationship between citizens and their government. Choosing local leaders, networks, groups, and institutions to partner with must be grounded in conflict sensitivity. Transition awards and opportunities like Local Works offer innovative ways of working with local actors, while cocreation processes can also be designed to promote feedback and local ownership. Throughout the program life cycle, the Local Systems Framework offers an overarching approach to engaging with local systems. The Results, Roles, Relationships, Rules, and Resources (5Rs) framework and CLA also provide useful ways to assess local context and provide guidance on program design and monitoring.

Promote Humanitarian-Development-Peace Coherence. Promoting coherence across humanitarian, development, and peace assistance is key for working in fragile and conflict-affected places. For one, people living amidst conflict and violence do not think in terms of sectors or kinds of assistance: they think about the problems they are facing in their lives. Coherence across humanitarian assistance, development assistance, and peace assistance, in pursuit of collective outcomes whenever and wherever possible, is critical for maximizing the impact of interventions in fragile and conflict-affected contexts.

Achieving coherence across kinds of assistance includes cross-sectoral communication, coordination, and learning platforms. It ideally involves joint planning toward collective outcomes and strategically sequencing, layering, and integrating humanitarian, development, and peace assistance, as appropriate. It also demands shock-responsive programming and adaptive management and, as identified in early promising practices, conflict integration and locally led approaches throughout programming.

Programming in Practice

Below are a series of examples from around the world that show what it can look like to integrate conflict across Feed the Future programming.

Feed the Future and Reconciliation Fund Layering in Eastern Democratic Republic of the Congo (DRC): In DRC's Tanganyika province, [Feed the Future and Reconciliation Fund investments](#) were successfully layered together to leverage agriculture activities—group farming and savings groups—for bridging conflict between competing ethnic groups.

Disaster Risk Reduction (DRR) in Post-Conflict Bangladesh: In the post-conflict Chittagong Hills Tract area of Bangladesh, a Resilience Food Security Activity (RFSA) found ways to [integrate traditional leadership into DRR committees](#) at the local and national level, gaining legitimacy that improved both local governance and DRR outcomes.

Local Conventions and Bylaws in Burkina Faso: In Burkina Faso, programming by nontraditional partner National Cooperative Business Association CLUSA International (NCBA CLUSA) had [local conventions and bylaws between farming communities and pastoralists](#) that significantly reduced conflict while surpassing sectoral Natural Resource Management (NRM) goals.

USAID-ACCESO in Honduras: In Honduras, more than 50 percent of the population believes the government is run by a few big interests looking out for themselves, and the country has been in a state of nearly constant crisis and widespread protest since marred elections in 2017.² The [USAID-ACCESO project](#) in Honduras has increased farmer incomes by offering technical training in pest management and engaging with grievances around access to economic opportunity.

Partnership for Recovery and Resilience in South Sudan: In 2017, USAID/South Sudan played a key role in [establishing the Partnership for Recovery and Resilience](#) in South Sudan, which brought together a diverse set of donors and partners to work together across the humanitarian-development-peace divide and toward a common goal. Exciting features to the partnership include: uniting donors and partners under a collective goal to strengthen resilience; joint work planning and a commitment to converge resources in selected partnership focus areas; and, in partnership focus areas, the development of local committees to provide feedback and set priorities for programming. This savvy approach fosters local ownership and collective action, even in a thorny context where we cannot work directly with the government.

Cacao Program in Colombia: Without strong institutions and with limited economic options, many in Colombia turn to the illicit economy—working in the illegal mines and drug trade—to earn a living. USAID’s cacao program has [helped families earn a steady income from cacao](#) by connecting them to the chocolate industry. The cacao project is one of many USAID-supported activities that benefit families in Colombia’s most violence-torn municipalities caught in the fighting between the government, the Revolutionary Armed Forces of Colombia—People’s Army (FARC), paramilitaries, and other illegal armed groups.

Climate Security Support in Northern Kenya: USAID/Kenya supported 29 conservancies across six counties to track and respond to cattle rustling, which prevented violence from becoming more severe, thereby decreasing retaliatory cycles. In 2020 and 2021, over 60 percent of stolen cattle was peacefully recovered through “people to people” negotiations and reconciliation. Laikipia Conservancies Association is strengthening its capacity to mediate and mitigate conflicts in Laikipia. This work is a direct extension of the Mission’s long-standing effort to support conservancies as locally driven solutions that drive local development in conservation, economic empowerment, peace, and climate security.

Amos Farms in Northeast Nigeria: In Northeast Nigeria, [a poultry activity combined livelihood inputs with the establishment of women’s economic collectives](#) that provide borrowing options and a platform for technical training. The Nigeria program had positive economic impacts for participants and, importantly, joined participants with new, sustainable social networks while promoting their confidence and sense of agency over their lives. The important takeaway is that light-touch changes to current programming—e.g., establishing inclusive women’s economic collectives with opportunities for new interactions and skills-building—can strengthen psychosocial factors and enhance the impact of livelihoods programming in areas of protracted crises.

Seeds Systems in Fragile Contexts, DRC: In DRC, USAID has [attracted private sector investment to the seed sector](#) in ways tailored to this fragile context. Because seed is often the first-entry agricultural intervention during a crisis, it is important to leverage, not disrupt, local markets. This seed system analysis in DRC provides a framework to encourage private sector investment through a phased approach. The phased approach aims to improve the enabling environment for the formal seed sector over time, with an emphasis on government capacity building.

Additional Resources and Tools

USAID has developed an in-depth Conflict Integration Toolkit for Feed the Future (you can find the Toolkit on [ResilienceLinks](#), forthcoming shortly at time of publication) that is strongly recommended as the primary, most comprehensive resource for integrating conflict across Feed the Future.

Resources that Provide Insight into FCV Dynamics:

- [World Bank Strategy for Fragility, Conflict, and Violence 2020–2025](#). The World Bank provided specific guidance on how to engage in different FCV settings, relying on four pillars of engagement: (1) preventing violent conflict and interpersonal violence, (2) remaining engaged during crisis situations and active conflicts, (3) helping countries transition out of fragility, and (4) mitigating the spillovers of FCV.
- [Resilience and Food Security Amidst Conflict and Violence](#). A policy brief prepared by USAID's Bureau for Resilience and Food Security that highlights key trends and the relationship between FCV and food systems.
- [UK Department for International Development Helpdesk Report: Current Trends in Violent Conflict](#). This report includes an annotated bibliography that highlights recent reports and identifies trends associated with FCV.

Additional Resources on Conflict Sensitivity:

- [Responsible Development: A Note on Conflict Sensitivity from USAID's Center for Conflict and Violence Prevention \(CVP\)](#). This guide highlights how practitioners can improve development outcomes using a conflict-sensitive approach, including how-to tables that walk through the programming cycle.
- [Conflict Sensitive Aid \(CSAid\) Online Course](#). This course trains participants on how to integrate conflict sensitivity into USAID programming.
- [United Nations Children's Fund \(UNICEF\) Conflict Sensitivity and Peacebuilding Programming Guide](#). A tool for field staff and leadership to understand, situate, and operationalize conflict sensitivity and peacebuilding through UNICEF's existing work or new initiatives in different contexts and in partnership with other stakeholders.
- [The Programme Clinic: Designing conflict-sensitive interventions—Approaches to working in fragile and conflict-affected contexts](#). This facilitation guide provides a structured participatory analysis designed to identify and integrate conflict sensitive strategies into the design and implementation of FAO interventions.

Additional Resources for Conducting Conflict Analysis:

- [Conflict Analysis Framework: Field Guidelines and Procedures](#). This document provides practice guidelines for conflict analysis in the field.
- [Good Practice Note: Conflict Sensitivity, Peacebuilding, and Sustaining Peace](#). A note that provides guidance on how peacebuilding activities interact with peace and conflict.
- [From Conflict to Collaboration in Natural Resource Management: A Handbook and Toolkit for Practitioners Working in Aquatic Resource Systems](#). This handbook provides detailed mapping tools to help conduct a conflict analysis.

References

¹ World Food Program USA. 2023. “Global Food Crisis: 10 Countries Suffering the Most from Hunger.” Last modified March 13, 2023.

<https://www.wfpusa.org/articles/global-food-crisis-10-countries-suffering-the-most-from-hunger/>.

² USAID. 2021. *Resilience and Food Security Amidst Conflict and Violence: Disrupting a Vicious Cycle and Promoting Peace and Development*. USAID.

For further assistance related to these Activity Design Guidance documents, please contact ftfguidance@usaid.gov.