



USAID
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



JESSICA HARTL, USAID

EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM

FISCAL YEAR 2017 REPORT TO CONGRESS

EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2017 REPORT TO CONGRESS

The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) submits pursuant to a statutory requirement under 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)). The report describes how USAID used FY 2017 International Disaster Assistance funding, through the Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP), to address food insecurity around the world. Activities included the use of market-based approaches, such as local and regional procurement (LRP), cash transfers for food, and food vouchers.¹

PURPOSE AND PROGRAM OBJECTIVES

The U.S. Government is the world's largest donor of international food assistance. USAID delivers most of this assistance through its Office of Food for Peace (FFP). FFP uses a variety of approaches to deliver food assistance and reduce hunger and malnutrition – especially in emergencies, when swift action is required to ensure people have access to sufficient, nutritious food.

USAID delivers two main types, or modalities, of food assistance: 1) food shipped from the United States, as authorized in Title II of the Food for Peace Act; and, 2) market-based food assistance, with complementary services. The Agency began using market-based food assistance in FY 2010, and the Global Food Security Act (GFSA) of 2016 (Section 7 of P.L. 114-195) formally authorized these modalities.² The GFSA states 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.”

USAID uses market-based assistance when appropriate conditions are present and based on four criteria: market appropriateness, feasibility, project objectives and cost.³ LRP has additional restrictions on the source and origin of commodities to ensure USAID activities reinforce, and do not undermine, developing markets to the greatest extent possible.

EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS

Studies have shown that market-based mechanisms can improve the efficiency and effectiveness of food assistance. Studies by the Government Accountability Office⁴ and Cornell University⁵ both found LRP could save cost and time in the delivery of in-kind food aid. This is consistent with USAID's internal analysis of several FY 2013 LRP programs, which found the average commodity and freight costs of LRP were approximately 30 percent lower than in-kind food aid shipped from the United States.

In 2016, the Overseas Development Institute, an independent think tank, conducted a rigorous review of cash transfers – examining 165 studies from 2000 to 2015 – and found cash-transfer programs can

¹ Definitions of all modalities appear in Appendix A

² Available at: <https://www.congress.gov/114/plaws/publ195/PLAW-114publ195.pdf>

³ For definitions of criteria, refer to the FFP Modality Decision Tool. Available at: http://pdf.usaid.gov/pdf_docs/pbae883.pdf

⁴ 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>

⁵ 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>

help diversify diets, reduce stunting in children, and improve beneficiary investment in agricultural products and livestock.⁶

Market-based assistance can also promote the recovery of local markets, strengthen and expand market linkages, and stimulate local farmers to renew or increase production, which often provides the best way to respond to food-insecurity needs in specific situations.

FISCAL YEAR 2017 GRANTS

In FY 2017, multiple humanitarian crises around the world demanded immediate, substantial, and innovative responses. Early in FY 2017, the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET) warned that an unprecedented 70 million people across 45 countries would need emergency food assistance because of persistent conflict, severe drought, and economic instability. Six months later, as conditions worsened, FEWS NET increased its estimate to 81 million people.

In addition to encouraging other donors to do their fair share, USAID provided \$1.9 billion in FY 2017 EFSP assistance that reached 36.4 million people in 42 countries. This funding included \$413.1 million in funds for preventing, mitigating, and relieving famine through EFSP programs that primarily helped four countries – South Sudan, Somalia, Yemen and Nigeria – that faced a high threat of famine.⁷ Regionally and locally procured commodities accounted for the majority of EFSP funding, at nearly 60 percent (37 and 22 percent, respectively). Food vouchers and cash transfers accounted for smaller proportions, at 21 percent for vouchers and 16 percent for cash. Complementary services and other activities accounted for four percent of EFSP funds. For a detailed list of all EFSP activities for FY 2017, see [Appendix C](#).

KEY HUMANITARIAN RESPONSES

Flexible EFSP funds enable USAID to respond quickly to emergencies. The following country-specific descriptions show how critical this assistance is in saving the lives of people affected by natural disaster and conflict.

SOUTH SUDAN

South Sudan remains one of today's most severe humanitarian emergencies, as a four-year civil conflict shows no sign of abating. Famine was declared in South Sudan in February 2017, which an immense, global humanitarian response managed to stem by May. U.S. food assistance saved lives, but conditions remained dire at the end of FY 2017. More than half of the country's 12 million people faced life-threatening hunger, as conflict prevented farmers from growing crops, laborers from traveling to work, and humanitarian actors from reaching vulnerable populations.

USAID and its partners provided millions of vulnerable South Sudanese with life-saving emergency food assistance in FY 2017, in the midst of this complex and dangerous environment. In June, USAID

⁶ 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>

⁷ In total, Congress provided \$990 million to prevent, mitigate, and relieve famine. FFP and its sister office in USAID, the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, receiving \$413.1 and \$275.4 million respectively. The remaining \$300 million was transferred to the Title II account and \$1.5 million was transferred and merged with the USAID Operating Expenses account. The Title II funding and will be reported in the FY 2017 International Food Assistance Report to Congress.

contributed approximately 53,400 metric tons of regionally procured food to the World Food Program (WFP). This was one of the largest regional commodity purchases ever made by USAID, and was enough food to feed approximately 3.5 million people for one month.

Purchasing regional commodities is often cheaper than buying U.S. commodities and shipping them overseas. This single purchase for South Sudan cost approximately \$14.6 million less than bringing the same food in from the United States, and allowed USAID to reach approximately 15 percent more people with food. Regionally purchased food arrives much faster to South Sudan, and can also help support farmers and vendors in regional, developing countries – which encourages economic development. In contrast, U.S. food can take up to six months to ship overseas and travel inland to final destinations.

Humanitarian conditions in South Sudan continue to deteriorate because of the ongoing conflict, which left an estimated 1.5 million people still at risk of famine at the beginning of FY 2018. USAID continues to use regional food, and the cost savings, to stretch U.S. food assistance resources as far as possible to prevent catastrophe and famine.

SOMALIA

Six years ago, famine in Somalia led to the deaths of more than 250,000 people. In December 2016, FEWS NET and the Somalia Food Security and Nutrition Analysis Unit (FSNAU) predicted that it could happen again in 2017. Drought and conflict led to livestock and crop losses, rising rates of malnutrition and disease, and an increased risk of famine. The number of Somalis in dire need of food assistance tripled, from one million to three million, by September 2017.

As forecasts indicated the drought would continue, the humanitarian community knew Somalia needed a timely and robust response to prevent a famine. USAID's increased contributions helped non-governmental organizations and UN partners expand in-kind food aid and cash transfers and reach more people across a larger geographic area. WFP reached 2.3 million beneficiaries in September 2017, up from 600,000 a year earlier, in part because of FFP resources.

To prevent the crisis from spreading, USAID not only provided food assistance to meet emergency needs, but also targeted assistance to vulnerable populations to increase medium-term food security. One USAID partner reached 324,150 people across 11 regions with monthly food vouchers and complementary services, such as high-performing seeds, hermetic bags to store harvests, and other farming tools to help farmers better survive future droughts.

The food vouchers allowed beneficiaries to purchase foods of their choice quickly in local markets, which directly supported those local operations. Farming tools helped beneficiaries diversify crops and increase yields so they could feed their families a nutritious diet and sell surpluses at market. This combination of early response and preventive assistance paid off: estimates from these activities show that for each dollar spent, households produced \$8.60 in sorghum and cowpeas.

USAID provided Somalia a total of more than \$262 million in FY 2017 in life-saving emergency food assistance, including \$150.7 million in EFSP funds, to help approximately 5.7 million drought-affected

Somalis.⁸ However, the risk of famine persisted at the start of FY 2018 because of relentless drought and ongoing conflict. While the overall number of people in need of humanitarian assistance is declining, the severity of hunger is increasing, particularly among internally displaced persons, according to FEWS NET, and FSNAU.

ETHIOPIA

Ethiopia has long been one of the most chronically food-insecure countries in Africa. Traditionally, USAID emergency food assistance programs in Ethiopia exclusively provided rations of wheat and split peas.⁹ In January 2017, FFP began a pilot program in northwest Ethiopia, using electronic cash transfers to support economic development in poor, rural communities. This marked the first time FFP used cash transfers to support food security outcomes in Ethiopia, although other donors have been using cash programs there for several years. It supported approximately 34,000 vulnerable people in one of Ethiopia's most food-insecure regions, in partnership with Food for the Hungry. Beneficiaries worked five days per month on local infrastructure projects that benefit the community. In exchange, they received monthly electronic cash transfers via mobile phone networks. The pilot is part of the larger Productive Safety Net Program – led by the Government of Ethiopia with support from USAID and other donors – that targets eight million chronically food-insecure people.

Beneficiaries reported that the regular, instantaneous mobile cash transfers reassured them they would receive a reliable amount of assistance at regular intervals to feed their families. This increased their confidence to invest in their own productive assets, such as investments in buying livestock, sending children to school, or starting small-scale businesses, which otherwise might have been too risky to consider. These assets helped families increase their income and become less reliant on the social safety net.

The pilot stimulated the local economy by encouraging participants to purchase from local vendors in community markets. USAID also collaborated with private Ethiopian cellphone service providers that managed the mobile money distribution platform, which further supported the Ethiopian economy.

Finally, the pilot increased financial inclusion by helping families in rural communities access new ways to store and save money in formal banking systems, and also incentivized private financial institutions to make services more accessible to rural communities. Because of the success of this pilot, USAID plans to expand this program in FY 2018 to support twice the number of Ethiopians.

SIERRA LEONE

In May 2014, the UN confirmed an Ebola outbreak in Sierra Leone, which marked the start of an unprecedented crisis that resulted in more than 14,000 Ebola cases and nearly 4,000 associated deaths. Beyond the severe health impacts, the epidemic destroyed livelihoods, purchasing power, and economic activity, as restrictions on movements and market activities drove thousands of households into isolation and increased food insecurity.

⁸ FFP also provided Title II funds in Somalia in FY 2017, which will be in the FY 2017 International Food Assistance Report.

⁹ FFP also provided Title II funds in Ethiopia in FY 2017, which will be in the FY 2017 International Food Assistance Report.

USAID was in a unique position to meet emergency food needs both during the crisis and in the recovery. With funding from EFSP, USAID partners in Sierra Leone provided emergency food assistance, bought in local and regional markets, to people directly affected by Ebola.

To help families recover as the epidemic waned, USAID provided cash transfers through five NGO partners which boosted access to food while also empowering households and catalyzing market recovery. USAID partners also provided complementary activities that helped communities generate income and build resilience to future crises. Activities included distributing vouchers to buy seeds, establishing community-led savings groups, teaching families better nutrition and hygiene practices, and providing small grants and business training to traders. Between 2015 and 2017, USAID provided market-based food assistance to approximately 360,000 people in Sierra Leone and injected money directly into the local economy, which spurred the restoration of Sierra Leonean livelihoods.

MONITORING AND EVALUATION STRATEGIES

USAID requires monitoring and evaluation for every activity. For activities longer than 10 months, baseline and final-evaluation surveys are required. FFP staff in Washington, D.C., review partner reports and field staff verify the information provided.

MONITORING

ESFP partners monitor activities to ensure targeted beneficiaries receive commodities, cash transfers, and food vouchers for the stated purpose and according to standard procedures. FFP staff verify this information through visits to distribution and project sites. As market conditions can change quickly because of price fluctuations, inflation, seasonality, and other factors, activities must adjust accordingly. Monitoring also helps USAID stay apprised of any issues that might hinder food assistance, potentially including the loss, damage, or theft of equipment or commodities.

FFP has developed tools and trainings to help staff and partners monitor market-based activities. For example, in FY 2017, FFP and the Cash and Learning Partnership commissioned guidance that recommends best practices for the monitoring of cash programs and outcomes, and the analysis of the monitoring data.¹⁰ Also, when security constraints have prevented site visits by U.S. Government staff, USAID has contracted third-party monitoring, such as in Iraq, Mali, Somalia, Syria and Yemen during FY 2017.

EVALUATION

FFP's FY 2017 Annual Program Statement for International Emergency Food Assistance includes indicators that evaluate system-wide cost-efficiency analysis across all modalities. This helps ensure FFP directs its program resources appropriately and efficiently. To improve the quality and consistency of reporting, FFP updates guidance annually, and requires reporting on gender integration, environmental factors, as well as the use of cash, voucher, and/or LRP. FFP also requests an analysis of households that benefit from multi-sectoral activities. Evidence suggests that households achieve better results when they participate in multiple interventions that address the availability, access, and use of food.

¹⁰ Martin-Simpson, Sophie et al. "MONITORING4CTP: Monitoring Guidance for CTP in Emergencies Available at: <http://www.cashlearning.org/downloads/calp-ctp-monitoring-web.pdf>

In FY 2016, FFP commissioned TANGO International to review the use of EFSP funds from 2010-2016 in Haiti, Sierra Leone, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Kenya, Nigeria, and Zimbabwe. The review and related case studies are expected to be available in FY 2018, and will help to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of EFSP programs. It will also inform market-based programming practices for the larger global humanitarian community.

APPENDIX A: DEFINITIONS OF MARKET-BASED ASSISTANCE

USAID uses EFSP funds in different ways, with the goal of offering the greatest possible flexibility in addressing disaster-related food security needs as they arise. The principal modalities have been the following:

- **Local and Regional Procurement**¹¹
 - Local procurement is the purchase of food in the same country in which it will be distributed.
 - Regional procurement is the purchase of food within the same continent as the country in which it will be distributed
- **Cash Transfers** are money provided to participants who lack economic access to food readily available in local markets. Cash can be delivered conditionally or unconditionally, but is always unrestricted.¹²
- **Food Vouchers** are redeemable for food from pre-selected vendors by beneficiaries affected by an emergency and lack the economic resources to purchase food readily available in local markets.
- **Complementary Services**¹³ supplement the primary mechanisms for providing food assistance, and directly support the modalities noted above. Based on their potential to contribute to the stabilization of households and community access to adequate and nutritious food, interventions may include the following:
 - Agriculture and food security, including support for agricultural inputs, such as seeds, tools and fodder, as well as agriculture-related training;
 - Livelihoods, including support for community-level savings and the restoration of livelihoods;
 - Nutrition, including support for community-based services, such as community-based management of acute malnutrition, integrated management of acute malnutrition, the promotion of appropriate infant and young child feeding practices in emergencies and/or other social and behavior change communication, or the distribution of locally/regionally procured nutrition products;
 - Water and hygiene behavior change and improvements in sanitation systems;
 - Support to facilitate a more effective and coordinated food security response to a specific shock; and
 - Efforts to strengthen gender equity, empower youth, or improve social cohesion when such factors have direct links to improved food security.

¹¹ In rare instances, FFP will allow international procurement, defined as the purchase of commodities sourced outside the continent of distribution, but it requires approval by the FFP Director.

¹² A conditional transfer comes with a set of conditions a beneficiary must meet prior to the transaction. Conditions can relate to attending trainings or health clinics, labor towards a livelihoods project or completing a stage of construction in an asset project.

¹³ 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 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.”

APPENDIX B: COUNTRIES WITH FISCAL YEAR 2017 EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM AWARDS¹⁴

Afghanistan*
Algeria
Angola
Bangladesh*
Burkina Faso*
Burma*
Burundi*
Cameroon*
Central African Republic (CAR) *
Chad*
Colombia*
Djibouti*
Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) *
Ecuador
Ethiopia*
Guatemala*
Haiti*
Honduras*
Iraq
Ivory Coast
Kenya*
Madagascar*
Malawi*
Mali*
Mauritania*
Mozambique*
Niger*
Nigeria*
Pakistan*
Republic of Congo (ROC) *
Rwanda
Sierra Leone
Somalia*
South Sudan*
Sudan*
Syria
Tanzania*
Uganda*
Ukraine
West Bank/Gaza
Yemen*
Zimbabwe*

¹⁴ FFP also provided FY 2017 Title II funds in the countries marked with an asterisk, as reported in the FY 2017 International Food Assistance Report.

APPENDIX C: FUNDING SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEAR 2017 EMERGENCY FOOD SECURITY PROGRAM AWARDS

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁵	TOTAL FUNDING	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFERS	FOOD VOUCHERS	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁶	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Afghanistan	Complex Emergency	World Food Program (WFP)	\$ 64,000,000	\$ 33,217,054	\$ 8,782,946	\$ 22,000,000	-	-	-	Kazakhstan, Pakistan
Algeria	Refugees	WFP	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	
Angola	Refugees	WFP	\$ 4,700,000	-	\$ 4,700,000	-	-	-	-	South Africa, Zambia, Botswana, Malawi
Bangladesh	Refugees	WFP	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 2,890,668	\$ 609,332	\$ 1,500,000	\$ 1,000,000	\$ 1,000,000	-	Indonesia
Burkina Faso	Refugees/Drought	UNICEF	\$ 81,226	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 81,226	
Burkina Faso	Drought	WFP	\$ 2,000,000	-	-	\$ 1,600,000	-	\$ 400,000	-	
Burkina Faso	Refugees	WFP	\$ 2,000,000	-	-	\$ 1,600,000	-	\$ 400,000	-	
Burma	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 12,000,000	\$ 6,675,793	\$ 719,283	\$ 4,604,924	-	-	-	Indonesia
Burundi	Refugees/Drought/Conflict	UNICEF	\$ 305,003	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 305,003	
Burundi	Refugees/Drought/Conflict	WFP	\$ 4,200,000	-	\$ 4,200,000	-	-	-	-	Uganda
Cameroon	Complex Emergency	International Rescue Committee (IRC)	\$ 3,000,000	-	-	\$ 2,868,920	-	\$ 131,080	-	
Cameroon	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 2,759,690	\$ 3,056,809	-	\$ 1,183,501	-	-	Sudan
CAR	Conflict	WFP	\$ 16,800,000	\$ 1,261,002	\$ 15,538,998	-	-	-	-	Cameroon
Chad	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 29,000,000	\$ 13,484,496	\$ 4,783,604	\$ 7,417,572	\$ 3,314,328	-	-	Sudan, Cameroon

¹⁵ USAID is withholding the identities of several partner organizations for safety and security reasons, but can provide additional information can be provided to authorized entities on request.

¹⁶ Other activities include international procurement, milling, twinning, and supporting humanitarian coordination and information management

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE 15	TOTAL FUNDING	LOCAL PROCURE- MENT	REGIONAL PROCURE- MENT	CASH TRANSFERS	FOOD VOUCHERS	COMPLE- ENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁶	REGIONAL PROCUR- EMENT COUNTRIES
Colombia	Conflict	WFP	\$ 3,300,000	-	-	-	\$ 2,935,601	\$ 364,399	-	
Djibouti	Refugees/Drought	WFP	\$ 749,890	-	-	-	\$ 749,890	-	-	
DRC	Conflict/Complex Emergency	Action Against Hunger (ACF)	\$ 4,005,000	\$ 4,005,000	-	-	-	-	-	
DRC	Returnees/ Conflict/ Complex Emergency	ACTED	\$ 2,431,697	\$ 485,801	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,945,896	
DRC	Complex Emergency	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	\$ 5,977,407	\$ 3,973,738	-	-	\$ 2,003,669	-	-	
DRC	Complex Emergency	Handicap International	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 4,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	
DRC	Complex Emergency	International Medical Corps	\$ 1,000,000	-	\$ 1,000,000	-	-	-	-	Tanzania, Malawi, South Africa, Kenya, Ethiopia
DRC	Complex Emergency	Samaritan's Purse	\$ 3,147,152	\$ 2,472,152	-	-	\$ 675,000	-	-	
DRC	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 25,023,954	\$ 14,035,828	\$ 4,488,126	\$ 6,500,000	-	-	-	Malawi, Kenya, Namibia, South Africa
DRC	Conflict	WFP	\$ 1,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,000,000	
DRC	Refugees/ Conflict	WFP	\$ 6,000,000	-	-	\$ 3,480,000	\$ 2,520,000	-	-	
Ecuador	Refugees	WFP	\$ 1,800,000	-	-	-	\$ 1,800,000	-	-	
Ethiopia	Drought	WFP	\$ 73,000,000	\$ 11,599,995	\$ 61,400,005	-	-	-	-	Sudan
Ethiopia	Refugees	WFP	\$ 20,000,000	\$ 2,260,233	\$ 17,739,767	-	-	-	-	Sudan
Guatemala	Drought	CRS	\$ 4,699,955	-	-	\$ 1,178,931	\$ 2,689,358	\$ 831,666	-	
Guatemala	Drought	Project Concern International (PCI)	\$ 6,000,000	-	-	\$ 1,799,189	\$ 3,690,596	\$ 510,215	-	
Guatemala	Drought	WFP	\$ 4,500,000	-	-	\$ 4,500,000	-	-	-	
Haiti	Hurricane	CARE	\$ 14,421,246	-	-	\$ 14,421,246	-	-	-	
Haiti	Hurricane	CRS	\$ 9,672,596	-	-	\$ 5,900,000	-	\$ 2,100,000	\$ 1,672,596	

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁵	TOTAL FUNDING	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFERS	FOOD VOUCHERS	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁶	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Haiti	Drought/Hurricane	UNICEF	\$ 750,000	\$ 750,000	-	-	-	-	-	
Haiti	Hurricane	WFP	\$ 10,258,530	\$ 7,000,000	-	-	-	-	\$3,258,530	
Honduras	Drought	WFP	\$ 3,500,000	-	-	\$ 3,500,000	-	-	-	
Iraq	Returnees/Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 65,000,359	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 58,789,731	-	\$ 3,210,628	-	-	Turkey
Iraq	Returnees/Complex Emergency	Partner 19	\$ 3,400,000	-	-	\$ 3,400,000	-	-	-	
Ivory Coast	Refugees	WFP	\$ 2,000,000	\$ 866,662	-	\$ 1,073,618	-	-	\$ 59,720	
Kenya	Drought/Conflict	WFP	\$ 2,250,000	-	-	\$ 2,250,000	-	-	-	
Kenya	Refugees/Drought	UNICEF	\$ 3,725,809	\$ 2,196,720	-	-	-	\$ 1,529,089	-	
Kenya	Drought	WFP	\$ 17,000,000	-	\$ 8,250,000	\$ 7,500,000	-	-	\$ 1,250,000	Rwanda
Kenya	Refugees	WFP	\$ 7,500,000	\$ 519,012	\$ 1,480,988	\$ 4,300,000	-	\$ 1,200,000	-	Zambia
Madagascar	Drought	WFP	\$ 2,747,004	\$ 1,368,669	\$ 1,378,335	-	-	-	-	South Africa
Malawi	Drought	UNDP	\$ 120,000	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 120,000	
Malawi	Drought	UNICEF	\$ 89,614	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 89,614	
Malawi	Drought	WFP	\$ 35,500,000	\$ 17,573,409	\$ 15,426,591	-	-	-	\$ 2,500,000	Indonesia, Mozambique, Zambia, South Africa
Mali	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 14,700,000	\$ 6,323,517	\$ 41,766	\$ 1,334,717	\$ 7,000,000	-	-	Senegal, Burkina Faso, Ivory Coast
Mali	Complex Emergency	CRS	\$ 676,626	-	-	\$ 676,626	-	-	-	
Mauritania	Drought	Oxfam	\$ 650,000	\$ 127,662	-	\$ 389,590	-	\$ 132,748	-	
Mauritania	Refugees/Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 2,000,000	-	-	\$ 2,000,000	-	-	-	
Mauritania	Drought	ACF	\$ 359,944	-	-	\$ 153,859	\$ 130,517	\$ 75,568	-	
Mozambique	Drought/Cyclone/Conflict	WFP	\$ 7,000,000	\$ 3,353,807	-	-	\$ 3,646,193	-	-	
Niger	Complex Emergency	Partner 10	\$ 2,500,000	-	-	-	\$ 2,500,000	-	-	

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁵	TOTAL FUNDING	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFERS	FOOD VOUCHERS	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁶	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Niger	Complex Emergency	UNICEF	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 3,000,000	-	-	-	-	-	
Niger	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 19,900,000	\$ 7,936,709	\$ 6,342,156	\$ 5,621,135	-	-	-	South Africa, Senegal
Nigeria	Complex Emergency	Partner 7	\$ 12,000,000	-	-	-	\$ 12,000,000	-	-	
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 10	\$ 2,611,105	-	-	\$ 2,243,648	-	\$ 367,457	-	
Nigeria	Complex Emergency	Partner 19	\$ 9,500,000	-	-	\$ 65,620	\$ 9,418,120	\$ 16,260	-	
Nigeria	Complex Emergency	Partner 35	\$ 7,250,000	-	-	-	\$ 7,075,318	\$ 174,682	-	
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 11	\$ 17,593,484	-	-	-	\$ 17,106,177	\$ 487,307	-	
Nigeria	Conflict/ Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 154,699,999	\$ 83,744,993	\$ 37,907,706	\$ 27,827,214	-	\$ 292,671	\$ 4,927,415	South Africa
Nigeria	Conflict	Partner 23	\$ 23,150,000	\$ 11,614,656	-	\$ 6,598,675	\$ 4,486,658	\$ 450,011	-	
Pakistan	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 38,000,000	\$ 10,757,684	\$ 2,725,545	\$ 6,866,884	-	-	\$ 17,649,887	Indonesia
ROC	Conflict	WFP	\$ 1,606,488	-	\$ 1,606,488	-	-	-	-	DRC
Rwanda	Refugees	WFP	\$ 11,000,000	\$ 3,737,163	\$ 2,422,183	\$ 4,350,000	-	-	\$ 490,654	Kenya, South Africa
Sierra Leone	Ebola	ACDI/VOCA	\$ 4,740,816	-	-	\$ 4,740,816	-	-	-	
Sierra Leone	Ebola	CARE	\$ 1,780,564	-	-	\$ 1,780,564	-	-	-	
Sierra Leone	Ebola	CRS	\$ 2,406,416	-	-	\$ 2,406,416	-	-	-	
Sierra Leone	Ebola	Save the Children	\$ 2,371,018	-	-	\$ 2,218,596	-	\$ 152,422	-	
Sierra Leone	Ebola	World Vision	\$ 2,999,191	-	-	\$ 2,999,191	-	-	-	
Somalia	Complex Emergency	Partner 4	\$ 4,100,000	-	-	\$ 4,100,000	-	-	-	
Somalia	Complex Emergency	Partner 5	\$ 4,954,712	-	-	\$ 4,954,712	-	-	-	
Somalia	Complex Emergency	Partner 6	\$ 7,250,000	-	-	\$ 7,250,000	-	-	-	
Somalia	Complex Emergency	Partner 7	\$ 6,269,766	-	-	\$ 6,269,766	-	-	-	
Somalia	Complex Emergency	Partner 8	\$ 3,530,000	-	-	\$ 3,530,000	-	-	-	

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁵	TOTAL FUNDING	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFERS	FOOD VOUCHERS	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁶	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Somalia	Complex Emergency	FAO	\$ 46,500,000	-	-	\$ 46,500,000	-	-	-	
Somalia	Complex Emergency	Partner 16	\$ 1,210,023	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,210,023	
Somalia	Complex Emergency	Partner 11	\$ 13,000,001	-	-	\$ 12,802,356	-	\$ 197,645	-	
Somalia	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 57,878,093	-	\$ 128,093	-	\$ 57,750,000	-	-	United Arab Emirates
Somalia	Complex Emergency	Partner 14	\$ 6,000,000	-	-	-	\$ 6,000,000	-	-	
South Sudan	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 218,430,000	-	\$ 204,509,632	\$ 8,440,368	\$ 5,480,000	-	-	Uganda, Tanzania, Rwanda, Kenya, Sudan
Sudan	Complex Emergency	Partner 1	\$ 17,405,592	-	\$ 17,405,592	-	-	-	-	Uganda, Kenya
Sudan	Complex Emergency	Partner 2	\$ 4,000,000	-	\$ 4,000,000	-	-	-	-	South Sudan
Sudan	Complex Emergency	Partner 3	\$ 3,354,749	-	-	\$ 3,354,749	-	-	-	
Sudan	Complex Emergency	Partner 36	\$ 1,753,197	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,753,197	
Sudan	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 63,569,260	\$ 40,504,370	-	-	\$ 23,064,890	-	-	
Syria	Conflict	Partner 7	\$ 69,111,040	-	\$ 51,773,396	\$ 2,195,734	\$ 15,141,910	-	-	Turkey
Syria	Conflict	Partner 10	\$ 3,634,992	-	\$ 1,233,927	\$ 478,482	\$ 1,922,583	-	-	Turkey, Jordan, India, Kyrgyzstan, Iraq
Syria	Conflict	Partner 16	\$ 860,812	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 860,812	
Syria	Conflict	Partner 22	\$ 9,358,292	\$ 4,633,186	\$ 4,725,106	-	-	-	-	Turkey, Iraq
Syria	Conflict	Partner 37	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 3,125,578	\$ 231,330	-	-	\$ 1,643,092	-	Turkey, Iraq
Syria	Conflict	WFP	\$ 90,000,000	\$ 684,018	\$ 89,315,982	-	-	-	-	Turkey, Jordan
Syria (Regional)	Conflict	Partner 17	\$ 17,953,149	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 17,953,149	
Syria (Regional)	Conflict	Partner 18	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 1,102,800	-	-	\$ 4,897,200	-	-	
Syria (Regional)	Conflict	Partner 20	\$ 21,663,452	\$ 910,551	\$ 13,311,723	\$ 84,792	\$ 7,356,386	-	-	Turkey

COUNTRY	EMERGENCY	AWARDEE ¹⁵	TOTAL FUNDING	LOCAL PROCUREMENT	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT	CASH TRANSFERS	FOOD VOUCHERS	COMPLEMENTARY SERVICES	OTHER ¹⁶	REGIONAL PROCUREMENT COUNTRIES
Syria (Regional)	Conflict	Partner 25	\$ 1,326,054	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,326,054	
Syria (Regional)	Conflict	Partner 19	\$ 2,860,190	\$ 2,703,390	\$ 156,800	-	-	-	-	Turkey
Syria (Regional)	Conflict	Partner 38	\$ 6,617,000	-	\$ 4,817,312	-	\$ 1,682,688	-	\$ 117,000	Turkey
Syria (Regional)	Refugees	WFP	\$ 167,400,000	-	-	\$ 17,400,000	\$ 150,000,000	-	-	
Tanzania	Refugees	WFP	\$ 16,584,039	\$ 4,853,172	\$ 11,730,867	-	-	-	-	South Africa, Zambia
Uganda	Refugees	WFP	\$ 66,280,278	\$ 56,742,799	\$ 9,412,479	-	-	-	\$ 125,000	Zambia, Sudan
Ukraine	Conflict	WFP	\$ 3,000,000	\$ 1,199,841	-	\$ 1,800,159	-	-	-	
West Bank/Gaza	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 6,000,000	\$ 2,259,470	\$ 808,013	-	\$ 2,932,517	-	-	Turkey
Yemen	Complex Emergency	Partner 24	\$ 10,776,212	-	-	-	\$ 10,423,297	\$ 352,915	-	
Yemen	Complex Emergency	Partner 16	\$ 1,072,079	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 1,072,079	
Yemen	Conflict/Complex Emergency	Partner 19	\$ 9,167,261	-	-	-	\$ 9,142,435	\$ 24,826	-	
Yemen	Complex Emergency	Partner 11	\$ 8,210,249	-	-	-	\$ 8,210,249	-	-	
Yemen	Complex Emergency	WFP	\$ 56,000,000	\$ 26,845,984	\$ 11,926,687	-	\$ 17,227,329	-	-	Sudan
Yemen	Complex Emergency	FAO	\$ 800,000	-	-	-	-	-	\$ 800,000	
Zimbabwe	Drought	WFP	\$ 10,000,000	-	\$ 10,000,000	-	-	-	-	Zambia
Zimbabwe	Drought/Flood	WFP	\$ 21,000,000	\$ 801,130	\$ 6,721,585	\$ 13,477,285	-	-	-	Zambia, Zimbabwe
Total			\$ 1,910,032,625	\$ 414,358,401	\$ 705,598,884	\$ 306,306,354	\$410,367,038	\$ 12,834,053	\$ 60,567,855	