



**USAID**  
FROM THE AMERICAN PEOPLE



WFP/GABRIELA VIVACQUA

# U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

## INTERNATIONAL FOOD ASSISTANCE

Report to Congress for Fiscal Year 2019

**Cover Photograph:** A distribution of food by the World Food Programme (WFP) in Unity State, South Sudan. Credit: WFP/Gabriela Vivacqua.

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

## CONTENTS

<b>LATEST DEVELOPMENTS</b>	<b>1</b>
IMPLEMENTING THE 2018 FARM BILL	1
NUTRITION AND THE QUALITY OF FOOD AID	2
BUREAU FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE	3
<b>REGIONAL HIGHLIGHTS</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>EMERGENCY RESPONSES</b>	<b>4</b>
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN	4
REPUBLIC OF YEMEN	5
<b>NON-EMERGENCY RESPONSES</b>	<b>5</b>
FEDERAL DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ETHIOPIA	5
PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF BANGLADESH	6
<b>APPENDICES</b>	<b>8</b>
APPENDIX A: LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK	8
APPENDIX B: LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	9
APPENDIX C: LIST OF AWARDEES	10
APPENDIX D: GRAPHS ON FOOD ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY USAID IN FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2019	12
APPENDIX E: USAID TITLE II EMERGENCY ACTIVITIES FOR FY 2019	17
APPENDIX F: USAID TITLE II NON-EMERGENCY ACTIVITIES FOR FY 2019	18
APPENDIX G: USAID TITLE II INTERNATIONAL FOOD RELIEF PARTNERSHIP ACTIVITIES FOR FY 2019	21
APPENDIX H: FOOD FOR PEACE TITLE II CONGRESSIONAL MANDATES FOR FY 2019	22
APPENDIX I: USAID'S USE OF THE AUTHORITIES IN SECTION 207(F) OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT	24
APPENDIX J: OVERSIGHT, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION	25
APPENDIX K: RATE OF RETURN OF, AND USE OF PROCEEDS FROM, MONETIZATION	28
APPENDIX L: THE FOOD AID CONSULTATIVE GROUP	29
APPENDIX M: BREAKDOWN OF FUNDS UNDER SECTION 202(E) AND FOR INTERNAL TRANSPORTATION, STORAGE, AND HANDLING FOR PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS IN FY 2019	30

# U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT INTERNATIONAL FOOD ASSISTANCE

## REPORT TO CONGRESS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2019

In Fiscal Year (FY) 2019, levels of acute hunger remained high around the globe, driven by conflict and insecurity. The Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), estimated that 85 million people across 46 countries needed emergency food assistance in Calendar Year 2019, which is nearly double the level of need from 2015.

Two main factors elevated the levels of global food-insecurity over the last several years.<sup>1</sup> The first is the persistence of multiple, large-scale conflicts that have disrupted markets and livelihoods and caused widespread displacement and insecurity. The United States continues to provide large-scale emergency food assistance for crises in places like Syria and the Republic of South Sudan.

The second factor that affected global food-insecurity is the recurrence of climatic shocks or extreme weather patterns across large parts of Africa. In the Horn of Africa, severe drought conditions have exacerbated the effects of persistent conflict, which has increased humanitarian needs in the Federal Republic of Somalia and the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. In Southern Africa, Tropical Cyclones Idai and Kenneth caused catastrophic flooding. Additionally, the second-strongest Atlantic storm on record hit the Bahamian islands of Abaco and Grand Bahama.

To address these crises, the Office of Food for Peace (FFP) within the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) at USAID (soon to be the new Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance) provided food assistance to save lives, reduce suffering, and support recovery for millions of people in both acute and chronic emergencies. In FY 2019, USAID provided nearly \$1.8 billion in assistance under Title II of the Food for Peace Act, which funded the procurement of more than 1.6 million metric tons (MT) of food that served a total of nearly 37 million beneficiaries in 36 countries. More than 83 percent of USAID's assistance under Title II went to emergency responses, and roughly 16 percent to non-emergency programming. When combined with funds from the International Disaster Assistance (IDA) and Development Assistance accounts provided as Community Development Funds (CDF),<sup>2</sup> USAID reached approximately 76 million people in 55 countries with food assistance in FY 2019, including almost 2.6 million MT of food, together valued at a total of \$4.4 billion dollars in FY 2019.

This report provides the highlights of trends and activities in USAID's food assistance under Title II for the year,<sup>3</sup> pursuant to Section 407(f) of the Food for Peace Act (Section 1736a of Title 7 of the United States Code [U.S.C.]).<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The 2019 State of World Food Security and Nutrition in the World Report: <http://www.fao.org/publications/sofi>

<sup>2</sup> Community Development Funds (CDF) are Development Assistance funds, authorized separately under Section 103 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961, as amended. USAID's Bureau for Food Security provides CDF resources to, and coordinates them with, 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.

<sup>3</sup> Food for Peace's FY 2019 Annual Report and a report on IDA funding, the Emergency Food Security Program Report, can be found on the USAID website: <https://www.usaid.gov/food-assistance/resources>

<sup>4</sup> Farmer-to-Farmer Title V will issue a separate annual report.

## LATEST DEVELOPMENTS

### IMPLEMENTING REVISIONS TO THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT

At the end of 2018, President Trump signed into law the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, informally known as "the Farm Bill." The 2018 Farm Bill included key technical changes to the Food for Peace Act that increased the efficiency and improved the oversight and management of food assistance under Title II during FY 2019, including the following:

- **Monetization:** The elimination of the required minimum for monetization enables more funding to go toward programs funded under Title II, which allowed USAID to reach more beneficiaries with food assistance. Selling U.S. commodities for cash to use for non-emergency programming is inefficient, and results in an average financial loss of 25 cents on the dollar for USAID.<sup>5</sup>
- **Programmatic Oversight:** Capped previously at \$17 million, funds under Section 207(f) of the Food for Peace Act are now 1.5 percent of the funds available under Title II, which totaled \$25.7 million in FY 2019. Adjusting the funding under Section 207(f) to a percentage allows for expanded programmatic design, learning, adaptive-management, and evaluation activities—which allows for increased evaluation of USAID’s programs and greater adoption rates of innovative designs.
- **Internal Transportation, Storage, and Handling (ITSH):** Congress expanded the ITSH authority to align better with improvements made by the World Food Programme (WFP) in its categories, which allows DCHA/FFP to continue to cover the implementation costs associated with providing U.S. agricultural commodities in emergency programs. In the Republic of Yemen, for example, this authority allowed USAID to pay for the in-country milling of 510,880 MT of wheat by using ITSH. The Farm Bill also sustained the principal authority that pays for the other associated costs of programs under Section 202(e) of Title II, capped at 20 percent of available resources.

To carry out these and other changes in the law, USAID updated and reissued several Food for Peace Information Bulletins<sup>6</sup> to ensure our staff and implementing partners understand the programmatic impacts of the reforms clearly.

### NUTRITION AND THE QUALITY OF FOOD AID

In FY 2019, USAID continued to improve aspects of our food assistance, including its packaging, the quality and safety of the food we purchase and distribute, and the management of our supply-chain.

USAID piloted a more-resilient, puncture-resistant hybrid (nylon and paper) packaging for fortified flours, which protects them against breakage and pest infestations to preserve the integrity of the food. USAID also collaborated with the WFP to improve the shelf life of high-energy biscuits (HEB). With updated formula and packaging, the shelf life of HEBs increased from a few months to two years.

USAID continued working with the suppliers of commodities and our implementing partners to improve the safety and quality of key food commodities, with a focus on therapeutic and supplementary ready-to-use foods (RUFs). An important contribution in 2019 was the implementation of quality controls at

---

<sup>5</sup> U.S. Government Accountability Office (2011) "International Food Assistance: Funding Development Projects through the Purchase, Shipment and Sale of U.S. Commodities Is Inefficient and Can Cause Adverse Market Impacts." Available at: <https://www.gao.gov/assets/330/320013.pdf>

<sup>6</sup> The updated bulletins can be found on the USAID website: <https://www.usaid.gov/food-assistance/resources/food-peace-information-bulletins>



manufacturing plants to ensure a more-preventive approach to quality-assurance and food safety. As a result, RUF suppliers established quality controls at their processing lines, which U.S. Government monitors and auditors use to assess risks to the safety and quality of food at its source.

On the research side, USAID funded Tufts University to continue its work on the Food Aid Quality Review (FAQR), including a study on the cost-effectiveness of four foods in treating moderate acute malnutrition in the Republic of Sierra Leone. The results suggest that corn-soy blend plus (CSB+) and oil are more cost-effective than other products, such as Super Cereal *Plus* Ready-to-Use Supplementary Food (RUSF), or a proposed formulation of CSB+ with whey powder. Although these results are not definitive, they allow USAID to make more-informed decisions when selecting commodities based on their cost-effectiveness.

The FAQR team also examined “the last mile” of food assistance in the Republics of Malawi, Burkina Faso, and Sierra Leone to learn what improvements USAID can make to the delivery of food aid in the field. They focused on logistical challenges, including transport, storage, distribution, accessibility to villages, and coordination with stakeholders. The FAQR team recommended a series of next steps, including continuing knowledge-sharing efforts among stakeholders, increasing the collection of last-mile data, and soliciting the perspective of beneficiaries.

## **BUREAU FOR HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE**

In December 2018, Congress concurred with USAID’s proposal to unite the two main USAID offices that provide international humanitarian assistance—FFP and the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA)—into the new Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA). By unifying and elevating humanitarian assistance into one Bureau, USAID seeks to eliminate the artificial distinction between emergency food and non-food responses.

Merging FFP and OFDA will consolidate core capabilities, integrate support structures, link programmatic assets, reduce gaps and duplication, streamline processes, and improve responses to modern emergencies, which are increasingly large, complex, and protracted. The new BHA will strengthen USAID’s role as the lead Federal coordinator for international disaster assistance, enable better outcomes, and bolster coordination within the U.S. Government interagency and with international partners.

BHA will pursue a comprehensive approach to delivering humanitarian assistance in a way that makes it possible for USAID to narrow the gap between relief and development programs to help communities in partner countries solve their own development challenges and support their Journeys to Self-Reliance (J2SR). While the bulk of BHA’s work will be responding to crises, FFP’s non-emergency programs and OFDA’s disaster-risk-reduction work will continue under BHA. These humanitarian-to-early-development efforts will help continue to build stable foundations and connect BHA to the rest of USAID’s planned Relief, Response, and Resilience (R3) family of Bureaus and other USAID Operating Units to mitigate the impact crises have on development gains.

The reorganization will be a gradual process, sequenced over time. Humanitarian operations are complex, and USAID’s top priority is to safeguard the continuity of these efforts throughout USAID’s Transformation. Administrator Green signed an Action Memorandum to establish BHA legally on January 27, 2020; USAID anticipates the Bureau will be operational in FY 2020.

## REGIONAL HIGHLIGHTS

### EMERGENCY RESPONSES

The United States sees the relationship between conflict and global hunger as an urgent priority that requires immediate and collective action. Two examples below demonstrate how U.S. in-kind food assistance has helped save the lives of people affected by conflict in FY 2019.

#### SOUTH SUDAN

South Sudan remains one of the most food-insecure countries in the world. Conflict since 2013 has caused widespread displacement, exacerbated food insecurity, disrupted livelihoods, and left families struggling to meet basic needs. At the end of FY 2019, approximately 3.7 million South Sudanese remained displaced from their homes, including 1.5 million people within South Sudan and 2.2 million refugees in neighboring countries, primarily the Republics of Sudan and Uganda. Nearly seven million people—61 percent of the population—needed emergency food assistance during the lean season in mid-2019. More than 1.8 million people experienced severe food-insecurity and required urgent assistance to save lives and livelihoods.

In FY 2019, USAID contributed more than \$375 million in emergency food assistance in South Sudan, including \$114 million in funds under Title II and \$262 million in IDA funds. To address the emergency food needs of multiple population groups throughout the country, including internally displaced persons (IDPs), refugees, young children, and other severely food-insecure South Sudanese, USAID used multiple types of responses to help the most vulnerable get the food they need in the given context. USAID used funding under Title II to purchase 38,148 MT of food grown in the United States, including sorghum, yellow split peas, and vegetable oil. USAID also provided nutritional, therapeutic food products to prevent and treat malnutrition in young children and pregnant and lactating women.

In addition, USAID implemented complementary activities alongside food assistance in Jonglei State, where it was safe enough for previously displaced persons to return home. USAID's partner Catholic Relief Services used funding under Title II Section 202(e) to help families who escaped war rebuild their lives after returning home. For example, households learned how to grow vegetables and other produce while using innovative farming equipment, and communities received food in exchange for digging ponds to provide water for household and village use. USAID also provided vouchers to some of the most-vulnerable families in the area to purchase healthy goats from local vendors at livestock fairs.

The remainder of funding for South Sudan from FY 2019—IDA funds—enabled USAID's partners to purchase and distribute food grown within South Sudan or from nearby countries, which allowed IDPs and refugees in particular to get food quickly, and bolstered local and regional markets without affecting local prices or commercial trade. The United States is the largest donor of humanitarian assistance to South Sudan, having provided more than \$4 billion since the start of the conflict in December 2013. This generosity allowed partners—including the WFP, which reached an average of 2.4 million South Sudanese each month with food assistance—to meet life-saving needs. The U.S. Department of State and USAID are also working on a donor-engagement strategy to increase the participation of other funders in humanitarian responses, including in South Sudan.

#### REPUBLIC OF YEMEN

Yemen is the largest food-security emergency in the world. Since 2015, conflict in Yemen has devastated civil infrastructure, displaced millions of people, and prompted an economic crisis, which has caused widespread acute food-insecurity. In FY 2019, nearly 17 million people—56 percent of Yemen's

population—were in urgent need of humanitarian food assistance, and 4.4 million people, including many children, were in acute need of nutrition support.

In FY 2019, USAID contributed more than \$585 million in emergency food assistance in Yemen, including \$437 million in funds under Title II, most of which purchased more than 586,000 metric tons of in-kind food aid—such as wheat, beans, and vegetable oil—from the United States.

By August 2019, support from USAID enabled the WFP to reach more than 12.4 million vulnerable Yemeni people—the most ever reached in one month in Yemen—with emergency food assistance. Over the year, this support included U.S. in-kind emergency food assistance, as well as \$148 million in IDA, most of which was for food vouchers redeemable at vetted vendor shops for food baskets of wheat, vegetable oil, and pulses in urban areas where markets remain functional.

USAID partners also provide life-saving nutrition assistance in Yemen to reduce the prevalence of, and prevent, acute malnutrition, particularly among children under five and pregnant and lactating women. USAID provided \$50 million in IDA funds for the scale-up of the prevention and treatment of moderate acute malnutrition and \$4 million in funds under Title II for therapeutic food to treat 72,000 children who were suffering from severe acute malnutrition countrywide.

## **NON-EMERGENCY RESPONSES**

Recognizing that repeatedly responding to emergencies is expensive and 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. Though not included in this report, Feed the Future, USAID’s flagship program under the *Global Food Security Strategy*, addresses development and resilience activities through other accounts that totaled more than \$1 billion in FY 2019. The new Bureau for Resilience and Food Security, part of the R3 family, manages Feed the Future.

Since 2016, DCHA/FFP has required implementing partners to develop strategies to ensure that development outcomes continue beyond the life of an award. We design our interventions to improve food security among vulnerable populations to perpetuate change at all levels—individual, household, community, and local and national governments—and continue beyond a project’s life, which is critical for lasting improvements. USAID encourages all potential partners to familiarize themselves with the principles of sustainability and lessons learned from past programs, so the communities we support are best-positioned to steer their own development.

Development Food-Security Activities (DFSAs) include interventions related to agriculture; water, sanitation, and hygiene (WASH); nutrition; improved livelihoods; and efforts to strengthen equality between women and men, empower youth, and reduce the risk of disaster. USAID has 12 active, non-emergency programs under Title II that span countries in Africa, Asia, and Latin America.

In FY 2019, USAID allocated \$281.9 million in non-emergency funding under Title II. Combined with \$80 million in Community Development Funds and \$15 million for the Farmer-to-Farmer program, USAID obligated a total of \$376.9 million in non-emergency awards.

## **ETHIOPIA**

In addition to emergency food assistance provided to Ethiopians who face drought, local conflicts, and other crises, USAID also finances programs to reduce the long-term vulnerability of Ethiopians to such shocks. Since 2005, DCHA/FFP partners in Ethiopia have implemented long-term non-emergency



activities that support the Government of Ethiopia’s Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP) and are part of Feed the Future. The PSNP addresses the basic food needs of approximately eight million chronically food-insecure people while supporting the creation of community assets like irrigation systems, tree nurseries, and water catchments. These activities generate economic benefit to communities while increasing a household’s ability to overcome poverty through livelihood support.

In FY 2019, DCHA/FFP provided more than \$85 million in non-emergency funding under Title II for four non-governmental organizations to support the PSNP in Ethiopia. Collectively, these programs reached 1.3 million people with assistance in FY 2019. Nearly 100,000 MT of U.S. in-kind food—including wheat, peas, and vegetable oil—made timely and predictable transfers of food possible. In addition to creating or improving the community assets mentioned above, according to annual partner reporting, USAID’s DFSAs also increased resilience, reduced poverty, and supported people on their Journeys to Self-Reliance by:

- Helping rural farmers improve farmland and agricultural production through natural-resource management, including by establishing land reserves, reforestation, and building structures that retain water and nutrients necessary for improved farming practices;
- Increasing job opportunities through skills coaching, business-management training, and micro grants in addition to the transfers of food assistance as part of a proven strategic transition approach for reducing chronic poverty in rural communities that will reduce the need for outside assistance; and
- Strengthening citizen-responsive governance at community level, by supporting a sustainable, scalable safety net led by the Government of Ethiopia.

#### PEOPLE’S REPUBLIC OF BANGLADESH

USAID’s multi-year DFSAs in Bangladesh are leading examples of Administrator Green’s vision of the J2SR, a push to sustain development outcomes and work toward a time when foreign assistance is no longer necessary.

USAID-funded research<sup>7</sup> indicates that outcomes from development programs last longer when our partners incrementally transfer ownership to local communities and strengthen local-level systems for delivering basic services. In Bangladesh, USAID’s partners CARE and World Vision are working to transition service-delivery gradually to local stakeholders. The projects, which began in 2015 and continue through FY 2022, provide assistance in health, livelihoods, nutrition, agriculture, the reduction of the risk of disasters, and WASH to approximately 850,000 vulnerable, food-insecure people. The programs also work to improve gender equity and local governance.

By the end of FY 2019, CARE reached nearly 308,000 Bangladeshis with assistance; annual survey results show approximately 50 percent of people reported increased income sources, more than 70 percent of households reported cash savings, and more than 50 percent of participants reported their satisfaction with basic public social services. The project’s mid-term evaluation conducted in February and March 2018 also found that a range of positive behavior changes were already taking place, including exclusive breastfeeding for children under six months, strengthened linkages between communities and government providers of health care, and increased disaster-preparedness and access to critical support during emergencies.

---

<sup>7</sup> Rogers and Coates (2015) “Sustaining Development: A Synthesis of Results from a Four-Country Study of Sustainability and Exit Strategies among Development Food Assistance Projects” Available at: [https://www.fsnnetwork.org/sites/default/files/FFP\\_Sustainability\\_Exit\\_Strategies\\_Study\\_Synthesis\\_Report\\_Dec2015\\_Final.pdf](https://www.fsnnetwork.org/sites/default/files/FFP_Sustainability_Exit_Strategies_Study_Synthesis_Report_Dec2015_Final.pdf)

World Vision reached more than 605,000 Bangladeshis—including nearly 36,000 children under two years of age who received nutritional care and approximately 53,200 people who participated in disaster-preparedness training—between the start of the program and late FY 2019. The project also provided training on improving livelihood strategies, WASH behaviors, and the management of disaster risks. Additionally, World Vision supported nearly 20,700 extremely poor Bangladeshi women to start new, or strengthen existing, income-earning opportunities to move out of extreme poverty.

Building on these accomplishments, in FY 2021 and FY 2022, CARE and World Vision will focus on providing technical support and guidance to local Bangladeshi communities, which, in turn, will continue these critical services themselves. In this way, USAID’s partners are fostering self-sustaining non-emergency activities, without the need for continued USAID support.

## APPENDICES

### APPENDIX A: LEGISLATIVE FRAMEWORK

Since the passage of Public Law 83-480, or “P.L. 480” (the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, renamed the Food for Peace Act by the Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008, and also known as the 2008 Farm Bill), U.S. international food-assistance programs have evolved to address multiple objectives. The U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) conducted programmatic operations during Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 consistent with the policy objectives set forth in the Food for Peace Act, as amended, to accomplish the following:

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

### USAID'S INTERNATIONAL FOOD ASSISTANCE

USAID provides U.S. international food assistance through the authorities established by the Food for Peace Act, as supplemented by the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust. The list below provides a brief description of each activity:

- **Food for Peace Act**
  - **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 2019): 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.<sup>8</sup>
- **Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust (BEHT):** A 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. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) makes the funds available upon the USAID Administrator’s determination that funds available for emergency needs under Title II of P.L. 480 for a Fiscal Year are insufficient. The Trust previously held commodities, but currently holds only funds to purchase commodities. USAID did not activate the BEHT in FY 2019, and at the close of the Fiscal Year, the Trust held more than \$260 million.

---

<sup>8</sup> Farmer-to-Farmer Title V will issue its own *Annual Report* separately.

## **APPENDIX B: LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS**

<b>BEHT</b>	Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust
<b>BHA</b>	Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance
<b>CDF</b>	Community Development Funds
<b>DCHA</b>	The Bureau of Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance
<b>DFSA</b>	Development Food-Security Activities
<b>FACG</b>	Food Aid Consultative Group
<b>FAQR</b>	Food Aid Quality Review
<b>FEWS NET</b>	Famine Early Warning Systems Network
<b>FFP</b>	Office of Food for Peace
<b>FFPMIS</b>	Food for Peace Management Information System
<b>FY</b>	Fiscal Year
<b>HEB</b>	High-Energy Biscuits
<b>IDA</b>	International Disaster Assistance
<b>IDP</b>	Internally Displaced Persons
<b>IFRP</b>	International Food Relief Partnership
<b>ITSH</b>	Internal Transportation, Storage, and Handling
<b>M&amp;E</b>	Monitoring and Evaluation
<b>MT</b>	Metric Ton
<b>OFDA</b>	Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance
<b>PIO</b>	Public International Organization
<b>PSNP</b>	Productive Safety Net Program
<b>PVO</b>	Private Voluntary Organization
<b>RUF</b>	Ready-to-Eat Foods
<b>TPM</b>	Third-Party Monitoring
<b>USAID</b>	U.S. Agency for International Development
<b>USDA</b>	U.S. Department of Agriculture
<b>WALA</b>	Wellness and Agriculture for Life Advancement
<b>WASH</b>	Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene

## **APPENDIX C: LIST OF AWARDEES**

The following partners implemented food assistance programs funded by the U.S. Agency for International Assistance (USAID) in Fiscal Year (FY) 2019:

Adventist Development and Relief Agency International, Inc. (ADRA)  
Agriculture Cooperative Development International / Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance (ACDI/VOCA)  
Alliance for International Medical Action (ALIMA)  
American Nicaraguan Foundation  
Americares Foundation (Americares)  
Association of Volunteers in International Service Foundation (AVSI)  
Batey Relief Alliance, Inc.  
Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere, Inc. (CARE)  
Children's Hunger Fund  
CitiHope International (CitiHope)  
Cultivating New Frontiers in Agriculture (CNFA)  
Catholic Relief Services (CRS)  
Evangelistic International Ministries (EIM)  
Fabretto Children's Fund  
Food for the Hungry International (FHI)  
Helen Keller International (HK)  
International Medical Corps (IMC)  
International Rescue Committee (IRC)  
International Relief Teams (IRT)  
Medicines for Humanity  
Mercy Corps  
Nascent Solutions  
Partner 20<sup>9</sup>  
Partner 39<sup>ix</sup>  
Partner 40<sup>ix</sup>  
Partner 42<sup>ix</sup>  
Partner 53<sup>ix</sup>  
Partner 62<sup>ix</sup>  
Project Concern International (PCI)  
Relief Society of Tigray (REST)

---

<sup>9</sup> Because of safety and security risks associated with programming in certain countries, USAID withholds the names of these implementing partners in public reporting. USAID can provide additional information on these programs at the request of Congress.

Resource and Policy Exchange (RPX)

Salesian Mission

Save the Children

United Nations (UN)Children's Fund (UNICEF)


UN World Food Programme (WFP)

World Vision




**APPENDIX D: GRAPHS ON FOOD ASSISTANCE PROVIDED BY THE U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID) UNDER TITLE II OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT IN FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2019**

USAID'S FOOD ASSISTANCE UNDER TITLE II DURING FY 2019, U.S. DOLLARS PER REGION<sup>10</sup>




USAID'S FOOD ASSISTANCE UNDER TITLE II DURING FY 2019, METRIC TONS (MT) PER REGION



<sup>10</sup> "Support costs" include funding used for office support or worldwide expenses, such as under Section 207(f) of Title II of the Food For Peace Act, including the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET); monitoring and evaluation; the Agency's general contribution to the World Food Programme (WFP); support for USAID's field Mission; rent for facilities, including pre-positioning warehouses; and staff and administrative expenses.

COMMODITY MIX OF USAID'S FOOD ASSISTANCE UNDER TITLE II DURING FY 2019 , METRIC TONS (MT)




COMMODITY MIX OF USAID'S FOOD ASSISTANCE UNDER TITLE II DURING FY 2019

FOOD GROUP	COMMODITY	NON-EMERGENCY	EMERGENCY	TOTAL METRIC TONS
<b>Grains and Fortified/Blended Food Products</b>	Corn/Soy Blend Plus (CSB+), Bagged	4,515	28,184	32,699
	Cornmeal, Bagged	1,650	46,465	48,115
	CSB Super Cereal <i>Plus</i> , Boxed	480	16,990	17,470
	Sorghum, Bagged	7,135	19,590	26,725
	Sorghum, Bulk	8,300	301,163	319,463
<b>Grains and Fortified/Blended Food Products Subtotal</b>		<b>32,080</b>	<b>412,392</b>	<b>444,472</b>
<b>Other</b>	Fortified Rice, Long-Grain, Bagged	-	660	660
	Ready-to-Use Supplemental Food (RUSF)	460	9,210	9,670
	Ready-to-Use Therapeutic Food (RUTF)	-	9,801	9,801
	Rice, Long-Grain, Bagged	7,160	10,110	17,270
	Rice, Long-Grain Parboiled, Bagged	-	5,430	5,430
	Rice, Medium-Grain, Bagged	1,170	-	1,170
	Rice, Medium-Grain Parboiled, Bagged	440	840	1,280
<b>Other Subtotal</b>		<b>9,230</b>	<b>36,051</b>	<b>45,281</b>
<b>Pulses</b>	Beans, Great Northern, Bagged	-	12,370	12,370
	Beans, Light Red Kidney, Bagged	-	620	620
	Beans, Pea Bagged	-	13,960	13,960
	Beans, Pinto, Bagged	-	1,830	1,830
	Beans, Small Red, Bagged	1,220	1,180	2,400
	Beans, Small White, Bagged	-	60	60
	Lentils, Bagged	-	14,300	14,300
	Peas, Green Split, Bagged	640	-	640
	Peas, Green Whole, Bagged	-	770	770
	Peas, Yellow Split, Bagged	13,720	75,256	88,976
	Peas, Yellow Whole, Bagged	-	2,340	2,340
<b>Pulses Subtotal</b>		<b>15,580</b>	<b>122,686</b>	<b>138,266</b>
<b>Vegetable Oil</b>	Vegetable Oil, Canned	5,550	99,407	104,957
<b>Vegetable Oil Subtotal</b>		<b>5,550</b>	<b>99,407</b>	<b>104,957</b>
<b>Wheat/Wheat Products</b>	Flour, All-Purpose, Bagged	-	2,270	2,270
	Wheat, Hard Red Winter, Bulk	180,740	131,870	312,610
	Wheat, Soft White, Bulk	-	510,880	510,880
<b>Wheat/Wheat Products Subtotal</b>		<b>180,740</b>	<b>645,020</b>	<b>825,760</b>
<b>WORLDWIDE TOTAL</b>		<b>243,180</b>	<b>1,315,556</b>	<b>1,558,736</b>

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

USAID'S USE OF FUNDS UNDER TITLE II IN FY 2019



**APPENDIX E: EMERGENCY ACTIVITIES FUNDED BY THE U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID) UNDER TITLE II OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT DURING FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2019**

COUNTRY	AWARDEE	ESTIMATED BENEFICIARIES	METRIC TONS	INTERNAL SHIPPING AND HANDLING (ITSH)	FUNDING under SECTION 202(e) of Title II	TITLE II TOTAL COST
<b>AFRICA</b>						
Republic of BURUNDI	World Food Programme (WFP)	0†	4,760	\$ 1,767,827	\$ 1,189,106	\$ 7,967,035
Republic of CAMEROON	WFP	322,105	20,820	\$ 9,044,930	\$ 4,233,280	\$ 27,411,850
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	WFP	800,172‡	16,369	\$ 10,562,685	\$ 3,268,433	\$ 29,915,129
Republic of CHAD	United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF)	347,789‡	600	\$ 442,776	\$ 595,416	\$ 3,024,212
	WFP	559,059	27,242	\$ 7,151,938	\$ 4,440,212	\$ 40,077,755
Republic of DJIBOUTI	UNICEF	10,800‡	50	\$ 23,328	\$ 37,213	\$ 214,609
	WFP	20,866	3,640	\$ 1,225,529	\$ 890,466	\$ 4,775,859
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC of CONGO	UNICEF	133,920*	1,395	\$ 3,170,982	\$ 3,769,489	\$ 11,997,346
	WFP	2,275,566‡	46,868	\$ 40,410,554	\$ 5,164,712	\$ 91,146,423
Federal Democratic Republic of ETHIOPIA	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	2,515,224	141,653	\$ 40,292,519	\$ 9,350,998	\$ 116,073,370
	International Rescue Committee (IRC)	1,433,804	930	\$ 713,439	\$ 153,267	\$ 2,830,853
	UNICEF	113,040*	2,700	\$ 432,000	\$ 1,853,566	\$ 11,012,826
Republic of KENYA	WFP	0†	117,340	\$ 15,012,676	\$ 11,555,365	\$ 95,320,318
	WFP	650,438*	15,730	\$ 3,312,895	\$ 3,611,437	\$ 18,873,635
Republic of MADAGASCAR	CRS	0†	6,360	\$ 1,214,261	\$ 2,061,690	\$ 7,093,126
	WFP	207,705	8,330	\$ 2,471,888	\$ 1,030,273	\$ 7,942,085
Republic of MALAWI	WFP	0†	230	\$ 36,182	\$ 37,425	\$ 332,284
Republic of MALI	UNICEF	31,680*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	216,667	3,400	\$ 884,255	\$ 821,772	\$ 4,913,756
Republic of MAURITANIA	UNICEF	7,344*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Republic of MOZAMBIQUE	WFP	266,916‡	275	\$ 180,849	\$ 73,738	\$ 541,940

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

‡ Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2019 from FY 2018 and FY 2019 funding.

\* Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2019 from prior FY award.



Republic of NIGER	WFP	421,266‡	10,570	\$ 3,265,855	\$ 2,719,696	\$ 18,489,987
Republic of NIGERIA	WFP	0†	16,640	\$ 12,947,628	\$ 4,067,777	\$ 40,897,815
REPUBLIC OF CONGO	UNICEF	0†	240	\$ 75,695	\$ 281,502	\$ 1,072,397
	WFP	9713*	1,430	\$ 997,243	\$ 298,664	\$ 2,683,380
Federal Republic of SOMALIA	UNICEF	57,600*	930	\$ 823,616	\$ 4,525,344	\$ 8,151,195
	WFP	530,068‡	83,640	\$ 49,829,615	\$ 9,811,713	\$ 114,871,882
Republic of SOUTH SUDAN	CRS	852,734	7,520	\$ 11,414,288	\$ 8,673,315	\$ 26,365,887
	UNICEF	377,640‡	1,250	\$ 1,307,880	\$ 14,716,896	\$ 22,187,276
	WFP	1,247,329	29,378	\$ 23,413,386	\$ 8,055,795	\$ 65,540,444
Republic of SUDAN	UNICEF	83,520	1,160	\$ 1,037,318	\$ 1,534,951	\$ 5,988,469
	WFP	3,972,485‡	123,920	\$ 49,311,579	\$ 14,397,564	\$ 113,906,433
United Republic of TANZANIA	WFP	276,340*	2,820	\$ 820,489	\$ 371,059	\$ 3,046,517
Republic of UGANDA	WFP	714,879*	1,810	\$ 403,819	\$ 246,279	\$ 2,177,803
Republic of ZIMBABWE	UNICEF	938*	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	WFP	388,034‡	23,240	\$ 10,603,937	\$ 4,017,687	\$ 33,872,505
<b>Subtotal Africa</b>		<b>18,845,641</b>	<b>723,240</b>	<b>\$ 304,603,861</b>	<b>\$ 127,856,100</b>	<b>\$ 940,716,399</b>
<b>ASIA</b>						
BURMA	UNICEF	10,080	140	\$ 168,290	\$ 531,217	\$ 1,105,507
Islamic Republic of PAKISTAN	UNICEF	45,288‡	336	\$ 302,400	\$ 765,929	\$ 2,092,443
<b>Subtotal Asia</b>		<b>55,368</b>	<b>476</b>	<b>\$ 470,690</b>	<b>\$ 1,297,146</b>	<b>\$ 3,197,950</b>
<b>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</b>						
Republic of COLOMBIA	WFP	99,725‡	1,880	\$ 1,226,273	\$ 729,537	\$ 3,654,536
COLOMBIA (VENEZUELA REGIONAL RESPONSE)	WFP	0†	30	\$ 22,775	\$ -	\$ 36,485
Republic of HAÏTI	WFP	0†	2,560	\$ 1,221,399	\$ 783,346	\$ 3,907,018
<b>Subtotal Latin America and the Caribbean</b>		<b>99,725</b>	<b>4,470</b>	<b>\$ 2,470,447</b>	<b>\$ 1,512,883</b>	<b>\$ 7,598,038</b>
<b>MIDDLE EAST</b>						
Republic of YEMEN	UNICEF	69,984*	1,000	\$ 324,000	\$ 598,800	\$ 3,867,800
	WFP	12,000,000‡	586,370	\$ 139,535,541	\$ 39,834,176	\$ 433,212,951
<b>Subtotal Middle East</b>		<b>12,069,984</b>	<b>587,370</b>	<b>\$ 139,859,541</b>	<b>\$ 40,432,976</b>	<b>\$ 437,080,751</b>
<b>SUPPORT COSTS</b>						
Support Costs	N/A	N/A	-	\$ 433,755	\$ 4,199,793	\$ 71,669,030
<b>Subtotal Support Costs</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 433,755</b>	<b>\$ 4,199,793</b>	<b>\$ 71,669,030</b>
<b>WORLDWIDE</b>		<b>31,070,718</b>	<b>1,315,556</b>	<b>447,838,294</b>	<b>175,298,898</b>	<b>1,460,262,168</b>

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

‡ Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2019 from funding from FY 2018 and FY 2019.

\* Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2019 from awards made in a prior Fiscal Year.

**APPENDIX F: NON-EMERGENCY ACTIVITIES FUNDED BY THE U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID) UNDER TITLE II OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT DURING FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2019**

COUNTRY	AWARDEE	ESTIMATED BENEFICIARIES	METRIC TONS	INTERNAL SHIPPING AND HANDLING (ITSH)	FUNDING under SECTION 202(e) of Title II S	TITLE II TOTAL COST	COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FUNDS (CDF)
<b>AFRICA</b>							
Republic of BURKINA FASO	ACDI/VOCA <sup>13</sup>	0†	-	\$ -	\$ 8,271,677	\$ 8,271,677	\$ -
	World Food Programme (WFP)	6,500*	1,810	\$221,888	\$ 1,176,893	\$ 3,094,026	\$ -
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO	Catholic Relief Services (CRS)	225,062	-	\$ -	\$ 6,604,538	\$ 6,604,538	\$ -
	FHI360	467,316	2,280	\$ 1,255,592	\$ 5,357,666	\$ 9,306,024	\$ -
	Mercy Corps	147,526	600	\$ 1,126,528	\$ 6,527,710	\$ 8,232,638	\$ -
Federal Democratic Republic of ETHIOPIA	CRS	318,306	15,720	\$ 1,135,764	\$ 8,197,129	\$ 17,167,494	\$ -
	FHI360	282,631	16,450	\$ 4,590,934	\$ 5,413,250	\$ 17,175,413	\$ -
	Relief Society of Tigray	558,555	39,870	\$ 3,694,823	\$ 4,155,963	\$ 25,378,085	\$ -
	World Vision	432,243	27,550	\$ 5,069,812	\$ 8,631,434	\$ 25,816,034	\$ -
Republic of KENYA	CRS	0†	-	\$ -	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 5,000,000	\$ 9,000,000
	Mercy Corps	0†	-	\$ -	\$ 2,946,545	\$ 2,946,545	\$ 8,000,000
	WFP	442,682*	22,800	\$ 7,221,900	\$ 11,170,350	\$ 26,730,117	\$ -
Republic of MADAGASCAR	Adventist Development and Relief Agency (ADRA)	262,572	-	\$ 746,742	\$ 9,187,850	\$ 9,934,592	\$ -
	CRS	433,103	4,610	\$ 935,048	\$ 5,654,113	\$ 9,177,531	\$ -
Republic of MALAWI	CARE	0†	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 638,706
	CRS	182,775	-	\$ 549,186	\$ 426,614	\$ 975,800	\$ 4,097,581
	Project Concern International (PCI)	571,710	-	\$ 70,300	\$ 718,400	\$ 788,700	\$ 2,799,518
Republic of MALI	CARE	30,749	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,771,907
Republic of NIGER	CARE	0†	160	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 176,042	\$ 5,584,821
	CRS	0†	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 11,401,241
	Save the Children	0†	1,150	\$ 110,791	\$ -	\$ 1,235,160	\$ 7,000,000

<sup>13</sup> Agriculture Cooperative Development International / Volunteers in Overseas Cooperative Assistance

<sup>14</sup>† Denotes a new award that has not yet reached beneficiaries.

‡ Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2019 from funding from FY 2018 and FY 2019.

\* Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2019 from awards made in prior Fiscal Years.

	WFP	0†	12,620	\$ 3,997,596	\$ 7,084,447	\$ 25,408,236	\$ -
Republic of UGANDA	Associazione Volontari per il Servizio Internazionale( AVSI)	36,692	-	\$ -	\$ 4,810,495	\$ 4,810,495	\$ -
	CRS	85,841	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 8,005,461
	Mercy Corps	117,083	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 9,700,765
	Save the Children	N/A	-	\$ -	\$ 07,732	\$ 207,732	\$ -
Republic of ZIMBABWE	Cultivating New Frontiers in Agriculture	120,057	-	\$ 231,972	\$ 4,436,677	\$ 4,668,649	\$ -
	WFP	61,124*	5,130	\$ 1,841,003	\$ 6,311,026	\$ 11,260,642	\$ -
	World Vision	134,241	-	\$ (425,202)	\$ 1,980,353	\$ 1,555,151	\$ -
<b>Subtotal Africa</b>		<b>4,374,308</b>	<b>150,750</b>	<b>\$ 32,374,677</b>	<b>\$ 114,270,862</b>	<b>\$ 225,921,320</b>	<b>\$ 80,000,000</b>
<b>ASIA</b>							
People's Republic of BANGLADESH	CARE	304,170	54,260	\$ 500,000	\$ 2,651,539	\$ 19,368,585	\$ -
	HK	104,331	-	\$ 20,669	\$ 809,000	\$ 829,669	\$ -
	World Vision	381,645	38,170	\$ -	\$ 2,500,000	\$ 15,064,796	\$ -
<b>Subtotal Asia</b>		<b>790,146</b>	<b>92,430</b>	<b>\$ 520,669</b>	<b>\$ 5,960,539</b>	<b>\$ 35,263,050</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN</b>							
Republic of HAÏTI	CARE	85,260	-	\$ -	\$ 7,812,238	\$ 7,812,238	\$ -
<b>Subtotal Latin America and the Caribbean</b>		<b>85,260</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ -</b>	<b>\$ 7,812,238</b>	<b>\$ 7,812,238</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>MONITORING, EVALUATION, AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT</b>							
Monitoring, Evaluation, and Technical Support	N/A	N/A	-	\$ 1,120,411	\$ 5,666,522	\$ 12,868,110	\$ -
<b>Subtotal Monitoring, Evaluation, and Technical Support</b>		<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$ 1,120,411</b>	<b>\$ 5,666,522</b>	<b>\$ 12,868,110</b>	<b>\$ -</b>
<b>WORLDWIDE</b>		<b>5,249,714</b>	<b>243,180</b>	<b>\$ 34,015,757</b>	<b>\$ 133,710,161</b>	<b>\$ 281,864,718<sup>15</sup></b>	<b>\$ 80,000,000</b>

<sup>15</sup> In FY 2019, USAID allocated \$281.9 million in non-emergency funding under Title II of the Food for Peace Act. Combined with \$80 million in Community Development Funds and \$15 million for the Farmer-to-Farmer program, USAID spent a total of \$376.9 million in non-emergency awards.

**APPENDIX G: ACTIVITIES BY THE U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT (USAID) IN THE TITLE II INTERNATIONAL FOOD RELIEF PARTNERSHIP (IFRP) UNDER TITLE II OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT DURING FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2019**

The IFRP provides small grants to private voluntary organizations 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 the community receive supplementary food designed to address food-insecurity.

COUNTRY	AWARDEE <sup>16</sup>	BENEFICIARIES	METRIC TONS	TOTAL COST
<b>Africa</b>				
Republic of Cameroon	Partner 62	12,379	75	\$ 427,839
Republic of Chad	Alliance for International Medical Action	5,429*	0	\$ 0
Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia	International Medical Corps	0†	51.8	\$ 382,154
Republic of Kenya	Medicines for Humanity	0†	110.3	\$ 509,583
Republic of Liberia	Nascent Solutions	0†	54	\$ 330,145
Republic of Niger	Partner 40	14,914	60	\$ 414,947
Republic of Sierra Leone	Nascent Solutions	690*	0	\$ 0
Federal Republic of Somalia	Partner 42	16,367	93.8	\$ 459,572
	Partner 39	9,520	108	\$ 508,413
	Partner 53	8,822	108	\$ 508,413
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>68,121</b>	<b>660.9</b>	<b>\$3,541,066</b>
<b>Asia</b>				

<sup>16</sup> Because of safety and security risks associated with programming in certain countries, USAID is withholding the names of these implementing partners in public reporting. USAID can provide additional information on these programs at the request of Congress.

<sup>17</sup>† Denotes a new award that has not yet reached beneficiaries.

‡ Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2019 from funding from FY 2018 and FY 2019.

\* Denotes beneficiaries reached in FY 2019 from awards made in prior Fiscal Years.

Central Asia <sup>18</sup>	The Resource and Policy Exchange (RPX)	29,995	131.3	\$ 573,824
Republic of Uzbekistan	RPX	30,002	131.3	\$ 573,824
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>59,997</b>	<b>262.6</b>	<b>\$ 1,147,648</b>
<b>Latin America and Caribbean</b>				
Dominican Republic	CitiHope	5,156	238.1	\$ 1,293,604
	Batey Relief Alliance	0†	105.1	\$ 630,799
Republic of Guatemala	International Relief Teams	20,543*	0	\$ 0
	Americares	6,398*	0	\$ 0
Republic of Haiti	Medicines for Humanity	4,975	74.9	\$ 421,346
	Salesian Missions	18,161*	0	\$ 0
Republic of Honduras	Emmanuel International	22,400*	0	\$ 0
Republic of Nicaragua	American Nicaraguan Foundation	17,265*	0	\$ 0
	Fabretto Children's Fund	0†	75	\$ 368,762
	Project Concern International	5,451*	0	\$ 0
Republic of Perú	Children's Hunger Fund	16,533	93.8	\$ 459,874
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>116,882</b>	<b>586.9</b>	<b>\$ 3,174,386</b>
<b>Middle East</b>				
Syria	Partner 20	0†	47.7	\$ 196,837
<b>TOTAL</b>		<b>0</b>	<b>47.7</b>	<b>\$ 196,837</b>
<b>Commodity Suppliers<sup>19</sup></b>				
N/A	Breedlove	N/A	N/A	\$ 4,100,000
N/A	Edesia	N/A	N/A	\$ 2,634,555
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>\$6,734,555</b>
<b>WORLDWIDE</b>		<b>245,000</b>	<b>1,558.1</b>	<b>\$14,794,493</b>

<sup>18</sup> The Republic of Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan

<sup>19</sup> The IFRP program provides funding through grants to commodity-suppliers for a set amount of metric tonnage, which then provide it to the transport grantees as an in-kind contribution, along with separate funding for implementation. For more information about the IFRP program, please visit <https://www.usaid.gov/food-assistance/what-we-do/nutritional-support-activities>

**APPENDIX H: CONGRESSIONAL MANDATES FOR PROGRAMS MANAGED BY THE U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT UNDER TITLE II OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT DURING FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2019<sup>20</sup>**

	MINIMUM	SUBMINIUM	VALUE-ADDED	BAGGED IN THE UNITED STATES
<b>FY 2019 Target</b>	2,500,000	1,875,000	75 percent	50 percent
<b>Final FY 2019 Level</b>	1,558,736	243,180	18 percent	23 percent

**Minimum:** Total approved metric tons (MT) programmed under Title II. USAID uses the MT grain equivalent to report against the target.

**Subminimum:** MT for approved, non-emergency programs through Private Voluntary Organizations, Community Development Organizations, and the World Food Programme. USAID uses the MT grain equivalent to report against the target.

**Value-Added:** Percentage of food in approved, non-emergency programs that is processed, fortified, or bagged.

**Bagged in the United States:** Percentage of food in approved, non-emergency bagged commodities that is whole grains bagged in the United States.

**Source:** Program Team, Office of Food for Peace, Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance, USAID

<sup>20</sup> Pursuant to Section 204 of the Food for Peace Act, the table above, along with USAID’s overview section, constitutes our report on the minimum and subminimum MT for FY 2019.



## **APPENDIX I: USE BY THE U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT OF AUTHORITIES UNDER SECTION 207(F) OF TITLE II OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT IN FISCAL YEAR 2019**

Section 207(f) of Title II the Food for Peace Act authorizes funds that cover costs associated with overseeing, monitoring, and evaluating programs. Activities and systems include programmatic monitors in countries that receive assistance under Title II from the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), country and regional food-impact evaluations, the assessment of monetization programs, and early-warning assessments and systems, among others. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2019, the Office of Food for Peace (FFP) of the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA) within USAID invested more than \$25.7 million in funds pursuant to the authorities of Section 207(f) of Title II. These funds paid for DCHA/FFP's Humanitarian-Assistance Support Contract, the Food for Peace Management Information System (FFPMIS), the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), the Food-Aid Quality Review (FAQR) undertaken by Tufts University, and tools for monitoring and evaluation, among others.

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

- Funding authorized by Section 207(f) supports FEWS NET. Created in 1985 by USAID, FEWS NET provides timely, relevant, and evidence-based analysis on the causes, levels, and consequences of food-insecurity to help decision-makers at the international, national, and local levels. USAID uses FEWS NET's analyses—evaluations of needs, markets and trade conditions, and anomalies—to inform decisions around our food-assistance programming. These data and analyses have been critical in enabling USAID to respond early and robustly to ensure our assistance has maximum impact. FEWS NET has a presence in many of the countries in which USAID provides assistance.
  - In FY 2019, USAID issued five new contracts for FEWS NET, to Abt Associates, Chemonics, DAI, TetraTech ARD, and Kimetrica, which last until FY 2026.
- Section 207(f) funded FFPMIS, which USAID is updating to support more effective and efficient operations. DCHA/FFP successfully transitioned from the existing FFPMIS system to a system called Abacus by September 30, 2019. DCHA/FFP worked with the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance (OFDA) to create a combined system that supports both offices ahead of the creation of the new BHA. The Abacus program will track programmatic activities, including initial budget allocations and expenditures; the submission of applications; and the review, approval, and automatic generation of associated award documents.
- Funding authorized by Section 207(f) also supports a team at the Friedman School of Nutrition Science and Policy at Tufts University that is working on the FAQR, a study that seeks to provide USAID and its implementing partners with recommendations on how to improve nutrition among vulnerable populations. Building on the recommendations of the first and second phases of the FAQR (2009–2015), the third and final phase (2016–2019) advanced an evidence-based approach through the production and testing of improved food products and packing and delivery methods; comparative studies of products' nutritional effectiveness and cost-effectiveness; implementation research and pilot projects; and the facilitation of interagency and multi-sectoral coordination to improve food-aid products, programming, and processes. USAID also continues to use funding under Section 207(f) to strengthen our monitoring system for the safety and quality of food, in partnership with the U.S. Department of Agriculture, to ensure the delivery of high-quality commodities.

## APPENDIX J: OVERSIGHT, MONITORING, AND EVALUATION

Implementers of food-assistance programs funded by the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) must conduct financial oversight over their activities and have a variety of checks and balances in place to monitor them. USAID also ensures our partners assess risks to programs and develop risk-mitigation plans for all our food-assistance funding, including resources authorized under Title II of the Food for Peace Act and from the International Disaster Assistance account (IDA) and the Community Development Fund (CDF).

### MONITORING AND EVALUATION (M&E)

**Capacity**—USAID’s Office of Food for Peace within the Bureau for Democracy, Conflict, and Humanitarian Assistance (DCHA), soon to be the Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) maintained its global M&E presence during Fiscal Year (FY) 2019. With M&E staff based in Washington, D.C., and offices in East, West, and Southern Africa, DCHA/FFP’s M&E Team strives to improve the quality and effectiveness of our activities in numerous ways, including by selecting and developing meaningful indicators and actively monitoring our investments and developing guidance and training sessions for both USAID and partner staff on topics that strengthen M&E capacity. DCHA/FFP’s M&E staff also participate in the midterm evaluations of USAID’s non-emergency awards under Title II.

**Significant M&E Developments in Awards under Title II**—Three notable achievements in FY 2019 improved the efficiency and effectiveness of programs funded under Title II: 1) an inaugural emergency M&E training for partners; 2) the Policy and Guidance for Emergency Activities, released in December 2019; and, 3) revising the M&E requirements in Requests for Applications for non-emergency programs. The revisions to the non-emergency programs included more scrutiny of distributions to protect and prevent the sexual exploitation of vulnerable populations—including the prevention of gender-based violence, transaction costs, and do-no-harm in conflict situations.

**Monitoring**—USAID requires partners that receive funding under Title II, or from the IDA account or the CDF to monitor supply-chains, the distribution of food, and post-distribution to ensure food is safe and the intended people receive our assistance.

- Before the distributions, USAID’s partners identify beneficiaries by using vulnerability criteria, USAID monitors the safety and quality of commodities, and our partners also track the commodity supply-chain and conduct internal and external market analyses to minimize the effect of food assistance on local markets.
- During distributions of food, USAID’s partners use several tools to ensure the intended beneficiaries receive assistance, including biometrics such as identification cards, fingerprints, or iris scans; electronic distribution systems of transfers; the distinct marking of paper vouchers; and regular in-person and unannounced visits to beneficiary households, distribution sites, or vendor shops.
- USAID’s partners also reverify program beneficiaries periodically to make sure they still need food assistance. The implementing partner must implement systems and feedback mechanisms to protect participants from sexual exploitation, avoid gender-based violence and transactional costs, and minimize losses and damages.
- Following distributions, USAID and its partners provide hotline numbers for beneficiaries to report problems; carry out post-distribution monitoring; conduct randomized follow-up phone

calls or visits; and support third-party monitoring in countries where it is difficult for USAID staff to track aid safely.

- USAID’s Inspector General also conducts independent audits and investigations that result in recommendations to which the Agency is committed to respond.

**Third-Party Monitoring (TPM)**—USAID uses contracts for third-party monitoring to track our investments in non-permissive environments for programs funded under Title II and with IDA when the mobility of USAID staff is limited. In 2019, DCHA/FFP used TPM in more than seven countries, through contracts often jointly funded and managed with DCHA/OFDA.

**Evaluations of Non-Emergency Programs under Title II**—In line with recommendations in USAID’s 2011 Evaluation Policy, and to improve the rigor of our evaluations, USAID has been managing the baseline studies and final evaluations of all its non-emergency programs funded under Title II as of Fiscal Year 2012. In FY 2019, USAID conducted six final evaluations in the Republics of Zimbabwe, Malawi, and Madagascar. The evaluations used rigorous methods and produced high-quality data that indicate that chronic malnutrition—the key indicator to measure food security—declined substantially in the target communities between the time of the baseline studies and final evaluations.

- In addition, USAID conducted a post-project evaluation of the Wellness and Agriculture for Life Advancement (WALA) program in Malawi (which lasted from 2009 through 2014) to assess the sustainability of its outcomes. Conducted five years after the end of the program, the evaluation shows that communities were not using all of the techniques promoted by WALA. One of the main reasons for the discontinuation of certain practices is that a series of shocks and stresses, such as droughts, floods, high winds, market failures, crop pests, and diseases, overwhelmed the communities' capacities to recover fully from a crisis. For the past five years, USAID has been prioritizing interventions to strengthen communities' capacity to be resilient to food-insecurity shocks and developing local systems and institutions to sustain food-security outcomes. To improve sustainability, USAID led the design of two pilot projects in the People’s Republic of Bangladesh that will develop and implement a market-based sustainable service-provisioning system by using local organizations.
- USAID also conducted mid-term evaluations for three programs in the Democratic Republic of Congo and four productive safety-net programs in the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia. USAID’s staff, the technical staff of implementing partners, and external consultants conducted these mid-term evaluations. USAID used many of the findings from the mid-term evaluation to inform the design of the next round of productive safety-net programs during negotiations with the Ethiopian Government. As the staff participate in the evaluation, they also continue to provide follow-up technical support to address many of the challenges. USAID also adapted our programmatic design, policy and guidance, and program-oversight processes to address findings identified in the mid-term evaluation.

## OVERSIGHT AND RISK-MITIGATION

For all food-assistance programs funded under Title II and with IDA and the CDF:

- **Pre-Award Surveys:** USAID conducts pre-award risk surveys of any new prospective Private Voluntary Organization (PVO) partner prior to providing any resources. The assessment considers the applicant’s system of internal controls, its capacity for the administration and monitoring of sub-awards, its procurement system, and its financial-management system.

- **Risk-Mitigation in Award Applications:** In addition to a safety and security plan, USAID requires all PVO applicants to submit an organizational risk-assessment and a protection risk-assessment for emergency funding. Prospective partners must address how they will reduce the risk of fraud, waste, and abuse associated with the proposed activities, including by providing information on their conflict-of-interest policies, cybersecurity procedures, and procurement and human-resources policies. The applicant must also present an analysis of the potential protection risks (including, but not limited to, sexual abuse and exploitation, safety, and security) to local communities and activity participants and detail how they implement their Codes of Conduct for employees. In countries deemed to have a higher level of risk because of the presence of sanctioned groups and a limited ability of USAID's staff to monitor programmatic implementation directly, applicants must provide additional information on their risks and safeguards.
- If applicants intend to use warehouses, USAID also requires them to detail their intended inventory-oversight efforts, including processes and standards for warehouse operations.
- **Reporting and Engagement with Partners:** All USAID's partners must submit performance reports and financial reports. USAID uses these reports as well as information on resource pipelines, communications on security and other constraints, and meetings and telephone calls with implementing partners to provide oversight of each award. Additionally, partners must notify USAID of any incidents that have a significant impact on their award(s), which can include instances of waste, fraud, and abuse or incidents regarding the safety and quality of food.
- **Financial-Compliance Reviews and Review of Audits:** USAID undertakes direct financial-compliance reviews of select recipients to verify their actual costs incurred align with their approved budgets; that their costs are reasonable, allowable, and allocable; and that they have complied with all terms and conditions of their agreements and all applicable laws and regulations. Additionally, USAID reviews audit information from both PVOs and Public International Organizations (PIOs) and uses information obtained from the audits for ongoing programs to inform our decisions on future programming.

**APPENDIX K: RATE OF RETURN FOR, AND USE OF PROCEEDS FROM, MONETIZATION UNDER TITLE II OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT**

Monetization is the process of selling U.S. in-kind goods in local (recipient country) markets, then using the proceeds to fund development activities or other costs within a program authorized under Title II. In Fiscal Year (FY) 2019, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) only monetized non-emergency programs under Title II in the People’s Republic of Bangladesh.

FY 2019 MONETIZATION FUNDS				METRIC TONS (MT)	ESTIMATED RATE OF RETURN
People’s Republic of Bangladesh	CARE	Commodity Costs	\$ 10,858,122	54,190	83.06 percent
		Freight Costs	\$ 5,285,075		
Bangladesh	World Vision	Commodity Costs	\$ 7,995,163	38,170	82.65 percent
		Freight Costs	\$ 4,569,633		

## **APPENDIX L: THE FOOD AID CONSULTATIVE GROUP**

Pursuant to Section 205 of the Food for Peace Act, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the U.S. Department for Agriculture (USDA) convene the Food Aid Consultative Group (FACG) biannually. The FACG brings together stakeholders, including partners, commodity groups, the maritime industry, and others with an interest in the U.S. Government's food-assistance programs. The 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 2019, the FACG convened in December 2018 and June 2019 to hold in-depth discussions on USAID's food-assistance programs. In December 2018, the meeting included presentations from USA Rice on the production for food aid and USA Maritime on U.S. flag shipping. In June 2019, the FACG focused on how USDA and USAID are implementing changes in the 2018 Farm Bill and how partners can improve the delivery and effectiveness of food assistance through innovation, technology, and private-sector engagement.

Recent changes to the Farm Bill included a reduction of the review period from 45 days to 30 days. This change has streamlined and expedited the approval of proposed regulations, handbooks, or guidelines and has not reduced opportunities for FACG members to provide feedback.

**APPENDIX M: BREAKDOWN OF EXPENDITURES UNDER SECTION 202(E) OF THE FOOD FOR PEACE ACT AND FOR INTERNAL TRANSPORTATION, STORAGE, AND HANDLING (ITSH) BY PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS (PIOs) AND PRIVATE VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS (PVOs) IN FISCAL YEAR (FY) 2019**

As outlined in Title II of the Food for Peace Act, funding authorized by **Section 202(e)** may finance the following activities:

- Establish and enhance programs under Title II;
- Meet the costs of administration, management, personnel, transportation, storage, and distribution for carrying out programs under Title II;
- Implement income-generating, community-development, health, nutrition, cooperative-development, agricultural, and other developmental activities in recipient countries; and
- Improve and implement methodologies for food-assistance programs, including needs-assessments and monitoring and evaluation.

Eligible uses for funding authorized under Section 202(e) include interventions that fall into general categories: 202(e) and 202(e) Enhanced.

Funding authorized under 202(e) includes the following:

- Direct administrative costs to implement programming under Title II, including salaries and fringe benefits for staff, travel and transport, professional/contracted services, audits, equipment and capital assets, supplies and other direct costs, operating costs;
- Indirect, or headquarters, costs;
- Costs associated with U.S. Government commodities not included within ITSH categories; and
- Interventions in development programs.

Enhanced 202(e) funding includes the following:

- Market-based assistance, including the local, regional, and international procurement of food, cash transfers, food vouchers, and twinning;
- Direct administrative costs associated with market-based assistance; and
- Essential complementary activities in emergency programs to protect impact, including food-security analyses, social/behavior-change communication, resilience interventions, etc.

The following charts break out costs under Section 202(e) by “enhanced” costs, “direct program” costs, and “indirect” costs. “Indirect costs” refer to all headquarters costs that support broad organizational costs. “Direct program costs” refer to all costs tied to the implementation of the programmatic activities.


**Internal Transportation, Storage, and Handling (ITSH)** funding is available to finance the direct costs of all emergency awards under Title II, or non-emergency awards in a least-developed country, associated with the in-country movement, management, implementation, and monitoring of U.S. agricultural commodities procured under Title II necessary for distribution and in direct support of eligible activities under Title II. ITSH funding is available to eligible organizations for in-country costs directly associated with the following:

- Movement of food assistance procured under Title II to storage and distribution sites;

- Storage of food assistance procured under Title I;
- Distribution of food assistance procured under Title II; and
- The implementation of emergency food assistance under Title II (this includes the costs required to process and use successfully U.S. in-kind food commodities in-country, such as milling or post-distribution monitoring).

In the following charts, USAID has broken down ITSH costs into two categories. The first category reflects direct “transfer” ITSH costs, which include those associated with the movement, storage, and distribution of U.S. food assistance procured under Title II. The second category reflects “implementation” ITSH costs, which include the relevant costs to process and use the commodities successfully.

**BREAKDOWN OF EXPENDITURES UNDER SECTION 202(E) AND FOR ITSH BY PVOs IN FY 2019**





BREAKDOWN OF EXPENDITURES UNDER SECTION 202(E) AND FOR ITSH BY PIOs IN FY 2019

