



**FOOD ASSISTANCE CONVENTION
2016 ANNUAL NARRATIVE REPORT**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents	2
Acronyms	3
Executive Summary	4
General Context	5
Overall Assistance	7
Key Food Assistance Responses in 2016	14
El Niño	14
Yemen	17
Syria	18
South Sudan	20
Hurricane Matthew	22
Lake Chad Basin	23
Coordination among Donors	24
Policy Initiatives	25
Innovative Approaches to Food Assistance	28
Best Practices and Lessons Learned in 2016	30

ACRONYMS

AECID	<i>La Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional para el Desarrollo</i> (Spanish Agency for International Development)
AUD	Australian Dollar
CFS	Committee on World Food Security
CHF	Swiss Franc
ECHO	Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations
EU	European Union
EUR	Euro
FAC	Food Assistance Convention
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FEWSNET	Famine Early Warning Systems Network
FFP	USAID's Office of Food for Peace
GBV	Gender-Based Violence
ICRC	International Committee of the Red Cross
IDP	Internally Displaced People
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OEWG	Open-Ended Working Group
PSNP	Protective Safety Net Programme
R&I	Refine and Implement
T	Tonnes
UN	United Nations
UNHCR	Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Fund
UNCERF	UN Central Emergency Response Fund
UNRWA	United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USD	U.S. Dollar
WFP	United Nations World Food Programme
WHS	World Humanitarian Summit

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Food Assistance Convention (FAC) includes many of the largest humanitarian food assistance donors that together seek to save lives, reduce hunger, improve food security, and improve the nutritional status of the most vulnerable populations around the world. To achieve these goals, the 14 FAC members provide a defined minimum level of food assistance on an annual basis. In 2016, this assistance totaled more than USD 3 billion dollars – the largest commitment to date and reflective of the increasing need for food assistance around the world.

In total, FAC members assisted 85 countries with key responses supporting Yemen, Syria, South Sudan, Hurricane Matthew, and the Lake Chad Basin. However, the largest geographic response was global: the worst El Niño event in more than 50 years. Even before droughts reduced harvests and worsened livestock, FAC members anticipated needs through early warning systems. By prepositioning assets and providing in-kind assistance quickly, FAC members averted a large-scale famine in Ethiopia and mitigated negative impacts in Central America and Southern Africa.

FAC members continue to strengthen coordination among donors. In June 2016, five FAC members travelled to Haiti for the FAC's first joint field mission in order to explore the food security situation in that country and see a holistic view of food assistance efforts by FAC members. It also provided an important opportunity for FAC members who work together on policy to see field operations in action, providing a fresh dynamic to dialogues.

Externally, FAC members also collaborated on policies at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit among high-level leadership from 173 countries as well as UN agencies, NGOs, and technical experts to exchange ideas on how the international community can best respond to growing crises and promote closer linkages with development. At the Summit, FAC members participated in drafting the 'Grand Bargain', a set of 10 non-binding political commitments that donor governments and humanitarian organizations plan to jointly pursue to strengthen the effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability of humanitarian assistance to people in need. Following the event, FAC members are actively leading and participating in work streams associated with implementing the Grand Bargain.

Putting policy into practice, several FAC members initiated innovated approaches to food assistance including multi-year funding, multi-purpose cash, and efforts to improve malnutrition treatments and their delivery systems. Sharing best practices amongst each other, FAC members also focused on localized partnerships, both in emergency and long term food security programs, as well as transparency on beneficiary reach.

GENERAL CONTEXT

About the Food Assistance Convention

The Food Assistance Convention (FAC) entered into force on January 1, 2013, following the depositing of instruments of ratification of the FAC by six parties –Canada, Denmark, the European Union, Japan, Switzerland, and the United States of America. The FAC is the latest in a long series of such multilateral cooperation instruments in operation since 1967, most recently preceded by the Food Aid Convention 1991.

The FAC expands the traditional focus of previous Food Aid Conventions that focused exclusively on commitments of in-kind food aid for direct consumption. The new Convention includes a broader toolbox of eligible activities and food assistance products, including cash, vouchers, and products intended for protecting livelihoods, a greater focus on nutrition, as well as a commitment to improved transparency and accountability. The Convention also provides an important set of guiding principles for the Parties to follow in implementing their food assistance programs. Finally, Parties to the Convention now make their commitments in monetary value as opposed to metric wheat ton equivalent.

The objectives of the FAC are to save lives, reduce hunger, improve food security, and improve the nutritional status of the most vulnerable populations by:

- Addressing the food and nutritional needs of the most vulnerable populations through commitments made by the Parties to provide food assistance that improves access to, and consumption of, adequate, safe, and nutritious food;
- Ensuring that food assistance provided to the most vulnerable populations is appropriate, timely, effective, efficient, and based on needs and shared principles; and
- Facilitating information-sharing, cooperation and coordination, and providing a forum for discussion in order to improve the effective, efficient, and coherent use of the Parties' resources to respond to needs.

To achieve these objectives, FAC Parties have committed to provide a defined minimum level of food assistance on an annual basis. Additionally, Parties have embraced the notion of transparency in all food assistance operations. To support this commitment, FAC Parties will report food assistance activities publicly, by country on an annual basis. This report is the narrative component of the Parties' 2016 annual reporting. It includes information on how each Party's food assistance policies, programs, and operations have contributed to the objectives and principles of the Convention for the reporting year.

The FAC is also a forum for Parties to share information and best practices in food assistance delivery. Meeting twice annually, the FAC provides an open forum for Parties to discuss the most efficient and effective means of delivery of food assistance. Recognizing the changing landscape of emergencies and other assistance needs, the Parties have prioritized the consideration of new modalities for food assistance aimed at reducing associated costs, while ensuring that those most in need are reached.

The proliferation of serious and large-scale crises occurring simultaneously confirms the relevance of the FAC. Combined with the ever-widening gap between resource needs and available humanitarian funding, the incentive to develop innovative solutions is more pressing than ever. International financial commitments certainly have their part to play – they are a visible and tangible demonstration of a minimum response by the donor community and one against which members are held publicly accountable. This predictable and certain response is an important signal to our partners and to those affected by crises that the international community stands with them in times of need.

Humanitarian assistance should be seen as a multi-faceted response to improve the human condition during conflicts and disasters, as a first step in reinvigorating local business and agriculture, and to helping people rebuild their lives and livelihoods. The forum provided by the FAC plays a key role in promoting best practices and shaping policies to encourage participating members to develop and implement innovative solutions to better respond to challenges faced by affected communities.

Reporting on Food Assistance Operations

Following each calendar year, Parties provide a report on food assistance operations, detailing how respective commitments were fulfilled. The minimum annual financial commitments of the 14 Parties who have ratified, accepted, and/or approved the FAC in 2016 are set out below, **totaling more than USD 3 billion dollars:**

Donor	Commitments in 2016	Equivalent in US \$ ¹
Australia	AUD \$80 million	US \$59.3 million
Austria	€1.495 million	US \$1.7 million
Canada	C\$250 million	US \$188.0 million
Denmark	DKK185 million	US \$27.6 million
European Union	€350 million	US \$388.9 million
Finland	€6 million	US \$6.7 million
Japan	¥ 10 billion	US \$92.0 million
Luxembourg	€4 million	US \$4.4 million
Russia	US \$15 million	US \$15 million
Slovenia	€30,000	US \$33,333
Spain	€500,000	US \$555,556
Sweden	SEK200 million	US \$22.3 million
Switzerland	CHF34 million	US \$34.3 million
United States of America	US \$2.2 billion	US \$2.2 billion

In 2016, all members fulfilled their commitments and some even exceeded their commitments substantially. All members either kept or increased their commitments for 2017.

In line with the Convention, members focused on addressing the food and nutritional needs of the most vulnerable populations to provide food assistance that improves access to and consumption of adequate, safe, and nutritious food. Parties also ensured that the food

¹ All currency conversions into U.S. Dollars were made using a table provided by the FAC Secretariat.

assistance provided was appropriate, timely, effective, and based on needs in line with the principles of the FAC.

Food assistance was delivered through: i) the provision and distribution of eligible products; ii) the provision of cash and vouchers; and iii) nutritional interventions. All funding was made fully in grant form. Food assistance was delivered avoiding harmful interference with normal patterns of production in recipient countries and international commercial trade. Food assistance operations were provided bilaterally, through intergovernmental or other international organizations, including the United Nations World Food Programme (WFP) as well as other food assistance partners.

Members also placed considerable efforts on the facilitation of information sharing, cooperation, and coordination, while also providing a forum for discussion in order to improve the effective, efficient, and coherent use of the resources to respond to needs.

Committee Meetings

In 2016, members convened one meeting in November to discuss the growing number of people affected by conflict and climate related emergencies resulting in record numbers of people displaced and food insecure. A seminar also accompanied the formal session, focusing on the role of early warning and analysis to improve food security responses, which explored the use of science, data, and early warning to help the food security community better prepare, plan, and respond to food insecurity. In lieu of its spring meeting, a delegation of FAC members traveled to Haiti to conduct a joint field mission – further discussed in the coordination section of this report.

More information is available at www.foodassistanceconvention.org.

OVERALL ASSISTANCE

Australia

Australia provides all food assistance as untied, cash-based support to WFP. Australia exceeded its commitment of AUD 80 million (USD 59.3) in 2016 and provided AUD 117.3 million (USD 86.9 million) in food assistance. Of this amount, Australia provided one-third as core, un-earmarked funding under its multiyear partnership with WFP. In addition, Australia did not earmark direct contributions to specific crises below the operational level. Minimally earmarked direct contributions ensured WFP retained the flexibility to adapt its operations to manage evolving situation challenges and determine the most effective means of delivering assistance, including through commodity distribution, cash, and vouchers. This served to maximise the effectiveness and efficiency of WFP's operations, assisting to meet the food requirements of vulnerable populations during a period of unprecedented humanitarian need.

In addition to supporting shelter, education, protection, and WASH initiatives through other UN and international agencies, Australia provided emergency food assistance through WFP valued at AUD 80.3 million (USD 59.5 million) – funding outside Australia's agreed, non-earmarked

contribution through the Australia-WFP Strategic Partnership Framework. This assistance targeted conflict-affected populations in Syria, Iraq, and Afghanistan, as well as refugee communities in the Middle East and the Horn of Africa.

This assistance was further supplemented by Australia's core funding, which in 2016 totalled AUD 37 million (USD 27.4 million) and was assigned by WFP to its highest priority and most underfunded operations (Nepal, Pakistan, Bangladesh, Laos, Iraq, Ukraine, Mali, regional Nigeria, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Ethiopia, and South Sudan). Additionally, Australia supported WFP's school feeding programs with AUD 3 million (USD 2.2 million) in funding to Bangladesh, Bhutan, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, and Kenya. These interventions focused on food distribution to improve average daily nutritional intake and incentivize school attendance, particularly for girls, and many included the establishment of community gardens to increase local food production and improve the sustainability of school feeding programs.

Austria

In 2016, Austria responded to food insecurity and humanitarian crises caused by conflict and natural disasters alike. Once again, Austria not only met its financial commitment within the framework of the FAC of EUR 1.495 million (USD 1.7 million) but exceeded its objective by a significant margin, increasing the Austrian commitment within the reporting period to total contributions amounting to EUR 6.65 million (USD 7.4 million). The Austrian contributions were increased by nearly three quarters, which significantly exceeded its stated 2016 commitment.

Since 2015, the annual funds allocated for food assistance activities provided by the Austrian Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management are administered by the Austrian Development Agency, the competence centre and operational unit of the Austrian Development Cooperation. This step was taken in order to establish a whole-of-government approach to ensure coherency and enhance effectiveness in Austria's aim to raise food security.

All food assistance contributions on behalf of Austria within the reporting period concerned were implemented via the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and the WFP. The ICRC received EUR 750,000 (USD 833,333) and the WFP received EUR 5.9 million (USD 6.6 million).

Programmatically, Austria continues to seek improvement in the effectiveness and efficiency of its response by working with partners who employ a range of delivery modalities, including vouchers, cash transfers, and regional procurement. Austria therefore works with partners on the ground that continuously overcome the challenge of securing access to the most vulnerable populations. Apart from providing short-term relief, Austria intended and continues to aim at directing its funds to projects with a sustainable rehabilitation and resilience approach, such as the provision of seeds and basic agricultural tools. The support is directed at assisting crises-affected people in restoring their livelihoods and preventing negative coping mechanisms and negative long-term effects.

Canada

Through its International Humanitarian Assistance Program, Canada aims to save lives, alleviate suffering, and maintain the dignity of those affected by conflicts, natural disasters, and situations of acute food insecurity. For a fourth year, Canada exceeded its CAD 250 million (USD 188 million) minimum annual commitment under the Convention and provided food assistance through 21 different United Nations agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGO).

Canada's estimated contribution of funding in food assistance amounted to approximately CAD 351 million (USD 264 million)². WFP continues to receive the bulk of Canada's food assistance funding, which amounted to 74 percent of Canada's total food assistance allocations in 2016. In 2016, Canada was WFP's fifth largest bilateral donor. The Canadian Foodgrains Bank and the Micronutrient Initiative received eight percent and four percent of Canada's contribution respectively and the balance was provided to the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and other Canadian and international NGOs. The provision of eligible products for food consumption remain an important portion of activities undertaken by Canada's food assistance implementing partners, accounting for close to 31 percent of eligible activities under the FAC. Cash-based programming represented 24 percent of the total eligible expenditures in 2016, and nutritional interventions accounted for 18 percent of the total expenditures. Multilateral (core) funding eligible under the FAC accounted for 15 percent and livelihoods expenditures accounted for nine percent.³

In 2016, Canada provided humanitarian assistance funding, including for food assistance, to help meet the needs of those affected by 34 natural disasters and complex emergencies⁴ in 53 countries (including conflict, food insecurity, and non-recurrent health epidemics). Overall, with Canada's support, the 21 implementing partners conducted eligible activities and provided eligible products under the FAC that benefited populations in 84 countries and regions.

Denmark

In 2016, Denmark exceeded its commitment under the FAC for 2016 of DKK 185 million (USD 29.4 million) for food assistance. Denmark's humanitarian assistance is un-earmarked and untied, providing core funding or funds at the level of country or region and without an earmark to any particular activity or sector.

Most of the funding for food assistance, DKK 314 million (USD 49.8 million), was channelled through WFP, of which DKK 210 million (USD 33.3 million) was given as core funding. The remaining funding for WFP targeted conflict-affected populations in Iraq, Yemen, and Somalia as well as populations in need in Tanzania and the Sahel region.

² This includes reporting from the majority of our partners who implement programming eligible to be counted against our FAC annual commitment.

³ Note that these statistics do not include approximately CAD 10.5 million (USD 7.9 million) of the total CAD 351 million (USD 264 million), as partners did not specify whether the funding supported food, cash, livelihoods or nutrition interventions.

⁴ Three natural disasters, one epidemic, and 23 complex emergencies.

European Union

In 2016, the European Union (EU) provided substantial needs-based emergency assistance in more than 70 countries around the world, primarily outside of the EU, for which the Directorate-General for European Civil Protection and Humanitarian Aid Operations (ECHO) committed a total of over EUR 2.1 billion (USD 2.3 billion). Since 2016, it can also fund emergency support operations to respond to disasters of exceptional scale within the EU to meet needs, for instance, of refugees in Europe, fleeing the consequences of war in Syria; the EU can also mobilise the EU civil protection mechanism. The corresponding amounts are included in the total figure. Funding assigned by EU Member States to ECHO, such as for the Turkey Facility, are not included and represent additional funding of just under EUR 500 million (USD 555.6 million).

Food security and livelihoods remained overall the most significant area of EU assistance in 2016, with food and nutrition interventions representing more than 30 percent of total EU humanitarian funding. About 33 percent of the total funds committed by ECHO are linked to cash-based interventions, increasing 30 percent from 2015. Cash assistance is used primarily to meet food assistance needs, followed by shelter, and WASH.

In 2016, allocations for cash-based interventions for humanitarian food assistance represented about 53 percent (the cash component of nutrition interventions was marginal), which is comparable to the figure of 55 percent reported for 2015. This slightly lower figure reflects a change in our internal reporting system introduced in 2016, which now reports multi-purpose cash transfer programs separately, without a breakdown per sector. The 53 percent share does not include the food component of multi-purpose cash grants. Including the food component of such grants means that approximately 70 percent of assistance related to food was in the form of cash-based assistance.

Of the 46 countries ECHO assisted through its partners in 2016, South Sudan, Syria, Turkey, Lebanon, and Greece received the highest amounts of food and nutrition assistance, together making up 40 percent of the total allocated funds. With EUR 184 million (USD 204.4 million) WFP remained the largest implementing partner for the EU's humanitarian food assistance (nearly 30 percent), followed by the ICRC (13 percent) and UNICEF (nearly eight percent).

Throughout 2016, the EU continued its humanitarian assistance to Syria and neighbouring countries. Furthermore, including development assistance, it allocated about EUR 606 million (USD 673.3 million) to help millions of people in need of assistance in the four countries facing famine and the risk of famine in Nigeria, Somalia, South Sudan, and Yemen – of this almost EUR 345 million (USD 383.3 million) was dedicated to humanitarian assistance. The El Niño response also represented an important part of the EU's 2016 response.

Multi-purpose cash programs in 2016 amounted to EUR 348 million (USD 386.7 million). The most relevant example is the Emergency Social Safety Net project implemented by WFP in Turkey, with a contracted amount of EUR 482 million (USD 535.5 million) in 2016, of which EUR 337.8 million (USD 375.3 million) was for multi-purpose cash transfers. Based on the applied Minimum Expenditure Basket, 36 percent (EUR 121.6 million) of the cash provided was

expected to be spent on food. Thus, overall, approximately 70 percent of assistance related to food was in the form of cash-based assistance.

Finland

In 2016, Finland exceeded its commitment under the FAC for 2016 of EUR 6 million for food assistance. Finland's humanitarian assistance is un-earmarked and untied, providing funds at the level of country or region and without an earmark to any particular activity or sector. This is the case with the UN organisations as well as the ICRC.

Most of the funding, EUR 28.5 million (USD 31.7 million), was channelled through WFP. This assistance targeted conflict-affected populations in Syria, Iraq and Yemen, as well as drought stricken communities in the Southern Africa region and Ethiopia. Finland also worked through WFP to address ongoing food insecurity in South Sudan and the Sahel region.

Finland also supported WFP's humanitarian response in the Southern Africa Region, following the drought caused by El Niño. Almost 16 million people needed emergency humanitarian assistance in drought stricken countries (Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, Zambia, and Zimbabwe) in late 2016/early 2017. Finland's contribution to WFP's El Niño operation amounted to EUR 4.5 million (USD 5 million) in 2016 and was the largest allocation, along with that of Yemen, last year.

Japan

Japan contributed JPY 26.37 billion (USD 237.4 million) towards food assistance in 2016, an increase of JPY 6.87 billion from its contribution in 2015. It substantially exceeded the amount of its annual commitment under the FAC, JPY 10 billion (USD 90 million), implemented as Bilateral Food Assistance projects, Food Assistance projects through international organizations, and development and emergency grants to WFP.

Japan concluded the Exchanges of Notes (E/Ns) with 12 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa (namely, Benin, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Cote d'Ivoire, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Sao Tome and Principe, Senegal, and Togo), Nepal, and Haiti to implement 15 food assistance projects amounting to JPY 3.64 billion (approximately USD 32.8 million).

Almost 78 percent of Japan's food assistance (JPY 20.8 billion; USD 187.1 million) was implemented via WFP and used to respond to serious damage caused by natural disasters including El Niño and Hurricane Matthew. More broadly, Japan partnered with WFP in response to food needs in Asia (Cambodia, Myanmar, Papua New Guinea and Sri Lanka), Middle East (Palestinian Authority and Yemen), and Sub-Saharan Africa (Central Africa, Chad, Republic of Congo, Djibouti, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Kenya, Liberia, Madagascar, Rwanda, Sierra Leone, South Sudan, Uganda, and Zimbabwe) to implement 20 food assistance projects amounting to JPY 4.67 billion (approximately USD 42.0 million). Other funds went to ethnic minorities in Myanmar valued at approximately JPY 2.25 billion (USD 20.1 million).

Also, Japan partnered with the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees

in the Near East (UNRWA) to provide foods to Palestinian Refugees valued at JPY 420 million (approximately USD 3.9 million).

Spain

The Spanish commitment under the FAC for 2016 was EUR 500,000 (USD 555,556). Spain exceeded its commitment comfortably with a total food assistance and nutrition allocations of EUR 14.66 million (USD 16.3 million), of which EUR 2.35 million (USD 2.6 million) have been allocated to nutrition-related interventions.

More than 50 percent of Spanish food assistance was implemented through three UN partners: WFP received EUR 4.8 million (USD 5.3 million, 33 percent of the total amount), FAO received EUR 1.36 million (USD 1.5 million, nine percent) and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) received EUR 1.5 million (USD 1.7 million, 10 percent). The Spanish commitment for 2017 was increased to EUR 10 million (USD 11.1 million).

Over 10 percent of the Spanish humanitarian funds were linked to cash-based interventions in 2016. Within the food assistance sector, cash transfers constitute more than 25 percent. Food is almost half of the funding, while 16 percent is allocated to nutrition (mainly in the Sahel) and nine percent is allocated to food security (development initiatives mainly through FAO).

Programmatically, Spain maintained its support to populations affected by protracted conflicts, food insecurity and displacement across Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America. In addition to supporting health, protection, and WASH initiatives through UN and international agencies, Spain provided emergency food assistance mainly to Africa (59 percent), of which 26 percent corresponds to the Sahrawi refugee crisis and 33 percent to nutrition and food assistance interventions in the Sahel and Yemen. The Middle East accounted for 33 percent of the Spanish funds for food assistance, with Syria and neighbouring countries (Turkey and Lebanon) the most funded at EUR 4.05 million (USD 4.5 million), followed by Iraq and the West Bank/Gaza.

Switzerland

Switzerland's commitment under the FAC for 2016 was CHF 34 million (USD 34 million); Switzerland exceeded its commitment by providing approximately CHF 67 million (USD 67 million). This amount covers a major part of the total food assistance but not all⁵. As for 2018, Switzerland will be able to keep the same level of commitment as well as about the same level of funding to activities falling under FAC.

Overall, Switzerland works in close partnership with international and national NGOs on food assistance in its priority countries through bilateral funding, and with the WFP, FAO, UNICEF, UNHCR and the ICRC through multilateral funding. Among all UN Agencies, the WFP receives the largest amount of Swiss Humanitarian Aid. In 2016, Switzerland contributed a total of USD

⁵ Due to internal limitations in the monitoring system, Switzerland's monetary contributions in food assistance such as to FAO and UNICEF in emergencies, UNHCR, ICRC, as well as other international organisations are not covered in this report. Switzerland is currently taken efforts to change the monitoring of its food assistance contributions thus to include all funding under the FAC criteria by next year's reporting.

67.4 million to WFP whereof more than 90 percent is eligible under the FAC. In 2016, Switzerland also became WFP's largest partner in the provision of experts in having seconded 28 specialists to the WFP.

Switzerland's in-kind contribution amounted to CHF 20 million (USD 20 million) in 2016. In kind contributions were provided in form of Swiss milk powder, whose use in food aid was evaluated in 2015. Following the reviewers' recommendations, Swiss Humanitarian Aid launched a pilot aimed at increasing efficiency along the lines of the FAC in 2016. In 2016, Swiss NGOs (USD 7 million) and the WFP (USD 13 million) were supported in 22 countries with milk powder from Switzerland (3,976 metric tons). Different from before, Swiss Humanitarian Aid commissioned the WFP to buy Swiss milk powder directly from Swiss milk processing companies at a lower export price. As a result, about 30 percent more milk powder could be purchased, which translated into an increase of beneficiaries, making an important contribution to the prevention of irreparable physical and mental consequences of malnutrition. In 2017, NGOs are supported for the last time with milk powder deliveries from Switzerland. From 2018 onwards, the total credit will go to the WFP as a financial contribution to be used under the FAC.

In 2016, Switzerland provided food assistance in 41 countries⁶ including those countries that received in kind contributions in form of Swiss milk products. Out of this, 46 percent of the food assistance was targeted to six countries only (Chad, DPRK, Madagascar, South Sudan, Somalia, and Syria).

Russia

The Russian Federation contributes to ending hunger and malnutrition through multilateral and bilateral partnerships. Multilateral partners of Russia include WFP, UNDP, FAO, World Bank, G20, and BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China). In 2016 Russian Federation contributed about USD 34.5 million to 14 eligible countries under WFP (Tajikistan, DPRK, Kyrgystan, Palestine, Syria, Somalia, Armenia, Nicaragua, Ethiopia, Zimbabwe, Iraq, Madagascar, Jordan, and Lesotho).

The majority of Russian food assistance is distributed among developing countries, especially in Africa, Latin America, Asia and Pacific through bilateral partnerships, with a priority given to the countries of Commonwealth of Independent States.

Besides the emergency food assistance, Russia is actively engaging in the development projects aimed at finding durable solutions to the food security problems. For a number of years Russian Federation, in collaboration with the WFP, has been implementing large-scale projects to support school feeding in the countries of Caucasus, Central Asia, and Middle East.

⁶ This includes: Afghanistan, Algeria, Bolivia, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroun, Chad, CAR, Colombia, Cuba, Djibouti, DPRK, DR Congo, Ethiopia, Guinea Conakry, Haiti, Iraq, Ivory Coast, Jordan, Lesotho, Madasgascar, Mali, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, OPT, Pakistan, Rwanda, SADC region, Senegal, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syria, Tanzania, Togo, Ukraine, Yemen, Zimbabwe.

United States

In 2016, the United States (U.S.) Government responded to six major crises simultaneously – a record number – including the West Africa Ebola outbreak, global drought induced by El Niño, and large-scale complex crises in Syria, South Sudan, Yemen, and Iraq. Despite these challenges, the U.S. Government worked with dedicated partners to provide food assistance to save lives, reduce suffering, and support recovery for millions in both acute and chronic emergency situations. The U.S. met its USD 2.2 billion commitment to the FAC for 2016, serving more than 70 million people in 58 countries.

Responding to crises, the U.S., through the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), increasingly uses a combination of modalities based on local contexts. In FY 2016, USAID provided 1.7 million MT U.S.-sourced commodities valued at nearly \$1.7 billion, as well as \$244.8 million of locally-sourced and \$389.8 million regionally-sourced commodities. USAID also provided \$144.1 million for cash transfers and \$160.2 million for food vouchers (roughly six percent, each, of total USAID programming). Responses in five countries (Ethiopia, South Sudan, Syria, Yemen, and Sudan) comprised 61 percent of U.S. emergency food assistance efforts in 2016, but often crises – and USAID’s response – knew no borders. In addition to aiding the largest displacement of people from their homes ever recorded, the U.S. Government provided assistance around the world to 10 El Niño-affected countries from Ethiopia to Southern Africa to Central America.

While 80 percent of USAID’s efforts focused on emergency response, 20 percent supported programming to address underlying causes of food insecurity. Efforts ranged from providing farmers with better land management skills, to training caregivers and healthcare workers in child health care and child nutrition. Complementing USAID’s work, the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) focused not only on meeting immediate food and nutrition needs of food insecure people worldwide, but also on improving agricultural productivity and expanding trade of agricultural products, and improving literacy (especially for girls). USDA administered three food assistance programs in FY 2016, including the Food for Progress, McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition, and Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement programs. These programs increase developing country farmers’ income from agricultural production, expand the skillsets and education levels of the rural community members, improve necessary infrastructure for the movement of agricultural goods, and advance developing countries’ access to local and regional markets. These programs are making a dent in reducing food insecurity for the 5.7 million people worldwide serviced by them, who do not have access to safe and nutritious food to lead healthy, productive lives.

KEY FOOD ASSISTANCE RESPONSES IN 2016

El Niño

Early in 2015, the U.S. Government’s Famine Early Warning System (FEWSNET) predicted that an El Niño weather event would fuel both extreme drought conditions and heavy rains in many parts of the world, contributing to the food insecurity of millions of people. In the face of one of

the worst El Niño events on record, FAC members took action and provided more than USD 900 million in food assistance, helping to ensure a robust response around the world – from Papua New Guinea to Haiti to Madagascar.

In addition to classic humanitarian response components such as support to health structures, provision of food and safe drinking water, supplementary food for pregnant women and children, and protection of threatened livelihoods, FAC funding also helped improve the local populations' ability to cope with future disasters by enhancing preparedness, bolstering early response mechanisms, and supporting long-term development solutions.

Ethiopia

El Niño hit Ethiopia hard; the country experienced its worst drought in 50 years. Despite dire conditions, the severe drought did not lead to famine thanks to effective early warning, resilience efforts, existing systems in place, and early action from donors and the Government of Ethiopia.

Austria contributed EUR 500,000 (USD 555,556) to the ICRC Emergency Appeal Ethiopia 2016. With the Austrian contribution, the ICRC was able to assist 8,000 vulnerable households (48,000 people) by distributing: 100 tonnes (T) of rice seed, 75 T sorghum seeds, 125 T bean seeds, 62 T teff seeds, 44 T maize seeds, onion and tomato seeds, 8,000 hoes, and 5,500 sickles.

The **EU** allocated EUR 168.3 million (USD 187 million) to Ethiopia in humanitarian funds for the refugee response and to address the El Niño induced drought. More than 7 million people in Ethiopia were reached with food assistance thanks to EU Humanitarian Aid. Partners provided communities with food assistance, but also nutrition for malnourished children and mothers. They made water available through water trucking and the digging and rehabilitation of water wells. They also created more livelihood opportunities for vulnerable communities.

The U.S. through USAID tripled the amount of U.S. commodities it provided in Ethiopia from the previous year, and expanded both its relief efforts and its four development programs. In total for 2016, USAID mobilized over 780,000 MT of U.S. grown food – valued at more than USD 500 million – and fed more than six million people. The U.S. also provided farmers seeds needed to plant their fields once the rains began, ensuring their recovery after the drought has subsided.

Ethiopia's Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP), established in the aftermath of previous famines to mitigate loss of life, also played a crucial role. It allowed an additional eight million chronically food insecure people to benefit from predictable, seasonal food and cash transfers, provided in exchange for participants' support in the creation of community assets and social infrastructure (e.g. schools, health posts). USAID development programs supporting the PSNP reached 2.6 million people, injecting approximately USD 100 million for conditional food transfers and activities that mitigated the impact of the drought and other shocks. **Canada** has also supported the PSNP since its inception in 2005 and is currently providing CAD 125 million (USD 94 million) over five years (2016-2021).

Canada provided CAD 30.9 million (USD 23.2 million) to address food insecurity and

malnutrition in Ethiopia through experienced partners, including WFP, FAO, ICRC, Micronutrient Initiative and a number of Canadian and international NGOs. Interventions included supporting in-kind food deliveries, livelihood activities, cash and/or vouchers distribution and nutritional interventions. Canada also contributed indirectly to food assistance through its significant un-earmarked contributions to the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (UNCERF) and WFP's Immediate Response Account.

Southern Africa

Further south on the African continent, El Niño exacerbated drought conditions across much of Southern Africa. After two or, in some cases three, consecutive years of poor rains and failed harvests, families were left with little to eat and very few ways of coping with the harsh drought. The drought was the worst in 35 years for the region and seriously affected Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Lesotho, Swaziland, and Zimbabwe. Even South Africa - normally a breadbasket for the region - had significant production deficits, creating a large regional food shortfall. By the end of 2016, approximately 21.3 million people in Southern Africa required emergency assistance, according to the Regional Inter-Agency Standing Committee.

In Southern Africa, **Australia** provided AUD 10 million (USD 7.4 million) through WFP to support the Southern African Development Community regional appeal to meet the most urgent humanitarian needs. This contribution assisted communities in Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Swaziland, and Zimbabwe.

Finland contributed EUR 4.5 million (USD 5 million) to WFP's Southern Africa Region El Niño response in 2016. Finland provided the funds un-earmarked, which meant that WFP was able to prioritize the countries/operations most in need. WFP directed EUR 2.7 million (USD 3 million) to Madagascar, EUR 1 million (USD 1.1 million) to Zimbabwe, and EUR 800,000 (USD 888,889) to Malawi.

The U.S. used a range of tools - including mobilizing U.S. commodities, providing funds for local and regional procurement of cereals and pulses, supporting agricultural activities and funding vulnerability assessments - to provide the appropriate response. In FY 2016, USAID provided over USD 236 million toward the Southern Africa drought response, reaching four million vulnerable people with critical food assistance and livelihoods support.

Latin America and the Caribbean

After minimal rainfall resulted in poor harvests, more than three million people faced food insecurity in the Central America and Haiti region. USAID responded with food assistance through WFP to more than 260,000 vulnerable, drought-affected people in Guatemala, Honduras, El Salvador, and Nicaragua.

The U.S. responded with market-based modalities and community asset-building activities, such as road rehabilitation and soil and water conservation projects. In El Salvador, for example, 517 hectares of degraded hillsides were rehabilitated with soil and water conservation methods.

In Guatemala, communities struggling to recover from consecutive years of drought, faced

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

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

Yemen

Since 2015 Yemen has been experiencing one of the world's worst humanitarian crises. While the country had already suffered from widespread food insecurity prior to the conflict, fighting, the imposition of a de facto blockade, and severe access restrictions imposed by warring factions have led to a dramatic food crisis in the country and the risk of famine.

In total, FAC members provided nearly USD 325 million to provide humanitarian assistance, primarily food assistance to vulnerable Yemeni communities. The FAC's largest partner, WFP, targeted three million people across Yemen with emergency food rations and one million people with commodity-based vouchers. Moreover, four additional partners were engaged in food security cash distributions and three (including WFP) in voucher distributions. According to the logistics cluster, Yemen received more than 3.8 million MT of food commodities in 2016 (including commercial and humanitarian food commodity imports).

Australia contributed to the Yemen response through core contributions to the UN Central Emergency Response Fund (UNCERF) and other UN agencies supporting civilians affected by the crisis in Yemen. Over the past three years, Australia has contributed AUD 33 million (USD 24.4 million) to the UN CERF. During this time, UN CERF allocated AUD 20 million (USD 14.8 million) in 2016.

Canada also contributed to the Yemen UN CERF as well as WFP's Immediate Response Account and bilateral contributions. In total, Canada provided over CAD 24 million (USD 17.8 million) in humanitarian funding to its experienced partners to ensure that conflict-affected people in Yemen are provided with life-saving assistance.

Specific to food assistance, Canada's funding totalled CAD 5.5 million (USD 4.1 million) and was allocated between WFP and ICRC to contribute to the delivery of critical emergency food assistance; coordination and logistics support for the delivery of that assistance; unconditional cash transfers; and treatment for severe acute malnutrition. The activities of WFP and ICRC included the provision of essential food items for crisis-affected people. Canada also allocated CAD 3 million (USD 2.3 million) for a project of Save the Children Canada in the Taiz governorate, in which a significant component of the project was for the treatment of severe

acute malnutrition. In addition, projects supported with Action contre la Faim (Action against Hunger), CARE Canada, and the Norwegian Refugee Council included unconditional cash transfer components, which may have been used to purchase food items. Furthermore, as part of its 2016 humanitarian response, Canada provided CAD 5 million (USD 3.8 million) in un-earmarked funding to the Yemen Humanitarian Pooled Fund which, in turn, funded numerous humanitarian assistance activities in the food security and nutrition sectors.

The **EU** contributed EUR 70 million (USD 77.8 million) in 2016 for humanitarian assistance to support populations across the country affected by conflict, forced displacement, food insecurity, and malnutrition, targeting specifically four million people with general food distribution, cash and vouchers, and treatment for about 900,000 children suffering from acute malnutrition.

Finland also provided EUR 4.5 million (USD 5 million) in 2016 to support WFP's operations in Yemen. In addition to the El Niño response, these were the largest operations supported by Finland in 2016 through WFP. **Japan** provided emergency food assistance to the food insecure and conflict-affected people in Yemen valued at USD 10 million. **Spain** contributed with EUR 500,000 (USD 555,556) to OCHA's Multisector Humanitarian Pool Fund.

In 2016, **the U.S.** provided more than USD 200 million for the ongoing humanitarian crisis in Yemen, using a variety of interventions and partnering with several organizations to meet the immediate food needs of the most vulnerable Yemenis. Through WFP, USAID provided nearly 154,000 MT of U.S. commodities, helping WFP to feed an average of three million people a month and fund the milling and local purchase of wheat flour.

More than USD 40 million in U.S. funding in Yemen was used for food vouchers, through WFP and three NGOs, enabling vulnerable communities to access food in local markets. This ensured recipients had consistent access to basic food commodities while supporting local vendors and stimulating local markets, crucial in crisis-affected communities.

Even before the conflict, 47 percent of children under the age of five were suffering from chronic malnutrition, and over 12 percent from global acute malnutrition. The conflict has continued to negatively affect malnutrition rates, so USAID support to UNICEF was vital to reach severely affected children. In 2016, USAID provided nearly USD 1.8 million to UNICEF for ready-to-use therapeutic foods (RUTF) to treat severe acute malnutrition (SAM) among 27,000 children under age five.

In addition to providing food assistance directly to vulnerable populations, USAID also supported an unusual project for an emergency humanitarian food assistance effort: large-scale infrastructure. The ongoing conflict damaged the Hudaydah port, reducing imports to a fraction of the levels required to sustain the Yemeni population, which relies on imports for 90 percent of its grain and other food sources. USAID contributed USD 2 million each to WFP's efforts to repair the port in order to improve its capacity to swiftly import essential supplies, including food. This effort has been critical for getting both humanitarian food aid and commercial food into the country, and to reach people in need and restock markets.

After six years of ongoing conflict, the precarious security situation in Syria displaced over 11 million people, displacing 6.5 million internally – some multiple times. In total, 13.5 million people in Syria need humanitarian assistance, including 6 million children. Large-scale infrastructural damage and inadequacy of basic services eroded available resources and shrunk households' resilience capacity, leaving 8.7 million people food insecure or at risk of food insecurity. Moreover, reduced food production, decreased governmental subsidies, and currency depreciation increased food prices over 300 percent since 2011, further compromising poor households' ability to meet their food needs.

Recognizing that short-term humanitarian assistance is no longer sufficient for the protracted crisis, **Australia** and **Canada** both announced three-year funding plans. Australia committed to AUD 220 million (USD 162.96 million) to the Syrian crisis to build the resilience and self-reliance of refugees and refugee-hosting countries. The first payment to WFP occurred in 2016/2017, providing AUD 2 million (USD 1.5 million) in Lebanon, AUD 3 million (USD 2.2 million) in Jordan, and AUD 5 million (USD 3.7 million) in Syria. This contribution will support WFP to purchase commodities and provide cash vouchers to populations displaced inside Syria and in neighbouring countries. Australia additionally supported WFP's work in Syria through AUD 8 million (USD 5.9 million) for cash and vouchers in Jordan, Lebanon, Egypt, and Turkey in fiscal year 2015-16.

Canada committed to provide CAD 840 million (USD 631.6 million) in humanitarian assistance over three years (2016-2019) to help families cope with the protracted crises in Syria and Iraq. In 2016, Canada provided CAD 280 million (USD 210.5 million) to respond to humanitarian needs, including cash-based and in-kind food assistance activities in Syria, Iraq, and support for refugees in neighbouring countries. Food assistance funding and activities supported by Canada have mainly been implemented through WFP and NGO partners. Partners have reported close to CAD 15 million (USD 11.3 million) for food assistance to conflict affected people inside Syria, and CAD 3.5 million (USD 2.6 million) in food assistance to support refugees in Jordan and Lebanon.

Humanitarian access remains one of the most critical issues inside Syria. In 2016, Canada contributed CAD 11.35 million (USD 8.5 million) to WFP, which included support to humanitarian air drops over Deir-Ezzor, a region of Syria besieged by ISIL. Between April and December 2016, WFP completed over 177 high altitude airdrops to some 93,500 living in Deir-Ezzor deprived of regular access to food, medicines, and other essentials.

In 2016, the **EU** provided EUR 445 million (USD 494.4 million) in humanitarian assistance to over 25 humanitarian organizations to address needs inside Syria as well as the needs of Syrian refugees and host communities in neighbouring countries. EUR 47.6 million (USD 52.9 million) was provided to cover food assistance needs in particular.

The EU with Member States also launched the "Turkey Facility" for Refugees to deliver efficient and complementary support to Syrian and other refugees and host communities in close cooperation with Turkish authorities. The Facility provides a joint coordination mechanism for actions financed by the EU budget and national contributions made by its Member States. It is designed to ensure that the needs of refugees and host communities are addressed in a

comprehensive and coordinated manner. The Facility has a EUR 3 billion (USD 3.3 billion) budget for 2016 and 2017 to support humanitarian interventions and long term assistance for refugees countrywide in Turkey. A key component of this initiative is the ESSN, an innovative, single card social assistance scheme that will allow up to one million refugees to cover their basic needs.

In 2016, the **U.S.** provided more than USD 330 million to provide food assistance to five million Syrians every month both inside Syria and to Syrian refugees in surrounding countries. USAID sponsored innovative programs to provide bread - the staple food of the Syrian diet - to food insecure populations throughout the country. By providing wheat flour and yeast through partners, local bakeries are able to increase the production of bread and sell it at a stable and affordable price to the community, mitigating the high price inflation that has affected many other items inside the country. As a result, millions of food insecure Syrians have access to bread and bakeries are able to stay in business, pay workers, and purchase additional supplies in local markets, encouraging stability, providing sustenance and a sense of community to the victims of war.

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

Austria, Finland, and Japan also partnered with WFP. Austria contributed EUR 5.9 million (USD 6.6 million) to the WFP Emergency Operation in Syria to provide 190,535 beneficiaries with 381 MT of rice, 593,705 beneficiaries with 1,187 MT of bulgur wheat, and 1.1 million beneficiaries with 4,078 MT of dry pulses for one month. These quantities complemented other commodities, enabling WFP to assemble food baskets to provide general emergency food assistance. Japan provided approximately USD 30.3 million and Finland provided EUR 4.7 million (USD 5.2 million) to WFP for emergency food assistance to those in Syria and surrounding countries (Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey). Finland also provided EUR 2.5 million (USD 2.8 million) to ICRC, EUR 1.2 million (USD 1.3 million) to the International Federation of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies, and EUR 2.5 million (USD 2.8 million) to UNICEF in Syria, which included food assistance and nutrition components.

Spain allocated EUR 10.79 million for humanitarian aid to respond to the Syrian crisis and host countries in 2016. More than EUR 4 million (USD 4.4 million) supported cash transfers. In 2016, Spain allocated EUR 700,000 (USD 777,778) to the WFP, EUR 500,000 (USD 555,556) to UNRWA, and EUR 1 million (USD 1.1 million) to UNHCR for cash transfer interventions.

South Sudan

South Sudan is the very definition of a "man-made crisis". Three years of conflict have had catastrophic consequences and humanitarian assistance is hindered by the parties to the conflict, which disrupt the delivery of assistance, even in famine-hit areas. In September 2016,

the conflict reached a grim milestone: more than one million people have fled the country, landing in neighbouring countries like Ethiopia, Kenya, Sudan, and Uganda. The vast majority of these refugees have been under the age of 18, and women are heads of households for 80 percent of South Sudanese refugees. Uganda in particular saw a massive influx of South Sudanese refugees. Between July and December 2016, over 400,000 South Sudanese crossed the border, swelling populations of Ugandan towns. Once a small town in northern Uganda, today Bidi Bidi is the fourth largest refugee camp in the world.

Food assistance funding and activities supported by **Canada** in 2016 in response to the South Sudan crisis were mainly implemented through the WFP and the ICRC and amount to a total of CAD 43.5 million (USD 32.7 million). Due to the severity of the crisis in South Sudan and lack of functioning markets, WFP funding was used 82 percent for food and 18 percent for cash vouchers.

Australia, Finland, and Japan supported WFP as well. Australia contributed AUD 3.75 million (USD 2.71 million) to South Sudan via WFP core funding, Finland gave EUR 2.5 million (USD 2.8 million) and Japan provided USD 2.4 million. Funding supported emergency food and nutrition support and the provision of agricultural livelihood support. In addition, Finland supported ICRC's food security and food assistance activities with EUR 2 million (USD 2.2 million) and Finn Church Aid with EUR 700,000 (USD 777,778).

WFP's overall 2016 results included the provision of food assistance to four million people in South Sudan – the highest number of people in one year since South Sudan's independence. Within this, 600,000 people received fortified nutritious foods for the prevention and treatment of acute malnutrition. Total food deliveries amounted to 265,000 MT – 56,000 MT more than 2015. In addition, WFP disbursed USD 13.8 million in cash based transfers.

The **EU** provided more than EUR 142 million (USD 157.8 million) in humanitarian assistance in addition to about EUR 83 million (USD 92.2 million) dedicated to development assistance. These humanitarian funds supported food assistance, health and nutrition, water, sanitation and hygiene interventions, education, as well as shelter and protection for the most vulnerable populations. Support was also provided to reduce the incidence of malaria and to respond to an increase in measles cases and epidemics such as cholera and Hepatitis E. Humanitarian food and livelihoods assistance and nutrition received the largest share of funding - nearly EUR 70 million (USD 77.8 million) in 2016.

In 2016, the **U.S.** contributed more than USD 229.5 million to partners, including WFP, to provide emergency food assistance to refugees in Ethiopia, Sudan, Kenya, and Uganda, including South Sudanese refugees who have recently arrived. The U.S. Government funding to WFP supports general food distributions to those in need as well as targeted food assistance to vulnerable groups, such as pregnant and lactating women and young children.

USAID also partners with UNICEF to purchase RUTF to treat SAM-affected children under five. In 2016 in Sudan, for example, USAID provided USD 1.8 million to UNICEF to purchase 280 MT of RUTF, a portion of which reaches South Sudanese refugees.

Austria and Spain contributed EUR 250,000 (USD 277,778) and EUR 500,000 (USD 555,556),

respectively, to ICRC in South Sudan. The ICRC appeal works to ensure that people affected by armed conflicts are protected, have access to medical/surgical care, physical rehabilitation and safe water, receive emergency relief and livelihood support, and can restore contact with relatives. With the Austrian contribution, the ICRC was able to distribute 55 T sorghum and 20 T beans to 6,000 people for one month.

Hurricane Matthew

On October 4, 2016, Hurricane Matthew made initial landfall near Les Anglais, in Haiti's Sud Department, and secondary landfall over eastern Cuba, before continuing to traverse the Bahamas from October 5–7, 2016. The hurricane brought destructive winds, heavy rainfall, and dangerous storm surge, resulting in extensive damage to crops, houses, and infrastructure, as well as widespread flooding in some areas. An initial rapid post-disaster needs assessment estimated that approximately 2.1 million Haitians were affected by Hurricane Matthew, of which 1.4 million required immediate humanitarian assistance and 806,000 were severely food insecure.

In response, the **U.S.** activated a regional Disaster Assistance Response Team (DART) which at its height comprised more than 70 people and included assistance from the U.S. military to deliver relief supplies and personnel. In 2016, the U.S. provided more than USD 82 million for the Hurricane Matthew Response. For food assistance, USAID provided USD 27.8 million to WFP which helped to provide approximately 720,000 people with emergency food assistance, including the provision of specialized nutritious foods to address acute malnutrition in 12,500 children younger than five years of age and 850 pregnant and nursing women.

USAID also provided USD 15.4 million to a non-governmental organization (NGO) consortium – led by CARE – that provided unconditional cash transfers to help hurricane-affected households meet monthly food needs. By the end of the year, consortium members had reached more than 426,000 beneficiaries in Haiti's Grand'Anse, Nippes, and Sud departments. In 2017, the consortium plans to transition to cash-for-work activities that will assist approximately 98,000 beneficiaries, building the foundation for livelihood recovery by increasing vulnerable households' access to food, while restoring community assets damaged by the hurricane.

EU humanitarian funds released in the immediate aftermath of the disaster provided assistance to the victims of Hurricane Matthew, mainly by supporting WASH, shelter, education, food assistance, and livelihoods recovery. Out of a total humanitarian budget of EUR 14 million (USD 15.6 million) for Haiti, the EU provided food assistance amounting to EUR 5.5 million (USD 6.1 million) in 2016, with most of this focused on livelihoods-related interventions.

In addition to funding, through its Civil Protection Mechanism, the EU mobilised in-kind assistance and technical expertise from participating states. A total of 14 experts in emergency coordination, logistics, information management, environment, health, water, and sanitation travelled to the affected areas.

Canada provided CAD 3.6 million (USD 2.7 million) in food-based programming to support vulnerable and crisis-affected households in Haiti through WFP, FAO, and the *Centre d'étude et*

de coopération internationale (Centre for International Studies and Cooperation). This support has enabled hurricane- and drought-affected populations to access immediate food and agricultural support and reduce the impact of these disasters on the country's food security.

Japan and Spain also contributed to the relief effort. Japan provided WFP USD 1 million and Spain gave Oxfam EUR 200,000 (USD 222,222) for the most affected by the hurricane in three municipalities in Sud department.

Lake Chad Basin

Despite favourable rainfall levels in 2016 and an improvement in agricultural conditions in most of Nigeria, food security conditions remained poor in Boko Haram-affected areas of the country's Northeastern states. According to FEWSNET, this was due to continued insecurity and conflict, high food prices, livelihood disruptions, and market constraints.

According to the *Cadre Harmonisé*,⁷ in 2016, 4.6 million people in Northeastern Nigeria experienced acute food insecurity and malnutrition – including 65,000 experiencing extremely critical levels of malnutrition. Conflict has displaced over 1.7 million people, prevented them from planting crops or accessing food, prevented markets from operating, and limited humanitarian assistance.

As the leading humanitarian donor, the **EU** has massively increased support in tandem with the evolving humanitarian needs and as access to the affected populations becomes possible. In 2016, it provided EUR 122 million (USD 135.6 million) for the Lake Chad crisis response, of which EUR 62 million (USD 68.9 million) was designated for Northeast Nigeria. Support has been provided to meet the urgent needs of internally displaced people (IDPs), refugees, and host communities in Nigeria and the other three countries in the Lake Chad area affected by the ongoing conflict.

In the Lake Chad region, the EU prioritizes food assistance and nutrition interventions, which received in 2016 more than 50 percent of the humanitarian funding. In addition, the EU also supports programmes providing access to basic healthcare, protection, water and sanitation, shelter, and livelihoods. While an increase in food assistance is important, parallel efforts are necessary to support livelihoods and early recovery, promoting the resilience of the affected populations. Therefore, with EU support, a combined food security and livelihoods strategy developed by WFP and FAO is being rolled out.

In 2016, the **U.S.** increased funding to programs, encouraging partners to expand their operations to reach newly accessible areas - supporting IDPs and vulnerable host community members, resulting in more than USD 102.6 million in emergency food assistance to Nigerian refugees in the Lake Chad Basin region (Niger, Chad, Cameroon, and Nigeria), including USD 50.8 million for IDPs in Northeastern Nigeria.

⁷ Cadre Harmonisé is a food security tool used throughout West Africa for the classification, analysis and reporting of food insecurity. The tool is funded by USAID, the European Union, the Permanent Interstate Committee for Drought Control in the Sahel (CILSS) member countries, the European Union and the French Agency for Development (AFD).

2016 Food Assistance Convention Narrative Report

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

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

In 2016, **Australia** provided AUD 5 million (USD 3.7 million) in direct contributions to address food insecurity in Lake Chad Basin countries (Nigeria, Niger, Chad, and Cameroon) through WFP. In addition, Australia has contributed indirectly through its annual funding to the UNCERF, which allocated to Nigeria AUD 32.4 million (USD 24 million) in 2016.

In 2016, **Canada** provided CAD 12,8 million (USD 9.6 million) to address food insecurity and malnutrition in the Lake Chad Basin countries through experienced partners, including WFP, UNICEF, ICRC, and other Canadian and international NGOs. Interventions included supporting in-kind food deliveries, livelihood activities, cash and/or vouchers distribution, and nutritional interventions. In addition, Canada contributed indirectly through its annual un-earmarked funding to UNCERF, which allocated more than USD 56 million to the four countries in 2016.

COORDINATION AMONG DONORS

FAC Joint Field Visit

In June 2016, nearly half of the FAC members travelled together to Haiti for the FAC's first joint field mission. The purpose of the trip was to explore the food security situation in the country and see first-hand how we as donors are responding. FAC participants included the U.S. (with participants from USAID, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, and the State Department), Canada, the EU, Slovenia, and Switzerland. With the exception of Canada and Slovenia, colleagues from respective field offices joined the participants.

Together FAC members visited a variety of different FAC member programs including food voucher and cash transfer programs that provided aid to the most vulnerable and drought affected, livelihood activities aimed at diversifying incomes, and projects targeted at boosting the agricultural production of the regions we visited.

The joint field visit was an important opportunity for FAC members who work together on policy and practice in headquarters to see field operations in action, providing a fresh dynamic to dialogues. It also offered an opportunity to informally evaluate programs funded by different donors and implemented by a range of partners, giving a holistic view of food assistance efforts in the country.

Beyond learning more about Haiti and how to improve multi-sector responses, the field mission demonstrated the need to improve donor coordination. Efforts among FAC members should go beyond information sharing and translate into program planning, beneficiary targeting, and complimentary responses. Coordinating better at both the headquarters level and on the ground would lead to improved programs for beneficiaries and the more effective use of resources.

World Humanitarian Summit

Held in Istanbul in May 2016, the World Humanitarian Summit (WHS) took place at a critical juncture, as an unprecedented level of humanitarian need is challenging the humanitarian system's ability to respond, driven largely by protracted crises and rising displacement. The WHS brought together high-level leadership from 173 countries as well as UN agencies, NGOs, and technical experts to exchange ideas on how the international community can best respond to growing crises and promote closer linkages with development. FAC members that participated include **Australia, Austria, Canada, the EU, Finland, Japan, Spain, and the United States.**

Global Network against Food Crises

The "Global Network against Food Crises" was launched in 2016 jointly by the **EU**, WFP, and FAO in Istanbul during the WHS. It is a platform to coordinate data on food crises, and to build consensus on the assessment of needs and coordination of the global response to food crises. The Global Network consists of a technical component (with the joint publication of the annual [Global Report on Food Crises](#), in collaboration with WFP, FAO, UNICEF, and other actors including FEWSNET, and regional organisations); and a political component, aiming for a global dialogue to facilitate coordination, joint planning, and implementation of responses to food crises. This approach has already proven its effectiveness for the joint humanitarian and development response of the EU to the El Niño event in 2016, and is equally helping coordination for the response to the 'Four Famine crises' in 2017. The idea of the Global Network has also generated wide interest among donors, partners, beneficiary countries, and regional organisations.

Committee on World Food Security

Finland participated actively in the work of the Committee on World Food Security in 2016. Finland acted as the Chair of the Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG) on Connecting Smallholders to markets, leading to Committee on World Food Security (CFS) policy recommendations, and contributed to the work of the CFS OEWG on Strategic Development Goals.

POLICY INITIATIVES

The Grand Bargain

The clearest outcome of the WHS was the Grand Bargain. The Grand Bargain is a set of 10

non-binding political commitments that donor governments and humanitarian organizations plan to jointly pursue to strengthen the effectiveness, efficiency, and accountability of humanitarian assistance to people in need.

Many FAC members are actively leading and participating in work streams associated with implementing the Grand Bargain including multi-year planning and funding (led by **Canada**), local actors (**Switzerland**), management costs (**Japan**), needs assessments (**EU**), participation (**U.S.**), earmarking (**Sweden**), the humanitarian-development nexus (**Denmark**), and an informal work stream on gender (**Canada**).

Gender Policies

Without addressing gender equality, the world will not be able to achieve a world of zero hunger. Gender inequality is often exacerbated by humanitarian crises and food insecurity, and must be addressed alongside our food assistance programming. **Canada** is intensifying its efforts to ensure that the needs of women and girls are addressed and integrated across all of its humanitarian policies and programs. In 2016, Canada actively engaged its food assistance and other humanitarian partners to ensure that gender was streamlined at all levels of their organizations, from headquarters to the field level. As well, Canada worked with partners, and notably WFP, which underwent a significant change to its corporate architecture, to ensure that gender was integrated appropriately throughout its corporate documents. As a member of the Call to Action on Protection from Gender-Based Violence (GBV) in Emergencies, in 2016, Canada became co-chair (with FAC member **Switzerland**) of the States/Donors working group. This forum, while broader than food assistance, is another avenue through which Canada is actively advocating for the greater inclusion of gender and GBV into humanitarian partners' response.

Policies Related to Refugee and Internally Displaced Persons

EU Communication on Forced Displacement

In April 2016, the **EU** adopted a communication on forced displacement that provides a strategic vision aiming at preventing forced displacement from becoming protracted, and at gradually ending dependence on humanitarian assistance in existing displacement situations by fostering self-reliance and enabling the displaced to live in dignity as contributors to their host societies. It presents a series of recommendations, notably calling for early involvement of political and development actors, greater regional cooperation, private sector involvement, working with partner countries, as well as enhanced access to services, labour markets, and good quality education. The new approach to forced displacement and development shaped the EU's engagement in important international fora in 2016, such as the WHS, in which policy orientations from the Communication translated into more than 20 EU commitments on addressing displacement, and the New York Declaration for Refugees and Migrants. Efforts to implement the approach at an operational level are being pursued, including a number of joint Commission missions (e.g. Tanzania at the end of January 2017).

EU Humanitarian Protection Policy

The **EU** published [revised humanitarian protection guidelines](#) in 2016, which provide guidance on programming of protection in humanitarian crises and on measuring the effect of the interventions, and set the framework capacity-building of the international humanitarian system regarding protection in humanitarian crises. The guidelines further highlight that protection should be mainstreamed in all humanitarian actions funded by the EU and also give key practical recommendations regarding partners and staff, exit strategy and transition, management of sensitive protection information, and sexual exploitation and abuse.

EU Humanitarian Shelter and Settlements Policy

The **EU** also published its [Humanitarian Shelter and Settlements guidelines](#) in 2016 to ensure that vulnerable people's shelter needs are met in an optimal and efficient way. Shelter and settlements are key components of post-disaster recovery, of providing protection, security and dignity, and of re-establishing economic well-being and secure livelihoods. The guidelines build on best practices in the sector, applying the criteria for EU humanitarian shelter and settlement funding for a most efficient and effective humanitarian responses. They promote in particular that assistance should be people-centred and supportive.

New and Revised Strategies

Spanish Humanitarian Strategy

Spain is evaluating its 2007 humanitarian action strategy, including the effectiveness of its interventions, including food assistance operations. The objectives of the evaluation are the following:

1. Provide an independent assessment on the fulfilment of the objectives and the use of the instrumental framework established in the 2007 humanitarian action strategy of the Spanish cooperation.
2. Identify lessons learned and establish strategic and operational recommendations that provide useful, quality, and evidence-based information for the development of a new humanitarian action strategy.

U.S. Global Food Security Act and 2017-2021 Strategy

In July 2016, President Obama signed the Global Food Security Act, P.L. 114-195, into law, marking a historic step toward ending global hunger and malnutrition. The largest development authorization since the President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief, the Global Food Security Act reinforces America's successful approach to increasing food security and nutrition through the Feed the Future initiative. The Global Food Security Act also highlighted the U.S. Government's commitment to empowering smallholder farmers and strengthening communities and economies through long-term agricultural development.

The corresponding **U.S.** Government Global Food Security Strategy outlines how 11 U.S. Government agencies and departments will continue to work together to sustainably reduce global poverty, hunger, and malnutrition by improving agriculture-led growth, resilience, and nutrition. The strategy recognizes the importance that emergency food assistance plays in

supporting the strategy's objectives to improve agriculture-led growth, nutrition, and resilience.

U.S. Food for Peace 2016-2025 Strategy

In October 2016, USAID's office of Food for Peace (FFP) launched its new 10 year strategy. The 2016–2025 Food Assistance and Food Security Strategy builds on the 2006–2010 strategic plan, draws on lessons learned during its implementation, and embraces new approaches and tools that have emerged in recent years to increase the impact of **U.S.** Government food assistance as a critical component in global efforts to end hunger and poverty.

The new strategy provides a programming framework that captures the best of what FFP currently does, but challenges FFP and its partners to strive for greater impact with greater efficiency and sustainability. It maintains the vision of the last FFP Strategic Plan, “A world free from hunger and poverty, where people live in dignity, peace, and security,” but broadens the previous goal of reducing food insecurity to one that envisions improving food security and sustaining it. FFP's goal also embraces “nutrition security”—deliberately signalling the importance of a wide range of nutrition, sanitation, and health factors that, together with the stable availability of and access to nutritious food, contribute to improved food security outcomes.

INNOVATIVE APPROACHES TO FOOD ASSISTANCE

Innovation Hubs

Australia has established the InnovationXchange at the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade to catalyse and support innovation across the Australian aid program. The InnovationXchange will identify, trial, and scale-up successful approaches, find and collaborate with new partners, share learnings, and broker connections to ensure that innovation becomes intrinsic to the delivery of the whole of Australia's aid program. For example, in 2015, the Pacific Humanitarian Challenge called on innovators entrepreneurs, designers, NGOs, and academics to rethink the humanitarian response. In 2016, the Humanitarian Supplies Challenge sought to identify new products, partnerships, and innovative solutions addressing key challenges faced in the immediate aftermath of a humanitarian crisis.

Multi-Year Funding

Innovative multi-year humanitarian funding is providing experienced multilateral and NGO partners with the predictability to plan and respond to the most immediate needs of vulnerable populations, including food assistance. Built-in flexibility in multi-year funding permits partners to meet immediate basic needs while providing the longer-term support to address gender barriers to access, including in livelihoods, and allowing partners to build on their yearly results.

In February 2016, **Canadian** Prime Minister Trudeau announced a new Middle East Strategy to respond to the crises in Iraq and Syria, and their impact on neighbouring countries such as Jordan and Lebanon. This included CAD 840 million (USD 631.6 million) for humanitarian assistance over three years, from 2016 to 2019, delivering on Canada's commitments from the

WHS and the Grand Bargain to provide multi-year humanitarian funding to respond to the crises. Other multi-year funding agreements include CAD 125 million (USD 94 million) to the Canadian Foodgrains Bank (2016-2020) and CAD 147 million (USD 110.5 million) to UNCF (2016-2020). A portion of the funding to UNCF goes toward food assistance.

As part of its multi-year commitment to the WFP, **Australia** has supported WFP in developing a paper on innovative assessments, improving the management of unsolicited bilateral donations and forecast-based early action for climate risks.

Nutrition Innovations

In 2016, the **EU** supported an innovative nutrition project led by the ACF-ALIMA consortium generating evidence that can be applied globally, feeding into the Severe Acute Malnutrition (SAM) 2.0 global initiative whose objective is to address critical issues in programming, policy, and funding of under-nutrition treatment. The supported project addresses issues related to access and use of malnutrition services by testing new delivery models for the treatment of severe acute malnutrition. Once completed, it is expected that the project will provide a more sustainable and scalable response to acute malnutrition and enhance the capacity of humanitarian actors worldwide through the generation and active dissemination of new evidence, tools, methods, guidance, and knowledge.

Cash Innovations

The **EU** funded a project by UNHCR on next generation cash-based interventions in displacement settings. Funded under the Enhanced Response Capacity funding instrument, the project helped to institutionalise and operationalize within UNHCR and its partners the use of cash-based interventions and multi-purpose cash transfers at a wider scale in displacement settings, and the development of a comprehensive toolkit. Documentation can be found on the thematic pages of the Cash Learning Partnership [website](#).

The EU also started working on a guidance note on large-scale cash interventions in 2016, which was finalized and shared with partners at the beginning of 2017. The note provides detailed guidance for partners that will propose multi-purpose cash operations for EU funding and will apply in cases of medium or large-scale funding to deliver cash transfers in a given country or for a given crisis where cash transfers make up a significant part of the overall response.

In Colombia, **Spain** is funding an innovative project on cash based transfer (CBTs) of Action against Hunger with EUR 130,000 (USD 144,444). This project is promoting innovation in modalities of cash transfer for IDPs in Colombia. The objective is the promotion of the KACHE system (a cash based transfer modality) to be used in contexts where there are functioning markets but there is no possibility of purchasing through traditional electronic devices because there is no access to internet and/or commercial providers don't use it.

Development Program Innovations

In 2016, the **U.S.** introduced a new pilot approach for multi-year food assistance development awards in the Democratic Republic of Congo and Liberia called “Refine and Implement” (R&I). Using this model, USAID hopes to design activities that are better shaped to reflect the operating environment during project inception and respond to changing or unanticipated situations on the ground during implementation.

R&I includes two stages:

- (1) A refinement period during the first year in which successful applicants (i.e., new awardees) will carry out pre-implementation studies and refine the project’s design, and undertake the preparation for implementation (e.g., hiring, training, procurements, etc.), followed by
- (2) The implementation of the activities. FFP expects that with the introduction of R&I, applicants will include strategic and creative approaches to achieve the stated goal and objectives because the R&I process provides the time and space for innovation and iterative learning.

By considering local contexts, the activity design will take into account the priorities of the communities, operating environment, contextual factors, capacities of local institutions and service providers, and other investments in the target area. USAID expects that during the refinement year, partners will refine the theory of change based on evidence, invest in staff development, and tailor social and behaviour change strategies to the local norms and context. Through the R&I approach, USAID believes activities will improve its impact and effectiveness, resulting in substantially higher food and nutrition security gains.

BEST PRACTICES AND LESSONS LEARNED IN 2016

Best Practice: Localisation

Australia is committed to localisation as a key priority from the 2016 WHS. As such, Australia is building Pacific resilience by recognising, respecting, and strengthening leadership and decision-making by national actors in humanitarian action, in order to better address the needs of affected populations.

Cyclone Winston, which hit Fiji in February 2016, was the most violent storm ever registered in the Southern Hemisphere. The storm affected over 350,000 people (equivalent to 40 percent of Fiji’s population). Australia’s response to Winston was a contribution of AUD 35 million (USD 25.9 million), including AUD 1 million (USD 740,741) to WFP’s emergency response (for cash and vouchers). WFP implemented a cash transfer operation to more than 70,000 people, delivered through the Fijian Government’s existing social welfare programs, in partnership with the Ministry for Women, Children and Poverty Alleviation.

Best Practice: Cash

Canada has been providing cash-specific funding since 2012 to increase the quality and effectiveness of cash transfer programming in emergency responses. In 2016, Canada provided CAD 9 million (USD 6.8 million) to the Cash Consortium of Iraq initiative, made up of Mercy Corps, the Norwegian Refugee Council, the Danish Refugee Council, the International Rescue Committee, and Oxfam. Canada is also making concerted efforts to engage with its UN and NGO partners to promote stronger coordination of cash-based programming.

Canada is committed to providing cash-based food assistance, whenever possible and based on needs. Canada continues to provide funding for cash-based assistance where appropriate, for a total of 26 percent or CAD 84 million (USD 63.2 million) of eligible expenditures under the FAC in 2016. There is strong evidence that shows that cash transfers are associated with reductions in monetary poverty, with an increase in food expenditure and a reduction in poverty measures. However, consideration needs to be given to using cash-based programming alongside complementary interventions to address specific needs that cannot be met with cash assistance alone, such as nutrition, protection, and gender equality. Canada is keenly interested in the impact of cash transfers on gender equality. Thus far, the evidence suggests that cash transfers need to be combined with parallel or complementary initiatives to see greater transformational effects on gender equality and empowerment.

As the evidence for multi-purpose cash increases, which allows beneficiaries the flexibility and dignity to prioritize their needs, it may become increasingly difficult for Canada or other FAC members to capture how much funding is solely going toward food assistance. Ensuring that FAC members have the tools to capture food assistance expenditures, while in no way hindering our delivery of humanitarian assistance, is an issue that will likely only increase in importance in the years to come.

Lessons Learned on Beneficiary Reach

In light of the Grand Bargain agreement and its efforts to improve transparency and efficiency in the humanitarian system, the **EU** commissioned a study in 2016 on funding flows in the humanitarian system. In particular, the study looked at how much donor funding actually reaches beneficiaries and what happens to the remaining funding. The study found that 81 percent of donor funding either reaches the beneficiaries directly (38 percent) or enables the direct delivery of goods and services to beneficiaries (43 percent). Projects including cash-based assistance perform better in terms of delivery costs. Furthermore, the study demonstrates that challenging environments result in higher delivery and support costs. More generally, the full costs associated with the delivery of humanitarian assistance are often not reflected in project proposals.