

## **Country Prioritization for Food for Peace Multi-Year Assistance Programs Proposal for Consultation**

### Background

The FFP Strategic Plan, approved in 2005 after being developed in close cooperation with Private Voluntary Organizations (PVOs), seeks to make the best use of food aid resources. The plan refocuses attention and resources on the most vulnerable groups to help build resiliency so, for example, they will be more resilient in dealing with the next drought or flood in a region and therefore it should require less emergency food aid than would otherwise be needed.

To implement the plan, FFP is working with USAID Missions and PVOs to focus future resources available for development-oriented multi-year assistance programs (MYAPs) on the most vulnerable people in the most food insecure countries. (Note – This will not impact emergency food aid.)

### Methodology

To identify the most food insecure countries, FFP developed criteria to rank countries by level of food insecurity based on quantitative indicators. Countries with current MYAPs were ranked based on a weighted average of the country's ranking under three food insecurity indicators: percentage of children stunted, percentage of population living under \$1 per day, and percentage of population undernourished. These three criteria were chosen because they addressed three aspects of food security – utilization, access and availability. Information was drawn from USAID and World Bank databases as of December 2005.

### Results

The analysis identified the fifteen most food insecure countries with current programs as Bangladesh, Burkina Faso, Chad, Ethiopia, Guatemala, Haiti, Liberia, Madagascar, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Sierra Leone, Uganda and Zambia (in alphabetical order).

Those countries with current programs that are not among the most food insecure are Benin, Cape Verde, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Honduras, Indonesia, Kenya, Nicaragua and Senegal.

Five countries with current programs were not ranked. Prior to the country prioritization effort, FFP had been in discussions on phasing down programs in Peru and India. Also, FFP is in discussions on phasing down programs in three countries – Rwanda, Tajikistan and Mali – in which circumstances make it extremely difficult to continue programs as currently planned.

### Program Implications

FFP intends to focus future funding on the most food insecure countries. In these (currently) fifteen countries, FFP will work with USAID Missions and Cooperating Sponsors to review and, as necessary, redesign ongoing programs to conform to the new Strategic Plan.

In other countries, programs due to end in 2006 and 2007 will be allowed to end as planned, if funding is available. For programs ending in 2006, extensions for a reasonable time period may be possible if it is determined that it is necessary for an orderly, successful close-out. In these cases, submission of amendment requests will be due on May 15, 2006. Programs ending in 2008 and 2009 will be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

As programs phase-out in the coming years, resources will become available to increase programming levels in priority countries.

### Summary of Frequently Asked Questions

Why are funds being focused on a smaller number of countries?

- U.S. food aid should have the greatest impact possible. By focusing food aid resources on the most food insecure countries, FFP would address the most pressing food security needs on a scale necessary to make a greater impact and reduce the need for emergency food aid over time.

Has the proposal been finalized?

- We are currently consulting with members of the Food Aid Consultative Group and have requested comments on the priority list by March 21, 2006.

Does this mean that funding for development food aid is going down?

- In the last several years, an increasing share of Title II food aid has been used for emergencies, while funding available for development food aid programs has fallen. This country prioritization, however, does not imply any further reductions. In fact, it is expected that funding for development-oriented multi-year assistance programs will increase in 2006 compared to 2005. The prioritization does, however, imply a shift over time of resources from countries that are more food secure to those that are the neediest.

Is emergency food aid affected by this prioritization?

- This prioritization affects only the location of development-oriented multi-year programs. There will be no shift in the locations of emergency food aid programs due to this effort. At the same time, in order to increase Title II impact in the field, we need to effectively program scarce resources to protect and enhance human, livelihood and community capacities in both emergency and development situations.

Why are regions within countries with similar or worse conditions (under the three indicators) not being considered for MYAP?

- Our analysis indicated that countries with high average prevalence for any indicator will contain regions where food insecurity is much worse than the national average. Moreover, regions within countries could not be ranked against each other in terms of food insecurity because comparable data on stunting, poverty and undernourishment are unavailable for all regions in all countries with current programs.

MYAPs Countries*	FFP Priority Country	Rank Order**	Weighted Ranking	% Stunted	Stunted Ranking	% Poverty	Poverty Ranking	% Under-nourished	Under-nourished Ranking
Zambia	√	1	4.1	46.8	5	63.7	3	49	2
Madagascar	√	2	4.3	48.3	4	61.0	4	37	7
Niger	√	3	6.5	41.1	7	60.6	5	34	8
Ethiopia	√	4	6.6	51.5	1	23.0	19	47	3
Malawi	√	5	6.7	49.0	3	41.7	13	33	10
Liberia (1) (3)	√	6	7.8	39.5	9	59.2	6	46	6
Uganda	√	7	8.2	39.1	10	84.9	1	19	19
Chad (1)	√	8	8.3	40.1	8	47.2	9	34	8
Guatemala	√	9	9.7	49.3	2	16.0	23	24	16
Bangladesh	√	10	9.9	44.7	6	36.0	17	30	12
Sierra Leone (3)	√	11	11.2	33.8	15	57.0	7	50	1
Burkina Faso	√	12	11.8	38.7	11	44.9	11	19	19
Mozambique	√	13	12.6	35.9	13	37.9	15	47	3
Haiti (2)	√	14	14.7	22.7	23	67.0	2	47	3
Mauritania	√	15	16.0	34.5	14	25.9	18	10	22
Benin (1)		16	16.4	30.7	16	37.3	16	15	20
Ghana		17	16.5	29.9	18	44.8	12	13	21
Indonesia (4)		18	16.7	38.0	12	7.5	24	6	23
Gambia (3)		19	17.0	23.0	22	53.7	8	27	14
Kenya		20	17.2	30.3	17	22.8	20	33	10
Guinea (1)		21	17.7	26.1	20	39.2	14	26	15
Nicaragua		22	18.7	20.2	24	45.1	10	28	13
Honduras		23	19.8	29.2	19	20.7	22	23	18
Senegal		24	20.5	24.7	21	22.3	21	24	16
Cape Verde (1) (3)		25	25.4	16.2	25	N/A	26	N/A	26

\* Includes countries with ongoing and approved MYAPs, as well as with one under consideration (Liberia). Excludes countries already in the process of MYAP phase out (India, Peru) and countries in which circumstances make it extremely difficult to continue Title II programs as planned (Mali, Rwanda, Tajikistan). An announcement on Bolivia will be made at a later date.

\*\* Rank order (1 to 32) is determined based on a weighted average of the country's ranking under 3 food insecurity indicators: % of children stunted (utilization), % of population living under \$1/day (access) and % of population undernourished (availability). The % stunted ranking contributed 60% to the need-based country rank, the % poor ranking contributed 30%, and the % undernourished ranking contributed 10%.

Source of data: Stunting from USAID's Data Online for Population, Health and Nutrition (DOLPHN) website <http://www.phnip.com/dolphn/>; % under \$1/day (PPP) from USAID's Center for Development Information and Evaluation Economic and Social Database (ESDB) website <http://esdb.cdie.org/cgi-bin2/broker.exe>; % undernourished from U.N. Millennium Development Goal Indicators Database website [http://millenniumindicators.un.org/unsd/mi/mi\\_goals.asp](http://millenniumindicators.un.org/unsd/mi/mi_goals.asp)

(1) No data on % population under \$1/day. % population under \$1/day estimated by regressing per capita gross national income (PCGNI) on proportion of the population under \$1/day (\$1/day).  $\$1/\text{day} = 1.247 - 0.321(\text{LogPCGNI})$ . Source for PCGNI: World Development Indicators database [web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/0,,contentMDK:20523710~menuPK:232599~pagePK:64133150~piPK:64133175~theSitePK:239419,00.html](http://web.worldbank.org/WBSITE/EXTERNAL/DATASTATISTICS/0,,contentMDK:20523710~menuPK:232599~pagePK:64133150~piPK:64133175~theSitePK:239419,00.html).

(2) % population under \$1/day from World Bank's International Development Association (IDA) website [http://ddp-ext.worldbank.org/ext/ddpreports/ViewSharedReport?REPORT\\_ID=2391&REQUEST\\_TYPE=VIEWADVANCED&HF=N&DD=N&WSP=N&XL=N](http://ddp-ext.worldbank.org/ext/ddpreports/ViewSharedReport?REPORT_ID=2391&REQUEST_TYPE=VIEWADVANCED&HF=N&DD=N&WSP=N&XL=N)

(3) Data on stunting from WHO Global Database on Child Growth and Malnutrition <http://www.who.int/nutgrowthdb/en/>

(4) Data on stunting from WHO Regional Office for South-East Asia <http://w3.whosea.org/nhd/indonesia1.htm>

March 1, 2006