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2021 achievements
Food Security Achievements 2021
January to December 2021

177.6M
PEOPLE IN NEED

125.9M
PEOPLE TARGETED

109.7M
PEOPLE REACHED

Reach 87%

This is not an indication of the “level of assistance”

FOOD ASSISTANCE

104.8M
PEOPLE TARGETED
Reach 88%

91.9M
PEOPLE REACHED

LIVELIHOOD ASSISTANCE*

59.8M
PEOPLE TARGETED
Reach 49%

28.6M
PEOPLE REACHED

41 Response Plans in 33 Countries
Only countries with HRP, ERP and/or Flash Appeal and an active Food Security Cluster/Sector

*Includes food transfers supporting livelihood assistance

In-kind 71%

In-kind 72%

CVA 27%

CVA 26%

Modality

Modality

Hybrid/Mixed 2%

Hybrid/Mixed 2%
**Percent reached populations**

Calculated against response plans targets

- **Over-reached**
  - Mozambique: 143%
  - Niger: 115%
  - Sudan: 114%
  - Haiti: 112%
  - Yemen: 107%
  - Bangladesh: 106%
  - Afghanistan: 106%
  - Colombia: 105%
  - Myanmar: 103%
  - Burundi: 102%
  - South Sudan: 98%
  - Honduras: 96%
  - Madagascar: 92%
  - CAR: 92%
  - Ethiopia: 91%
  - Palestine: 91%
  - Burundi: 88%
  - Cameroon: 87%
  - Overall: 87%
  - Somalia: 87%
  - Lebanon: 80%
  - Libya: 80%
  - DRC: 69%
  - Chad: 67%
  - Mali: 66%
  - Syria: 64%
  - Venezuela: 62%
  - Nigeria: 53%
  - Iraq: 48%
  - Ukraine: 36%
  - Zimbabwe: 34%

- **Under-reached**
  - Mozambique: 69%
  - Niger: 67%
  - Sudan: 66%
  - Haiti: 64%
  - Yemen: 62%
  - Bangladesh: 61%
  - Afghanistan: 60%
  - Colombia: 58%
  - Myanmar: 53%
  - Burundi: 52%
  - South Sudan: 51%
  - Honduras: 50%
  - Madagascar: 49%
  - CAR: 49%
  - Ethiopia: 49%
  - Palestine: 49%
  - Burundi: 48%
  - Cameroon: 48%
  - Overall: 48%
  - Somalia: 47%
  - Lebanon: 44%
  - Libya: 44%
  - DRC: 43%
  - Chad: 43%
  - Mali: 43%
  - Syria: 42%
  - Venezuela: 41%
  - Nigeria: 40%
  - Iraq: 39%
  - Ukraine: 36%
  - Zimbabwe: 34%

**Over-reaching is mostly due to changed operational environments and increased needs throughout the year, which was not followed by an official HRP / response plan revision.**

- **UKRAINE**
  - Limited humanitarian access in non-government-controlled areas and limited funding

- **IRAQ**
  - Limited livelihoods support for out of camp population

- **BANGLADESH**
  - Cox Bazaar
  - Host community households, although not part of the initial JRP targets, received one time food assistance during emergencies

- **AFGHANISTAN**
  - Flash Appeal targets were initial estimates while the needs increased during the year

- **HAITI**
  - Flash Appeal targets were initial estimates while the needs increased during the year

- **COLOMBIA**
  - Unforeseen humanitarian emergencies and the increase in the arrivals of the migrant population leading to increased FSC caseloads

- **NIGERIA**
  - Limited operational capacity of partners compared to official HRP targets and many hard to reach areas (due to security issue)

- **SUDAN**
  - IPC analysis revealed increased needs; operational targets were revised upwards

- **AFGHANISTAN**
  - Increased operational capacity of partners not foreseen during the HRP target definition

- **YEMEN**
  - Deterioration of the food security situation and increased operational plans of partners without official HRP revision

- **MOZAMBIQUE**
  - Increased displacement (notably following the attacks in Palma district in March) not reflected in a revised PiN or target

- **ZIMBABWE**
  - Most of the assistance is provided outside the HRP
**People reached against targets by domain**

**Clarifications on over-achievements:**
- Afghanistan: Flash Appeal targets were initial estimates.
- Burkina Faso: CH analysis revealed increased numbers of AFI people, operational targets were revised upwards.
- CAR: Higher reach is due to the deterioration of the socio-economic situation.
- Colombia: unforeseen humanitarian emergencies led to response in 7 departments not initially targeted in the HRP, and the increase in the arrivals of the migrant population due to the entry into force of the Temporary Statute of Protection of the Venezuelan population led to increased caseload under the RMRP.
- Cox’s Bazar: Host community households, although not part of the initial JRP targets, received one time food assistance during emergencies flood, fire, monsoon season and COVID-19 response.
- Haiti – Flash Appeal targets were initial estimates.
- Lebanon: pending verification.
- Myanmar: Increased operational capacity of partners not foreseen during the HRP target definition.
- Mozambique: increase displacement following attack on Palma.
- Niger: IPC/CH analyses revealed increased numbers of AFI people, operational targets were revised upwards.
- Somalia: FSC partners’ operational target for the main planting season (Gu, Feb-July 2021) was adjusted upwards compared to official HRP targets based on assessment of needs. This has driven the augmented response. Moreover, a further scale up was done in Nov/Dec 2021 to respond to the drought.
- Sudan – IPC analysis revealed increased numbers of AFI people, operational targets were revised upwards.
- Yemen: deterioration of FS situation and increase of operational plans for FSC partners, without an official HRP revision.

Overall, significant underperformance of the livelihood response compared to the food assistance one, mostly due to lack of funding for this response component.
The seemingly good performance for the food assistance component hides a major trade-off that is often observed in the FSC operations, i.e. the one between the number of people reached and the coverage of their needs (in terms of assistance package).

With the exception of Cox’s Bazar, Colombia, Iraq, Syria and Mali, the majority of the people assisted in the various countries did not receive enough assistance (as per plan / FSC standards), with ration cuts observed across the board.

Overall, significant underperformance of the livelihood response compared to the food assistance one, with 48% of the livelihood targets reached on average, vs 89% for food assistance. This is mostly due to lack of funding for this response component.

Only around a quarter of the FSC operations (8 out of 29) could reach more than 80% of their targets, while three quarters could do it for food assistance, with the divide between the two domains visible across different regions and operational contexts: Iraq, Libya, Syria, Palestine, Mali, Chad, Cameroon, South Sudan, Ethiopia, Mozambique, Madagascar, and Haiti.

Low investments into livelihood support will not strengthen the resilience of the population and therefore they will continue relying on food assistance in the coming years.
Main Challenges & Constraints
Hindering the delivery of food and livelihood assistance

Funding constraints are the main reason for under-delivery of assistance followed by operational and access challenges.

- **UKRAINE**: limited humanitarian access hampered response in non-government-controlled areas.
- **AFGHANISTAN**: IPC phase 3 and 4 people received 4 months half basket due to funding constraints.
- **ETHIOPIA**: fewer / infrequent distributions due to operational challenges meant that the caloric needs of crisis-affected populations could no be fully covered.
- **AFGHANISTAN**: IPC phase 3 and 4 people received 4 months half basket due to funding constraints.
- **VENEZUELA**: limited or lack of partners operational capacity in certain states was, together with limited funding, the reason for under-reaching.
- **SAHEL REGION**: in Burkina Faso, due to funding shortfalls, most of the reached people received reduced rations (50% in IPC 3 areas and 70% in IPC 4 and hard-to-reach areas), with only 23% receiving a full ration. In Niger, due to funding shortfalls, rations were reduced from 75% to 50%. The same happened in some locations in Nigeria, with rations (both in-kind and CVA) reduced from the recommended 70% to 50%. In Chad, only 20% of the reached people (IDPs) received full ration, while the rest received half-ration as lean season assistance due to resources shortage.
- **SUDAN**: only refugees and IDPs received a full ration, while other vulnerable groups only a half ration.
- **SUDAN**: only refugees and IDPs received a full ration, while other vulnerable groups only a half ration.
- **SOMALIA**: approximately 50% of the people reached with food assistance received the full ration, with the remaining receiving between half and three quarters of the ration.
- **YEMEN**: The fragile funding situation led partners to adjust the frequency of assistance to stretch available resources, such as providing it once every two months instead of every other month.
- **SUDAN**: due to funding constraints, some partners distributed half rations and/or with less frequency compared to cluster recommendations and standards.
- **MYANMAR**: the civil unrest and the difficulties in getting approvals for interventions and travel authorisations has led to delays in monthly programming as well as gaps in reaching targeted populations.
- **CAR**: the resurgence of conflict due to the presidential election impacted the first planting season, and most livelihood actors could not reach the beneficiaries.
- **SOUTH SUDAN**: ration cuts were needed in order to cover the caseload; the ration for refugees & POC residents (approx. 500k people) was reduced to the same level as the lean season ration for host communities – 50% (down from 100% in 2019) due to funding shortfalls.
2021 People Reached

Biggest operations by overall people reached in 2021

People reached by domain in 2021

- Food Assistance
- Livelihood Assistance

- Ethiopia: 16,417k
- Afghanistan: 13,877k
- Yemen: 13,197k
- Syria: 6,096k
- DRC: 5,460k
- Sudan: 5,079k
- South Sudan: 3,547k
- Somalia: 2,718k
- Myanmar: 2,563k
- Nigeria: 2,271k
- Burkina Faso: 2,203k
- Palestine: 2,050k
- Lebanon: 1,781k
- Colombia: 1,584k
- Haiti: 1,495k
- Chad: 1,304k
- Zimbabwe: 1,280k
- Bangladesh - Cox Bazar: 1,215k
- Mali: 1,172k
- Madagascar: 1,157k
- Mozambique: 1,079k
- Niger: 1,052k
- CAR: 962k
- Honduras: 672k
- Burundi: 481k
- Venezuela: 380k
- Cameroon: 334k
- Iraq: 191k
- Libya: 125k
- Ukraine: 20k
## Modality of Assistance in 2021 – Operations with highest % of CVA

### Percent by modality delivered for **Food Assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% CVA</th>
<th>% In-kind</th>
<th>% Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh - Cox Bazar</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Percent by modality delivered for **Livelihood Assistance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% CVA</th>
<th>% In-kind</th>
<th>% Hybrid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh - Cox Bazar</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAR</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRC</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lebanon</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% CVA</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% In-kind</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Hybrid</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overview of the Food Security
2021 funding
FSC Funding trends
2017 to 2021

% Funded

Funding Requirements

Funding Gap

Funding Received

2017 2018 2019 2020 2021

$4.10B $4.51B $5.50B $4.96B $6.15B

$2.90B $2.62B $2.79B $4.00B $8.17B

$7.00B $7.13B $8.29B $8.96B $14.32B

59% 63% 66% 55% 43%

Lower than the overall GHO funding 53%

Including funding under unspecified and multiple sectors

Extracted from 2021 FTS Sector funding data for all plans
2021 Funding situation of country-specific food security response plans

43% funded
when including all GHO response plans, including the regional ones

in 33 Countries
with an active Food Security Cluster/Sector and an HRP, ERP and/or Flash Appeal

$12.0B
FUNDING REQUIRED

$5.5B
FUNDING RECEIVED

FUNDED

Extracted from FTS for all plans (01 April 2022)