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Executive Summary

In 2021, the number of people suffering from acute hunger surpassed all previous records as reported by the 2022 Global Report on Food Crises (GRFC), with close to 193 million people acutely food insecure (IPC/CH Phase 3 and above or equivalent) in 53 countries and territories. In addition, some 236 million people were in conditions of Stressed (IPC/CH Phase 2 or equivalent) in 41 countries/territories, requiring action to prevent them from slipping into worse levels of acute food insecurity. Many of the drivers are not new. Conflict escalated or persisted in most of the major crises worldwide, economies struggled to recover from the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic and increasingly extreme weather events driven by climate change punished vulnerable households worldwide.

The war in Ukraine continues to roil global markets, creating more severe food security challenges, especially for low-income countries dependent on food imports and vulnerable population groups. According to the Mid-Year Update of the 2022 GRFC, by September 2022, up to 205 million people were facing acute food insecurity and in need of urgent assistance (IPC/CH Phase 3 and above or equivalent) in 45 countries. If additional data from latest available analysis of 2021 were included for 8 countries and territories, the total number would reach up to 222 million people in 53 countries/territories covered by the 2022 GRFC. The international community must better understand food crises and their structural causes, in order to reverse these trends.

Against this background, the Global Network Against Food Crises (GNAFC) is releasing a series of analytical products to help practitioners, policy makers and political leaders better understand food crises and support informed decision-making on investments, policies, and programmes. This second edition of the Financing Flows and Food Crises report serves as a companion piece to the Global Report on Food Crises by providing an evidence-based snapshot of humanitarian and development financing trends in food crisis contexts in the sectors of food, agriculture and nutrition, together with acute food insecurity data. A better understanding of financing trends, as covered by the report can help in informing decision making and in promote policy dialogues to ensure that the right sort of financing is in place at the right time to save lives and livelihoods and ultimately reduce food crises over time.

Key Findings

1. Against the landscape of global external assistance, where do food crises sit?

Addressing food crises remains a priority for the international community. Large contributions of humanitarian assistance and development assistance are channelled into food crisis countries, indicating that addressing immediate hunger alongside a growing recognition of the value of building longer-term resilience and strengthening of national food systems, remain at the top of the agenda of the international community.

Countries characterized by food crises absorb the largest volume of humanitarian financing, especially for what concerns humanitarian allocations to food sectors. Of all humanitarian assistance worldwide, 77 percent was absorbed by food crisis countries across all sectors with 43 percent of these resources are allocated food sectors. When only humanitarian assistance to food sectors is considered, food crisis countries absorbed 88 percent of the global allocation on average.

---

1 According to the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) and Cadre Harmonisé (CH) scale, population in Crisis or worse (IPC/CH Phase 3 and above or equivalent) refers to population classified in Crisis, IPC Phase 3, Emergency, IPC Phase 4 and Catastrophe/Famine, IPC Phase 5.

2 According to the Integrated Food Security Phase Classification (IPC) and Cadre Harmonisé (CH) scale, households are classified in IPC/CH Phase 2 “Stressed” when they have minimally adequate food consumption but are unable to afford some essential non-food expenditures without engaging in stress-coping strategies.
For what concerns development allocations to food sectors in food-crisis countries, 33 percent of all development assistance worldwide was absorbed by food crisis countries, with 11 percent of these resources is allocated for assistance to food sectors. When only development assistance to food sectors is considered, food crisis countries absorbed 46 percent of the global allocation on average.

2. **Why is it important to understand allocations to food crises?**

   Levels of acute food insecurity are outpacing financial allocations, despite the significant increase in humanitarian assistance over the past few years. However, humanitarian assistance per person has decreased.

   193 million people (IPC/CH Phase 3 and above or equivalent) in 53 countries and territories faced high levels of acute food insecurity in 2021, surpassing all previous record numbers reported by the six editions of the Global Report on Food Crises (GRFC). In the same year, humanitarian assistance to food sectors in these countries increased by 20 percent reaching a record USD 9.8 billion. However, humanitarian assistance per person in Crisis or worse (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above) has decreased by 40 percent from USD 85 per person in 2018 to USD 51 in 2021.

   On the other hand, development assistance to food sectors in food crisis countries decreased by almost 10 percent to USD 6.2 billion in 2020 (latest data available) from the previous year. This follows a steady increased from 2016-2019.

   Looking ahead, preliminary data for 2022 (as of September 2022) indicates that humanitarian allocations to food sectors in these countries is likely to increase further, with USD 8 billion already committed in the first three quarters of the year.

3. **Do populations at the tipping point of crises require a special focus?**

   While attention towards acute food insecurity commands vast majority of response and financing, populations in Stressed (IPC/CH Phase 2 or equivalent) face deepening food insecurity.

   In the 22 countries where there is consistent data on all IPC/CH phases across the years, the population in Stressed (IPC/CH Phase 2 or equivalent) conditions increased by almost 70 percent over the past six years. This increase was despite sustained levels of humanitarian assistance and consistent levels of development assistance, allocated to these countries.

   Food crisis countries account for a significant portion of population in Stressed (IPC/CH Phase 2 or equivalent) conditions requiring assistance to protect and sustain their livelihoods and build resilience so to avoid worsening levels of food insecurity and maintaining capacities to cope with shocks.

   Between 2016 and 2021, humanitarian and development allocations to food sectors in these countries remained constant.

4. **Allocations according to drivers of food crises: what are the priorities?**

   Food crises, where conflict and insecurity are the main drivers, absorb the largest share of both humanitarian and development assistance while also accounting for the majority of food insecure people. On the other hand, allocations to food crises where weather extremes is the key driver significantly decreased, although food insecurity levels remain significant.

   In 2021, 83 percent of humanitarian assistance to food sectors went to food crises driven by conflict and insecurity. This represented an increase of more than 35 percent compared to the previous year. Between 2020 and 2021, humanitarian allocation to food crises driven by economic shocks and weather extremes decreased by 44 and 25 percent, respectively, despite countries primarily affected by these two drivers were continuing to host a significant share of population in acute food insecurity.

---

3 Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Chad, Eswatini, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Yemen.
Development assistance continues to represent a significant source of financing in contexts characterized by conflict and insecurity. In 2020, 42 percent of all development allocations went to these countries. Those affected by economic shocks (including COVID-19-related economic impacts) witnessed a significant increase in development assistance (from USD 0.6 billion to USD 2.5 billion), while investments in countries affected by weather extremes decreased by almost 70 percent between 2019 and 2020.

5. Addressing immediate needs while protecting and strengthening livelihoods - Do allocations reflect an approach that seeks to ‘reduce and end need’?

Addressing immediate needs while tackling structural causes of acute food insecurity requires a holistic approach. Food assistance, agriculture/livelihoods assistance and nutritional assistance are equally important when supporting vulnerable populations in addressing their food needs, protecting their livelihoods and becoming self-reliant in terms of their food security. However, humanitarian and development allocations among food sectors show significant differences that require attention.

When considering the share of humanitarian allocations among food sectors, cash and in-kind food assistance is consistently the most-funded food sector (on average 84 percent of the humanitarian assistance to food sectors during 2016–2021), while nutrition, agriculture/livelihoods receive 13 and 4 percent of allocations, respectively.

On the other hand, in 2020 development assistance to agriculture absorbed over half of the development funding to food sectors in food crisis countries (nearly 60 percent between 2016 and 2020). In contrast, investments in social protection programmes and long-term household food security, rural development and basic nutrition, represented approximately 10 percent each.

6. Protracted crises represent a particular challenge. Are allocations able to address the root causes of food insecurity and break the cycle of hunger?

Protracted crises, characterized by recurrent natural disasters and/or conflict, longevity of food crises, breakdown of livelihoods and insufficient institutional capacity to react to the crises, receive substantial amounts of both humanitarian and development financing every year, but their acute food insecurity levels keep increasing.

Despite the protracted nature of such crises, humanitarian assistance remains the most significant source of funding. These countries have been receiving 75 percent of the total humanitarian assistance to food sectors (average 2016–2021) and 45 percent of the development assistance to food sectors (average 2016–2020).

Between 2016 and 2021, humanitarian agriculture/livelihoods assistance received a minimal share (4 percent of the humanitarian assistance to food sectors) compared to the other sectors of assistance (food assistance and nutrition assistance accounted for 83 percent and 13 percent of the humanitarian assistance to food sectors, respectively), despite its importance in sustaining productive capacities and building the resilience of communities to cope with the prolonged crisis, as well as additional shocks.

Although a large share of agriculture-related funding is part of development assistance, the longevity of these crises and the significant and prolonged levels of need point to the necessity of funding to address the underlying causes of food insecurity.

The Global Network will facilitate a series of strategic and policy discussions amongst all relevant stakeholders, to address the findings and analysis captured in this report, with a view to generating recommendations and concrete proposals for action across 2023.

This product is a global public good that seeks to inform policy development and further enhance evidence-based resourcing to address and prevent food crises.
External financing to food sectors

In 2021, humanitarian assistance to food sectors in food crisis countries/territories witnessed an increasing trend (+20 percent from the previous year and +10 percent from the previous five-year average). However, food insecurity continues to escalate and increase in severity, faster than humanitarian allocations. The latest data available for development assistance show a reduction in 2020 compared to the previous year. Despite the decrease, development assistance still represents a significant proportion of support to food sectors.

In 2021, humanitarian assistance to food sectors in the 53 countries and territories with food crises was USD 9.8 billion. This represents the highest allocation of humanitarian assistance recorded in the past six years. Acute food insecurity levels also reached the highest number with 193 million people facing high levels of acute food insecurity (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent) in the same 53 countries and territories, representing an increase of nearly 40 million people compared to the previous high in 2020. At the same time, latest data available on development assistance (for 2020) show that food sectors in the 50 countries and territories with food crises (excluding refugee crisis) received USD 6.2 billion (Figure 1).

After humanitarian assistance to food sectors in food crises decreased in 2019 and 2020, in 2021 it increased by almost 20%, from USD 8.3 billion in 2020 to USD 9.8 billion in 2021. This increase surpasses the previous record of 2018 in the aftermath of the 2017 famine in South Sudan, and risk of famine in northeastern Nigeria, Somalia and Yemen. The 2021 humanitarian allocation to food sectors increased “only” by 11 percent compared to the average of the previous five years (USD 8.8 billion for 2016–2020).

4 The global trend analysis of humanitarian and development assistance to food crises presented in the previous edition of the Financing Flow and Food Crisis report (2021) presented different amounts compared to the data in the current report. The reasons for the differences are technical refinements of the methodology and a revised methodological approach. In particular, the approach to extract and clean data has changed to increase the overall accuracy of the data presented. Moreover, data for each year were aligned to the geographical coverage of each edition of the GRFC, increasing the alignment between global estimates of acute food insecurity each year and humanitarian and development allocations to each country. Full details will be published in a separate methodological note to the analysis.

5 This increase must be interpreted with care, given that it can be attributed both a worsening acute food insecurity situation and a substantial (22 percent) expansion in the population analysed between 2020 and 2021.

6 Bangladesh (Cox’s Bazar), Egypt (Syrian refugees), Jordan (Syrian refugees), Lebanon (Syrian refugees) and Turkey (Syrian refugees) were excluded from the aggregates for development assistance to food sectors, and assistance for these five refugee contexts was included in the humanitarian assistance aggregates instead.
Figure 1: Number of people (million) in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above, humanitarian (2016-2021, USD billion) and development assistance (2016-2020, USD billion) to food sectors in food crisis countries and territories.

Source: FSIN and GNAFC for acute food insecurity data; GNAFC for data on humanitarian and development assistance based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS.
Humanitarian assistance to food sectors and acute food insecurity - Analysing humanitarian allocation to food sectors alongside acute food insecurity figures presented in the different editions of the GRFC shows that the increase in humanitarian assistance seen in 2021 has not kept pace with the number of people facing high levels of acute food insecurity. Since 2018, humanitarian assistance per person facing high levels of acute food insecurity has constantly decreased, from USD 85 per person in 2018 to USD 51 in 2021. In particular, in 2021 humanitarian allocation per capita decreased by 6 percent compared to 2020, and by almost 30 percent compared with the 2016–2020 average (USD 71 per person) (Figure 2).

Figure 2: Humanitarian assistance to food sectors per person facing high levels of acute food insecurity.

Per capita analysis does not take into consideration the different operational costs that might increase or decrease humanitarian disbursements depending on many factors (including type of assistance provided, logistic needs and access constraints).

Source: FSIN and GNAFC for acute food insecurity data; GNAFC for data on humanitarian and development assistance based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS.

The decrease in per capita allocation must be interpreted with care as the increase in acute food insecurity can be attributed to both a worsening acute food insecurity situation and a substantial expansion in the population analyzed, notably by 22 percent between 2020 and 2021.

Figure 3: Aggregate funding and requirements for food security and nutrition clusters in UN-coordinated response plans or appeals (2016–2021, USD billion).

Data reflects aggregate funding and requirements for the food security, agriculture, and nutrition clusters. Regional response plans data for 2021 is not complete and therefore share of met requirements might higher than presented in the graph.

Source: GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS)
Humanitarian requirements - In 2021, the volume of humanitarian assistance requested for the food sectors through the United Nations Appeals and Response Plans8 grew for the sixth consecutive year, reaching a new high of USD 16.8 billion (33 percent of the global humanitarian requirements to cover all response sectors). Between 2016 and 2021, humanitarian requirements for food sectors rose by almost 180 percent signifying increased humanitarian need. The total requirements almost tripled from USD 6.1 billion in 2016 to USD 16.8 billion in 2021. In particular, 2021 requirements increased by 90 percent compared to the average requirements of the previous 5 years (2016–2020). At the same time, the percentage of met requirements against the appeals and response plans showed a decreasing trend since 2019. In 2021, 47 percent of the food sector requirements were met, down from almost 70 percent in 2019 (Figure 3).

Humanitarian assistance to refugees crises - Given the unique characteristics of refugee contexts, the flows of humanitarian assistance to food sectors in these situations were disaggregated from those of other food crisis countries and territories. In 2021, USD 0.7 billion was allocated as humanitarian assistance to food sectors for the refugee response in five contexts: Bangladesh (Cox’s Bazaar), Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon (Syrian refugees), and Rwanda. This represented 6 percent of all humanitarian assistance to food sectors in the 53 food crisis contexts covered by the 2022 GRFC. Humanitarian assistance to food sectors for these populations has decreased since 2018, from USD 1.8 billion to USD 0.7 billion in 2021 – even though the number of acutely food-insecure people in refugee contexts has remained constant over the past 4 years (on average they represent 2 percent of the total number of people facing high levels of acute food insecurity (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent across all food crises) (Figure 1).

Development assistance to food sectors in food crisis countries - In 2020, the latest year for which data are available and in the middle of the global COVID-19 pandemic – the development assistance to food sectors decreased from USD 6.8 billion in 2019 to USD 6.2 billion (almost 10 percent decrease). In 2020, the increasing trend of development assistance to food sectors in food crises, which started in 2016, was halted. Compared to the average of the previous 4 years (USD 6.1 billion for 2016–2019), 2020 development assistance to food sectors looks stable with an increase of 1 percent.

Despite the decrease, development assistance to food sectors represents a substantive source of funding in food crisis countries. On average, development assistance represented around 40 percent of all external financing to food sectors in food crisis countries.

---

8 The UN appeals and Humanitarian Response Plans and Regional Plans are those plans coordinated by UN OCHA (or Regional refugee plans usually coordinated by UNHCR) which seek to provide a strategic approach to coordinating the planning, funding, implementation and monitoring of humanitarian response. Through this process, humanitarian actors come together to identify and prioritise humanitarian needs in major crises, noting likely scenarios in the future 12-month period, which are published in the Humanitarian Needs Overview updates, based on this, proposed assistance and funding requirements of UN agencies, national and international non-governmental organizations, and other humanitarian actors are prioritized and consolidated in the Humanitarian Response Plan or Regional Response Plan.
2022 Outlook

According to the Mid-Year Update of the 2022 GRFC, by September 2022, the population facing the three highest phases of acute food insecurity and in need of urgent assistance was estimated to reach up to 205.1 million in 45 countries, marking the direst acute hunger situation in the report’s six-year history. If additional data from latest available analysis of 2021 is included for 8 countries and territories, this number is estimated to reach up to 222 million people in 53 countries/territories covered by the 2022 GRFC.

Preliminary data show that, as of September 2022, the 2022 humanitarian assistance to food sectors in food crisis countries reached USD 8 billion between commitments and expenditures. A quarter of a year still needs to be reported, however, as of September 2022, humanitarian assistance to food sectors already surpassed the allocation made in 2016 and represents 80 percent of what was allocated in 2021.

Against this background, some countries have already increased their humanitarian allocation compared to 2021. Notably, humanitarian allocation to food sectors in response to the crisis in Ukraine skyrocketed from USD 7 million in 2021 to almost USD 550 million in 2022. Similarly, humanitarian allocation to food sectors in response to the crisis in Afghanistan increased more than 80 times. Moreover, humanitarian allocation to food sectors in Kenya doubled in the context of persistent drought, coupled with high commodity prices, poor trade conditions and high inflation heavily impacting food insecurity across the arid and semi-arid lands (ASAL) counties. Lastly, humanitarian allocations to food sectors increased by almost 25 percent in Ethiopia which is facing the cumulative effects of conflict, drought conditions and, macroeconomic challenges resulting in an increase in the acutely food-insecure population requiring humanitarian assistance in 2022.
External financing to 39 countries with constant food crises between 2016-2021

When comparing the 39 countries/territories that were consistently in food crisis in all six editions of the GRFC between 2016-2021, the number of people in Crisis or worse (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above) or equivalent almost doubled during this period – up from 94 million in 2016 to almost 180 million in 2021 (Figure 4). This increase across the six years of the GRFC, both in terms of absolute numbers and the percentage of the analysed population in these three highest acute food insecurity phases, reflects increased availability of acute food insecurity data, broader geographical coverage, revised population figures and deteriorating food security contexts in a number of countries.

The two graphs below (Figure 5) show humanitarian and development financing to the same 39 countries. These countries receive on average 90 percent of the total humanitarian assistance to food sectors in food crisis countries (average 2016-2021) and 85 percent of the development assistance (average 2016-2020). Moreover, humanitarian assistance follows the trend of acute food insecurity over the years, except for 2020, when needs increased by close to a third from 2019, while humanitarian allocation decreased instead by almost 10 percent.

Figure 4: Global number of people (million) in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above, and number of people (million) in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent in the 39 countries included in each GRFC edition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Countries</th>
<th>IPC/CH Phase 3+ or Above</th>
<th>Share of Population Analyzed Facing High Acute Food Insecurity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FSIN and GNAFC

---


10 The increase in acute food insecurity must be interpreted with care, given that it can be attributed to both a worsening acute food insecurity situation and increase in geographical coverage of food security analysis at country level. For more information on comparability issues at country level, please refer to the technical note of the 2022 GRFC (page 227-228).
Figure 5: Development and humanitarian assistance (USD billion) included in all GRFC editions to food crises, and development and humanitarian assistance (USD billion) to the 39 countries included in each GRFC edition.

Source: GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS data)
Of the 39 countries consistently in food crisis in all six editions of the GRFC, 22 have consistent data on population facing Stressed (IPC/CH Phase 2) levels of acute food insecurity.\footnote{Afghanistan, Burkina Faso, Chad, Eswatini, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Lesotho, Liberia, Madagascar, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Yemen.} The chart below (Figure 6) shows the number of people in IPC/CH Phase 2 and 3 or above, as well as development and humanitarian allocations for these 22 countries across the 6 years. Even if the population analysed has increased, the number of people and prevalence of both in IPC/CH Phase 2 and 3 or above have increased. The increase was despite the sustained levels of humanitarian assistance and consistent levels of development assistance allocated to these countries.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure6.png}
\caption{Number of people in IPC/CH Phase 2 and 3 or above (million), and humanitarian and development assistance (USD billion) to the 22 countries with consistent data for IPC/CH 2 in each GRFC edition.}
\end{figure}

\textbf{For what concerns data on acute food insecurity, there may be comparability issues when population analysed varied year on year at country level.}

\textbf{Source:} FSIN and GNAFC for acute food insecurity data, GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS data) for humanitarian and development assistance data.
External financing to food sectors put into context

When all sectors are considered, development allocations to food crisis countries are much larger than humanitarian assistance. However, when analysing the breakdown of funding allocations for food sectors to these countries, specifically, 44% of all humanitarian funding and only 11% of development financing is allocated to food sectors.

The analysis presented in this report focuses on disbursements to food sectors in countries and territories with food crises covered by the GRFC. However, to provide a comprehensive overview of the financial landscape globally and in food crisis countries and territories, these numbers need to be compared to overall humanitarian and development disbursements globally.

Looking at the countries included in the 2022 GRFC and accounting for all sectors, on average 77 percent (USD 21 billion per year, average 2016–2021) of global humanitarian assistance and 33 percent (USD 58 billion per year, average 2016–2020) of the total development assistance is allocated to food crisis countries (Figure 7). Thus, food crisis countries absorb proportionally larger shares of total humanitarian allocations compared to development assistance. However, in absolute numbers, development allocations are significantly larger than humanitarian ones.

Considering only assistance to food sectors, food crises absorb 88 percent of global humanitarian allocations to food sectors, and 44 percent of global development allocations to food sectors.

In food crisis countries, humanitarian assistance to food sectors represents on average 43 percent of the total humanitarian assistance. The other 56 percent is shared among the other sectors (e.g. health, education, camp coordination and management, WASH, shelter, protection, logistics and emergency telecommunications) (Figure 7).

In food-crisis countries, development assistance to food sectors represents on average 11 percent of the total development assistance to these countries. The other 89 percent is shared among the other sectors (e.g. government and civil society, infrastructure and services, energy, banking and financial services, industry, trade, industry, health and education) (Figure 7).
Figure 7: Global humanitarian and development assistance to food sectors in food crises (average 2016-2020, USD billion).

Source: GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS data).
External financing by main driver of food crises

In 2021, humanitarian assistance to food sectors was mostly directed to food crises driven by conflict and insecurity, with an increasing trend compared to the previous year (humanitarian allocation to these countries increased by 35 percent between 2020 and 2021). At the same time, humanitarian allocation to food crises driven by economic shocks and weather extremes decreased (−44 and −25 percent between 2020 and 2021, respectively) despite countries primarily affected by these two major drivers continuing to host a significant share of population facing high levels of acute food insecurity. Food crises driven by conflict and insecurity were also the main recipients of development assistance in 2020, representing 42 percent of all development allocations to food crisis countries. However, 2020 witnessed a significant increase in development assistance to food sectors in countries affected by economic shocks, which include COVID-19-related economic impacts.

The GRFC aims to identify the most prominent driver of acute food insecurity within each country and territory every year. However, these drivers are often interlinked and mutually reinforcing, making it difficult to identify a single trigger. In 2021, the three primary drivers of acute food insecurity were (i) conflict and insecurity, (ii) weather extremes and (iii) economic shocks (Figure 8). This section analyses these drivers to determine how humanitarian and development financing is allocated. However, the analysis should be interpreted considering the interconnectedness among different drivers and the difficulty in distinguishing the influence of individual drivers on food security outcomes.
At the same time, humanitarian allocation to food crises driven by economic shocks and weather extremes decreased. Between 2020 and 2021, allocations to food crises driven by economic shocks dropped by 44 percent (from USD 0.7 billion to USD 0.4 billion) (Figure 9). At the same time acute food insecurity levels also decreased – from 40.5 million people facing high levels of acute food insecurity (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent) in 17 countries in 2020, to 30.2 million people in 21 countries in 2021 (Figure 8).

Related to food crises mainly driven by weather extremes, humanitarian allocations dropped by 25 percent between 2020 and 2021 (from USD 1.6 billion to USD 1.2 billion) (Figure 9). However, acute food insecurity levels driven by weather extremes increased, from 15.7 million people facing high levels of acute food insecurity (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent) in 15 countries in 2020, to 23.5 million people in eight countries in 2021 (Figure 8).

In terms of development assistance, in 2020, conflict-affected countries received approximately USD 2.6 billion, representing 42 percent of all allocations to food crisis countries. However, 2020 witnessed a significant increase in development assistance to food sectors in countries affected by economic shocks (including COVID-19-related economic impacts). Assistance to countries affected by economic shocks went from USD 0.6 billion in 2019 to USD 2.5 billion in 2020. At the same time, development assistance to food sectors of countries affected by weather extremes decreased by almost 70 percent between 2019 and 2020 (from USD 3.3 billion to 1.1 billion) (Figure 8).

Many food crises are the result of multiple drivers. The infographic is based on the predominant driver in each country/territory as per GRFC. Economic shocks include the indirect impact of COVID-19 in 2020 and 2021.

Source: FSIN and GNAFC.
Figure 9: Humanitarian (2018-2021, USD billion) and development assistance (2018-2020, USD billion) to food crisis countries and territories, by key driver.

Many food crises are the result of multiple drivers. The infographic is based on the predominant driver in each country/territory as per GRFC. Economic shocks include the indirect impact of COVID-19 in 2020 and 2021.

Source: GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS data) for humanitarian and development assistance data.
External financing by food sector

In 2021, humanitarian food assistance (cash and in-kind) continued to represent the largest sector of humanitarian allocations to food sectors (83 percent), with humanitarian assistance to nutrition and agriculture/livelihoods remaining proportionally lower (13 and 4 percent, respectively). At the same time, agricultural development assistance remained the largest sector (59 percent) for what concerns development funding in 2020. Development food assistance, which is intended for social protection programmes and long-term household food security, was the second most-funded sector in 2020 (12 percent), followed by rural development and basic nutrition assistance (around 10 percent each).

In 2021, humanitarian assistance to cash or in-kind food assistance comprised 83 percent of all humanitarian assistance to food sectors (USD 8.1 billion). Food assistance was consistently the most-funded food sector in all 6 years of analysis, even if relative share terms decreased by 5 percent during 2016–2021. Humanitarian assistance to agriculture and livelihoods represented 4 percent of all humanitarian assistance to food sectors in 2021 (USD 385 million), increasing by more than 55 percent since 2016. Countries and territories with food crises received nearly USD 1.3 billion in 2021 for nutrition, or 13 percent of the total humanitarian allocation to food sectors (Figure 10).

The increase in absolute terms of humanitarian assistance to food sectors between 2020 and 2021 included an increase of 15 percent of allocations to cash and in-kind food assistance and of 35 percent in nutrition allocations. At the same time, allocations to agriculture and livelihoods increased only by 1 percent.

Development assistance to agriculture amounted to USD 3.7 billion in 2020, or 59 percent of development funding to food crises. Development food assistance, intended for social protection programmes and long-term household food security, was the second most-funded sector in 2020, receiving 12 percent of assistance to food sectors (USD 0.8 billion). Rural development and basic nutrition were the other sectors to receive the most funding, with 11 percent (USD 0.7 billion) and 8 percent (USD 0.5 billion), respectively (Figure 10).

In absolute terms of development assistance to food sectors between 2019 and 2020, there was an average decrease of 20 percent in allocations to development food assistance, rural development and basic nutrition, while of 10 percent in the allocation to agriculture.

---

12 The previous edition of the Financing Flow and Food Crisis report (2021) presented a different breakdown for what concerns humanitarian assistance to food sectors. Specifically, humanitarian agriculture/livelihood assistance had a larger proportion of humanitarian allocations. The reason behind the decrease presented in the current edition of the report lies in a technical revision of the methodology to extract and clean OCHA FTS data, related to an update to the assigned global cluster for FTS flows, and an update to manual inclusion and keyword search methodologies used to aggregate data.
Figure 10: Humanitarian (2016-2021, USD billion) and development assistance (2016-2020, USD billion) to food crisis countries and territories, by sector.

Source: GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS data) for humanitarian and development assistance data.
According to the 2017 State of Food and Nutrition Security in the World report, protracted crises are "characterized by recurrent natural disasters and/or conflict, longevity of food crises, breakdown of livelihoods and insufficient institutional capacity to react to the crises".

More specifically, to establish that a country is experiencing a protracted crisis, it needs to meet three criteria:

- Longevity of the crisis: the country has faced a shock – either natural or human-induced – for four consecutive years during 2018–2021, or for eight out of ten years during 2012–2021, and is listed among countries requiring external assistance for food.
- Humanitarian aid flow to the country: it has received more than 10 percent of total external financing in the form of international humanitarian assistance during 2012–2020.
- Economic and food security status of the country: it is among the low-income food-deficit countries (LIFDCs), as defined by FAO in 2021.

In 2022, 20 countries met the above three criteria: Afghanistan, Burundi, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Haiti, Liberia, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen and Zimbabwe. All of them were also affected by food crises in 2021, although no data were available for acute food insecurity in the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Eritrea.

Between 2016 and 2021, on average, 66 percent of the people facing high levels of acute food insecurity (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent) across food crises worldwide were in countries experiencing protracted crises. These countries have been receiving 75 percent of the total humanitarian assistance to food sectors (average 2016–2021) and 45 percent of the development assistance to food sectors (average 2016–2020). While humanitarian and development assistance to food sectors in these countries remained consistent across the years, levels of acute food insecurity steadily increased since 2016 and notably increased by almost 30 percent between 2020 and 2021 (Figure 11).
The average allocations of humanitarian and development financing to food sectors show that countries in protracted crisis keep receiving substantial amounts of financing. However, average food insecurity levels kept increasing. On average, each protracted crisis received around USD 310 million for humanitarian food assistance, USD 17 million for humanitarian agriculture/livelihood assistance, USD 48 million for humanitarian nutrition assistance and USD 153 million in development assistance to food sectors. Despite these stable allocations across years, average levels of acute food insecurity went from 3.8 million people facing high levels of acute food insecurity (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent) per country in 2016 to 7.5 million per country in 2021, an almost 100 percent increase (Figure 12).

Figure 13 brings additional granularity on four different protracted crises. The Central African Republic, Chad, Somalia and Yemen have been consistently reported in the six editions of the GRFC. Over the past six years all of them faced generally increasing acute food insecurity levels (despite some decreases observed punctually from one year to the other in all the four countries).

On average, the four countries received sustained levels of humanitarian assistance throughout the years and the proportions between humanitarian and development assistance to food sectors have been skewed towards humanitarian financing in all four countries and across the years: humanitarian assistance in Yemen is 13 times higher than development assistance, 7 times higher in Somalia and the Central African Republic, and 3 times higher in Chad.

Moreover, across the four countries, humanitarian food assistance receives almost 80 percent of the humanitarian assistance within the food sectors. For what concerns development assistance, agriculture-related allocations have the largest share on average. However, in many cases, the amount allocated to agriculture is lower than development allocations directly supporting food security (e.g. social protection schemes).
Figure 12: Average number of people in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above in protracted crises (million), and average humanitarian and development assistance (USD million) to protracted crises, 2016-2021.

Source: FSIN and GNAFC for acute food insecurity data, GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS data) for humanitarian and development assistance data.
Figure 13: Number of people (million) in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above in 2021, average humanitarian assistance to food sectors per year (USD million) between 2016 and 2021, and average development assistance to food sectors per year (USD million) between 2016 and 2020, in Yemen, Somalia, Central African Republic and Chad.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>People facing high levels of acute food insecurity (USD) in 2021</th>
<th>Average humanitarian assistance to food sectors per year (USD) between 2016 and 2021</th>
<th>Average development assistance to food sectors per year (USD) between 2016 and 2020</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>16.1 M</td>
<td>86% food assistance, 12% nutrition assistance, 2% agriculture/livelihoods assistance</td>
<td>45% development food assistance, 25% nutrition assistance, 20% rural development assistance, 8% agriculture assistance, 2% other sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>3.5 M</td>
<td>77% food assistance, 12% nutrition assistance, 11% agriculture/livelihoods assistance</td>
<td>35% agriculture assistance, 28% development food assistance, 23% other sectors, 7% rural development assistance, 7% nutrition assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td>2.3 M</td>
<td>77% food assistance, 12% nutrition assistance, 11% agriculture/livelihoods assistance</td>
<td>35% development food assistance, 26% nutrition assistance, 24% agriculture assistance, 13% rural development assistance, 2% other sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>1.8 M</td>
<td>77% food assistance, 20% nutrition assistance, 3% agriculture/livelihoods assistance</td>
<td>50% agriculture assistance, 29% development food assistance, 10% rural development assistance, 10% nutrition assistance, 1% other sectors</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: FSIN and GNAFC for acute food insecurity data, GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS data) for humanitarian and development assistance data.
In 2021, the Eurasia region (comprising Eastern Europe, Middle East and South Asia)\(^\text{13}\) accounted for 31 percent of the total number of acutely food-insecure people in need of urgent assistance (IPC Phase 3 or above) globally (60.5 million comprising 0.4 million in Eastern Europe, 31.4 million in the Middle East and 28.7 million in South Asia). It was also the largest recipient of humanitarian assistance to food sectors, with USD 4.7 billion allocated to food crises in the region in 2021 (USD 7 million in Eastern Europe, USD 3.5 billion in the Middle East and USD 1.2 billion in South Asia). In terms of development assistance, the latest data show that Eurasia received USD 657 million in 2020 (USD 41 million in Eastern Europe, USD 173 million in the Middle East and USD 443 million in South Asia), becoming the fourth largest recipient region of development assistance to food sectors.

East Africa\(^\text{14}\) was the second largest recipient of humanitarian assistance to food sectors in 2021, with USD 2.8 billion allocated in 2021. That same year, there were 43.6 million acutely food-insecure people in need of urgent assistance (IPC Phase 3 or above), accounting for more than 23 percent of the total number globally. This region was also the largest recipient of development assistance to food sectors in 2020, with USD 2.2 billion invested.

West Africa and the Sahel (including Libya and Cameroon)\(^\text{15}\) received the third greatest amount of humanitarian assistance to food sectors in 2021, at almost USD 1 billion. In 2021, the number of people facing high levels of acute food insecurity in West Africa and the Sahel reached the highest for the region in the GRFC’s 6-year existence as 30.4 million people faced high levels of acute food insecurity (CH Phase 3 or above) accounting for 16 percent of the total number globally. These countries also received USD 1.9 billion in development assistance to food sectors in 2020 and the region was the second largest recipient of development assistance to countries and territories with food crises.

---

13 Eastern Europe includes Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine; Middle East includes Iraq, Palestine, Syrian Arab Republic, Yemen and Syrian refugees in Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon; and South Asia includes Afghanistan, Bangladesh (Cox’s Bazar) and Pakistan (Balochistan, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Sindh).

14 Including Burundi, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, Rwanda (refugees), Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan and Uganda.

15 Including Benin, Burkina Faso, Cameroone, Chad, Côte d’Ivoire, Gambia, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Libya, Mali, Mauritania, Niger, Nigeria (21 states and FCT), Senegal and Sierra Leone.
Central and Southern Africa\textsuperscript{16} received the lowest amount of humanitarian assistance to food sectors of any region in Africa in 2021, at USD 1 billion. However, the number of acutely food-insecure people in need of urgent assistance (IPC Phase 3 or above) was the highest on the continent, at 45.6 million, accounting for 24 percent of the total number globally. In terms of development assistance, Central and Southern Africa was the third largest recipient in Africa and the world, receiving USD 1.2 billion in development assistance to food sectors in 2020.

Latin America and the Caribbean\textsuperscript{17} received USD 202 million in humanitarian assistance to food sectors in 2021, despite being home to 12.8 million acutely food-insecure people in need of urgent assistance (IPC Phase 3 or above) – or 7 percent of the total number globally. This region received nearly USD 271 million in development assistance to food sectors in 2020.

\textsuperscript{16} Including Angola, Central African Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Eswatini, Lesotho, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, United Republic of Tanzania, Zambia and Zimbabwe.
\textsuperscript{17} Including El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras and Nicaragua.
Figure 14: Number of people (million) in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above and humanitarian assistance (USD) in 2021, and development assistance (USD) in 2020 by region.

- **Population in acute food insecurity (million people)**
  - Latin America and the Caribbean: 12.8 M
  - Eastern Europe: 31.4 M
  - Western Africa: 30.4 M
  - Central and Southern Africa: 45.6 M
  - East Africa: 43.6 M
  - Middle East: 28.7 M
  - South Asia: 28.7 M

- **Humanitarian assistance (USD)**
  - Latin America and the Caribbean: USD 0.2 billion
  - Eastern Europe: USD 7 million
  - Western Africa: USD 1 billion
  - Central and Southern Africa: USD 1 billion
  - East Africa: USD 2.8 billion
  - Middle East: USD 3.5 billion
  - South Asia: USD 1.2 billion

- **Development assistance (USD)**
  - Latin America and the Caribbean: USD 0.3 billion
  - Eastern Europe: USD 41 million
  - Western Africa: USD 1.9 billion
  - Central and Southern Africa: USD 1.2 billion
  - East Africa: USD 2.2 billion
  - Middle East: USD 0.2 billion
  - South Asia: USD 0.4 billion

*Regional grouping used in the Global Report on Food Crises.*

*Source:* FSIN and GNAFC for acute food insecurity data, GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS data) for humanitarian and development assistance data.
In 2021, the ten largest recipients of humanitarian assistance to food sectors were Yemen (USD 1.5 billion), Syrian Arab Republic (USD 1.3 billion), Afghanistan (USD 0.9 billion), Ethiopia (USD 0.9 billion), South Sudan (USD 0.7 billion), Somalia (USD 0.6 billion), Democratic Republic of the Congo (USD 0.5 billion), Sudan (USD 0.4 billion), Nigeria (USD 0.3 billion) and Palestine (USD 0.2 billion).

In 2021, humanitarian assistance to the ten countries represented almost 75 percent of all humanitarian assistance to food sectors in the 53 food crisis countries and territories. The remaining 25 percent was split among the other 43 food crisis countries and territories.

Out of these ten countries, six recorded increases in humanitarian assistance between 2020 and 2021: Yemen (+42 percent), Syrian Arab Republic (+54 percent), Afghanistan (+296 percent), Palestine (+72 percent), Ethiopia (+41 percent) and Somalia (+16 percent).

Among the ten largest recipients of humanitarian assistance, decreases in humanitarian disbursements were reported in South Sudan (−12 percent), Democratic Republic of the Congo (−5 percent), Sudan (−23 percent) and Nigeria (−9 percent).

When 2021 humanitarian allocations are compared to the previous 5-year average, South Sudan, Nigeria, Somalia and Sudan reported decreases (−22, −18, −10 and −6 percent, respectively). Notable increases were reported in Afghanistan (+400 percent), Palestine (+45 percent), Democratic Republic of the Congo (+40 percent) Ethiopia (+33 percent), Syrian Arab Republic (+17 percent) and Yemen (+12 percent).

**Figure 15: Ten largest recipients of humanitarian assistance to food sectors in 2021 (USD billion), variations of humanitarian allocations between 2020 and 2021 (USD million), and number of people (million) in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above in 2021.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2020-2021 Variation (USD million, %)</th>
<th>2021 Number of People Facing High Levels of Acute Food Insecurity (million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yemen</td>
<td>▲ 440 (+42%)</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>▲ 455 (+54%)</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>▲ 708 (+296%)</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>▲ 255 (+41%)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sudan</td>
<td>▼ -98 (-12%)</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somalia</td>
<td>▲ 85 (+16%)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>▼ -24 (-5%)</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>▼ -109 (-23%)</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>▼ -34 (-9%)</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palestine</td>
<td>▲ 98 (+72%)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: FSIN and GNAFC for acute food insecurity data, GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS data).*
In 2020, the ten largest recipients of development assistance to food sectors were Ethiopia (USD 751 million), Kenya (USD 638 million), Niger (USD 326 million), Uganda (USD 317 million), Nigeria (USD 287 million), Afghanistan (USD 273 million), Burkina Faso (USD 239 million), Democratic Republic of the Congo (USD 198 million), Mali (USD 197 million) and Malawi (USD 191 million).

In 2020, development assistance to the ten countries represented more than 50 percent of all development assistance to food sectors in the 50 food crisis countries and territories. The remaining 50 percent was split among the other 39 food crisis countries and territories.

Out of these ten countries, six recorded an increase in development assistance between 2019 and 2020: Ethiopia (+7 percent), Niger (+37 percent), Uganda (+41 percent), Malawi (+9 percent), Burkina Faso (+18 percent) and Democratic Republic of the Congo (+19 percent).

Among the ten largest recipients of development assistance, decreases in development disbursements were reported in Kenya (−9 percent), Nigeria (−35 percent), Afghanistan (−10 percent) and Mali (−34 percent).

When 2020 development allocations are compared to the previous 4-year average (2016–2019), only four countries reported a decrease: Nigeria (−17 percent), Afghanistan (−26 percent) Mali (−21 percent), and Malawi (−14 percent). All the other countries had increases in development allocations – notably Kenya (+76 percent), Niger (+46 percent) and Uganda (+37 percent).

**Figure 16: Ten largest recipients of development assistance to food sectors in 2020 (USD billion), variations of development allocations between 2019 and 2020 (USD million).**

- Development assistance to food sectors in 2020 (USD billion)
- 2020-2021 variation (in USD million and %)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Development Assistance (USD billion)</th>
<th>Variation 2020-2021 (in USD million)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>▲ 47 (+7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>▼ -63 (-9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>▲ 88 (+37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>▲ 91 (+41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>▼ -153 (-35%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghanistan</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>▼ -30 (-10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>▲ 37 (18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of Congo</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>▲ 31 (19%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>▼ -101 (-34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>▲ 15 (9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: GNAFC (based on OECD CRS data).
External financing to ten countries with the highest levels of acute food insecurity in 2021

The ten food crises with the highest number of people facing high levels of acute food insecurity (Democratic Republic of the Congo, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Yemen, Nigeria, Syrian Arab Republic, Sudan, South Sudan, Pakistan and Haiti) absorbed 70 percent of the total humanitarian assistance to food crises (2021), and 34 percent of the total development assistance (2020). At the same time, these countries hosted almost 70 percent of the people with high levels of acute food insecurity (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above or equivalent) worldwide in 2021.

Among these ten countries, eight were also in the top recipient list for humanitarian assistance in 2021 (Democratic Republic of the Congo, Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Yemen, Nigeria, Syrian Arab Republic, Sudan and South Sudan) and four were in the top recipient list for development assistance (Ethiopia, Afghanistan, Nigeria and Democratic Republic of the Congo).

All countries witnessed an increase in acute food insecurity levels between 2020 and 2021 (with the exception of the Syrian Arab Republic for which numbers of people facing high levels of acute food insecurity slightly reduced). At the same time, four countries had a significant increase in humanitarian allocations (Afghanistan, Ethiopia, Yemen and Syrian Arab Republic), two countries witnessed a slight increase (Pakistan and Haiti) and four countries showed a decrease (Democratic Republic of the Congo, Nigeria, Sudan and South Sudan).

Figure 16: Number of people (million) in IPC/CH Phase 3 or above and humanitarian assistance (USD billion) 2020-2021, and development assistance (USD billion) 2020, in the ten countries/territories with the highest number of people in Crisis or worse (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above) or equivalent in 2021.

Source: FSIN and GNAFC for acute food insecurity data, GNAFC (based on OCHA FTS and OECD CRS data) for humanitarian and development assistance data.
Annex 1 - Glossary of terms

**Acute food insecurity**
Acute food insecurity is any manifestation of food insecurity at a specific point in time that is severe enough to threaten lives, livelihoods or both – regardless of the causes, context or duration. These acute states are highly susceptible to change and can manifest in a population within a short period due to shocks or sudden changes that impact food availability, access, utilization or stability. Transitory food insecurity is a short-term or temporary inability to meet food requirements related to sporadic crises, indicating a capacity to recover.

In this report, acute food insecurity data refer to the highest numbers of acutely food-insecure people in each year, as published in the six editions of the GRFC covering 2016–2021. In particular, the analysis focuses on the number of people in Crisis or worse (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above). Populations in Crisis (IPC/CH Phase 3), Emergency (IPC/CH Phase 4) and Catastrophe (IPC/CH Phase 5) are in need of urgent food, nutrition and livelihood assistance.

**Food Crisis**
A food crisis occurs when acute food insecurity and malnutrition rates rise sharply at the local or national level, creating the need for emergency food assistance. This definition distinguishes a food crisis from chronic food insecurity, although food crises are more likely among populations already suffering from prolonged food insecurity and malnutrition. A food crisis is usually set off by a shock or combination of shocks that affect one or more of the pillars of food security: food availability, food access, food utilization and food stability.

In terms of country selection, the report is aligned with the geographical coverage of each edition of the GRFC, which is based on specific country selection criteria. List of country coverage for each year is provided in annex.

**Drivers of food crises**
The drivers of food crises are often interlinked and mutually reinforcing, making it difficult to pinpoint the specific trigger or driver of each crisis. This analysis refers to the same drivers identified in the 2022 GRFC by estimating which were the most relevant in each country or territory out of the following categories:

- **Conflict/insecurity**: includes interstate and intrastate conflicts, internal violence, banditry and criminality, civil unrest and political crises, which can lead to population displacements.
- **Weather extremes**: include droughts, floods, dry spells, storms, cyclones, hurricanes, typhoons and untimely start of rainy seasons.
- **Economic shocks**: affect food insecurity of individuals or households in many ways. Macroeconomic shocks (including those stemming from COVID-19 containment measures), such as currency depreciation and high inflation, triggering increases in production costs and food prices, and worsening terms of trade all tend to coincide with increases in acute food insecurity.

18 In the GRFC 2022, the criteria for country selection are listed on pp.13-14 of the report and include (i) countries/territories that requested external assistance for food and/or faced shocks as assessed by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations Global Information and Early Warning System (FAO-GIEWS) in 2021 or at least once in the past 3 years or at least 3 years in the past 10 years and (ii) low- or middle-income countries/territories that did not meet FAO-GIEWS criteria, but requested external assistance as a result of hosting refugee populations who were assisted by UNHCR and WFP or having over 1 million or at least 20% of its population forcibly displaced, or having populations affected by conflict and insecurity, weather extremes and/or economic shocks. Countries were excluded if they were high-income countries, if they did not ask for FAO or WFP assistance or if the shocks had little impact on food security.
External financing

In the report, the term “external financing” refers to both data on development assistance to food sectors (excluding data reported as humanitarian assistance) extracted from the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance Committee (DAC) Creditor Reporting System (CRS) and data on humanitarian assistance to food sectors extracted from the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) Financial Tracking Service (FTS). Unless otherwise specified, the humanitarian assistance totals presented in the report refer only to assistance for food sectors.

Although this analysis covers humanitarian and development assistance data, it is important to note that it does not consider other important resources such as domestic resources, foreign direct investments and private-sector financing.

Humanitarian assistance

Humanitarian assistance is intended to save lives, alleviate suffering and maintain human dignity during and after human-made crises and natural disasters, as well as to prevent and strengthen preparedness for such situations. This assistance should be governed by the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality and independence.

Unless otherwise specified, the total of humanitarian assistance presented in the report refer only to assistance for food sectors. Humanitarian assistance to food sectors includes allocations aimed at improving or safeguarding food security by providing cash or in-kind food assistance, agriculture and livelihoods support, as well as allocations to improve and safeguard nutrition and health. Humanitarian agriculture and livelihoods support covers a broad range of activities that specifically aim to save lives and safeguard livelihoods ahead of, during and immediately after crises. These include as providing livestock feed, water and healthcare to keep animals alive and productive, fishing nets and other equipment to restore fishing livelihoods after a destructive storm, or quality seeds, tools and fertilizers when a season is threatened by disaster. These totals comprise the sum of commitments and paid contributions for humanitarian action spent outside donor countries as reported to the OCHA FTS – including those from non-official resource partners (e.g. private donors). They exclude domestic responses by national governments. The FTS data were cross-checked against development assistance from the OECD CRS to avoid duplication and presented in United States dollars (2020 constant prices).

Compared to the 2021 edition of the report, the methodology to calculate humanitarian assistance to food sectors has been revised. A new approach was used in the curation of the FTS dataset for food sectors analysis resulting in a deflated dataset, with queries performed by year. This updated approach results in differences based on sector and annual split of FTS financial flows, together with an updated methodology to reduce double-counting of flows at country level. Moreover, custom cluster mapping to allocate flows to an IASC global cluster was used.

Development assistance

Development assistance is referred to as “flows to countries and territories on the DAC list of official development assistance recipients [...] provided by official agencies and administered with the promotion of the economic development and welfare of developing countries as its main objective; and [that] are concessional in character”.

Amounts of development assistance presented in the report include allocations to agriculture, basic nutrition, development food assistance, fishing, forestry, rural development and school feeding, as well as additional sectors such as food safety and quality, food security policy and administrative management, and household food security programmes. Among them, development food assistance supports lasting physical assets or human capital that benefit poor, food-insecure households and their communities. It is intended for social protection programmes and long-term household food security. These totals correspond to the sum of disbursements spent outside donor countries as reported in the OECD DAC CRS, excluding flows reported as humanitarian assistance. Estimates of development assistance include flows categorized as “grants”, “loans”, and “equity investments”. The CRS data were cross-checked against humanitarian assistance from the OCHA FTS to avoid duplication. Monetary amounts are presented in United States dollars (constant 2020 prices).
Annex 2 - Geographical coverage of the analysis by year


2017 – as per GRFC 2018, 51 countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh (South Central & Cox’s Bazar), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti (rural areas), Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iraq, Kenya, Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar (southern and southeastern), Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Myanmar (selected areas), Namibia, Nepal (selected areas), Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria (Northern), Pakistan (4 districts in the Sindh province), Palestine, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Africa, South Sudan, Sri Lanka (ten affected districts), Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, United Republic of Tanzania, Uganda, Ukraine (Luhans and Donetsk), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

2018 – as per GRFC 2019, 53 countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh (Cox’s Bazar refugee and host population), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon (7 regions), Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia (Venezuelan migrants), Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti (rural areas), Ecuador (Venezuelan migrants), El Salvador (Dry corridor), Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guatemala (dry corridor), Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras (dry corridor), Iraq, Jordan (Syrian refugees), Kenya, Lebanon (Syrian refugees), Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar (southern and southeastern), Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Myanmar (selected areas), Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria (16 States and FCT), Pakistan (Sindh drought-affected areas), Palestine, Peru (Venezuelan migrants), Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye (Syrian refugees), Uganda, Ukraine (Luhans and Donetsk oblasts and IDP), Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

2019 – as per GRFC 2020, 55 countries: Afghanistan, Angola (24 communes in 3 provinces), Bangladesh (Cox’s Bazar and host population), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon (7 regions), Central African Republic, Chad, Colombia (Venezuelan migrants), Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo (109 territories), Ecuador (Venezuelan migrants), El Salvador (Eastern region), Eswatini (rural population), Ethiopia (selected areas in 6 regions), Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras (13 departments), Iraq, Kenya (Arid and Semi-Arid Lands), Lebanon (Syrian refugees), Lesotho (rural population), Liberia, Libya, Madagascar (southern, southeastern and eastern areas), Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique (39 districts), Myanmar, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria (16 States and FCT), Pakistan (Balochistan and Sindh drought-affected areas), Palestine, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan excluding (West Darfur), Syrian Arab Republic, Türkiye (Syrian refugees), Uganda, Ukraine (Luhans and Donetsk oblasts and IDP), United Republic of Tanzania, Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic off), Yemen, Zambia (86 districts), Zimbabwe (rural population).
2020 – as per GRFC 2021, 55 countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh (Rohingya refugees and host populations), Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cabo Verde, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt (Syrian refugees), El Salvador, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iraq, Jordan (Syrian refugees), Kenya, Lebanon (Syrian refugees), Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria (15 States and FCT), Pakistan, Palestine, Rwanda, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Togo, Türkiye (Syrian refugees), Uganda, Ukraine (Luhansk and Donetsk oblasts and IDP), United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.

2021 and 2022 for preliminary humanitarian assistance data – as per GRFC 2022, 53 countries: Afghanistan, Angola, Bangladesh (Rohingya refugees and host populations), Benin, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Côte d’Ivoire, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Djibouti, Egypt (Syrian refugees), El Salvador, Eswatini, Ethiopia, Gambia, Guatemala, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Honduras, Iraq (IDPs and returnees), Jordan (Syrian refugees), Kenya, Lebanon (Syrian refugees), Lesotho, Liberia, Libya, Madagascar, Malawi, Mali, Mauritania, Mozambique, Namibia, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria (21 States and FCT), Pakistan, Palestine, Rwanda (refugees), Senegal, Sierra Leone, Somalia, South Sudan, Sudan, Syrian Arab Republic, Uganda, Ukraine (Luhansk and Donetsk oblasts and IDP), United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe.
The European Union, FAO and WFP founded the Global Network Against Food Crises at the 2016 World Humanitarian Summit to step up joint efforts to address food crises along the humanitarian-development-peace nexus and continue to raise global awareness and commitment from all relevant actors. The Global Network offers a coherent coordination framework to promote collective efforts in analysis and strategic programming for more efficient use of resources to prevent, prepare for and respond to food crises and, ultimately, support collective outcomes related to SDG 2 for lasting solutions to food crises.

Through its work, the Global Network facilitates a fundamental transformation in the way international and local actors interact to holistically address food crises worldwide.

**Founding partners:**

[European Union](https://www.europa.eu/), [Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations](https://www.fao.org/), [World Food Programme](https://www.wfp.org/)