AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2020

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

SANFORD D. BISHOP, Jr., Georgia, *Chairman*

ROSA L. DELAURO, Connecticut
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
MARK POCAN, Wisconsin
BARBARA LEE, California
BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota
HENRY CUELLAR, Texas

JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
ROBERT B. ADHERHOLT, Alabama
ANDY HARRIS, Maryland
JOHN R. MOOLENAAR, Michigan

NOTE: Under committee rules, Mrs. Lowey, as chairwoman of the full committee, and Ms. Granger, as ranking minority member of the full committee, are authorized to sit as members of all subcommittees.

MARTHA FOLEY, DIEM-LINH JONES, JOSEPH LAYMAN, JUSTIN MASUCCI, PERRY YATES, and RANDALL STAPLES
Subcommittee Staff

PART 3

	Page
International Food Assistance Programs at USDA and USAID	**1**
Food and Nutrition Service: Policy and Program Overview	**207**

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

39–606 WASHINGTON : 2020

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

NITA M. LOWEY, New York, *Chairwoman*

MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
ROSA L. DELAURO, Connecticut
DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR., Georgia
BARBARA LEE, California
BETTY MCCOLLUM, Minnesota
TIM RYAN, Ohio
C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
HENRY CUELLAR, Texas
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
MIKE QUIGLEY, Illinois
DEREK KILMER, Washington
MATT CARTWRIGHT, Pennsylvania
GRACE MENG, New York
MARK POCAN, Wisconsin
KATHERINE M. CLARK, Massachusetts
PETE AGUILAR, California
LOIS FRANKEL, Florida
CHERI BUSTOS, Illinois
BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN, New Jersey
BRENDA L. LAWRENCE, Michigan
NORMA J. TORRES, California
CHARLIE CRIST, Florida
ANN KIRKPATRICK, Arizona
ED CASE, Hawaii

KAY GRANGER, Texas
HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama
MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, Idaho
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas
KEN CALVERT, California
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Florida
TOM GRAVES, Georgia
STEVE WOMACK, Arkansas
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
CHUCK FLEISCHMANN, Tennessee
JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, Washington
DAVID P. JOYCE, Ohio
ANDY HARRIS, Maryland
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
MARK E. AMODEI, Nevada
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
DAN NEWHOUSE, Washington
JOHN R. MOOLENAAR, Michigan
JOHN H. RUTHERFORD, Florida
WILL HURD, Texas

SHALANDA YOUNG, *Clerk and Staff Director*

AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2020

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25, 2019.

INTERNATIONAL FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS AT USDA AND USAID

WITNESSES

TREY HICKS, DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF FOOD FOR PEACE, U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

KEN ISLEY, ADMINISTRATOR, FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Mr. BISHOP. The subcommittee will come to order.

Let me say good morning and welcome to today's hearing. This morning, we are examining the international food assistance programs that are funded by this subcommittee. Within USDA, food assistance and agricultural development are provided by the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program and the Food for Progress program. Within USAID, food assistance funding is provided by the Food for Peace title II program.

We have two witnesses to help us understand all the aspects of these programs, from the 30,000-foot view of strategic planning to the on-the-ground realities of project execution.

I would like to welcome Ken Isley, the Administrator of the Foreign Agriculture Service at USDA, and Trey Hicks, Director of the Office of Food for Peace at USAID. I want to welcome both of you to our subcommittee. These programs under each of your purview are multifaceted, and they cover much more than just food assistance and agricultural development. We look forward to hearing about what you do, how you do it, and how we can help you to achieve your future goals.

I thank both of you for being here. I look forward to a robust discussion about these very, very important programs.

Now, before we begin, I recognize that we are here this morning to discuss the operations and the implementation of USDA and USAID international food assistance programs, but I would be remiss if I did not bring up the lack of support for these programs from the current administration.

As I have said before, the administration's proposed elimination of these programs is shortsighted, and it ignores their value as an essential tool for our country's diplomacy. That is why the House

mark rejects the proposed elimination and instead funds McGovern-Dole and Food for Peace at $2 billion, well above last year's enacted level.

Now, moving on, while the various goals for each of these programs may differ, their overall mission is the same: alleviate hunger, improve food security around the world. It is my hope that today's discussion will help shed light on how these programs achieve their missions, what are the various challenges they face, and how you measure success.

Additionally, while, today, we are discussing food assistance and these programs, they are not the only tools the United States has at its disposal for combating food insecurity around the globe. I am also interested in how these programs fit within a broader national strategy for international food assistance.

Our farmers, our ranchers, our producers don't just feed Americans. We help feed the world. The commodities that we send abroad are a gift from the American people, and it is our duty to ensure this generosity is treated with great care to make the most positive impact around the world that we can possibly make.

I want to thank our witnesses for being with us today. I look forward to today's discussion.

Now let me ask our distinguished ranking member, Mr. Fortenberry, if he has any opening remarks.

Or should I just recognize him for some opening remarks?

Mr. FORTENBERRY. The answer is yes, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for recognizing me and for holding this important hearing.

The chairman and I discussed the possibility of bringing in the directors of the multiple food assistance programs and policies that we have across our government, and so I think I am grateful to you all for coming today but really especially grateful for the chairman's leadership in this regard.

I don't think this is a well-understood space by the American people, and yet it is essential to well-being throughout the world. So, again, thank you for coming, your leadership.

I think it is important at the start of the hearing to point out the United States does lead the world, both in terms of generosity and outreach. That includes agricultural and humanitarian assistance. I think it is not only necessary to point that out because it compels us to examine how effective these programs are but also the underlying premise.

Despite any temporary disagreement with another nation or trade dispute, countries all around the world turn to us because of our leadership and capacity and generosity. America's ability to help other people in need and the generosity of the people that we serve are really a hallmark of who we are. It marks the character of us as a Nation.

Regarding international food assistance, many of us have worked in this space for a very long time and we often hear that this is actually 1 percent, less than 1 percent of the overall Federal budget, but for our Appropriations Committee, it represents 8 percent. So it is a significant portion of what we are dealing with and, therefore, a priority.

So, as a part of our oversight of these programs, we have to do two things at once: Look at the management of the programs, but also—and this is very important—how do we also think innovatively? How do we attack the sources of structural poverty and overcome misery in the world so that we can create stability in other countries and even the possibility of flourishing for communities and other persons?

It is about possibilities, the possibilities of innovation and new approaches, that we also have to have a marked focus on as a part of our oversight efforts.

This hearing is a great way for us to step back and provide some reflection on just what the purpose of these programs are, how successful they are, but also what are the metrics? How do we measure outcomes to meet these fundamental goals? Also, how are they reconcilable with other programs? Are we unnecessarily duplicating, why one program is embedded in one agency versus another and how those agencies collaborate?

Our ultimate goal is to, again, create the conditions in which persons can have lives filled with opportunity and hope and that we can do our part to build more just and good societies because, again, that is who we are. That is a humanitarian impulse, but it is also critical to international stability and, therefore, our own security.

I believe this vision and goal should continue to be a part of the evolvement—evolving of our entire foreign policy and defense policy in Congress. They are inextricably intertwined.

With that, Mr. Chairman, thank you very much again for holding this committee.

And I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. Let me now recognize our distinguished guests for brief oral statements, and then we will proceed with questions.

Without objection, gentlemen, your entire written testimonies will be included in the record, and you may proceed in any order which you may decide to.

Mr. ISLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee.

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the international food assistance programs implemented by USDA. Before I address this topic, however, I first want to thank the subcommittee for your continued support of my agency, the Foreign Agricultural Service. USDA administers three international food assistance programs: the Food for Progress Program, the McGovern-Dole Program, and a subset of that being the Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program.

Food for Progress has two principal objectives: to improve agricultural productivity in developing countries and emerging democracies without negatively impacting the export of U.S. commodities and to expand trade in agricultural products. Donated U.S. commodities are shipped to recipient countries and sold on the local market. The proceeds are used to support agricultural and infrastructure capacity-building projects, project implementers, including Private Voluntary Organizations (POVs), foreign governments, universities, and intergovernmental organizations.

At the end of fiscal year 2018, there were 52 active Food for Progress projects valued at over $1 billion. For fiscal year 2019, USDA announced preliminary allocations for seven multiyear projects in Africa, Asia, and Central America, totaling more than $140 million. As an example, a Food for Progress project in East Timor helps support the export of local crops and creates economic opportunities for subsistence farmers. The project's first harvest of fair-trade certified coffee will commence in 2019 with more than 19 tons headed for international buyers, including many U.S. importers.

McGovern-Dole provides school meals and nutrition programs for school-aged children, women, and infants in countries with high food insecurity. Projects are implemented by PVOs and international organizations. The program's statutory objectives include reducing hunger, improving literacy and primary education, and carrying out maternal, infant, and child nutrition programs.

McGovern-Dole projects are designed to graduate from USDA assistance. For fiscal year 2019, USDA announced preliminary funding allocations for nine proposals in Africa, Asia, Central America, and the Caribbean valued over $190 million. McGovern-Dole projects reached over 4.3 million beneficiaries in fiscal year 2018. As an example, in 2018, Kenya became the first country in Africa to transition all schools previously supported by McGovern-Dole to a government-supported national school meal program.

First authorized in the 2014 farm bill, the Local and Regional Procurement Program (LRP) provides a complimentary mechanism for delivering international food assistance. Including local commodities, such as fruits and vegetables, improves the taste of nutritious meals, strengthens supply chains, and boosts local support for sustainability.

In fiscal year 2019, USDA LRP projects are estimated to reach more than 105,000 children in McGovern-Dole schools. As an example, a recent LRP project incorporated sweet potatoes into school meals in Mozambique.

From selecting countries and priorities to reviewing proposals, monitoring agreements, evaluating project performance, and reporting progress, Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) staff coordinate with colleagues across USDA and the U.S. Government, particularly USAID, as well as with donors, ag industry stakeholders, implementing partners, U.S. land grant universities, and recipients.

Collaboration does not just occur in Washington, D.C. We also work closely with our overseas posts to select priority countries and themes for food assistance and to implement the programs.

And, last, collecting evidence on effectiveness of food aid is an important part of the administration of these programs. In recent years, FAS has strengthened our monitoring and evaluation systems. We adhere to a results-oriented management approach. We invest in independent research of our learning agendas, which serve as five-year strategies used to prioritize areas to improve the programs. To share our research and to fulfill our strong commitment to transparency, we publicly post evaluations of food aid projects implemented by FAS on USAID's public portal for monitoring and evaluation.

Thank you, again, for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to addressing your questions.

[The information follows:]

FOREIGN AGRICULTURAL SERVICE

Statement of Ken Isley, Administrator
Before the House Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development,
Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies

September 25, 2019

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the international food assistance and capacity building programs administered by the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). As Administrator of the Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS), I want to thank the Subcommittee for your continued support for the Agency.

Introduction

USDA administers three international food assistance programs established and funded by Congress: the Food for Progress Program (FFPr); the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (McGovern-Dole); and the Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program (LRP). These programs operated in a total of 38 developing countries in fiscal year (FY) 2018.

The President's 2020 Budget did not fund FFPr or McGovern-Dole; rather the Budget proposes to fund related food aid, development and education programs through U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) bilateral programs.

McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program

McGovern-Dole provides school meals and nutrition programs for pre- and primary school age children, women, and infants in countries with high food insecurity. McGovern-Dole projects are implemented by private voluntary organizations (PVOs), international organizations,

and other partners. The program's statutory objectives are to improve food security; reduce hunger; improve literacy and primary education, with an emphasis on girls; and carry out maternal, infant, and child nutrition programs. McGovern-Dole project designs are intended to "graduate" from reliance on USDA assistance and become self-sustaining with active involvement and support from the host government or local communities.

For FY 2019, USDA recently announced preliminary funding allocations for nine McGovern-Dole proposals valued at approximately $191 million. U.S. commodities will be provided over the term of these agreements to school feeding programs in Cambodia, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti, Malawi, Mauritania, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Togo, and Uzbekistan. At the end of FY 2018, McGovern-Dole had a total of 43 active projects in 27 countries valued at over $921 million. The projects reached over 4.3 million children and community members directly in FY 2018.

FAS will be updating the McGovern-Dole regulations with a final rule to implement a provision in the 2018 Farm Bill that allows up to 10 percent of McGovern-Dole funding to be used annually for the local and regional procurement of commodities.

In 2018, Kenya, whose school feeding program was originally launched by the World Food Programme in 1980 and which was funded by McGovern-Dole starting in 2004, became the first country in Africa to transition all schools previously supported by McGovern-Dole to a government-supported national school meal program. The Government of Kenya has become a leader in school feeding, developing home grown school meals policies and programs. USDA worked closely with our implementing partner, World Food Programme (WFP), to support Kenya's efforts. McGovern-Dole projects in Kenya in the past have supported more than 4,000 schools.

Food for Progress

FFPr has two principal objectives: to improve agricultural productivity in developing countries and emerging democracies and to expand trade in agricultural products. Donated U.S. agricultural commodities are shipped to recipient countries and sold on the local market in a process that is often referred to as monetization. The proceeds are used to support agricultural, economic, or infrastructure development projects. FFPr projects have trained farmers in animal and plant health, improved farming methods, developed road and utility systems, established producer cooperatives, provided microcredit, and developed agricultural value chains. FFPr project implementers have included PVOs, foreign governments, universities, and intergovernmental organizations.

For FY 2019, USDA announced preliminary allocations for seven FFPr projects totaling nearly $140 million. Funding is provided through the Commodity Credit Corporation (CCC). The countries to be covered through these projects include Ethiopia, Indonesia, Paraguay, the Philippines, Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Nigeria, and Venezuela. There is also a project focused across the East African Community. The FY 2019 preliminary allocation for Venezuela is contingent upon initiation of a democratic transition. Together, the FY 2019 FFPr projects are intended to reach over 239,000 beneficiaries directly over the next five years. At the end of FY 2018, there were 52 active FFPr projects in 31 countries valued at over $1.016 billion.

The FFPr program was reauthorized by the 2018 Farm Bill through December 31, 2023. Current operations continued uninterrupted under the new Farm Bill. The Farm Bill also added U.S. public and non-profit colleges and universities as eligible entities to receive FFPr awards.

A Food for Progress project in East Timor has helped to support the export of locally cultivated crops that do not compete with U.S. production and created opportunities for subsistence farmers to increase their income. USDA's FFPr activities in East Timor touch along

the entire agricultural value chain from providing seedlings to farmers, to equipment purchases and assistance in exporting harvested crops. Sustainability is a key goal. FFPr supported activities have resulted in new commercial market relationships between U.S. companies and East Timor producers. The program is intended to benefit local producers of commodities, including cloves, vanilla, coffee, black pepper, and cacao. The project's first yields of organic, fair-trade certified coffee will commence in 2019 with more than 19 tons in the upcoming harvest headed to international buyers, including U.S. importers. U.S. companies have also recently purchased more than 50 tons of cloves and 4 tons of vanilla.

Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program

First authorized as a permanent program in the 2014 Farm Bill, LRP was designed to provide a complementary mechanism for delivering international food assistance. Preference for funding is given to entities implementing active projects under McGovern-Dole. The objectives of LRP include strengthening the ability of local and regional farmers, community farmer groups, farmer cooperatives and associations, processors, and agribusinesses to provide high-quality commodities. LRP can enhance organizations' abilities to procure such commodities in support of school feeding programs, provide technical and management expertise, and, in coordination with USAID, help expedite provision of safe and quality foods to populations affected by food crises and disasters.

For FY 2019, Congress directed $15 million of McGovern-Dole funds to be used to conduct LRP. USDA recently announced a preliminary allocation of these funds to projects in Burkina-Faso, Cambodia, and Nicaragua. In FY 2019, USDA LRP projects are estimated to reach more than 105,000 school-age children. LRP projects aim to strengthen the ability of local host governments to take ownership of McGovern-Dole projects. Including local commodities, such as fruits and vegetables, increases the acceptability and palatability of nutritious meals, strengthens supply chains, and boosts local support for sustainability.

LRP project designs are intended to improve diets and support local farmers. For example, USDA awarded LRP funding to a 2-year project designed to incorporate orange-fleshed sweet potatoes into daily school meals in Mozambique. Farmers received assistance growing sweet potatoes that were then harvested and purchased for use at schools, benefitting 25,000 school-aged children. With the proceeds earned from selling the sweet potatoes, the farmers were able to reinvest in the following year's crops.

Coordinating USDA Food Aid Programs

From selecting countries and priorities to reviewing proposals, monitoring agreements, evaluating project performance, and reporting progress, USDA's food assistance staff coordinate with colleagues across the Department and the U.S. Government, particularly USAID, as well as with donors, stakeholders, and recipients.

USAID and USDA regularly share priority country selection. USDA food assistance staff work daily with their colleagues at USAID and meet regularly with USAID's Office of Food for Peace to discuss issues related to specific programs, commodity specifications, leveraging resources, and managing constraints. USDA has a memorandum of understanding on education with USAID to promote coordination between our McGovern-Dole projects and USAID's education programs.

Collaboration with our interagency partners does not occur just in Washington. As Administrator of FAS, I know the benefits of FAS attachés collaborating in embassies around the world. USDA's food assistance program staff work closely with our overseas posts to select priority countries and themes for food assistance programs. This also includes working with our overseas colleagues from USAID, the State Department, the Department of Commerce, the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative, the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and numerous other agencies.

Experienced subject matter experts across not only FAS, but also across USDA, are included in the proposal review process. There is a wealth of knowledge and agricultural expertise across USDA. For example, representatives from the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) provide nutrition-related input on McGovern-Dole proposals and staff from the Agricultural Marketing Service (AMS) provide input on commodity selections.

We also work closely with our implementing partners, including U.S. PVOs, the United Nations food agencies, and U.S. land grant universities. USDA holds public meetings with stakeholders when soliciting proposals or making changes to a program,. .

Monitoring and Evaluation

Collecting evidence on the effectiveness of food aid interventions is an important part of USDA's administration of these programs. In recent years, we have strengthened our monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems. In administering our food assistance programs, FAS adheres to a Results Oriented Management (ROM) approach.

To support ROM, all food aid projects use a monitoring and evaluation system that is formalized in the FAS food aid operations M&E policy and indicator handbook. The policy and handbook were updated in FY 2019. The system requires implementers to use standard indicators to measure performance and report on results, which allows us to aggregate results in a unified way across countries and time. Implementers must also commission objective third-party evaluations of their projects' outcomes.

USDA invests in independent research that helps answer questions identified in our programmatic Learning Agendas, which serve as 5-year strategic documents used to prioritize areas where evidence is needed most for the improvement of programs. To share such research and to fulfill our strong commitment to transparency, we recently collaborated with USAID to publicly post evaluations of USDA food aid projects in the Development Experience Clearinghouse, which is USAID's public portal for monitoring and evaluation. As USDA

continues to make food aid evidence available to fellow stakeholders in the field and to the American public, we expect the evidence base to grow regarding what works and what doesn't in food assistance to the benefit all U.S. food aid programs.

Conclusion

Thank you for the opportunity to testify. USDA appreciates the opportunity to speak to the Subcommittee about the administration of our international food assistance and capacity building programs.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Isley.

Mr. Hicks.

Mr. HICKS. Chairman Bishop, Ranking Member Fortenberry, other members of the subcommittee, thank you for the invitation to speak with you today about international food assistance programs.

My name is Trey Hicks, and I am the Director of the Office of Food for Peace, the world's largest provider of international food assistance. Last year, we reached 76 million people in 59 countries with lifesaving aid. We do this because alleviating global hunger represents the best of America's generosity and goodwill. It is also crucial to our national security. Where hunger persists, instability grows. Our efforts help build a more stable world and ensure people have the chance to lead more productive lives.

More than 80 percent of our programs respond to humanitarian crises by providing food assistance to people affected by conflict and natural disasters. We also have multiyear development programs that address the root causes of hunger, such as drought, to build resilience and food security among vulnerable populations. This helps people, equip people with the knowledge and tools to feed themselves and reduce the need for future international assistance.

There are four main ways that the U.S.A. provides life-saving food assistance: number one, food growing in the United States through title II; number two, food grown locally or regionally; number 3, through food vouchers; and, finally, number four, through money that helps families buy food on local markets.

Many times and often, there is a combination of these legalities that we use for each and every response based on the contexts unique to those responses. For today's testimony, I will focus on U.S. in-kind food assistance, food bought with title II funds and authorized in the Food for Peace Act, which this subcommittee has jurisdiction over. The other modalities are primarily provided through the International Disaster Assistance or development assistance funds authorized under the Foreign Assistance Act.

When we purchase and deliver U.S. commodities, we work with two types of partners: nongovernmental organizations, like Catholic Relief Services, and international organizations, like the World Food Program. These partners choose from a set of approved U.S. commodities, and then Food for Peace evaluates the offers and buys the commodities on the open market through the U.S. Department of Agriculture. After that, cargo is shipped from a U.S. port to the recipient country. Upon arrival, the food goes to the people in greatest need: children under five; pregnant and lactating women; the elderly; and other vulnerable populations.

Our help is needed now more than ever. For the first time in decades, the number of hungry people is rising. More than 820 million people do not have enough food to eat. That is one in every nine people on the planet. Conflict is the largest factor and compounded by natural disasters like drought. As a result, today's crises in places like Syria, South Sudan, Venezuela, and Yemen, they are bigger. They last longer. They are more complex.

In partnership with Congress, we must constantly find ways to be more coordinated, creative, and efficient in our responses.

In Yemen, conflict has left nearly 17 million people in urgent need of food assistance, more than the total population of both Georgia and Nebraska combined. If the situation gets worse, famine may occur. This school year, USDA has helped feed 11 million people in Yemen by providing food assistance including 450,000 metric tons of food. We have provided wheat, beans, and vegetable oil from the United States and are saving lives every single day.

Additionally, 1 million Rohingya refugees live in Bangladesh, where they have formed the world's largest refugee settlement after fleeing violence in Burma. The U.S. helps feed roughly 700,000 Rohingya every year. One of the ways we help is providing American-made therapeutic food. This peanut-based paste is very effective. If a child is malnourished, parents take them to a health center where they feed their children a packet a day and watch them grow healthy and strong.

I was in Bangladesh earlier this year, and I saw at one clinic a white board that tracked how many kids that were help at that clinic. Two years ago, this clinic alone was treating 1,000 malnourished kids a month. Today, they are down to 200. Our program is making a difference.

USAID does not do this work alone. As Administrator Mark Green has said, tackling hunger requires an all-hands-on-deck approach. We work alongside America's farmers, mariners, affected governments, other donors, NGOs, and the international community. We also coordinate within the U.S. Government. We work with the State Department's Bureau of Population, Refugee, and Migration on overseas refugee issues. The U.S. Department of Agriculture helps us procure title II food. Our development activities are an essential component of the Feed the Future initiative, led by USAID's Bureau for Food Security. Most frequently, we work alongside the Office of U.S. Foreign Disaster Assistance, responding to humanitarian emergencies. We provide food while they provide other needs, like shelter, medical care, and water.

The forthcoming USAID Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance will bring our offices together, creating a more strategic, seamless approach to delivering both food and nonfood in humanitarian crises.

In our 65 years, Food for Peace has helped to end hunger for more than 4 billion people. That legacy would not have been possible without congressional support, including from this subcommittee.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to your questions.

GLOBAL FOOD INSECURITY CHALLENGES

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much, both of you.

Let me just make an announcement. Our chairwoman, Mrs. Lowey, we anticipate her arrival at any moment, and while we will begin our questioning, when she comes, I will give her the respect of allowing her to make some opening statement at her pleasure. But let me begin the questions.

Mr. Isley, Mr. Hicks, your agencies have provided food assistance around the world for more than 50 years. Can you each take a moment to give us a sense of the global picture of food insecurity

today and then just tell us, in that context, what the biggest challenges are that face both of your programs?

And since I have but 5 minutes, I would like for both of you. As I understand it, the common mission that you have of alleviating hunger and improving food insecurity provides different ways of achieving the mission, but the largest cost driver for both of you is transportation. So could you also just take a moment to discuss how your programs are addressing the cost drivers and how the FAS and USAID work together to achieve efficiencies in those areas and what challenges remain?

Mr. HICKS. Excellent question.

It is something that we think every day about some of these challenges on the cost drivers. Overall, there are over a hundred million people around the world that require emergency food assistance, and we are feeding about 76 million of those. It is a huge effort. When it comes to the landscape, we are increasingly responding to very complex political crises where there is conflict; there is war. It is becoming increasingly difficult to get food to the people that need it most.

When it comes to the transportation, we do work very closely with USDA and when it comes to all the pieces of getting the food from the U.S. ports to the beneficiary. And we are constantly looking for efficiencies. So, for example, we have a pilot program tracking the commodities using quick reference codes just to have an easier way to make sure that the bags are getting to where they need to go in each step of the process as one example.

But every single dollar we save in efficiencies for transportation, for example, it is another dollar we can feed right back into the program and feed more people. So it is something we take seriously. We look at it every day.

Mr. ISLEY. Okay. Yeah.

Mr. Chairman, and to address the first part of your question, there certainly is not a lack of opportunities in the world in terms of these programs and our ability to select priority countries and the number of proposals we receive to actually enact the programs.

In terms of challenges, let me address them separately, depending on the program.

In Food for Progress, one of our key challenges is to meet the 70 percent cost recovery requirement as we monetize the commodities. This can be challenging in countries where some of the U.S. commodities aren't as price-competitive and also when you take into account the shipping costs that we incur to get the commodities to the country to monetize.

Also for us—and it highlights your issue on transportation—we deal in Food for Progress with a $40 million transportation cap that has been flat for over a decade. Now this subcommittee did appropriate an additional $6 million for transportation in fiscal year 2019, which will provide us more flexibility.

Both of our programs are subject to U.S. Cargo preference, which requires at least 50 percent of oceangoing cargo generated by our programs to be transported by U.S.-flagged, privately-owned commercial vessels. This requirement increases our cost of transportation significantly and reduces the amount of commodities that we are able to supply.

Competition for U.S. vessels is limited with only three major U.S. carriers participating in the program, and we estimate those costs are roughly 200 percent higher than the foreign cargo rates.

Specific to McGovern-Dole, getting host country buy-in is a significant challenge we have, and actually implementing programs in very remote locations is a challenge. We are serious about the graduation requirement and objectives under this program, and we work hard with those host countries to ensure that that graduation occurs.

And I would concur with my colleague, Mr. Hicks, on the close collaboration between USDA and USAID to try to address these challenges, particularly in cargo preference. Our staff are meeting constantly to see if there are opportunities to ship cargo together for our multiple programs and, therefore, reduce cost.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much.

Perfect timing.

At this time, I would like to recognize Mr. Fortenberry for any questions that he may like to have in this first round.

IMPROVING PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So we all agree on the mission and goal. This is, again, about America's humanitarian impulse. We also help create stability in far-off places. And that is, again, inextricably intertwined with national security. So we agree on that.

The broad architectural question, though, here is: Is our policy response the right construct for this era? Now, what happens in government is somebody has a good idea, and we respond to it. It creates a policy and a program that gets embedded in an institution, the department, then carries a sort of infrastructure with it into time and those of us who come along have to pick that up. But, again, we have got to go back and continue to re-examine, is this the right and best response? Is your construct the proper one for our modern time in USDA? Is USAID's construct the proper one?

And you mentioned the merging of the food security office and the Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance. I think you said that. So, again, that is an attempt to start to rethink how a more effective response is necessary in modern time.

So you also mentioned, Director Isley, that you are not just doing this program embedded in Foreign Agricultural Service on behalf of Food for Peace, as well as Food for Progress, or McGovern-Dole, I should say, and Food for Progress. You are also working with other partners which include land grant institutions, the agricultural industry itself, individual donors. Where we sit, again, touching this, along with many other things, it is important to me for you all to talk about the full spectrum of activities that are going on in this space because it ties back to whether or not our policy construct is the best and most appropriate one and you are seeing movement to change certain things.

And one other idea before I stop. I will let you answer that, if you can, briefly. For instance, OPIC, Overseas Private Investment Corporation, has gone through a new phase of development which they are shifting to a new model of development, finance around equity finance. Does this have implications for Food for Progress?

Rather than monetizing a commodity that then gets—pays for a particular type of project, can that combine with other private players who will hold a piece of equity and we can leverage that for 10, 20 more times the impact?

It is this type of creative thinking, again, that can provide a new architecture on the mission that we all agree with. So, I would like to give you a moment to respond to that.

Mr. ISLEY. Sure. And thank you, Congressman Fortenberry, for the question.

Similar to USAID, we also are looking at our organizational structure and are implementing some transformation change, and we are including these programs in a program area with our trade promotion programs as well to pick up the full continuum. These programs don't sit alone and can be very complimentary to programs that you are fully aware of, like Cochran and Borlaug and others, to provide educational training and assistance and coordinate more with our universities.

I always think there is room for creativity in looking at is there a better way to implement, and it gets down to communication and coordination. It gets down to having experienced staff and continuing their development and expertise and how they interact with all the other providers to deliver the programs in the most effective and efficient way.

So we are driving that communication, not just with USAID at the more senior level and at the staff level but across U.S. Government broadly and getting more embedded with our implementing partners like World Food Program, like Catholic Relief Services, and some of the industry partners. Land O'Lakes is coming up with some creative programs.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. It would be nice to see an inventory of all of these components because I think that would be helpful to give a bigger picture because it is hard to do, particularly here.

Let me stop right quick.

GLOBAL REVIEW PROCESS

What about the idea, this idea of a country ag leader, a country ag coordinator—maybe they are embedded in the Foreign Agricultural Service—particularly in Feed the Future countries—that then sets up metrics? It is my understanding that Feed the Country have 50 to a hundred metrics of outcomes. There really ought to be two, you know. Are we stopping child stunting and getting to the heart of structural poverty issues? And, secondly, what we call yield gap analysis, how well are we doing with the resources that are there?

Again, I am getting ready to run out of time, but I want to use this opportunity to force us to reflect higher and bigger about structural changes that actually are consistent with the mission.

I have talked too much again, Mr. Chairman. I apologize.

So I yield back.

We will come back around.

Mr. ISLEY. Well, I can just react to that quickly, Congressman. In terms of our footprint and overseas, we look at that every single year through a global review process. We currently have global attaches, Foreign Service officers in 93 posts, in addition to our local

employed staff. Some of those posts serve multiple countries, some of which are implementing these programs. So we are constantly looking at that. We always have a lead on the USDA side within each of those posts, and they coordinate very closely with the USDA or USAID counterparts and other government officials within those embassies and consulates.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Don't get me wrong. I am very familiar with the ag attaches, but I am talking about a next level of leadership and policy.

So thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. The gentlelady, Ms. McCollum, is recognized.

POTENTIAL FOR FUTURE RESCISSIONS

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you for holding this hearing here today.

And to my friend, Mr. Fortenberry, as the lead Democrat in the house that worked or the Global Food Security Act for many, many years. I was pleased to see that you are here today, the Food for Peace office on the witness list.

We are here talking about Food for Peace, of course, and that is the two main types of food assistance under title II and the market-based assistance authorized under the Global Food Security Act.

I just want to point out, in 2016, $7.6 billion—excuse me—7.6 billion people suffered from food undernourishment. Since then, we know we have had Syria, troubles continue in South Sudan, Burma, Bangladesh with the Rohingya, and Yemen, all countries that I visited. And you work in other countries, too. So we know that that number, it has only done but increased, and the Emergency Food Security Program, that is funded under the International Disaster Assistance account within USAID.

Now I am going to talk about some accounts here, and I have to do it quick in the amount of time I have. We know the President zeroed in his budget IDA and Food for Peace. That is because of this new reprogramming, reorganization, and I understand you are working with the committee on it.

But in the meantime, until it happens, you need to know that I am concerned about the potential for future rescissions and the increasing levels of unobligated fund balances within IDA and other food assistance accounts. The White House fiscal year 2020 budget reported an estimated $2 billion, $2 billion of unobligated balances covered over from fiscal year 2019. And we know that there is hunger in this world. We know where it is. While some carryover is expected—I chair the Interior Committee, and I expect the secretary to have some carryover—the IDA account has a total funding level of only $4.4 billion in fiscal year 2019, meaning half of the money was not spent. Half of the money was not spent to feed hungry people all over the world.

To address this, the fiscal year 2020 omnibus bill included report language and bill language stating that the IDA funds shall be distributed—shall be distributed—within 60 days of enactment. The fiscal year 2020 House-passed version of the SFOP shortens this timeline within the bill, and report language requires that IDA

funding be distributed within 30 days. These people are hungry now.

The Senate also has concerns in their SFOP drop, which is their State and Foreign Operations, and that hasn't been to the full committee yet, but it has passed through the subcommittee and that maintains the 60-day language. It requires report language on strict reporting requirements of unobligated balances.

So, over the past two fiscal years, the House and the Senate have been making it perfectly clear, trying to get your attention, that we when we put taxpayers' dollars towards these important programs of saving children from starvation and stunting, that we know that these funds are going to get out the door.

So, gentlemen, can you explain to me what is going on here? I am fully supportive of looking at reprogramming, reorganization, but in the meantime, Congress has appropriated these funds. People are hungry, malnutrition, and starving, and half the fund balance has not been accounted for.

Mr. HICKS. So, first of all, thank you for the question.

I think, number one, message well received, loud and clear. I think, for the way we program, I appreciate your acknowledgment that some carryover is actually necessary for us to have a steady flow of a response. So there needs to be some carryover from year to year, and thank you for acknowledging that.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. But not half.

Mr. HICKS. Correct. So, you know, we are constantly trying to ensure that we have stability. When a sudden onset like a Dorian happens, we have to have funds available, and many times we are in between fiscal years, and these events happen. We have to have a certain kind of reserve on hold, but, you know, I know that some of the budgetary language is being worked out. I assure you whatever is, you know, signed into law we will faithfully execute.

There is no shortage of hunger around the world. Even if we piled up every single penny in IDA and in title II and only used it for food——

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I only have a minute. So you are telling me that half the funding that wasn't spent in fiscal year 2019, it is ready to go out the door? You can submit to this to the committee?

Mr. HICKS. So I can only speak to on the food side. The Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance, we share a portion of the IDA account with the Office of Foreign Disaster Assistance. So they have their own budget process. We are not yet merged into one single Bureau of Humanitarian Assistance. So I can't speak on behalf of the entire account because, you know, there are carryovers that are attributed to both offices. So some of that is food. Some of it is not food. And none of it is title II, the title II appropriation.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I think we should ask for when this money is going to be spent because, as Mr. Fortenberry pointed out, there are people very hungry, malnutrition, and, in some cases, starving.

Thank you.

Mr. HICKS. I am very happy to provide a more detailed response on kind of the budget flow for the record.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. That would be great. Thank you.

Mr. HICKS. Okay.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

Mr. Moolenaar.

PROGRAMMATIC APPROACH UNDER DIFFERING CHALLENGES

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you both for being here today.

I wanted to ask you both a couple of questions. You talked a little bit about involvement in conflict areas. You have talked a little bit about places where there are natural disasters.

I wonder if you could speak to, you know, kind of how your approach differs in those kind of scenarios and what are the kind of the challenges you face in each of those kinds of situations?

Mr. ISLEY. Yeah, thank you, Congressman Moolenaar.

The USDA programs are not designed to be the short-term disaster relief type programs. They are more mid- to long-term under the McGovern-Dole and the Food for Progress programs. So we are identifying priority countries with similar criteria but aren't necessarily implementing in some of the most difficult countries from a security standpoint, like USAID and others are more equipped to do, but we are trying to identify those countries where we can come in and provide assistance when the appropriate time is right.

And an example of that is like Food for Progress. If you look at our 2019 award, we did award Venezuela, a subject on the democratic transition of Venezuela, to go in and provide capacity-building work to reestablish some of their agricultural capacity to produce for their own domestic use and for export and to be an export market for the U.S. as well in the future.

So we identify countries that are in difficult circumstances beyond just food security and are able to implement programs in those geographies to provide medium and longer term assistance, not immediate disaster relief.

The same way on McGovern-Dole. Obviously, some of these countries also have the biggest challenges with feeding school-aged children, and we identify those countries where we can actually effectively implement these programs and implement 3- to 5-year projects to try to raise up the ability and deal with the malnutrition at the school-age level and work with the governments hand in hand to try to get them to transition into providing that support directly.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. So, just as a quick follow up, you mentioned Venezuela. I did notice that. How do you work in a situation, what is happening there right now? I mean, are you able to find partners to work with in Venezuela, or how does that work?

Mr. ISLEY. Yes, yes, we have.

And it is a partner that has been involved in Venezuela for quite some time and is also partnering with other organizations like Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture (IICA) that we work with routinely in that region and it is also through our participation in an interagency process. So we are very involved with State Department, USAID, and others as we look at the full range of assistance and services we can provide at the right moment in Venezuela's transition.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Okay. Thank you.

Mr. HICKS. Sure. So there are basically three scenarios where Food for Peace operates and responds. Primarily, we are an emergency response. We look at the need and we meet the need on the emergency basis, but one type of response would be a sudden onset kind of like Hurricane Dorian, where there is an immediate need; there is an immediate disaster, and we need to quickly move in to get food to help save lives.

We also have more protracted conflict kind of settings, like in Yemen, like in northeast Nigeria, where it is a protracted crises, where there isn't a political solution to the underlying problems that is driving the food insecurity. It is a long-term, high-risk environment.

And then the third is we have development programs where we look at countries that have recurrent shocks, like drought, and we do development programs funded through this committee where we help communities adapt to those recurrent shocks and get them on their journey to self-reliance, which is one of the priorities of Administrator Mark Green, so they don't have to rely on humanitarian assistance the next time the shock comes by.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Just as a follow up, the World Food Program with the U.N., how do you coordinate with their efforts?

Mr. HICKS. So we look at every crisis and every activity by itself, and we make a determination whether or not which partner is the right partner. And in the cases where the World Food Program is the best positioned to meet that particular activity, we will enter into an agreement with them. And it is a whole process, whether it is going to be title II commodities or other types of assistance.

But when it comes to how we coordinate on a grander scale, we are actually on the board of the World Food Program. And together, with my colleagues from the USDA, we go as the U.S. delegation where we have the broader kind of strategic conversations. We also get into their, you know, backyard a little bit and tell them how they need to clean up their management issues and better align their accountability with what our standards and expectations are.

Mr. MOOLENAAR. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Pocan, please.

USAID PROGRAMS IN GAZA

Mr. POCAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And thanks both for being here.

If you could also send my greetings to Mark, I would appreciate it. He comes from my home State. I would say he is one of my favorite Trump appointees, but I did that when Commissioner Gottlieb was here, and then he resigned a month later. So tell mark Green, "Hey," please. I would appreciate that.

I want to follow up a little bit on the questions about going to tough areas. So, back in February, we quit going and doing work in the West Bank in Gaza. And I know that there has been a lot—1.1 million people are on food assistance; 95 to 100 percent of the water is undrinkable. There was a U.N. report that said, by next year, Gaza will be unlivable. I just had a professor in from Gaza who was visiting for a couple of weeks and said that, just in the

last few weeks, they have had suicide bombings against Hamas police from people who have been radicalized even further because of the situation there.

My concern is, while we had projects going on there around food assistance and other areas—also there is a company in my district that had recently completed a water desalination project and working on the reservoir. They are shuttered, not even opened, because the funding went away.

Can you give me an update on, you know, what other projects have had to be abandoned in that area and what the consequences are of the fallout from those projects stopping in that area?

Mr. HICKS. So, first of all, you know, I don't have the fullest of programs that were operating in those areas, but I am happy to provide the details on not just for our programs but all of the U.S. aid programs, but the decision and the policy for West Bank, Gaza, Palestinian territories, they happen in a different, kind of different level beyond the humanitarian scope. It is more the diplomatic/strategic kind of policy, but, you know, as soon as any policy shifts occur, we are constantly vigilant in assessing needs around the world, including in that region, and, you know, we will follow. We always follow where the needs are.

Mr. POCAN. Do we still have any staffing with that mission?

Mr. HICKS. That is not something I have an answer for you right now, but I can go to the Middle East bureau and provide you for the record the information.

Mr. POCAN. I would appreciate that.

I think a followup question maybe to then, too, would be what the situation on the ground, their assessment, since that assistance has been pulled, again, just because I have gotten reports of escalation of what is happening in that area. You know, clearly, this is something that we all should be concerned of. And, you know, just I am getting varied firsthand reports including from, I guess, a completed water desalination plant that can't be opened when you have got undrinkable water. We have already put all the money in, and we are just not doing the final step. So I would appreciate it.

PLANS FOR IRAQI AND SYRIAN REFUGEES

Also, in regards to Iraq and Syria and refugees, I really appreciate all the efforts that we do in this area. However, I am concerned that there is no plan beyond the immediate. I am afraid things could spiral downward in the camps and outside the camps without a plan. So a few questions. What are the short- and medium-term plans for returns and resettlement of Iraqi refugees and Syrian internally displaced persons, and how are we engaging with those governments to ensure resettlement is safe and there is employment opportunities and functioning infrastructure, et cetera? And what efforts are there to develop a comprehensive repatriation plan for the 11,000 people that are currently in camps in 58 different countries?

Mr. HICKS. So, on the resettlement and repatriation issue, that is not something that is handled by my office. It is something that, obviously, affects our work. We do follow, you know, the changing landscape, you know, but it does present particular challenges for

how we get our assistance, which is the food side of the equation, how we get our assistance to folks as they are on the move.

So I don't have—I am not the—it is not our office that handles that, but, you know, when it comes to the provision of food, we go where the need is. So, whether they are going to be internally displaced, resettled back, as long as there is a food insecurity that we have been able to assess, and we have access, we are going to be continuously providing food to the folks with the greatest need.

Mr. POCAN. Okay. I appreciate it.

Any information you could get would be much appreciated. I know it is a little beyond your scope, but I thought, since you are here, this is a good opportunity to ask those questions.

And then, finally, I will spend my final 15 seconds, so the farms in my area—and it is even immediately outside the district, but a lot of my district residents working at—provide a lot of good, especially corn-based dry product. We really appreciate that. Love to have people come and visit those companies anytime. We would be glad to set up any visits if anyone is in the area. Give Mark Green a chance to go to a Badger or Packer game.

Mr. BISHOP. With the gentleman's final second, would you yield to Mr. Fortenberry for that final second?

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I am intrigued by your question, particularly regarding the refugee situation in Iraq. I would urge you—I would like to talk to you privately about this. I have a northern Iraq security resolution that goes to the heart of this, went with the Director of the USAID there last year, along with Sam Brownback. There are some good things happening. Can we chat off on the side?

Mr. POCAN. Absolutely. Thank you. I appreciate it.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

At this time, I am pleased to yield to the former chairman of this subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama who is a big supporter of both of these programs and has a great history with them, Mr. Aderholt.

MERGING HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE ACCOUNTS

Mr. ADERHOLT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is good to be here, and thanks for your leadership.

And thank you both, guests, for being here today and for your testimonies.

I want to start out by reiterating a concern that I brought before this subcommittee many times, and I believe that any type of proposals to reform or eliminate programs that have U.S. commodities and cargo preferences be eliminated are ill-advised. The preferences align with the administration's policy of America First, and the programs have worked successfully since the creation of the programs back in the 1950s.

I just like for to you explain, you know, why you believe these programs, which I think offer in-kind food assistance that can be very helpful, have once again been proposed for elimination.

Mr. HICKS. Sure. I am very happy to answer that question. So the proposal in the budget request would actually take all humanitarian assistance accounts, whether it is title II, international disaster assistance, or migration refugee assistance, and merge them into one new account. So, in effect, it is not just title II, but it is

also the IDA account and the MRA account that would be eliminated, and this new account would be stood up where all humanitarian assistance would be provided under one account. It would be proposed at $6 billion, and it would do a few things.

Number one, it would maintain the U.S. position as a world leader on humanitarian assistance. Number two, it would provide a better flexibility for the program to respond whatever the conditions are on the ground, without artificially favoring one type of response over another. Basically, every year, we have a zero-based budget, where we look at the needs. We look at all the different types of responses we can have, whether it is title II or LRP or market-based. And we make the best choice for each and every response. And what this account would do would not set artificial requirements to use one or the other but allow the facts on the ground to inform whether we use title II.

So, in places like Yemen, there is no local market. There are no local regional procurements we can make. We have to use title II commodities. So, you know, when we say we want to increase flexibility, it is about using whatever is appropriate for each response. South Sudan, Yemen, they are going to be primarily title II U.S. in-kind commodity type responses under the current situation. And I don't see that kind of need for U.S. commodities changing anytime soon.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Go ahead.

Mr. ISLEY. So I would just echo what Director Hicks said. It is more of the consolidation of these programs within USAID, with USDA continuing to provide support as needed based on our expertise and our footprint globally as well, but it addresses some of the challenges, reduces the duplication, and would center it all within USAID.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Well, and I understand that there has to be a combination of things. I just have seen and when I chaired this subcommittee, there seemed to be a movement to try to, you know, eliminate these U.S. Commodity and cargo preferences and I just—I just want to—I would really hate to see those completely eliminated because, when we go back home as Members of Congress and we explain that we are trying to help people—and I think most Americans around the world want to try to be helpful, to feed people that are hungry. I don't know of any American that does not have that thought.

However, there are some—they do have concerns about when cash is sent over, but when you send American-grown produce over or some kind of—that is grown and that helps the farmer here and helps the people over there, it is a lot easier sell than saying, "We are just going to send some cash over." I understand that sometimes you have to do that. I understand, and it needs to be both, but I can tell you if we—it is a lot easier. I have to sell the American people this is the money that we, the American taxpayers' dollars.

And so if it is an easier sell—and saying we are not going to allow farmers to ship their goods and try to help them and it is a—to me, it is a win-win situation. It helps the farmers. It helps the shippers, and it helps the people who receive it.

So I am just saying that it is really—I think you are treading on very dangerous ground to try to go down that route because I have so many constituents that red flags go up when you talk about sending cash or sending money, but if you are sending some commodities to help feed somebody, then they are much more likely to say, "Yes, we want to help."

So I just tell you that because, like I said, this is the taxpayers' money that we are spending on this, so I think that needs to be—I see my time is up.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

The gentleman from Texas, Mr. Cuellar.

Mr. CUELLAR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ADDRESSING CENTRAL AMERICAN ISSUES

First of all, to both of you, thank you for the great job that you all do. I want to see if I can focus on Central America. That has been an issue for the whole country. I was just down there with Speaker Pelosi, and we saw the great work that you all are doing, USAID and the other folks. And you all have come up with a lot of good work over the years, and we appreciate what you all do.

You know, the bottom line is, as you have, folks coming in from Central American, we have to look at the drivers, why they are coming here. The wall is a 14th century solution that is not going to stop those people. We have to go to the root of the problem, and looking at some of the research that you all done, I mean, you guys are right.

For example, some of the key findings that you all have looked at, if you look at data from 166 countries for the last 40 years, it shows you that, as long as you have different income levels, the folks on the lower income level will be coming over here. So, as long as we don't help work with those countries, they are going to be coming here.

Violence leads to migration. Corruption drives migration. Lack of jobs is another thing. And the strongest economic factors associated with people coming up here have to look at food insecurity—and this is from your own research—and, of course, families' personal economic situation. You all have done a lot of work including how the coyotes—and I have some of the work that you all have done—why they come up here, how they advertise, how they use social media. And it is an amazing situation what they do to try to get people over here.

The funding that the President wanted to cut was wrong. As you know, he reversed that because we heard it from your folks; this would have been a disaster in Central American if we would have allowed those cuts to happen. Back in 2014, when they started coming up, Congresswoman Kay Granger, myself, and Congress restarted this program, $750 million. Unfortunately, it has been cut down to about I think a little over $500 million. The President was looking at stopping $1.1 billion a few months ago, and I am glad he reversed and flip-flopped on that position because it would have been the wrong thing to do on this.

So my question is and I know a lot of the success stories. We went to some of the USAID work that you all did a lot, but we have

to do a lot more and we have put in billions of dollars. And for the billions of dollars we are putting, what are the results? What else can we do? What else can we leverage to do this? Because we have to go to the root of the problem. So appreciate any insights you can give me.

And, again, I have everything, what you did for, you know, what you are doing in Honduras, Salvador, Guatemala. It is wonderful work. We need to do that.

And before my time runs out, as you answer the question, I do have a rider here that I wish you guys would respond within the time that is asked, asking you to look at Central America, and this is USAID and, of course, USDA also, working groups so we can work with them on the agriculture part. I will ask you to make sure you fulfill the time to do this.

Tell me: What else can we do beside putting more money in Central America?

Mr. ISLEY. Yes, thank you, Congressman.

We have many active projects within the scope of McGovern-Dole and within the scope of Food for Progress in that region. We also implement Cochran and Borlaug scientific exchange programs with thought leaders there to improve the capacity of their agricultural industries.

One project I would like to highlight in specific is TechnoServe, our implementing partner in Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Peru, where we are building capacity in cacao and coffee production. That supports 120,000 farmers, 1,200 organizations, is valued at $47 million to provide that kind of stability and, again, production that benefits the U.S. industries based on the output.

So we are continuing to look at opportunities to implement these programs in that region and support the very people you are talking about and improve stability there.

Mr. CUELLAR. Can you give us an inventory, both of you all, what you all are doing there? Again, I am very supportive, and I want to do more, but if you all can give me an inventory because, as you know, coffee provides affected the situation. The drought, they have a drought there, so whatever we can help them address that. And, you know, a lot of people think people are coming in from the urban areas, but a lot of the folks are coming in, according to your work, are from the rural areas, where the agricultural areas are at. So we really need your help, and whatever we need to do—I know we are at the end of the funding process—what we can do to put more money into the areas, we need your assistance.

Mr. ISLEY. Very good. We will follow up on the inventory.

[The information follows:]

USDA Food Aid and Development Projects in Central America

Regional Project

Program	Award Year	Description	Implementing partner, if any
Food for Progress (Covers Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Peru)	2018	This project aims to build capacity in cacao and coffee production, supporting production that benefits U.S. industries. The $47 million regional project supports 120,000 farmers and 1200 organizations.	TechnoServe

Costa Rica

Cochran Fellowship	2018	USDA trained five importers in U.S hops, barley, and malts and organized retail and e-retail. The goal of these programs was to increase the country's imports of U.S. agricultural products.	N/A

El Salvador

Cochran Fellowship	2018	USDA trained six fellows in school meals and nutrition in order to improve the country's food security. The fellows were also trained in U.S. craft beverage marketing and merchandising, with the goal of increasing El Salvador's imports of U.S. products.	N/A

Guatemala

Food for Progress	2016	This $18.3 million project aims to improve the profitability of the coffee value chain by focusing on the quality of production and processing practices in Guatemala's coffee producing regions. The project's largest presence is in the Western Highlands, where factors affecting migration are significant and	Counterpart International

		where this strategic value chain is needed in the face of historically low global coffee prices.	
McGovern-Dole	2018	This $27 million project provides healthy school meals made from U.S. commodities to school-age children and improve their literacy. It also aims to strengthens the government's capacity to operationalize the National School Feeding Law.	Save the Children
Local and Regional Procurement (LRP)	2018	This $4 million LRP project aims to provide locally sourced fruits, vegetables, and eggs for school meals to supplement U.S. commodities donated to McGovern-Dole schools in Guatemala.	Project Concern International
McGovern-Dole	2016	This $24 million project aims to provide nutritious U.S. commodities for use in school meals to school-age children and improve their literacy, attentiveness, and attendance.	Project Concern International
McGovern-Dole	2016	This $27 million project aims to provide nutritious U.S. commodities for school feeding and to improve literacy and school attendance. It also aims to increase knowledge of safe food preparation.	Catholic Relief Services
Cochran Fellowship	2018	USDA trained three fellows in school meals and nutrition, in order to improve the country's food security. Separately, three fellows were trained in U.S. craft beverage marketing and merchandising, with the goal of increasing Guatemala's imports of U.S. products.	N/A

Honduras

Food for Progress	2017	This $16.5 million project aims to increase the production and quality of coffee, to expand trade, and increase sales.	TechnoServe

Food for Progress	2015	This $17.4 million project aims to improve agricultural productivity, increase access to information and market skills, build government capacity, and strengthen local, regional, and international trade of agricultural products.	Government of Honduras
LRP	2018	This $2.4 million LRP project aims to increase the capacity of municipalities and producer groups to deliver locally produced eggs and vegetables for McGovern-Dole school feeding, and to improve utilization of this nutritious food by building the capacity of School Feeding Committees, School Feeding Monitors, and Community Health Volunteers.	Catholic Relief Services
McGovern-Dole	2015	This $33.7 million project aims to provide nutritious U.S. commodities for school feeding, and to improve literacy and attendance of school-age children.	Catholic Relief Services
Cochran Fellowship	2018	USDA trained three fellows on U.S. craft beverage merchandising and marketing. The goal was to increase Honduras' imports of U.S. agricultural products.	N/A

Nicaragua

McGovern-Dole	2017	This $23.25 million project aims to provide nutritious U.S. commodities for school feeding, improve literacy and student attendance. The project also aims to improve health and hygiene practices, and to increase access to clean water and sanitation.	Project Concern International
Cochran Fellowship	2018	USDA trained two fellows on hops, barley, and malts and organized retail and e-retail. The goal of these programs was to increase the country's imports of U.S. agricultural products.	N/A

Panama

Cochran Fellowship	2018	USDA trained two fellows in school meals and nutrition, in order to improve the country's food security. The fellows were also trained in hops, barley, and malts and organized retail and e-retail, to increase Panama's imports of U.S. agricultural products.	N/A

Mr. HICKS. And just quickly, so I don't run over the time, but a lot of the programs you were referencing are handled out of our Latin American, Caribbean bureau. Very happy to provide you inventory information. I will get that relayed back to you for the record if that is okay.

You did ask how we might improve. I think it is a good opportunity. You mentioned a lot of data that we collect and we monitor.

Mr. CUELLAR. Excellent data.

Mr. HICKS. And, you know, the last farm bill was passed with an increase in our funding to our data collection type of contract. We have a contract that is called a Famine Early Warning System, and it is where we pull in data from crop yields to rainfall to purchasing power, all the different components to figure out where the food insecurity is. You guys provided us some ability to increase our monitoring, evaluation to make sure that that program is at tiptop shape. So you guys are already doing a lot to help us, and I appreciate your referencing to our vigorous data collection because that is what drives our targeting of our program.

Mr. CUELLAR. Thank you.

And I appreciate both of you. Thank you so much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. I would like to recognize Mr. Fortenberry for purposes of request for submission to the record.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And when I have my full 5 minutes, I will go into this in more detail. This is a letter I wrote to the Comptroller General, the Government Accountability Office, regarding what I asked you earlier in terms of a survey of all internationally related food assistance programs in our government and internationally.

But I am going to come back to this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

I would like to recognize Dr. Harris.

VENEZUELAN ASSISTANCE

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And, yeah, we are certainly a very generous nation, but I have a couple of questions for you. One thing that came up is that, in the testimony, there is mention of Venezuela receiving assistance. Is that just for this future fiscal year if they do democratization, or have they been receiving assistance up until now?

Mr. ISLEY. Correct. Yes, it would be for the future year, and it would be contingent on the transition to a democratic government that would meet our satisfaction to release those funds with our implementing partner.

Mr. HARRIS. So, right now, they are not one of the 38 countries mentioned in your testimony that received aid.

Mr. ISLEY. Correct.

Mr. HARRIS. Good.

GMO CORN REJECTION

Now a couple/few years ago, I was in Kakuma in Kenya, which I understand is one of the countries that receives aid, and visited the camp there, went to the food distribution site, and was a little puzzled to find that they reject U.S. corn for human consumption

because it is GMO corn. This is very curious to me because my children eat GMO corn, and I find it a little unusual that a country that asks for U.S. aid would actually reject it because, you know, they don't want their children to eat what my children eat.

So, of those 38 developing countries and these programs, how many will not accept U.S. corn because it is GMO corn for human consumption?

Mr. HICKS. First of all, I eat GMO every day.

Mr. HARRIS. I think almost everyone in this room does probably.

Mr. HICKS. But I don't have the total number, but I will tell you that we have an amazing, phenomenal Ambassador in Rome, who is Ambassador Kip Tom, and it is his job to work on these international agriculture and food assistance issues, and this is on his radar. It is at the top of his list. He is an excellent advocate to try to convince these countries that GMO not only isn't going to hurt you; it could probably help you overcome a lot of the food insecurity and agricultural challenges that are in a lot of these countries.

So I feel like we have really good representation right now on this issue. It is not something that I in my humanitarian capacity do, but with our Ambassador, who I coordinate with and his staff almost daily, it is on his radar, and it is also on the radar of the Bureau of Food Security, which is a sibling bureau to the Humanitarian Bureau. The Administrator there, Beth Dunford, it is something on her radar, too, where she is actively working on this.

So I am very happy to provide the USAID information on which countries have these issues, and I can help direct you to any resource you want to talk about this issue.

Mr. HARRIS. Well, that is what I would like. I would like to know which countries actually will not accept U.S. humanitarian aid of GMO corn. It is fascinating. Look, our district, we do corn and soybeans. Okay. They are GMO, basically. I mean, 88 percent of corn, 90 percent of corn is GMO. It is not a hundred percent. But we are talking about trade, and everybody is criticizing the President: Oh, it is trade, you know.

Look, that is a trade—the fact that there are European nations, many European nations, trading partners who will not take, who will not accept U.S. GMO corn for human consumption—and I will tell you, because I had these discussions with some of these Parliamentarians, they know this is political. They know there is no scientific background for this. So why aren't we using our aid programs as leverage against these political trade barriers that are put up by these countries?

Mr. ISLEY. Well, we do, and it is USDA's job to address some of those barriers, and we do that through these programs and a lot of others.

This is an example of them adopting European policies in this area and us continuing to work very hard to reverse that, rebut that. And Food for Progress, for instance, we have several projects in the SPS area, sanitary/phytosanitary, to implement U.S.-based policies, science-based policies, not based on fear. And it is our people, our attaches, our local employed staff that get a lot of these shipments cleared that may originally face obstacles based on whatever those import barriers are, whether they are GMO or other requirements countries may have, that are ill-advised.

So we work very hard to get them cleared there, also on the trade side, but also in these programs. And we target Food for Progress. We target Cochran, Borlaug to try to educate people and to implement well-thought-out programs that not only improve productivity but also sustainability and a lot of other benefits of these technologies we see. So I am passionate. I grew up on a farm in Iowa. Corn and soybeans. We use GMOs. I get it.

Mr. HARRIS. Thank you very much.

Our farmers are the best agricultural producers in the world, using the best technology, and have a lot to offer this world, and these obstacles are tremendously frustrating to me.

Thank you very much.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much.

IN-KIND FOOD ASSISTANCE ISSUES

Mr. Isley and Mr. Hicks, I would like to return to a subject that Mr. Aderholt touched on and ask you to discuss how your programs ensure that the in-kind contributions support both our farmers at home and the agricultural economies of the recipient countries. Our authorizing and Appropriations committees spent a number of years studying these effects and trying to strike the right balance. In the past, we have heard concerns that the use of the in-kind donations sometimes limits the sustainability and the strength of the local agricultural economy. And I recognize that programs, such as the Local and Regional Procurement Program, have been established to attempt to defray the consequences of in-kind donations.

But this is just one of the options in your toolkit to ensure that your programs achieve the ultimate goal of creating self-sustaining agricultural economies in recipient countries. How do you respond to these criticisms of in-kind donations and how do you address these concerns and what improvements need to be made to your programs to ensure that in-kind donations advance the local agricultural economy? And tell me whether or not the programs are flexible enough today to do this and still give the pride and the utilization of American-grown products.

Mr. ISLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And we work, first and foremost, we work very closely with our ag industry constituents in terms of these in-kind contributions. We work with our sister agency AMS on the procurement of those, as Director Hicks had mentioned.

To give you an example, under Food for Progress, we purchased 185,000 metric tons of U.S. commodities comprising soybeans, wheat, rice, and others. So those groups are very interested. Peanuts is another big commodity we supply. So, they are very interested and meet with us regularly on that. We also are constantly accepting proposals on what is qualified under these programs to supply in expanding that list based on our technical criteria.

In terms of impact, some of the criticism really is on the Food for Progress Program as the monetization of those. So one of our requirements is we have to do economic analysis of potential disruption of local economies and local markets. We take that very seriously. Our Office of Global Analysis does those economic analyses and could substantiate the low to negative or no impact from the

supply, and the actual commodities are chosen on that basis as well.

And we take those projects in turn on the Food for Progress and use the proceeds to actually build capacity there. So, instead of negative consequences, there is actually positive consequences. I mentioned cacao and coffee projects. There is also the regulatory SPS projects. We have got a poultry project where we are developing feed and productivity improvements to the poultry industry in Tanzania.

So there is multiple positive benefits to the countries, but we are always cautious about economic impact from the supply of the commodities.

Mr. HICKS. And I would echo that.

We are required under title II to do what is called, which you are probably familiar with, the Bellman determination. It is a constant monitoring of the economic impact. You know, when we are the largest provision of food aid, bringing in large amounts of food can sometimes cause some imbalances on the local economies. So we take a lot of care to make sure that we are looking at all the right indicators. We are doing market analysis. We have partner reporting requirements on this particular issue from their point of view. We also have a lot of field-deployed staff who are monitoring local markets.

So we take it very seriously. It is a very important piece of the Food for Peace Act and the requirements that are in the legislation, and we adjust our response accordingly when we find that there is an imbalance.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

We have been joined by the distinguished lady from New York, the chairwoman of the full Appropriations Committee. She has had a busy schedule this morning, but I announced earlier that, when she arrived, we would defer to her and the gentlelady has arrived.

And I am pleased to recognize the gentlelady from New York, Mrs. Lowey, for whatever time she may take and for whatever questions she may like to address.

EMERGENCY VS. DEVELOPMENTAL ASSISTANCE

The CHAIRWOMAN. I do want to thank the distinguished chair for that very generous introduction. We are trying to get our work done, and there are several Appropriations hearings at the same time. So thank you.

And thank you to our distinguished minority for your generosity. I appreciate it.

So, let me welcome you. I am sure you have been adequately welcomed, Mr. Isley from USDA, Mr. Hicks from, USAID. And, again, I apologize because I was looking forward to hearing from you with your very important presentation.

From the perspective of this subcommittee and as chairwoman of the Subcommittee on State and Foreign Operations, it really is important that we provide responsive assistance in emergencies and that, when possible, we ensure this aid compliments the longer term development programs. Providing humanitarian support to those in need, in addition to promoting resilience and sustainable economic growth, is critical to global stability and national security.

The distinction between food aid and longer term food assistance is important in my judgment, and I am sorry that I missed your very eloquent, informative testimony, but I did kind of read it quickly before.

A couple of questions. Mr. Hicks, can you please describe how USAID Food for Peace efforts in areas where there is prolonged need for food differ from those supported by development initiatives, like Feed the Future, that promote longer term food security? Now, if you have already answered these questions and my staff is giving them to me again, I apologize. So, I am assuming you didn't have them. If you can please respond, to what degree does Food for Peace programming intersect with Feed the Future programming, if at all?

Mr. HICKS. Sure. Well, first of all, I think it is a good enough question to answer twice. So but this is my first time to address it. So Food for Peace is indeed integrated with Feed the Future. We are part of the Global Food Security Strategy that was required under the Global Food Security Act, and we are increasingly becoming more coordinated with the Bureau of Food Security and the Feed the Future initiative.

Our job is to address the root causes of hunger. We target the most vulnerable. We work in our development programs that is funded by this subcommittee. We improve agriculture. We improve livelihoods, maternal and child health, women's empowerment, disaster-risk reduction. What we are doing is helping these communities adapt to the recurrent shocks, and then we program alongside Feed the Future, who will come in behind us, and once these communities graduate from the need for humanitarian assistance, Feed the Future will come in and not only help them thrive with their own self-reliance but also get access to markets and value chains.

And I actually saw this with my own eyes when I was in northern Kenya a couple of years ago. There was a community that was using—there was needing humanitarian assistance for drought. We did a work-for-assets program funded by this committee, and we were able to provide food in exchange for the creation of a water canal. Feed the Future came in behind us, used that water canal to help them with agricultural development. Now they are feeding themselves, and they are connected to value chains, and they have graduated from our program.

So, that is one example. We are doing it in Sahel. We are going to be doing it in Haiti. We are working alongside integrated in Feed the Future with the Global Food Security Strategy, with the resilience strategy, and with the new redesign where we are transforming USAID and bringing these bureaus together. We are creating a Humanitarian Bureau. That is going to be a sibling bureau to the Resilience and Food Security Bureau to even bring tighter integration.

The CHAIRWOMAN. I just want to pursue that for a minute because what I have wondered about: Are there measures in place to ensure that funding for these programs is complimentary and not duplicative?

Mr. HICKS. That is an excellent question.

So our primary focus on the emergency side, we are the first responders on the emergency side. We are the lead for providing emergency food assistance. On the development side, we have a different target, a different kind of angle for addressing the root causes. So we are doing the root causes of hunger. We are working with communities that have recurrent shock. And Food for Peace, they are working many times at a systems level, at a national level, or they are working with families that are further along that journey of self-reliance that Administrator Green talks about. These are like the entrepreneurials, the producers.

So we start at the beginning of the journey, and then we pass it off for them to take it off to the further development. So we are working at the most vulnerable portion of that.

The CHAIRWOMAN. So just continue that a bit because, in protracted scenarios, how does it work?

Mr. HICKS. So, in protracted scenarios, because there is such a high degree of conflict and instability, there aren't opportunities for development. And if there are, it is very on the margins. If there aren't the persistent rule of law and safety and security, markets aren't going to happen.

The CHAIRWOMAN. Right.

Mr. HICKS. So, for example, in northeast Nigeria, it is complete unsafe for free markets, for rule of law. There aren't those opportunities, but we are monitoring the situation. So, when there are opportunities on the margins and it makes sense to make those investments, we will be working with Feed the Future to take advantage of those if the landscape changes.

The CHAIRWOMAN. And in areas where vouchers used and particularly in settings where food aid is required for prolonged periods, just tell me how programs are being designed because I know how difficult it is.

Mr. HICKS. Sure. So, on vouchers and other means to use local markets, there really isn't a one-size-fits-all. We look at the availability of infrastructure, the availability of markets for each individual response, and we design our response according to what is there.

So, in Jordan, where it is a middle-income country, where there are thriving markets, we use many times debit cards at local markets. There is a very high number of urban refugees spread out over the entire city—all these cities. It is impossible to find each one and give them a bag of wheat and there is this thriving market. So it is more effective to use that kind of credit card system. And other places where there isn't electronic banking, we will sometimes use paper vouchers, and there are systems in place to monitor that and to ensure that those vouchers are being used by the right beneficiaries. Sometimes we use biometrics, photo IDs, other methods.

But every context is different, and we have to kind of build out from whatever is available there and what the dangers and the risks are for each.

FOOD ASSISTANCE BRANDING

The CHAIRWOMAN. Now I would also appreciate your views with respect to branding. Is food aid from the United States generally branded with USAID marking?

Mr. HICKS. Absolutely. So, when it is commodities, whether it is U.S. commodities or local regional commodities, the USAID logo is very prominently displayed on the bags, containers, on the packaging. If it is a debit card, like used in Jordan, the logo is on that card. If it is on voucher paper, it is on the paper. If it is a work-for-food worksite, there is a sign prominently displayed. When I was in northern Kenya, I saw the sign right next to the canal. It is very evident. We also use messaging like radio and other types of public messaging as well.

The CHAIRWOMAN. Thank you very much. I won't take advantage of your generosity anymore, but I really appreciated this, and I apologize because there is another hearing next door.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much, Madam Chairwoman. We are always delighted to have you come and to bring your insight and your wisdom, and we appreciate that very much.

At this time, I will be happy to yield to Mr. Fortenberry.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you again, Mr. Chairman.

And, Madam Chair, if I can say, even though you didn't have the benefit of the fullness of the hearing earlier, your questions were absolutely precisely what was needed at this point in the hearing. So, thank you. That is a great contribution.

The CHAIRWOMAN. Well, thank you, my friend.

FOOD ASSISTANCE INNOVATION

Mr. FORTENBERRY. And especially the last one as well, the branding, and that is well answered. I think this is very important, particularly what Congressman Aderholt was also saying, that we are telling, we have to tell our story. No one else will.

I am going to be abstract for a moment more. Then we are going to go to some specifics.

The letter that I have sent to the General Accountability Office asks for a map, a mapping strategy. This is basically the language: Develop a comprehensive map of all United States and international food-related agencies and programs and share that with Congress in the next 180 days.

It won't be quite that fast. You said you do your own analysis of global food programming. Maybe we can have another conversation about that; but I think can you understand my intention in trying to push this because I worry about the issue of fragmentation. Very helpful to hear has that the Global Food Security Act is one of the compelling factors of helping you all integrate Feed the Future and your other emergency assistance programs, how those build upon one another. That is very helpful feedback.

But if you simply do a survey, back-of-the-envelope survey, I mean, we have USAID and USDA with long-term structural missions, emergency missions, long-term development missions, and overlap. We have university systems. You mentioned Borlaug program out of Iowa as well, extraordinary work that they do. We

have the Food for Peace program, McGovern-Dole, Food for Progress. On the international stage the World Food Program, the biggest agency in this humanitarian space, which America leads by the way. You mentioned the Ambassador that we have to the U.N. Missions in Rome, most of which are agricultural related. We give money to the International Fund for Agricultural Development. Nobody is even aware of what it does. The U.S. African Development Foundation.

The Food and Agriculture Organization founded in post-World War II in Rome, how are we integrated with them? And by the way, China has now taken the leadership of the FAO. Now tell me what that means. Give me an answer. How much does China give away in humanitarian assistance each year? Can you give it right off the top of your head? You don't have to answer it. It is a rhetorical question.

Mr. HICKS. I don't think there is any.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. I asked the Secretary of State this, and he had a dumbfounded, stumped look. I said: Mr. Secretary, it is not meant for an answer because who knows? And it is probably about as close to zero as you get.

One of the largest economies in the world and now the leadership of the one of the main organizations for agricultural development, agricultural policy, and, to some degree, food assistance is being headed by a country that does no lifting in this regard.

So, again, back to the original intent of what I was talking about, this is an important mission for us. It is not well understood in terms of the global communities—well, in terms of America's generosity in creating conditions for stability in the global community. It is not understood by most Americans.

This is part of the reason why, again, taking a step back and surveying everything that we are doing and assuring that it is properly integrated, that we are not just moving old things forward in time, but that we are actually creating innovation in this space for the 21st century is absolutely necessary for this committee to be in front of.

So thank you, Mr. Chairman, for including this in the record.

ASSISTANCE TO HAITI

Haiti, so, Congressman Moolenaar, who was here earlier, and I traveled to Haiti at the request of an NGO who you help underwrite, Director Hicks. They do extraordinary work among the poorest of the poor. So we go to the hurricane-ravaged areas. We look at some special projects they have been involved in. We run into people that are developing solar down there, Americans, young American people, probably in some way funded by you all as well. We also met with a group of business people who all of them could move their businesses out of Haiti, but they are good Haitians who want to do the right thing for their own people.

Haiti's market has been disrupted by this problem with the Dominican Republic. It is in some ways a nonfunctioning market because of the problem of the, I would say, black market flow of goods and the disruption of the ability for the Haitian market to function properly.

Anyway, the point being Haiti can't even provide enough coffee production for its own needs, much less the potential of what it could be for huge export opportunity for the people there. So we looked at that southern area there, the potential for a co-op in partnership with that business community who does not have the ability of initial capital leverage, which we could provide, maybe even in concert with, again, the development finance organization of OPIC, on and on and on. That becomes then a project scalable to meet not just the emergency needs in ravaged areas but then the type of Feed the Future, Global Food Security Act thinking for long-term sustainability.

How are we going to get to this? I mean, it is ripe with potential out there, but I just want to make sure that we are all thinking innovatively and in solidarity together about what can be versus getting caught up in what a lot of times we do, just managing what is. Now we are doing both and here, and I appreciate that.

And I have done it again. I have taken my full 5 minutes, Mr. Chairman, without letting them respond. What am I supposed to do? I yield back.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Fortenberry.

Ms. McCollum.

MITIGATION OF EFFECTS OF CLIMATE CHANGE

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Well, we have heard about Wisconsin and Iowa, but Mr. Borlaug is a Golden Gopher from the University of Minnesota. So I just wanted to set the record straight on that. We are all proud of him, and he saved many, many lives.

Everybody here today knows that we are witnessing record numbers of forcibly displaced people around the world, displaced people, refugees, asylum seekers. We are experiencing them right here at our borders.

June 2019, the U.N. Refugee Agency put the number at a devastating 70.8 million people around the world. Rising global conflicts, which Mr. Hicks has spoken to, regional instability, we are well aware of extreme weather and climate events that are directly linked to food insecurity.

But in Central American—and I am using a World Bank statistic—20 million people in Central American are displaced by climate change, and it is brought on because they have been experiencing serious drought conditions since 2014 and that drought just makes the whole issue of growing coffee with this leaf lust in coffee more because it is so heat-sensitive.

And, in fact, when I was in El Paso, through an interpreter, I heard firsthand from coffee farmers who were fleeing 3 years of bad crops. They had no trace of their own. They wanted to—went to the cities and then were attacked by gangs, and they just want to work and feed their family. That is El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras. I met farmers from all areas.

So, as the food insecurity continues to set the stage for instability and violent extremism in regions that we already know are highly volatile, can you maybe talk about some of the mitigation that you are doing in some programs or what USAID is doing to help with this global landscape, which is under, you know, under siege with

climate change? Because some of these transformative things that we have in Feed the Future means that we have to start being honest and open and talk about alternative crops.

Mr. HICKS. So, for the programs that would help, like, the coffee growers and some of these challenges with agriculture, like using different types of techniques for agriculture, that is most definitely a key part of Feed the Future initiative that is led by the Bureau of Food Security.

Where Food for Peace comes into play, we also have a part to play when there is the need for adaption to change. And that is what we do with our nonemergency development portion of title II. As I was saying earlier to the chairwoman, you know, we are working with the most vulnerable to help them adapt to these changes. So, whatever the recurrent shock is—and a lot of times it is from these climate shocks, these droughts, these adverse weather conditions—we are building resilience in those communities. We have been doing it for decades where we are helping them adapt to those recurrent shocks, to adjust the way they are living so that they can survive those shocks and continue with their own self-reliance and self-development.

And it is a keystone piece of what our program does.

Mr. ISLEY. Yes, and Food for Progress is particularly tailored to be able to address some of the challenges you highlighted. I mentioned the Food for Progress Program we actually have targeted in the region with the three countries, in addition to others you mentioned, on coffee and cacao production. Some of objectives are to increase the productivity, based on the current economic conditions they are facing around their production practices, around genetics, and how to improve in drought conditions and other conditions the actual output.

That is targeted broadly at a large group of farmers. It also benefits the U.S. based on taking the output of that production and helping the industries here like our chocolate industry, our coffee industry, based on being able to import the products that they produce there.

So it is a very well-integrated project, and it is very directed at adopting technology and best practices to improve productivity and to improve stability of the people there that can earn a livelihood based on that production.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Climate change is affecting our farmers here, whether we want to call it extreme weather or whatever or extreme drought. And if we don't get a handle on it, reducing the amount of carbon in the air, this problem is only going to get worse.

I thank you, gentlemen, for your work. I really do. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Fortenberry.

FOOD FOR PROGRESS AND HAITI

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate it. I will try not to give another speech.

Back to Haiti, again, it is what I call place-based strategy. So we take a specific place, and we actually can generalize to the prin-

ciple of what we are talking about. You respond to the emergency need.

Years ago, I was election observer in Haiti and, again, after the massive earthquakes. But the Vice President of Haiti told us something that was very fascinating. He said: You have given us $5 billion.

He said: Thank you, but what we need is direct foreign investment.

Now that term is a bit out of vogue now, but at the same time, the idea is back to what I was saying earlier.

Let's envision, for instance, if we took Food for Progress and we had a conversation with the new development finance mechanism at OPIC that comes on the heels of what USAID is doing in terms of going in first, working with NGOs, creating some stability in the midst of an emergency. You go to southern Haiti, which was devastated, and you see the sides of those mountains and the fullness of potential for coffee production there. You use the business community's expertise who are trustworthy there—this is an underlying problem of lack of governance and corruption and on and on—but, again, an integrated partnership in solidarity with good people who are going to provide the long-term sustainability so they can graduate, and the actual conditions there will shift so that each small-scale farmer is then put in a type of community cooperative arrangement, underwritten by capital flows, potentially with us, maybe leveraged through the private sector through your program or others. That then is shepherded by USAID, who is on the ground and our own American Embassy personnel, Foreign Ag Service, that creates a project in 2 to 3 years, first with banana production development so you are covering your variable costs, because that crop comes in quickly, with a longer term crop of coffee coming because the banana can grow underneath the coffee plant.

So this is all and then you take that model, once it works, and scale it across regions that have this particular type of production opportunity or others.

This is the type of thing we are talking about when we are looking for a spectrum of who is doing what and where, and what can we do to innovate around it? Mark Green and I have had this same conversation. I would like to have it with you in terms of the potential of Food for Progress, as well as OPIC's new development initiative, because this is what I want to get to, in my time, however long it is here. What is the architecture of what we are doing now, which seems to be very, very good? But what gaps are there potentially—others international partners who are doing certain things, other international partners who are claiming rights to ownership of this space but aren't doing anything, as I mentioned the Chinese, and on and on. This is the broader conversation that I want to continue with you all.

I am going to stop and let you respond to everything I have been saying.

Director Hicks, you haven't had a chance.

Mr. HICKS. So I actually would love to respond. And Haiti, it is one of the places where we are working.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Remember it is a place-based strategy. It is a specific that is generalizable to the principle. That is what I want to keep doing.

Mr. HICKS. Correct. There are very specific contextual issues in Haiti that we are responding to, but we are changing the way we respond to the emergency in a way that better links to the resilience and the development side. So what we are doing is we are, if we are providing food, we are going to do a food-for-assets kind of project, where we give folks food, but we have them work on an asset for the community that can be used in a development context. Feed the Future can come in behind us, use those assets to then build resilience, and get them on that self—

Mr. FORTENBERRY. How does that reconcile with the Food for Progress option?

Mr. ISLEY. Well, yes, we can certainly build that program, and we put Haiti on, in communication coordination with USAID, as a priority country for McGovern-Dole. We just awarded fiscal year 2019 a new project to do school feeding in Haiti to bring on that midterm support for Haiti, not the immediate emergency relief, but the longer term sustainability.

We can certainly look at Food for Progress in the same context to build onto what is already there and address the capacity in the crops you mentioned. We are very attuned to doing that.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. So, once I good threat report back, it is going to come to you guys as well in this committee. And we are going to continue this conversation about the continuum of support mechanisms here and throughout the world, what we do well, what gaps we might be able to identify, how we can become more effective.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ISLEY. We welcome that.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Very good. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

Mr. Isley, Mr. Hicks, you each have programs where success can be defined in a number of ways.

DETERMINING WHEN PROGRAMS ARE NO LONGER NECESSARY

Mr. Isley, I think Mr. Hicks has given an excellent example, but can you just tell us—well, both of you can—how you determine when a country should be graduated from your programs when they have achieved a level of self-reliance that removes the need for the programs to continue? And, of course, Mr. Isley, if you want to give us an example of a success story, we would appreciate that.

Mr. ISLEY. Certainly. And as indicated before and in the written and oral testimony, graduation is a key component as we go into the programs in the beginning and as we work with the implementing partners. Of course, each of the programs that we implement have specific selection criteria. So the countries would need to continue to meet that selection criteria or fall outside of it in terms of whether they would get new programming.

Take McGovern-Dole, for example, and school feeding. We work very closely with local government and even country government in terms of the taking over those programs. The things we do to ensure the graduation is to ensure that the laws and regulations are in place that enable them to take over the programs and to ensure

they do what you all do, and that is appropriate the necessary money and have the ability to actually take over the school feeding from us.

Recent example in Laos, where we are in transition for the government to take over, we brought a group over to the U.S. under our Cochran program and provided that education here in the U.S. on how to transition that programming back to the country.

A recent example of success, as was mentioned in the materials, was Kenya where over 4,000 schools that we have supported have now been taken over by the Kenyan Government, again, with our assistance and support in that transition.

Mr. HICKS. Well, you know, I provided a specific example, but I think a response that would maybe get to what both of you guys are looking at right now: We at Food for Peace we don't have anything on autopilot. We are constantly assessing. Basically, every year, we do a zero-based budget when it comes to our response. We are constantly looking at the data. We have the Famine Early Warning System. We have staff on the ground. We are looking at rainfall. We are looking at purchasing power. We are looking at all the things that go into food insecurity, and if the data doesn't show there is a need, we are not going to give humanitarian assistance to folks that don't have a demonstrated need. So we are constantly shifting.

So there are countries that graduate. There are countries that get on the dole. All we are doing is looking at the data, and the second that we provide assistance to folks that don't have a need, it is no longer humanitarian. So we take the data-driven approach very seriously. So, you know, it is not on autopilot. And we are constantly looking. If there is an area that had drought but doesn't have a need this year, we are not going to fund that area.

Mr. BISHOP. Well, Mr. Isley and Mr. Hicks, I would like to thank you both for being here today.

I know there are a few things on which you are going to get back to us on, and I think you will be submitted some questions that you can get back. I think Mr. Cuellar wanted some additional information. And we will forward additional questions to you for the record, and we would appreciate your diligence in getting responses back to us as quickly as you can.

But, again, we would like to thank you. And we look forward to continuing to work with you to make sure that these programs and American generosity is administered effectively and efficiently around the world. With that, we thank you.

And the subcommittee is adjourned.

[Questions and answers submitted for the record follow:]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AND
UNITED STATES AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT
QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON
INTERNATIONAL FOOD ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS
SEPTEMBER 25TH, 2019

QUESTIONS FROM CHAIRMAN SANFORD BISHOP

USAID

Value of Food For Peace Nonemergency Programs

1. The 2018 Farm Bill reauthorized Food for Peace non-emergency activities (also known as Development Food Security Activities) that have been vital to allowing a seamless transition between emergency and development contexts as well as build the resilience of communities so that the impact of future shocks and stresses are mitigated and they can feed themselves and their families.

Mr. Bishop: Director Hicks, can you provide an example of a Development Food Security Activity with a particular focus on how these programs might be different than they were 10-15 years ago?

Mr. Hicks: USAID's Bureau of Food Security (BFS), as the USG interagency lead for Feed the Future, has worked with interagency to develop a new approach to programs to achieve longer-term food security including programs to build resilience.

BFS led the effort to develop rigorous performance measures for USAID's mission-led Feed the Future target country programs and to collaborate closely with the interagency on this effort. For the 12 Feed the Future target countries, in the areas (called zones of influence) in which USAID's mission-funded programs operate, USAID specifically measures the percentage changes in poverty and malnutrition along with a number of other performance indicators. Other Feed the Future programs at USAID (and in other agencies) may not be working in these countries or zones of influence and tend to select a narrow subset of these other performance indicators to measure for the places in which they work. Development Food Security Activities (DFSAs) are key contributors to USAID Missions' measurements of percentage changes in poverty and malnutrition.

USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP), in discussion with BFS and other stakeholders, has invested in more rigorous evaluation methods and increased technical oversight to help ensure that current Development Food Security Activities (DFSAs) track real change and have sustainable impacts on food security and nutrition in the communities we work. The current awards are subjected to a much more rigorous mid-term evaluation process that results in significant mid-course corrections to existing awards, resulting in improved food security and nutrition outcomes. Current DFSAs have much more focus on gender, as gender analyses and

startup gender workshops are now required. Technical oversight for these multi-sectoral interventions has improved as the number of Washington-based technical staff increased from one to twenty-seven, including monitoring and evaluation staff with expertise across nine technical sectors. The current activities have a much stronger focus on sustainability due to the results of an FFP-funded study on exit strategies, performed by Tufts University, and increased oversight and focus on sustainability of programming.

FFP's DFSAs in Bangladesh are examples of the Agency's emphasis on sustainable development outcomes and the Journey to Self-Reliance. The projects, which began in 2015 and continue through FY2020, provide health, livelihoods, nutrition, agriculture, disaster risk reduction, and Water, Sanitation, and Hygiene (WASH) assistance to approximately 850,000 vulnerable, food-insecure people. The projects also work to improve gender equity and local governance.

USAID-funded research indicates that outcomes from development programs last longer when our partners incrementally transfer ownership to local communities and strengthen local level service provisioning systems. FFP's partners are fostering self-sustaining development activities, without the need for continued USAID support.

USAID AND USDA

Food Security 101: Coordinating Within the Global Food Security Strategy

2. Congress passed the Global Food Security Act in 2016 and reauthorized it in 2018, reaffirming the US government's commitment to continue to lead global efforts to fight hunger and malnutrition. The Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) was created by this legislation and is implemented through the Feed the Future Initiative across at least 11 different departments and agencies to ensure the US government's food security efforts are coordinated and complementary. As reported in the annual GFSS implementation report, inter-agency coordination has improved.

Mr. Bishop: Administrator Isley and Director Hicks, can you please share how you coordinate programs with the rest of the US government through the Global Food Security Strategy? In particular, can you provide an example of how this strategy has improved coordination of efforts in a particular country or community overseas?

Mr. Isley: USAID is the lead agency for the GFSS, and USDA's objectives for its international food assistance programs align with the goals and objectives of the 2017-2021 GFSS ("Feed the Future"). The link can be found at the following link: https://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do/agriculture-and-food-security/us-government-global-food-security-strategy. USDA implements these programs, including the McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (McGovern-Dole), Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program (LRP), and Food for Progress Program (FFPr) in alignment with Feed the Future, where appropriate. In addition, USDA includes Feed the Future country status as a point of coordination when selecting priority countries for future programming. USDA has also integrated the relevant Feed the Future standard indicators into the food aid division's monitoring and evaluation system, ensuring that McGovern-Dole, LRP, and FFPr can report regularly on their contributions to food security. For example, USDA reports on Feed the Future indicators that measure hectares under improved management practices, the value of new public and private sector investments leveraged by USDA to support food security and nutrition, and the overall number of individuals participating in our food security programs. Similarly, USDA endeavors to align its agricultural trade and scientific exchange and fellowship programs, including the Norman E. Borlaug International Agricultural Science and Technology Program, the Cochran Fellowship Program, and the Faculty Exchange Program with Feed the Future and includes Feed the Future country status as one of the criteria when determining priority countries.

USDA appreciates USAID's role as the lead agency on the implementation and coordination of Feed the Future. USDA participates actively on interagency coordination to ensure our activities minimize duplication with efforts and activities being undertaken by the other participating agencies in Feed the Future.

We note that in the FY 2020 and earlier President's Budgets, the Administration has sought to reduce or eliminate funding for several Feed the Future partner agencies and programs

within GFSS identified as duplicative, ineffective and/or inefficient, including but not limited to USDA's McGovern-Dole Food for Education and Food for Progress programs, and USAID's P.L. 480 Title II food aid program.

Mr. Hicks: Feed the Future draws on the agricultural, trade, investment, development, and policy resources and expertise of a number of USG Departments and Agencies and their related programs that are included in this interagency effort. USAID's Bureau for Food Security (BFS) is the interagency lead for these long-term food security and resilience efforts. In response to the Global Food Security Act of 2016, these agencies developed the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS), a five-year integrated strategy that builds on the first phase of Feed the Future's experience and responds to changes in the global context. Within USAID, USAID's Global Health office, which supports a number of important nutrition programs, and USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP), which funds Development Food Security Activities (DFSAs) are also included in the GFSS.

FFP coordinates with BFS to reduce poverty, hunger, and malnutrition. FFP and BFS work jointly on issues relating to resilience, including standing up the Resilience Leadership Council, expanding the policy, program, and technical assistance role of the Center for Resilience. FFP and BFS also annually identify Resilience Focus Countries in which the two offices will continue or start to work to reduce the impact of shocks and stresses on the most vulnerable populations to preserve or improve their economic situations. These resilience efforts contribute important results to the Feed the Future results framework because they reach the most vulnerable, helping them graduate from emergency food assistance to sustainable agricultural livelihoods. Strategic coordination includes sequencing, layering and integrating FFP and GFSS investments in Resilience Focus Countries in order to maximize impact.

Furthermore, in several countries, Feed the Future exercises the tools, authorities, and resources of the interagency to advance the Global Food Security Strategy. In northern Senegal, several USG agencies have worked collaboratively with the local government to support and accelerate growth in what has become the country's most dynamic agricultural region. This collaborative effort has leveraged each agency's unique strength. The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), for example, designed a compact to renovate and expand local irrigation systems, improve transportation infrastructure and consolidate local land tenure laws. USAID then launched a series of programs focused on improving farm-level financial and market access and the provision of local technical services. Peace Corps Volunteers were positioned to work with local farmers' cooperatives, and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) supported efforts to ensure phytosanitary improvements and support school lunches via the former McGovern-Dole program. The impact of this interagency coordination in promoting agriculture-led growth has been widely acknowledged.

The drafting of new Feed the Future target country plans, required by the reauthorization of GFSA, further promoted interagency collaboration and coordination. For example, in Niger, MCC and USAID both strategically engage on the livestock sector with the former working on issues facing livestock migration corridors and the latter focusing on productivity of livestock value chains.

With respect to GFSS, while most programs are not affected, a number of recent Administration Budget Requests seek to reduce or eliminate funding for several partner agencies and programs that the Administration has identified as duplicative, ineffective and/or inefficient, including but not limited to the P.L. 480 Title II food aid program.

FFP defers to USDA to answer the portion of the question on USDA programming.

Central America

3. In August 2019, Voice of America reported that the World Food Program hopes to quadruple its response reach in Central America now that 5 years of drought have affected over 2 million people and increased the food insecurity of smallholder producers throughout the region. FEWSNET predicts that pockets of the dry corridor in Guatemala will continue to see risks of IPC 3 levels of food insecurity, which means emergency food assistance is needed as families have already resorted to negative coping mechanisms.

Mr. Bishop: Can the witnesses please provide any additional information about the increasing food insecurity in Central America and share if your programs are currently working to address the immediate emergency needs as well as invest in the longer-term development needs of the countries in Central America?

Mr. Isley: USAID leads all foreign food security emergency responses. USDA's Food for Progress Program is investing in Central America's long-term development as detailed below. In accordance with the President's decision regarding foreign assistance for El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, USDA ceased obligating new funds for these countries. We continue with our previously funded projects.

USDA Food Aid and Development Projects in Central America

Regional Project

Program	Award Year	Description	Implementing Partner
Food for Progress (Covers El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua)	2018	This project aims to build capacity in cacao and coffee production, supporting production that benefits U.S. industries. The $47 million regional project supports 120,000 farmers and 1200 organizations.	TechnoServe

Guatemala

Food for Progress	2016	This $18.3 million project aims to improve the profitability of the coffee value chain by focusing on the quality of production and processing practices in Guatemala's coffee producing regions. The project's largest presence is in the Western Highlands, where factors affecting migration are significant and where this strategic value chain is needed in the face of historically low global coffee prices.	Counterpart International

Honduras

Food for Progress	2017	This $16.5 million project aims to increase the production and quality of coffee, expand trade, and increase sales.	TechnoServe
Food for Progress	2015	This $17.4 million project aims to improve agricultural productivity, increase access to information and market skills, build government capacity, and strengthen local, regional, and international trade of agricultural products.	Government of Honduras

Mr. Hicks: Central America's Dry Corridor—comprising parts of the Northern Triangle (NT) countries of Guatemala, El Salvador, and Honduras—has had poor harvests, lost labor opportunities and reduced household incomes, exacerbated by drought.

In accordance with the President's decision regarding foreign assistance for El Salvador, Guatemala, and Honduras, USAID ceased obligating new funds for these countries. In accordance with current policy, funds previously obligated to grants or contracts in these countries continue to be used to implement programming according to the original objectives of those awards—addressing longer-term development needs and root causes of food insecurity by identifying market opportunities— such as in coffee, increasing water availability, and reducing vulnerability to droughts and other shocks like crop diseases.

Similarly, FFP currently has an emergency food assistance program in Guatemala whose previously obligated funds cover the remainder of the program. This program addresses nearly 30,000 vulnerable people in Huehuetenango Department, helping the most food insecure populations to meet their basic food needs, working to increase livelihood opportunities and build resilience of communities to withstand shocks, and allowing household and community resources to help protect against shocks.

FFP defers to USDA to answer the portion of the question on USDA programming.

Efficiencies – Shipping

4. GAO has reported in the past about the challenges of efficiently moving food assistance.

Mr. Bishop: Can you describe what some of the logistical challenges are and how USAID and USDA are working together to overcome these challenges?

Mr. Isley: USDA operates foreign food assistance programs within the legal requirements of cargo preference. For the McGovern-Dole and Food for Progress programs, cargo preference requirements stipulate that at least 50 percent of the gross tonnage of commodity shipments shall be transported on privately owned, U.S.-flag commercial vessels to the extent such vessels are available at fair and reasonable rates. Pursuant to the 1998 Farrell Lines, Inc. v. USDA court order (which only applies to USDA), USDA must jointly comply with cargo preference on a program basis, by country, and by vessel type. Overall, this requirement complicates efforts to move food assistance efficiently. USDA is usually closer to 100 percent than to 50 percent because, among other reasons, the freight rates for smaller shipments on U.S.-flag vessels are significantly higher than larger ones and more than offset any cost savings from sending freight on foreign-flag vessels.

When appropriate, USDA seeks to combine shipments with USAID. The agencies issue monthly solicitations for packaged/containerized shipments. Recently, a solicitation was issued that included over 30,000 MT of food aid cargo for both agencies. As a result, awards were made to four liner vessels that included both USAID and USDA cargo for delivery to nine countries (Mali, Nicaragua, Tanzania, Senegal, Laos, Nepal, Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, and Zimbabwe). In most cases, USAID and USDA are shipping to different ports and countries. However, in cases where coordinated procurement is possible, USDA has been able to achieve some reduction in commodity and U.S.-flag transportation costs.

Mr. Hicks: USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP) collaborates most closely with USDA on operational, supply chain, and logistics issues pertaining to the procurement of Title II commodities. For example, USAID has worked closely with USDA for several years on a project to improve supply chain management, including technologies to help us better track commodities throughout the supply chain and identify new contracting mechanisms. USAID has also worked closely with USDA and other commodity suppliers to pilot "hybrid" bags for various milled products. We are continually looking for ways to improve the storage and handling of Title II commodities.

Some logistical challenges FFP faces occur when implementing cargo preference requirements:

- Timeliness: Timeliness can be a significant challenge with existing requirements, particularly for emergency food aid. Regular U.S. flag services do not exist to some parts of the world that USAID operates in, such as Western and Southern Africa. However, Maersk has begun offering a U.S. flag service to West Africa every two months.
- Cost: Ocean freight costs come directly out of the Title II budget and additional transportation costs directly reduce USAID's ability to purchase and ship domestically-

sourced commodities. The costs for U.S.-flagged vessels when compared to commercially available foreign-flagged vessels are substantially more expensive.

- Appropriateness: FFP is often required to use inappropriate types of U.S. flag vessels to transport its commodities in order to remain compliant under the cargo preference statute. For example, USAID has recently had to contract heavy lift type vessels (meant to carry engineering-type project cargoes) and in the past petroleum tankers to transport bulk grain commodities due to a lack of availability of proper bulk carrying vessels in the U.S. flag fleet. These practices add substantial cost and operational delays to the delivery of vital emergency foods.
- Programmatic Sensitivities: There are emergency contexts in which the political and/or security climate makes it unwise to transport commodities on a U.S.-flagged ship. For example, over the past two years, four U.S. flag vessels declined to service the ports in Yemen as contracted because the U.S. ship owners determined it was too dangerous to make the port calls. As a result, USAID has had to rely exclusively on foreign flag vessels to deliver the desperately needed emergency food to the USAID Yemen programs, one of the largest recipients of U.S. procured in-kind food assistance.

USAID values the services that U.S. flag vessels provide. However, it also believes that it's important that USAID have the ability to utilize the most suitable and cost-effective ocean transportation services available to service its programs. Overall, the added flexibility and cost savings offered by the international flag vessels help the program achieve greater response times and save valuable taxpayer dollars.

USDA will be providing additional information regarding logistical challenges specific to USDA-managed programs.

QUESTIONS FROM RANKING MEMBER JEFF FORTENBERRY

Effectiveness of Feed the Future Initiative

1. Mr. Fortenberry: For each agency and respective program, please provide details on where the bulk of your budgets go? Specifically, give us a breakdown of where it goes by recipients or partner and then by type of cost (i.e., food, transportation, overhead, etc.).

Mr. Isley: The requested breakdown of USDA funding for fiscal year (FY) 2018 is shown in the tables below. FY 2019 awards, while signed, are still undergoing final negotiations.

FY 2018 USDA Food for Progress Awards ($ millions)

Country	Org.	Commodity	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost (Activity Portion) **	Freight Cost	Admin. Cost	Total
Egypt	Land O'Lakes International Development	Soybean Meal	19,360	$8.71 ($3.86)	$3.31	$0.81	$12.83
Georgia	Land O'Lakes International Development	Soybean Meal	54,000	$15.84 ($7.30)	$6.68	$1.36	$23.88
		Hard Red Winter Wheat	4,000				
Cambodia	American Soybean Association	Soybean Meal	38,710	$17.42 ($7.83)	$8.90	$1.62	$27.94
Philippines	ACDI/VOCA	Soybean Meal	36,390	$16.38 ($6.44)	$7.64	$1.19	$25.21
Latin America-Caribbean Regional*	TechnoServe	Crude Degummed Soybean Oil	43,450	$33.89 ($25.10)	$10.26	$3.00	$47.15
Totals			195,910	$92.24 ($50.53)	$36.79	$7.98	$137.01

** Includes Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Peru*
*** Note that Activity Cost is funded out of the monetization proceeds using the allocated commodities*

FY 2018 USDA McGovern-Dole Awards ($ millions)

Implementer	Country	Commodity	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost	Freight Cost	Admin. Cost	Activity Cost	ITSH	Total
Catholic Relief Services	Burkina Faso	Cornmeal, Lentils, Soy Fortified Bulgur, Vegetable Oil	8,910	$4	$4	$6	$8	$2	$24

Nascent Solutions, Inc.	Cameroon	Corn-Soy Blend Plus, Fortified Milled Rice, Pinto Beans, Vegetable Oil	9,290	$5	$2	$11	$6	$3	$27
Save the Children Federation, Inc.	Guatemala	Black Beans, Fortified Milled Rice, Vegetable Oil	7,740	$5	$1	$11	$7	$2	$27
Counterpart International, Inc.	Senegal	Fortified Milled Rice, Green Split Peas, Soy-Fortified Cornmeal, Vegetable Oil	3,380	$2	$1	$10	$7	$1	$21
Catholic Relief Services	Sierra Leone	Fortified Milled Rice, Lentils, Vegetable Oil	6,940	$4	$2	$10	$6	$3	$25
Save the Children Federation, Inc.	Sri Lanka	Pink Salmon, Split Yellow Peas	4,220	$8	$1	$5	$9	$3	$26
CARE, Inc.	Timor-Leste	Dark Red Kidney Beans, Fortified Milled Rice, Vegetable Oil	3,240	$2	$1	$13	$9	$1	$26
Totals			43,720	$31	$12	$66	$52	$15	$176

One cost driver for McGovern-Dole is funding of statutorily authorized activity costs that are captured as a stand-alone line item. For FFPr, activities are funded through the monetization of commodities and, therefore, are incorporated into the commodity line item. Under FFPr, administrative costs represent the operational costs primarily for starting the programs in-country. For McGovern-Dole, administrative costs include not only start-up costs, but also recurring and ongoing programmatic support costs in addition to ITSH (internal transportation, storage, and handling). ITSH costs may be significant when moving commodities into difficult-to-access areas. An additional cost driver is that McGovern-Dole commodities are often bagged, processed, and fortified for distribution to targeted, individual schools whereas FFPr ships commodities in bulk for commercial purposes.

Mr. Hicks: We are working on compiling the requested data for our annual FY2019 International Food Assistance Report to Congress and look forward to sharing the final product with you when it is ready. In the meantime, please find USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP) estimated FY2019 Title II Emergency and Development Programming figures below.

FY2019	ITSH	202(e) Administrative	202(e) Enhanced	Commodity Value	Ocean Freight	Inland Freight	Total
Development	$32,895,346	$115,697,986	$12,345,654	$71,646,375	$37,368,150	$12,191,558	**$282,145,068**
Emergency	$447,404,539	$170,297,266	$801,839	$518,688,361	$187,404,050	$64,739,433	**$1,389,335,488**

Notes:
*FY2019 numbers are estimates and will change as commodity value, ocean freight and inland freight values are reconciled with actuals.
**These figures include Title II emergency and development food security program costs only, and do not include technical and office support awards. The development total also excludes Development Assistance funded Community Development Funds that are authorized by the Food for Peace Act (P.L. 83-480) as amended by the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (P.L. 115-334) to apply against 7 USC 1736f(e).

FY2019 USAID/FFP Title II Development Programing	
Partner	**Total Funding**
ACDI/VOCA	$8,271,677
Adventist Development and Relief Agency	$9,934,592
Association of Volunteers in International Service	$4,810,495
Cooperative for Assistance and Relief Everywhere	$31,648,039
Cultivating New Frontiers in Agriculture	$4,668,649
Catholic Relief Services	$40,785,110
FHI 360	$27,246,062
Helen Keller International	$829,669
Mercy Corps	$11,179,183
Project Concern International	$788,700
The Relief Society of Tigray	$27,237,382
Save the Children	$1,553,323
World Food Program	$67,567,811
World Vision	$45,624,376
Total	**$282,145,068**

FY2019 USAID/FFP Title II Emergency Programing	
Partner	**Total Funding**
Catholic Relief Services	$149,544,955
International Rescue Committee	$2,982,456
UNICEF	$70,546,783
World Food Program	$1,166,261,294

Total	**$1,389,335,488**

Please find the Bureau for Food Security Feed the Future Budget Table for FY2018 which provides a breakdown of the FY2018 budget by operating unit requested below.

$ in thousands for all items	Feed the Future Budget Table FY2018 Initial Actual			
	Total	AEECA	DA	ESF
Total	1,000,600	12,500	841,400	146,700
Africa	422,815	-	410,715	12,100
Democratic Republic of the Congo	12,100	-	-	12,100
Ethiopia	55,000	-	55,000	-
Ghana	35,082	-	35,082	-
Kenya	40,079	-	40,079	-
Liberia	7,000	-	7,000	-
Malawi	12,000	-	12,000	-
Mali	24,500	-	24,500	-
Mozambique	6,800	-	6,800	-
Niger	15,085	-	15,085	-
Nigeria	26,000	-	26,000	-
Rwanda	22,000	-	22,000	-
Senegal	25,000	-	25,000	-
Somalia	14,200	-	14,200	-
South Sudan	6,000	-	6,000	-
Tanzania	25,329	-	25,329	-
Uganda	30,440	-	30,440	-
Zambia	12,000	-	12,000	-
Zimbabwe	4,500	-	4,500	-
USAID Africa Regional	2,000	-	2,000	-
USAID East Africa Regional	20,000	-	20,000	-
USAID Sahel Regional Program	4,000	-	4,000	-
USAID Southern Africa Regional	8,000	-	8,000	-
USAID West Africa Regional	15,700	-	15,700	-
East Asia and Pacific	29,000	-	10,000	19,000
Burma	19,000	-	-	19,000
Cambodia	10,000	-	10,000	-
Timor-Leste	-	-	-	-
Europe and Eurasia	4,400	4,400	-	-
Georgia	4,400	4,400	-	-
Near East	11,400	-	400	11,000
Egypt	9,500	-	-	9,500
Yemen	1,500	-	-	1,500

USAID Middle East Regional (MER)	400	-	400	-
South and Central Asia	140,025	8,100	53,425	78,500
Afghanistan	63,500	-	-	63,500
Bangladesh	53,425	-	53,425	-
Nepal	15,000	-	-	15,000
Pakistan[2]	TBD	-	-	-
Tajikistan	8,000	8,000	-	-
Uzbekistan	100	100	-	-
Western Hemisphere	48,500	-	48,500	-
Guatemala	18,000	-	18,000	-
Haiti	11,500	-	11,500	-
Honduras	18,000	-	18,000	-
Central America Regional - TBD	-	-	-	-
USAID Latin America and Caribbean Regional	1,000	-	1,000	-
USAID Asia Regional	900	-	900	-
USAID Asia Regional	900	-	900	-
BFS - Bureau for Food Security	315,960	-	315,960	-
USAID Bureau For Food Security (BFS)	315,960	-	315,960	-
E3 - Economic Growth, Education, and Environment	1,500	-	1,500	-
USAID Economic Growth, Education and Environment (E3)	1,500	-	1,500	-
Other Funding	26,100	-	-	26,100
To Be Programmed	26,100	-	-	26,100

[1]These levels do not include reprogrammed funds.

[2]Funding for Pakistan programs (all accounts) was shown as "To Be Determined" in the FY 2018 653(a) report, with funding previously assumed for Pakistan programs shifted to the "To Be Programmed" line in the FY 2018 653(a) report, including resources to meet the Food Security and Agricultural Development directive.

Effectiveness of Feed the Future Initiative

2. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide one or more examples of a Feed the Future country in which we have made progress in sustainable agriculture, or in even one district in which people are now food secure.

Mr. Isley: USDA defers to USAID, the lead agency for Feed the Future, but here is one example involving a USDA program. Following 14 years of McGovern-Dole-funded school feeding, USDA handed responsibility for school feeding in McGovern-Dole-supported schools over to the Government of Kenya (GOK) in June of 2018. The McGovern-Dole project now only provides technical support to the GOK to ensure sustainability. During the course of USDA's partnership with the World Food Programme (WFP) in Kenya under McGovern-Dole, WFP reached over 1.3 million children across 4,048 schools. Specific to the provision of meals, before transitioning schools, USDA began activities that supported the GoK's vision of an ongoing cash transfer system. USDA trained school administrators and management committees on money transfer management, tendering, procurement of local food, and quality control. USDA also focused its Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program funding in Kenya on developing, using, and promoting diverse school meal menus based on locally-produced, nutritious, and drought-tolerant crops, including sorghum, millet, and cowpeas. Local procurement was incorporated into the McGovern-Dole sustainability strategy as it stimulates local food production, increases farm income, and supports jobs in the community.

Mr. Hicks: Feed the Future is a data-driven effort. The interagency has tracked both the immediate and direct results of U.S. Government investments, as well as the broader impact of these results. For example, based on the data we've collected, we can estimate that poverty has dropped an average of 23 percent across the specific country areas (zones of influence) where the U.S. Government targeted Feed the Future investments from 2010 to 2017. Similarly, we estimate that stunting among children has dropped an average of 32 percent in this timeframe. Chronic malnutrition, as measured by stunting, has negative consequences on health, including physical and cognitive growth, and constrains the advancement of individuals, families, and nations.

We've seen notable improvements in food security in many of these areas, including at least a 25 percent drop in the proportion of households that suffer from hunger in Ghana, Guatemala, Liberia, Rwanda, and Senegal.

Maximize USDA/USAID in Feed the Future Countries

3. Mr. Fortenberry: How does each agency plan to maximize the work of USDA and USAID, particularly in Feed the Future countries, properly maximize the use of the Farmer-to-Farmer Program in way that is focused on the exact need of that country?

Mr. Isley: USDA defers to USAID, which administers the Farmer-to-Farmer Program.

Mr. Hicks: The Agency focuses on several of the Farmer-to-Farmer (F2F) Program's elements, including technical soundness, demand-driven activities, local ownership, sustainability and diversity. F2F has selected partners who have identified technically sound, qualified volunteer farmers, cooperative and agribusiness leaders, and researchers from across the nation. Working with USAID Missions, F2F places volunteers in areas where their knowledge can be best utilized. F2F partners identify demand-driven activities, which are then developed by the technically-qualified local country F2F staff on the ground after networking with potential host organizations to facilitate the volunteer assignments. This selection process allows all our volunteers and hosts to have the support they need, and elevates the need for clear and transferable knowledge-sharing as an outcome for each assignment. Local hosts and partners provide key insight into food system constraints and locations where volunteer farmers, agribusiness experts, and researchers can have an impact, driving local ownership and capacity building in the selection process. Additionally, in FY2020 USAID is looking forward to working with USDA on leveraging their networks across the land-grant university system to encourage more diverse volunteers to apply and participate in the program. This includes a presentation early in FY2020 to USDA staff to increase knowledge of the program and participation as volunteers by USDA personnel, extension agents, and recent retirees.

Simplifying Metrics of Success

4. Mr. Fortenberry: It's my understanding that USAID has 50 to 100 metrics for Feed the Future. Why wouldn't only two metrics, like child stunting and yield gap analysis, be enough to measure proper nutrition and improved local food production? As part of your answer, please provide the list of current metrics.

Mr. Isley: USDA refers you to Mr. Hick's responses for the answer to this question on USAID's programs and activities.

Mr. Hicks: For current target countries and the specific areas (zones of influence) in which USAID's mission-funded Feed the Future programs operate, USAID measures performance on these two critical outcome indicators. In addition, USAID has identified a small, core set of indicators that all programs that measure their progress are encouraged to use. The Feed the Future Indicator Handbook presents the current set of all performance management indicators for Feed the Future guided by the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) that was developed through a year-long collaborative process that included stakeholders and was led by the GFSS Interagency Monitoring and Evaluation Working Group. The set of indicators described in this Handbook are designed to measure progress against each result in the Feed the Future results framework. This results framework and the indicators identified at each level of this logic model helps U.S. agencies and programs monitor the causal flow from outputs to project outcomes to population/system-level outcomes to impacts, and supports our ability to assess the plausible contribution of our actions to the achievement of our impact. While collecting data on the higher-level outcome indicators is central to Feed the Future, collecting only one or two high-level metrics would not allow us to track progress along this logic chain and assess our contribution, nor would it allow us to understand why and why not we may be seeing changes in food insecurity, poverty and stunting outcomes so we can adapt our programs. In addition, the higher-level indicators, like stunting, are only collected every few years through population-based surveys, whereas output and most outcome-level results are reporting annually. This difference in frequency of collection also affects the number of indicators we need to collect.

A list of our current performance metrics is included in **Attachment A**, and full definitions and details for these are in our Feed the Future Indicator Handbook.

ATTACHMENT A - USDA Foreign Food Assistance Programs Commodity Table

				FISCAL YEAR 2015	
PROGRAM	PVO	COUNTRY	COMMODITY	COST($)	QTY(MT)
McGovern-Dole	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S.	BENIN	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	310,923.20	680
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	146,029.20	200
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	147,852.64	130.02
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	152,225.08	130.02
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	209,619.70	460
		BENIN Total		966,649.82	1,600.04
		BURKINA FASO	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	1,026,944.20	2,560.00
			CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	54,276.80	160
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	364,613.10	480
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	33,669.03	30
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	144,979.22	120.01
		BURKINA FASO Total		1,624,482.35	3,350.02
		GUATEMALA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	134,446.20	210
			CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	103,600.00	350
			CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	76,497.40	140
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	54,571.42	50.02
			OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	208,243.57	160
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	100,056.60	210
		GUATEMALA Total		677,415.19	1,120.02
		HONDURAS	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	928,726.50	1,570.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	525,865.56	440.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	135,629.20	280
		HONDURAS Total		1,590,221.26	2,290.02
		LAOS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	356,511.20	790
		LAOS Total		356,511.20	790
		SIERRA LEONE	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	142,728.60	270
		SIERRA LEONE Total		142,728.60	270
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S. Total			5,358,008.42	9,420.10
	COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC.	CAMEROON	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	144,421.20	230
			OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	108,684.76	80.01
			POTATO GRANULES, DEHYDRATED BAG-10 KG	709,234.50	370
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	646,860.10	1,340.00
		CAMEROON Total		1,609,200.56	2,020.01
		SENEGAL	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	190,704.80	440
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	76,500.00	90
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	116,384.77	110.01
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	29,793.00	60
			RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	98,400.00	200
		SENEGAL Total		511,782.57	900.01
	COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC. Total			2,120,983.13	2,920.02
	INTERNATIONAL RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT	CAMBODIA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	106,380.00	200
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	84,157.19	70.02
		CAMBODIA Total		190,537.19	270.02
	INTERNATIONAL RELIEF AND DEVELOPMENT Total			190,537.19	270.02
	MERCY CORPS	KYRGYZSTAN	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	87,773.40	180
			OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED CAN-6/4 L	77,911.18	40.03
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	26,586.40	40
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	45,096.10	90
		KYRGYZSTAN Total		237,367.08	350.03
	MERCY CORPS Total			237,367.08	350.03
	NASCENT SOLUTIONS INC.	CAMEROON	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	106,945.20	180
			OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	104,151.40	80.01
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	247,836.40	520
		CAMEROON Total		458,933.00	780.01
	NASCENT SOLUTIONS INC. Total			458,933.00	780.01
	PLANET AID, INC.	MOZAMBIQUE	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	269,735.00	500
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		269,735.00	500
	PLANET AID, INC. Total			269,735.00	500
	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL	GUATEMALA	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	107,037.00	140
			CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	51,297.00	100
			FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	47,196.00	100
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	51,720.76	50.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	111,004.80	240
		GUATEMALA Total		368,255.56	630.02
		NICARAGUA	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	410,752.70	320
			CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	133,181.80	260
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	64,446.94	60.01
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	119,618.40	260
			WHEAT, HARD RED SPRING BAG-50 KG	65,440.00	160
			WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG	38,900.00	100
		NICARAGUA Total		832,339.84	1,160.01
		TANZANIA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	227,768.60	400
			OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L	142,473.99	60.04
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG	759,286.20	1,260.00

		TANZANIA Total		1,129,528.79	1,720.04
	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL Total			2,330,124.19	3,510.06
	SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC.	GUATEMALA	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	355,814.80	480
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	149,265.00	300
			FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	233,983.80	480
			OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	83,444.23	60.02
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	219,207.60	480
			SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	729,060.00	1,740.00
		GUATEMALA Total		1,770,775.43	3,540.02
	SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC. Total			1,770,775.43	3,540.02
	UNITED NATIONS	BANGLADESH	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	2,351,138.60	9,740.00
		BANGLADESH Total		2,351,138.60	9,740.00
		CAMBODIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	147,855.08	130.02
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	134,482.80	270
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	2,231,280.60	4,110.00
		CAMBODIA Total		2,513,618.48	4,510.02
		ETHIOPIA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	2,327,745.00	4,900.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,203,709.13	1,020.02
		ETHIOPIA Total		3,531,454.13	5,920.02
		KENYA	BULGUR BAG-50 KG	792,888.80	2,420.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	94,509.50	80
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	294,048.00	600
		KENYA Total		1,181,446.30	3,100.00
		LAOS	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	850,450.20	1,890.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	391,021.98	360.04
			RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,354,217.60	2,980.00
		LAOS Total		2,595,689.78	5,230.04
		LIBERIA	BULGUR BAG-50 KG	922,615.10	2,530.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	367,716.42	280.02
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	323,122.40	680
		LIBERIA Total		1,613,453.92	3,490.02
		MALAWI	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,762,009.50	3,500.00
		MALAWI Total		1,762,009.50	3,500.00
		NEPAL	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	2,326,487.00	4,350.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	419,716.71	380.03
			RICE, 3/15 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	147,210.70	260
		NEPAL Total		2,893,414.41	4,990.03
	UNITED NATIONS Total			18,442,225.12	40,480.13
	WORLD VISION, INC.	MOZAMBIQUE	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	403,053.00	700
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		403,053.00	700
		NICARAGUA	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG	384,180.30	250
			CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	135,233.00	370
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	187,637.40	330
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	165,898.34	150.02
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	154,006.20	330
		NICARAGUA Total		1,026,955.24	1,430.02
	WORLD VISION, INC. Total			1,430,008.24	2,130.02
McGovern-Dole Total				32,608,696.80	63,980.40
Food for Progress	ACDI/VOCA	PAKISTAN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	2,992,500.00	4,500.00
		PAKISTAN Total		2,992,500.00	4,500.00
		SENEGAL	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	7,280,000.00	10,000.00
		SENEGAL Total		7,280,000.00	10,000.00
	ACDI/VOCA Total			10,272,500.00	14,500.00
	AGA KHAN FOUNDATION U.S.A.	MALI	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L	7,056,116.58	6,000.38
			WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	2,230,300.00	10,000.00
		MALI Total		9,286,416.58	16,000.38
	AGA KHAN FOUNDATION U.S.A. Total			9,286,416.58	16,000.38
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S.	BURKINA FASO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,962,123.20	4,280.00
		BURKINA FASO Total		1,962,123.20	4,280.00
		NICARAGUA	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	3,271,600.00	4,000.00
			WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	4,081,275.00	18,700.00
		NICARAGUA Total		7,352,875.00	22,700.00
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S. Total			9,314,998.20	26,980.00
	MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA GANADERIA	GUATEMALA	CORN, YELLOW BULK	1,928,800.00	10,000.00
			SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	2,095,000.00	5,000.00
		GUATEMALA Total		4,023,800.00	15,000.00
	MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA GANADERIA Total			4,023,800.00	15,000.00
	SECRETARIA DE AGRICULTURA Y GANADER	HONDURAS	CORN, YELLOW BULK	5,584,180.00	30,700.00
		HONDURAS Total		5,584,180.00	30,700.00
	SECRETARIA DE AGRICULTURA Y GANADER Total			5,584,180.00	30,700.00
	SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE FUNDS	TANZANIA	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK	6,828,360.00	24,000.00
		TANZANIA Total		6,828,360.00	24,000.00
	SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE FUNDS Total			6,828,360.00	24,000.00
	TECHNOSERVE, INC.	MOZAMBIQUE	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	3,028,770.00	4,610.00
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		3,028,770.00	4,610.00
	TECHNOSERVE, INC. Total			3,028,770.00	4,610.00
Food for Progress Total				48,339,024.78	131,790.38
Grand Total FY 2015				80,947,721.58	195,690.78

PROGRAM	PVO	COUNTRY	COMMODITY	FISCAL YEAR 2016 COST($)	Values QTY(MT)
McGovern-Dole	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S.	BENIN	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	125,418.00	300
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	156,479.40	100
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	32,574.81	30
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-799	111,881.29	100.02
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	90,590.00	200
		BENIN Total		516,943.50	730.02
		BURKINA FASO	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	765,762.30	2,030.00
			CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	57,735.40	170
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	269,730.00	370
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	135,653.15	110.01
		BURKINA FASO Total		1,228,880.85	2,680.01
		GUATEMALA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	153,713.00	210
			CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	103,950.00	350
			CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	72,116.80	140
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	112,020.30	100.02
			OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	224,998.87	160
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	99,466.50	210
		GUATEMALA Total		766,265.47	1,170.02
		HONDURAS	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	298,585.80	360
			CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	148,875.00	500
			CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	454,019.40	900
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	203,427.00	400
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	309,748.87	280.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	267,686.10	540
		HONDURAS Total		1,682,342.17	2,980.02
		LAOS	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	82,249.32	70.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	148,981.90	300
		LAOS Total		231,231.22	370.02
		MALI	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	268,553.80	210
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	307,340.51	260.02
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	90,720.00	160
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	900,810.90	1,710.00
		MALI Total		1,567,425.21	2,340.02
		SIERRA LEONE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	225,450.00	210
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	77,152.92	70.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	726,075.40	1,340.00
		SIERRA LEONE Total		1,028,678.32	1,620.02
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S. Total			**7,021,766.74**	**11,890.11**
	COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC.	SENEGAL	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	34,146.40	40
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	12,409.80	30
		SENEGAL Total		46,556.20	70
	COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC. Total			**46,556.20**	**70**
	PLANET AID, INC.	MOZAMBIQUE	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	530,039.00	1,100.00
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		530,039.00	1,100.00
	PLANET AID, INC. Total			**530,039.00**	**1,100.00**
	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL	NICARAGUA	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	158,942.60	190
			CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	66,549.60	130
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	88,934.17	80.02
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	140,342.60	260
			WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG	32,505.00	110
		NICARAGUA Total		487,273.97	770.02
	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL Total			**487,273.97**	**770.02**
	SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC.	GUATEMALA	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	124,180.01	100
		GUATEMALA Total		124,180.01	100
	SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC. Total			**124,180.01**	**100**
	UNITED NATIONS	BANGLADESH	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	2,341,200.00	12,000.00
		BANGLADESH Total		2,341,200.00	12,000.00
		ETHIOPIA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	2,696,170.80	6,110.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,845,967.53	2,200.05
		ETHIOPIA Total		5,542,138.33	8,310.05
		GUINEA-BISSAU	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	364,067.60	530
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	291,371.41	260.02
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,449,851.10	3,400.00
		GUINEA-BISSAU Total		2,105,290.11	4,190.02
		HAITI	BULGUR BAG-50 KG	1,054,836.00	3,600.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	184,160.94	170.01
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	187,185.35	160
			PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	393,390.00	940
			PEANUTS, ROASTED, UNSL PKG-500/1 OZ	0	500.12
		HAITI Total		1,819,572.29	5,370.13
		IVORY COAST	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	74,298.39	70.02
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	108,496.83	90.01
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	321,129.00	450
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	1,903,158.60	3,780.00
		IVORY COAST Total		2,407,082.82	4,390.03
		NEPAL	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,301,099.70	2,980.00

			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	180,572.44	160
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	8,300.00	20
			RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	28,742.00	70
			RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	92,452.00	200
		NEPAL Total		1,611,166.14	3,430.00
		RWANDA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	425,038.40	930
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	127,020.00	110.01
		RWANDA Total		552,058.40	1,040.01
	UNITED NATIONS Total			16,378,508.09	38,730.23
	WORLD VISION, INC.	MOZAMBIQUE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	317,999.50	670
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		317,999.50	670
		NICARAGUA	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG	179,215.50	200
			CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	100,891.00	300
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	135,080.10	270
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	131,800.84	120.01
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	103,341.20	180
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	35,527.80	70
		NICARAGUA Total		685,856.44	1,140.01
	WORLD VISION, INC. Total			1,003,855.94	1,810.01
McGovern-Dole Total				25,592,179.95	54,470.38
Food for Progress	ACDI/VOCA	GHANA	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	1,013,760.00	2,400.00
		GHANA Total		1,013,760.00	2,400.00
		IVORY COAST	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	5,914,482.20	12,500.00
		IVORY COAST Total		5,914,482.20	12,500.00
		PAKISTAN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	5,549,625.00	7,500.00
		PAKISTAN Total		5,549,625.00	7,500.00
	ACDI/VOCA Total			12,477,867.20	22,400.00
	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION	GHANA	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	1,098,240.00	2,600.00
		GHANA Total		1,098,240.00	2,600.00
		IVORY COAST	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	5,911,125.00	12,500.00
		IVORY COAST Total		5,911,125.00	12,500.00
	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION Total			7,009,365.00	15,100.00
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S.	BURKINA FASO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	2,979,542.60	6,320.00
		BURKINA FASO Total		2,979,542.60	6,320.00
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S. Total			2,979,542.60	6,320.00
	COOPERATIVE HOUSING FOUNDATION CORP	TANZANIA	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK	3,038,880.00	13,000.00
		TANZANIA Total		3,038,880.00	13,000.00
	COOPERATIVE HOUSING FOUNDATION CORP Total			3,038,880.00	13,000.00
	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	5,819,920.00	8,000.00
			TALLOW, TECHNICAL BULK	861,300.00	1,100.00
			TALLOW, YELLOW BULK	670,980.00	1,060.00
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC Total		7,352,200.00	10,160.00
		EL SALVADOR	CORN, YELLOW BULK	389,800.00	2,000.00
			SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	7,013,000.00	19,250.00
		EL SALVADOR Total		7,402,800.00	21,250.00
		SENEGAL	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	2,853,038.50	4,030.00
		SENEGAL Total		2,853,038.50	4,030.00
	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S. Total			17,608,038.50	35,440.00
	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	3,627,030.00	11,370.00
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC Total		3,627,030.00	11,370.00
	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS Total			3,627,030.00	11,370.00
	PARTNERS FOR DEVELOPMENT	GUINEA	RICE, MILLED BULK	2,520,853.50	5,610.00
		GUINEA Total		2,520,853.50	5,610.00
	PARTNERS FOR DEVELOPMENT Total			2,520,853.50	5,610.00
	SECRETARIA DE AGRICULTURA Y GANADER	HONDURAS	CORN, YELLOW BULK	1,101,000.00	6,000.00
			SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	6,744,240.00	18,000.00
		HONDURAS Total		7,845,240.00	24,000.00
	SECRETARIA DE AGRICULTURA Y GANADER Total			7,845,240.00	24,000.00
	SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE FUNDS	TANZANIA	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK	2,571,360.00	11,000.00
		TANZANIA Total		2,571,360.00	11,000.00
	SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE FUNDS Total			2,571,360.00	11,000.00
	TECHNOSERVE, INC.	GUINEA	RICE, MILLED BULK	4,682,227.00	10,420.00
		GUINEA Total		4,682,227.00	10,420.00
	TECHNOSERVE, INC. Total			4,682,227.00	10,420.00
Food for Progress Total				64,368,403.80	154,660.00
Grand Total FY2016				89,952,583.75	209,130.38

				FISCAL YEAR 2017	Values
PROGRAM	PVO	COUNTRY	COMMODITY	COST($)	QTY(MT)
McGovern-Dole	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S.	BENIN	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	315,570.80	700
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	185,015.50	250
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	297,566.90	260.04
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	166,251.00	430
		BENIN Total		964,404.20	1,640.04
		BURKINA FASO	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	928,660.20	2,170.00
			CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	70,489.20	180
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	221,652.00	400

		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	157,900.55	130.02
	BURKINA FASO Total		1,378,701.95	2,880.02
	GUATEMALA	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	174,721.80	230
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	106,959.60	120
		CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	76,190.00	190
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	40,617.60	80
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	143,368.20	230
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	388,078.37	260.02
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	248,908.30	510
	GUATEMALA Total		1,178,843.87	1,620.02
	HONDURAS	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	276,584.40	360
		CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	165,750.00	500
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	225,076.40	450
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	469,853.00	750
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	327,715.99	280.04
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	216,607.50	540
	HONDURAS Total		1,681,587.29	2,880.04
	LAOS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	113,040.00	170
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	218,443.65	180.02
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	451,096.00	1,000.00
	LAOS Total		782,579.65	1,350.02
	MALI	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	204,887.80	220
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	341,096.85	260.02
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	79,570.50	150
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	723,955.10	1,690.00
	MALI Total		1,349,510.25	2,320.02
	SIERRA LEONE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	156,498.60	220
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	81,266.28	70.02
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	475,611.20	1,040.00
	SIERRA LEONE Total		713,376.08	1,330.02
CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S. Total			**8,049,003.29**	**14,020.18**
COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC.	SENEGAL	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	53,930.50	130
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG	18,630.00	30
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	60,710.95	50.02
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	16,350.00	30
		RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	127,915.20	270
	SENEGAL Total		277,536.65	510.02
COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC. Total			**277,536.65**	**510.02**
MERCY CORPS	KYRGYZSTAN	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	112,669.80	270
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	18,670.00	30
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	24,750.00	60
		OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-899	59,187.93	30.03
	KYRGYZSTAN Total		215,277.73	390.03
MERCY CORPS Total			**215,277.73**	**390.03**
NASCENT SOLUTIONS INC.	CAMEROON	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	116,566.50	150
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	105,525.60	70
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	164,073.00	420
	CAMEROON Total		386,165.10	640
NASCENT SOLUTIONS INC. Total			**386,165.10**	**640**
PLANET AID, INC.	MOZAMBIQUE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,147,816.10	2,000.00
	MOZAMBIQUE Total		1,147,816.10	2,000.00
PLANET AID, INC. Total			**1,147,816.10**	**2,000.00**
PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL	GUATEMALA	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	282,091.80	330
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	69,028.30	110
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	61,235.09	50.02
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	147,962.10	330
	GUATEMALA Total		560,317.29	820.02
	TANZANIA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	192,437.10	240
		OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L	115,827.63	50.01
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	313,166.00	810
	TANZANIA Total		621,430.73	1,100.01
PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL Total			**1,181,748.02**	**1,920.03**
SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC.	GUATEMALA	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	570,873.10	650
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	87,229.30	130
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	44,105.00	100
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	275,992.11	180.01
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	297,519.20	670
	GUATEMALA Total		1,275,718.71	1,730.01
SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC. Total			**1,275,718.71**	**1,730.01**
UNITED NATIONS	CAMBODIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	240,298.75	200.04
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	1,385,729.10	3,070.00
	CAMBODIA Total		1,626,027.85	3,270.04
	GUINEA-BISSAU	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	367,864.80	480
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	315,368.04	240.03
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,239,224.10	3,230.00
	GUINEA-BISSAU Total		1,922,456.94	3,950.03
	HAITI	BULGUR BAG-50 KG	590,308.00	2,040.00
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	191,119.55	170.01
		PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	210,249.20	510
	HAITI Total		991,676.75	2,720.01

		IVORY COAST	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-899	166,175.92	150.02
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	218,544.20	450
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	1,556,217.00	3,750.00
		IVORY COAST Total		1,940,937.12	4,350.02
		KENYA	BULGUR BAG-50 KG	3,178,538.40	11,050.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	439,913.55	380.01
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,475,987.70	3,070.00
		KENYA Total		5,094,439.65	14,500.01
		LAOS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	790,682.80	1,060.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	259,857.63	230.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,528,662.00	3,900.00
		LAOS Total		2,579,202.43	5,190.02
		MALAWI	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	519,077.30	1,310.00
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	6,454,936.40	11,470.00
			CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25-KG	147,456.00	360
		MALAWI Total		7,121,469.70	13,140.00
		NEPAL	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	799,643.30	1,220.00
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	56,770.00	70
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	179,076.49	160
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	14,232.60	20
			RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	25,312.80	60
			RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	90,548.00	200
		NEPAL Total		1,165,583.19	1,730.00
		RWANDA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	560,554.20	930
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	133,325.47	110.01
		RWANDA Total		693,879.67	1,040.01
	UNITED NATIONS Total			**23,135,673.30**	**49,890.13**
	WORLD VISION, INC.	MOZAMBIQUE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	738,163.20	1,380.00
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		738,163.20	1,380.00
		NICARAGUA	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG	117,465.60	120
			CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	60,111.90	150
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	107,173.90	170
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	55,816.90	50.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	98,187.10	190
		NICARAGUA Total		438,755.40	680.02
	WORLD VISION, INC. Total			**1,176,918.60**	**2,060.02**
McGovern-Dole Total				36,845,857.50	73,160.42
Food for Progress	ACDI/VOCA	GHANA	RICE, MILLED BULK	2,200,000.00	5,000.00
			SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	854,400.00	2,400.00
		GHANA Total		3,054,400.00	7,400.00
	ACDI/VOCA Total			**3,054,400.00**	**7,400.00**
	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION	GHANA	RICE, MILLED BULK	440,000.00	1,000.00
			SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	925,600.00	2,600.00
		GHANA Total		1,365,600.00	3,600.00
	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION Total			**1,365,600.00**	**3,600.00**
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S.	HAITI	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	4,534,800.00	20,000.00
		HAITI Total		4,534,800.00	20,000.00
		NICARAGUA	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	2,775,500.00	3,500.00
		NICARAGUA Total		2,775,500.00	3,500.00
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S. Total			**7,310,300.00**	**23,500.00**
	COOPERATIVE HOUSING FOUNDATION CORP	KENYA	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	6,047,946.00	22,200.00
		KENYA Total		6,047,946.00	22,200.00
	COOPERATIVE HOUSING FOUNDATION CORP Total			**6,047,946.00**	**22,200.00**
	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.	SENEGAL	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	4,485,261.90	5,810.00
		SENEGAL Total		4,485,261.90	5,810.00
	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S. Total			**4,485,261.90**	**5,810.00**
	COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC.	GUATEMALA	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	3,094,360.00	4,000.00
		GUATEMALA Total		3,094,360.00	4,000.00
	COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC. Total			**3,094,360.00**	**4,000.00**
	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	Oil Soybean, Crude Degummed	6,719,440.00	8,000.00
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC Total		6,719,440.00	8,000.00
	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS Total			**6,719,440.00**	**8,000.00**
	LAND O'LAKES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	MALAWI	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	4,099,920.00	5,280.00
		MALAWI Total		4,099,920.00	5,280.00
		MOZAMBIQUE	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	5,373,380.00	6,920.00
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		5,373,380.00	6,920.00
	LAND O'LAKES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT Total			**9,473,300.00**	**12,200.00**
	LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF INC.	BURKINA FASO	RICE, MILLED BULK	4,677,720.00	12,000.00
		BURKINA FASO Total		4,677,720.00	12,000.00
	LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF INC. Total			**4,677,720.00**	**12,000.00**
	MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA GANADERIA	GUATEMALA	CORN, YELLOW BULK	1,661,300.00	10,000.00
			SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	5,212,500.00	15,000.00
		GUATEMALA Total		6,873,800.00	25,000.00
	MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA GANADERIA Total			**6,873,800.00**	**25,000.00**
	PARTNERS FOR DEVELOPMENT	GUINEA	RICE, MILLED BULK	5,204,010.00	12,540.00
		GUINEA Total		5,204,010.00	12,540.00
	PARTNERS FOR DEVELOPMENT Total			**5,204,010.00**	**12,540.00**
	SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE FUNDS	KENYA	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	1,580,094.00	5,800.00
		KENYA Total		1,580,094.00	5,800.00
	SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE FUNDS Total			**1,580,094.00**	**5,800.00**

	TECHNOSERVE, INC.	GUINEA	RICE, MILLED BULK	14,766,500.00	35,580.00
		GUINEA Total		14,766,500.00	35,580.00
	TECHNOSERVE, INC. Total			14,766,500.00	35,580.00
	WINROCK INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR	BANGLADESH	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK	5,605,432.00	19,900.00
		BANGLADESH Total		5,605,432.00	19,900.00
		PAKISTAN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	10,829,980.00	14,250.00
		PAKISTAN Total		10,829,980.00	14,250.00
	WINROCK INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR Total			16,435,412.00	34,150.00
Food for Progress Total				91,088,143.50	211,780.00
Grand Total FY 2017				127,934,001.40	284,940.42

PROGRAM	PVO	COUNTRY	COMMODITY	FISCAL YEAR 2018 Values COST($)	QTY(MT)
McGovern-Dole	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S.	BENIN	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	202,126.20	420
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	33,583.51	30
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	177,734.85	150.04
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	32,375.70	70
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	187,955.60	380
		BENIN Total		633,775.86	1,050.04
		GUATEMALA	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	242,570.90	310
			CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	107,800.00	490
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	180,015.60	280
			OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	160,257.19	120.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	69,186.00	130
		GUATEMALA Total		759,829.69	1,330.02
		HONDURAS	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	300,211.20	360
			CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	127,500.00	500
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	635,519.20	850
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	145,135.25	120.01
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	175,798.56	160.03
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	289,781.30	540
		HONDURAS Total		1,673,945.51	2,530.04
		LAOS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	130,555.00	240
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	181,282.92	160.03
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	610,902.00	1,150.00
		LAOS Total		922,739.92	1,550.03
		MALI	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	114,653.70	220
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	320,445.48	280.02
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	67,851.00	150
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	857,872.40	1,610.00
		MALI Total		1,360,822.58	2,260.02
		SIERRA LEONE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	98,614.00	200
		SIERRA LEONE Total		98,614.00	200
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S. Total			5,449,727.56	8,920.13
	MERCY CORPS	KYRGYZSTAN	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	177,551.20	380
			OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	79,844.02	40.03
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	19,706.40	40
			RICE, 3/15 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	50,886.40	80
		KYRGYZSTAN Total		327,988.02	540.03
	MERCY CORPS Total			327,988.02	540.03
	NASCENT SOLUTIONS INC.	CAMEROON	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	85,927.20	120
			OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	76,501.10	50.01
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	167,775.60	320
		CAMEROON Total		330,203.90	490.01
	NASCENT SOLUTIONS INC. Total			330,203.90	490.01
	PLANET AID, INC.	MOZAMBIQUE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	432,885.60	700
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		432,885.60	700
	PLANET AID, INC. Total			432,885.60	700
	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL	GUATEMALA	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	247,662.00	300
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	67,712.00	100
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	56,488.18	50.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	166,975.30	310
			SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	1,341,684.00	3,600.00
		GUATEMALA Total		1,880,521.48	4,360.02
		NICARAGUA	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	200,862.40	240
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	260,072.00	400
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	123,546.41	100.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	185,931.90	330
			WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG	63,444.00	240
		NICARAGUA Total		833,856.71	1,310.02
		TANZANIA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	276,894.50	440
			OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L	183,736.75	90.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	749,265.00	1,500.00
		TANZANIA Total		1,209,896.25	2,030.02
	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL Total			3,924,274.44	7,700.05
	SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC.	GUATEMALA	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	163,762.00	200

		GUATEMALA Total		163,762.00	200
		LIBERIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	237,144.65	180.02
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	207,693.00	450
			RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	468,720.50	950
		LIBERIA Total		913,558.15	1,580.02
	SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC. Total			**1,077,320.15**	**1,780.02**
	UNITED NATIONS	BANGLADESH	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	564,149.80	2,450.00
		BANGLADESH Total		564,149.80	2,450.00
		CAMBODIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	105,765.33	100.02
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	109,147.93	100.02
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	1,513,936.00	3,000.00
		CAMBODIA Total		1,728,849.26	3,200.04
		CONGO-REPUB. OF	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	168,954.20	150.02
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	172,211.10	390
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	727,885.50	1,450.00
		CONGO-REPUB. OF Total		1,069,050.80	1,990.02
		GUINEA-BISSAU	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	346,512.20	570
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	333,835.62	290
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,756,822.40	3,780.00
		GUINEA-BISSAU Total		2,437,170.22	4,640.00
		HAITI	BULGUR BAG-50 KG	455,980.00	1,250.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	106,210.26	100.02
			PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	139,345.00	310
		HAITI Total		701,535.26	1,660.02
		IVORY COAST	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	164,129.73	150.02
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	207,088.50	450
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	1,976,955.00	3,750.00
		IVORY COAST Total		2,348,173.23	4,350.02
		KENYA	BULGUR BAG-50 KG	1,615,915.50	4,990.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	214,413.93	180.02
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	658,161.40	1,460.00
		KENYA Total		2,488,490.83	6,630.02
		LAOS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	561,112.00	1,020.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	405,465.25	360.02
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,852,691.00	3,400.00
		LAOS Total		2,819,268.25	4,780.02
		NEPAL	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	418,361.20	800
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	483,515.62	400.01
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	1,575,962.50	3,200.00
		NEPAL Total		2,477,839.32	4,400.01
		RWANDA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	630,688.80	930
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	136,547.12	120.01
		RWANDA Total		767,235.92	1,050.01
	UNITED NATIONS Total			**17,401,762.89**	**35,150.14**
	WORLD VISION, INC.	MOZAMBIQUE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	663,358.90	980
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		663,358.90	980
		NICARAGUA	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG	123,139.90	130
			CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	75,454.50	170
			CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	84,523.40	130
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	74,122.40	60.01
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	73,245.90	130
		NICARAGUA Total		330,485.10	620.01
	WORLD VISION, INC. Total			**1,093,845.00**	**1,600.01**
McGovern-Dole Total				**30,038,087.56**	**56,880.40**
Food for Progress	ACDI/VOCA	ETHIOPIA	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	5,666,400.00	30,000.00
		ETHIOPIA Total		5,666,400.00	30,000.00
		GHANA	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	2,225,000.00	5,000.00
		GHANA Total		2,225,000.00	5,000.00
	ACDI/VOCA Total			**7,891,400.00**	**35,000.00**
	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION	GHANA	SOYBEANS, YELLOW BULK	2,322,000.00	6,000.00
		GHANA Total		2,322,000.00	6,000.00
	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION Total			**2,322,000.00**	**6,000.00**
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S.	NICARAGUA	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	3,116,000.00	4,000.00
		NICARAGUA Total		3,116,000.00	4,000.00
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S. Total			**3,116,000.00**	**4,000.00**
	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.	EL SALVADOR	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	6,015,900.00	13,200.00
		EL SALVADOR Total		6,015,900.00	13,200.00
	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S. Total			**6,015,900.00**	**13,200.00**
	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS	SRI LANKA	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK	12,956,996.60	39,800.00
		SRI LANKA Total		12,956,996.60	39,800.00
	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS Total			**12,956,996.60**	**39,800.00**
	LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF INC.	BURKINA FASO	RICE, MILLED BULK	8,222,880.80	15,440.00
		BURKINA FASO Total		8,222,880.80	15,440.00
	LUTHERAN WORLD RELIEF INC. Total			**8,222,880.80**	**15,440.00**
	MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS	MALI	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	2,968,350.00	15,000.00
		MALI Total		2,968,350.00	15,000.00
	MINISTRY OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS Total			**2,968,350.00**	**15,000.00**
	SHELTER FOR LIFE INTERNATIONAL, INC	SENEGAL	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	4,592,640.00	6,000.00
		SENEGAL Total		4,592,640.00	6,000.00
	SHELTER FOR LIFE INTERNATIONAL, INC Total			**4,592,640.00**	**6,000.00**

	TECHNOSERVE, INC.	HONDURAS	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	6,236,800.00	12,500.00
		HONDURAS Total		6,236,800.00	12,500.00
	TECHNOSERVE, INC. Total			6,236,800.00	12,500.00
Food for Progress Total				54,322,967.40	146,940.00
Grand Total FY 2018				84,360,974.96	203,820.40

				FISCAL YEAR 2019	Values
PROGRAM	PVO	COUNTRY	COMMODITY	COST($)	QTY(MT)
McGovern-Dole	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S.	BENIN	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	41,796.80	80
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	81,909.32	80
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	55,744.81	160
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	123,392.70	270
		BENIN Total		320,788.02	590.00
		Burkina Faso	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	280,866.40	690
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	193,711.00	450
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	130,012.34	110
				604,589.74	1,250.00
		Guatemala	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	152,450.72	110
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	105,468.00	240
		GUATEMALA Total		257,918.72	350.00
		HONDURAS	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	337,494.30	280
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	602,505.00	1,350
		HONDURAS Total		939,999.30	1,630.00
		LAOS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	104,602.20	240
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	215,141.53	170
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	498,086.70	1080
		LAOS Total		817,830.43	1,490.00
		MALI	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	86,834.00	220
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	219,248.00	120
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	67,287.00	150
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	742,772.00	1,430.00
		MALI Total		1,116,141.00	1,920.00
		SIERRA LEONE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	298,961.20	710
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	315,036.80	260
			RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	1,401,291.60	2920
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	55,357.00	100
		SIERRA LEONE Total		2,070,646.60	3,990
	CATHOLIC RELIEF SERVICES - U.S. Total			6,127,913.81	11,220.00
	COOPERATIVE FOR ASSISTANCE AND RELIEF	East Timor	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	141,115.00	130
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	416,971.00	860
		EAST TIMOR Total		558,086.00	990
	COOPERATIVE FOR ASSISTANCE AND RELIEF Total			558,086.00	990.00
	COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC	SENEGAL	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	43,626.80	80
			LENTILS BAG-50 KG	80,950.00	190
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	84,872.80	70
			CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	22,548.80	40
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	422,850.60	860
		SENEGAL Total		654,849.00	1240
	COUNTERPART INTERNATIONAL, INC Total			654,849.00	1240
	MERCY CORPS	KYRGYZSTAN	RICE, 3/15 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	79,544.40	130
			OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	128,041.10	70
			PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	34,633.20	70
		KYRGYZSTAN Total		242,218.70	270
	MERCY CORPS Total			242,218.70	270
	NASCENT SOLUTIONS INC.	CAMEROON	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	724,642.20	1620
			OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	296,350.50	210
		CAMEROON Total		1,020,992.70	1830
	NASCENT SOLUTIONS INC. Total			1,020,992.70	1830
	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL	GUATEMALA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	35,098.69	30
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	126,513.90	270
		GUATEMALA Total		161,612.60	300.00
		NICARAGUA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	285,398.50	240
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	253,164.70	490
		NICARAGUA Total		538,563.20	730.00
	PROJECT CONCERN INTERNATIONAL Total			700,175.80	1,030.00
	SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC.	GUATEMALA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	89,485.60	70
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	372,494.70	810
		GUATEMALA Total		461,980.00	880
		LIBERIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	218,221.30	180
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	187,000.00	450
			RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	535,002.00	950
		LIBERIA Total		940,223.30	1,580.00
	SAVE THE CHILDREN FEDERATION, INC. Total			1,402,203.30	2,460.00
	UNITED NATIONS	CONGO-REPUB. OF	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	158,961.67	150
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	165,825.00	390
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	598,342.50	1,450.00

		CONGO-REPUB. OF Total		923,129.17	1,990.00
		IVORY COAST	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	173,022.64	150
			PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	175,459.10	440
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	1,352,947.90	3,130.00
		IVORY COAST Total		1,701,429.64	3,720.00
		LAOS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	299,637.30	680.00
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	419,855.85	360
			RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	997,458.00	2,200.00
		LAOS Total		1,716,951.15	3,220.00
		NEPAL	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	380,782.10	870
			OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	326,808.87	280
			RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	1,151,729.00	2,390.00
		NEPAL Total		1,859,319.97	3,540.00
		RWANDA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	131,579.66	110
		RWANDA Total		131,579.66	110.00
	UNITED NATIONS Total			6,332,409.59	12,580.00
	WORLD VISION, INC.	NICARAGUA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	38,042.40	80
			CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	37,071.00	90
			OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	30,718.82	30
		NICARAGUA Total		105,832.22	200
	WORLD VISION, INC. Total			105,832.22	200.00
McGovern-Dole Total				30,038,007.56	56,880.40
Food for Progress	ACDI/VOCA	ETHIOPIA	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	5,767,250.00	25,000.00
		ETHIOPIA Total		5,767,250.00	25,000.00
		PHILIPPINES	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	13,409,617.50	36,390.00
		PHILIPPINES Total		13,409,617.50	36,390.00
	ACDI/VOCA Total			19,176,867.50	61,390.00
	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION	CAMBODIA	SOYBEANS, YELLOW BULK	4,712,300.00	12,900.00
		CAMBODIA Total		4,712,300.00	12,900.00
	AMERICAN SOYBEAN ASSOCIATION Total			4,712,300.00	12,900.00
	CNFA	MOZAMBIQUE	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	7,019,900.00	10,000.00
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		7,019,900.00	10,000.00
	CNFA Total			7,019,900.00	10,000.00
	COOPERATIVE HOUSING FOUNDATION CORP.	KENYA	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK	5,407,718.40	20,510.00
		KENYA Total		5,407,718.40	20,510.00
	COOPERATIVE HOUSING FOUNDATION CORP. Total			5,407,718.40	20,510.00
	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S.	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	5,509,053.00	8,100.00
			TALLOW, YELLOW BULK	743,060.00	1,060.00
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC Total		6,252,113.00	9,160.00
	COOPERATIVE LEAGUE OF THE U.S. Total			6,252,113.00	9,160.00
	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	136,026.00	200.00
		DOMINICAN REPUBLIC Total		136,026.00	200.00
	INTERNATIONAL EXECUTIVE SERVICE CORPS Total			136,026.00	200.00
	LAND O'LAKES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT	MOZAMBIQUE	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	9,729,581.40	13,860.00
		MOZAMBIQUE Total		9,729,581.40	13,860.00
		MALAWI	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	7,398,974.60	10,540.00
		MALAWI Total		7,398,974.60	10,540.00
	LAND O'LAKES INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT Total			17,128,556.00	24,400.00
	PARTNERS FOR DEVELOPMENT	GUINEA	RICE, MILLED BULK	3,442,500.00	7,500.00
		SENEGAL Total		3,442,500.00	7,500.00
	PARTNERS FOR DEVELOPMENT Total			3,442,500.00	7,500.00
	SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE FUNDS	KENYA	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	491,818.80	2,120.00
			WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK	1,093,157.80	3,910.00
		KENYA Total		1,584,976.60	6,030.00
	SMALL ENTERPRISE ASSISTANCE FUNDS Total			1,584,976.60	6,030.00
	TECHNOSERVE, INC.	GUINEA	RICE, MILLED BULK	8,179,380.00	17,820.00
		GUINEA Total		8,179,380.00	17,820.00
	TECHNOSERVE, INC.	PERU	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	9,086,000.00	14,000.00
		PERU Total		9,086,000.00	14,000.00
	TECHNOSERVE, INC. Total			17,265,380.00	31,820.00
	WINROCK INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR AGRI	PAKISTAN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	21,779,674.20	31,220.00
		PAKISTAN Total		21,779,674.20	31,220.00
	WINROCK INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTE FOR AGRI Total			21,779,674.20	31,220.00
Food for Progress Total				103,995,174.03	215,130.00
Grand Total FY 2019				134,033,181.59	272,010.40

Effectiveness of Humanitarian Assistance Programs

5. Mr. Fortenberry: At a macro level, is the U.S. government working effectively with other Nations and private partners to address global hunger, increase food security, and create greater food independence? How do we know whether we are succeeding or failing the people in greatest need across the globe?

Mr. Isley: USDA refers you to Mr. Hick's responses for the answer to this question on USAID's programs and activities.

Mr. Hicks: The U.S government works with other nations through its participation in multilateral fora, bilateral engagement with other donors, and on the ground coordination.

To name just a couple of efforts, the U.S. government has been a key driver of the Grand Bargain, an international agreement between the largest donors and humanitarian agencies committed to improving the effectiveness and efficiency of humanitarian action, and follow-on efforts to improve the delivery, performance, and management of global humanitarian assistance, including food assistance. Our engagement has focused on improving the assessment process, prioritizing needs, and ensuring that funding is used most effectively and efficiently. The U.S. worked closely with other donors to forge the Grand Bargain and is working now to ensure that key elements of the agreement are implemented. In addition to focusing on improving the implementation and management of humanitarian assistance, a key component of the Grand Bargain is addressing relief – development coherence. In its role as the primary donor to the World Food Program (WFP), USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP) continues to press for these major improvements in WFP Executive Board meetings, with other members of the Board, and with WFP's staff and management.

The Food Assistance Convention (FAC) is a multilateral cooperative instrument whereby member countries are committed to ensuring that food assistance is efficient, effective and delivered in a principled manner. FAC facilitates exchange of information on planned food assistance operations, policy developments, lessons learned, and best practices globally. During its chairmanship of the FAC in 2014 and from 2016 - 2017, the United States re-invigorated the group, expanding membership and fostering increased coordination around both major emergencies and important policy issues related to food security.

Another effort to increase food security and address global hunger is the Global Network Against Food Crises (GNFC). Launched in 2016, the GNFC produces the annual Global Report on Food Crises and consists of over a dozen members spanning donors, United Nations agencies, and intergovernmental organizations, including the Southern African Development Community and the Central American Integration System. The network's objective is to develop a common understanding across donors and members on three main areas:

1) Data and analysis: GNFC members publish the annual Global Report Against Food Crises, which serves as a technical account of the number of people facing acute food crises, the particulars of each crisis situation, and corresponding levels of need for

assistance. This evidence-based report assists humanitarian actors in understanding and responding to food crises.

2) Increased coordination at country level for response and prevention of food crises: The objective is to perform an analysis of the capacity of local actors (e.g. implementers, the food security and agricultural cluster, the nutrition cluster, the national government) to implement effective programming and establish coordination structures along the humanitarian, development, and peace nexus in six countries (Niger, Democratic Republic of Congo, South Sudan, Madagascar, Yemen, and Afghanistan). The findings will be compiled in a Food Crises Responses and Prevention report.
3) Linkages beyond food: This aims to link other sectors including WASH, health, and peace-building initiatives with food security to address the root causes of food insecurity and strengthen programming.

USAID's work accelerating progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance will promote greater food independence. USAID's current food security efforts reduce global poverty, hunger and malnutrition and help countries drive inclusive economic growth to enable self-reliance. This progress is affected by humanitarian emergencies, conflict and natural disasters that in some contexts cause a cycle of chronic vulnerability, poverty, hunger, and water insecurity. To break this cycle, reduce recurrent need for humanitarian assistance, and accelerate progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance, USAID is transforming to combine the Bureau for Food Security (BFS), the Office of Water within the Bureau for Economic Growth, Education, and the Environment (E3/W) and E3 Climate Adaptation (E3/AD) team into a new Bureau for Resilience and Food Security.

USAID uses a results-based approach in all programming with rigorous monitoring, evaluation, and learning to track progress, facilitate performance-based and adaptive management, accountability and evidence-based approaches to food security and nutrition. USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP) investments are aligned with the U.S. Government's Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) Results Framework using its performance monitoring and metrics, to track program implementation and results. Results from individual FFP programs, trends in the Global Food Security Strategy Results Framework, and international reports of food security needs and trends all provide information to inform our ongoing work to address global hunger, increase food security, and create greater food independence.

6. Mr. Fortenberry: Who is evaluating these programs in a comprehensive manner to meet both the short-term emergency needs of suffering people across the globe AND the needs of an international community to build sustainability for current and future generations?

Mr. Isley: USDA refers you to Mr. Hick's responses for the answer to this question on USAID's programs and activities.

Mr. Hicks: USAID's Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) efforts, led by USAID's Bureau of Food Security (BFS), use a results-based approach in all programming with rigorous monitoring, evaluation, and learning to track progress, facilitate performance-based and adaptive management, accountability and evidence-based approaches to food security and nutrition. USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP) investments are aligned with the U.S. Government's GFSS Results Framework using its performance monitoring and metrics, to track program implementation and results.

Examples of indicators for food assistance programming include prevalence of stunted and underweight children under five years of age, prevalence of children under two years of age receiving a minimum acceptable diet, prevalence of population living under poverty, prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity, food consumption scores, household hunger scale among many others.

FFP uses rigorous monitoring, evaluation, and learning practices to continually assess the performance of programs, integrate lessons learned, adapt approaches, and make course corrections based on evidence and new findings. FFP measures resilience and incorporated resilience indicators in all multi-year non-emergency programs. Through efforts like the Food Assistance Convention, the FFP-funded Implementer-Led Design, Evidence, Analysis and Learning (IDEAL) mechanism and the Global Network Against Food Crises, lessons learned are shared widely to help the international community to build sustainability for current and future generations.

USAID's Center for Resilience will be focusing on new and best practices on evaluating resilience programs and on evaluating programs' effectiveness. The Center has already evaluated resilience programs in Ethiopia and Kenya, demonstrating promising results.

7. Mr. Fortenberry: When Raj Shah was leading the Feed the Future initiative at USAID during the previous Administration, we had a chance to discuss a number of agricultural productivity issues in developing countries. We saw eye-to-eye on the need to build capacity for people in need. What new and innovative ideas are USDA and USAID infusing into their respective agricultural development programs to help build greater sustainability?

Mr. Isley: USDA Food for Progress (FFPr) projects target issues that USDA programs can address in conjunction with other U.S. Government partners, such as the Overseas Private Investment Corporation, USAID, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation. With its current awards, Food for Progress intends to help countries to improve their food safety, meet their World Trade Organization Trade Facilitation Agreement commitments, and to improve production and processing methods of high-value, non-U.S. competing specialty crops for export (coffee, cacao, cashews, and spices). The FFPr program is using new innovative drone technology to map cashew production in West Africa. FFPr is also piloting an innovative cash transfer program in Ethiopia to reduce the risk to farmers undertaking renovation and rehabilitation of their coffee trees and providing funding for mobile laboratories in the Phillipines to provide local proximity to producers concerned about meeting export SPS standards. This approach may improve sustainability by addressing issues comprehensively with development food assistance as one of multiple tools.

USDA's LRP Program is intended to build the capacity of smallholder farmers to supply agricultural produce to designated McGovern-Dole funded schools, aiming to improve the resiliency and sustainability of school feeding supply chains and income generating opportunities for local farmers. In Senegal, the LRP program successfully introduced a new agricultural commodity, Mung beans, into the local production. Mung beans are not native to this part of Africa, but are easily adaptable to the growing environment. Mung beans provide critical nutrition to combat malnutrition and their short growing season is an innovative intervention into school feeding programs. In Honduras, USDA/LRP introduced a new and innovative early warning system which provided early intervention from warehouses to local and regional farmers supporting school feeding. This greatly increased efficiency and lowered costs while ensuring a constant supply of locally procured vegetables.

Mr. Hicks: The Bureau for Food Security's (BFS) work on resilience supports Objective 2 of the USG's Global Food Security Strategy: Strengthened resilience among people and systems, as increasingly frequent and intense shocks and stresses threaten the ability of men, women, and families to sustainably emerge from poverty. The vision is that highly vulnerable individuals, households, communities, systems, and host governments face reduced sensitivity to shocks and have the capacity to successfully manage their own risk and thrive in the face of the shocks and stresses they face along their Journey to Self-Reliance. The principal efforts are in areas that are subject to recurrent food crises and that receive U.S. emergency humanitarian assistance, with an aim towards sustainably reducing future emergency needs.

To achieve this vision, BFS, led by the Center for Resilience, prioritizes a cross-sectoral approach to reduce risk and build people's capacity to withstand shocks and to bridge the gap between humanitarian and development assistance. This approach focuses on building internal and partner capacities; leveraging evidence for impact; and advancing technical expertise to reduce areas of recurrent crisis and to foster sustainable poverty reduction. USAID has named 13 Resilience Focus Countries (Burkina Faso, Democratic Republic of Congo, Ethiopia, Haiti, Kenya, Malawi, Niger, Nigeria, Mali, Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda, and Zimbabwe). Each country has a sub-national Resilience Focus Zone -- areas of recurrent humanitarian crises where USAID is prioritizing long-term and strategic development investments. The Center for Resilience also supports the integration of resilience into larger efforts within the new Bureau for Resilience and Food Security and across USAID Bureaus.

Through these resilience efforts aimed at reducing and mitigating risks to the most vulnerable farmers and pastoralists, USAID is revolutionizing how we address food insecurity, focusing at least 25 percent of its specific State, Foreign Operations appropriations for long-term bilateral agricultural development and food security funding on effective and innovative programs intended to reduce humanitarian needs in areas that face recurrent food crises. These relatively small U.S. investments, implemented in collaboration with host governments, other donors, and the private sector, such as in Kenya, have demonstrated that such programs can produce significant results. Despite recurrent and severe droughts in Kenya's northern arid lands between 2013-18, USAID programs aligned to the Government of Kenya's Ending Drought Emergencies (EDE) programs helped dramatically reduce poverty prevalence from 55% to 38%. USAID has established a $30 million Resilience Challenge Fund to further help USAID missions to leverage other donors, the private sector and host governments to catalyze transformative resilience efforts. In addition, Community Development Funds from USAID's BFS appropriation are used for Title II DFSA program resilience efforts.

USDA and USAID are supporting implementation of the Global Food Security Strategy and Presidential Prosper Africa initiative by bringing in innovative models and approaches for our collective work. This is happening not only through individual technologies and partnerships, but also through broader, system level interventions that are accelerating country and regional level progress on the Journey to Self-Reliance.

USDA and USAID are key partners in advancing the President's Prosper Africa initiative as well as implementing USAID's Private Sector Engagement strategy. The two are very closely linked as both efforts rely on strengthening our partnerships with the private sector as well as substantially increasing trade and investment between the United States and Africa. These approaches are being incorporated throughout our program and assistance efforts.

Across the board, USDA and USAID are working together to provide trade-related capacity building and technical assistance to countries and regions to expand agriculture-led growth, bring international standards into trading systems, and use trade as a key driver of support to countries' Journey to Self-Reliance. USAID is coordinating with USDA to crowd-in technical assistance on key trade promotion activities, such as the Food Safety Network (in tandem with the Food and Drug Administration). USAID and USDA are delivering assistance to modernize trading systems, remove policy-oriented barriers to trade, establish new science-based

sanitary and phyto-sanitary standards, and bring cutting edge research results into policy processes. Through regional trade programming, USDA and USAID are also supporting market access for U.S. producers and firms and facilitating trade to increase food security in our partner countries and regions.

A recent example is in Nigeria, where we helped the country establish and build the capacity of its National Biosafety Management Agency. This Agency approved and oversaw biotechnology field trials over the past several years, culminating in the approvals of Bt Cotton and Bt Cowpea for commercial cultivation in Nigeria. The latter is the first genetically engineered food crop approved for cultivation in a country in Sub-Saharan Africa.

Additionally, to improve program design through co-creation and to promote adaptive management for optimizing the impact of USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP) investments, FFP developed and piloted a new approach called Refine and Implement (R&I). The R&I approach allows USAID and implementing partners to refine the activity design and implementation based on evidence and participation of target communities. This approach was widely shared within USAID and the agency included this approach in its Acquisition and Assistance toolbox as a best practice.

Lastly, FFP has been piloting a new approach to improve sustainability of food and nutrition security outcomes for all its programs. This approach seeks to develop the capacity of local communities and individuals as service providers using market-based approaches. In this approach, the implementing partners hand over the delivery of services to the local service providers during the project life and the local service providers will deliver services using market-based approaches for the last year of an activity. The approach was recently shared in the sustainability and development conference organized by the University of Michigan.

8. Mr. Fortenberry: In order to more rapidly assist impoverished communities, escape decades of abject poverty, we need to break out of the model we have used in the past so many times. As I alluded to in my opening statement, I would like each of you to tell me how your programs are leveraging U.S. agricultural ingenuity and innovation to help struggling communities around the world to provide for themselves?

Mr. Isley: One example is USDA's Food for Progress project implemented by the American Soybean Association's World Initiative for Soy in Human Health. The project introduced a Ghanaian feed miller and poultry farmer to post-harvest technologies that reduced the amount of grains lost due to improper moisture content and pests. The project connected the miller to Grain Mate moisture meters, a technology originally developed by a USDA engineer working as part of a USAID-funded Feed the Future Innovation Lab for the Reduction of Post-Harvest Losses at Kansas State University and then adapted and commercialized by a Ghanaian agricultural technology startup, Sesi Technologies. Once the miller tested his grain for proper moisture content, he began storing the grain in Purdue Improved Crop Storage (PICS) bags developed by Purdue University. Using the PICS bags reduced grain losses.

McGovern-Dole provided funding for a Micronutrient-Fortified Food Aid Products Pilot project with Kansas State University (KSU) and Project Concern International that tested the delivery and use of several fortified foods in direct feeding programs in Tanzania to address nutrient deficiencies in specific populations served by McGovern-Dole. The results found that the products had nutritional benefits and were well accepted in the local communities. Through this project, KSU also developed a range of nutrition education materials on the benefits of fortifying local drought resistant crops like cowpeas and sorghum. Communities in Tanzania are now growing cowpeas and sorghum in addition to other crops as part of a Local and Regional Food Aid Procurement Program to supplement the rice, pinto beans, and vegetable oil provided under McGovern-Dole. These innovations developed by KSU have increased awareness of the importance of food fortification and micronutrients for infants and children as well as boosted local production, aiding rural communities in Tanzania.

Mr. Hicks: USAID, through USAID's Bureau of Food Security, invests in 23 Feed the Future Innovation Labs, which are led by U.S. universities and draw upon a network of university and research partners throughout the U.S. and developing countries. These Labs bring the expertise and ingenuity of the U.S. land-grant university system to bear to better understand and develop solutions for agricultural challenges in Feed the Future countries.

For example, the new Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Crop Improvement will conduct research, develop and share new tools and technologies, and connect breeding efforts for niche crops like banana, sweet potato, and cassava to market demand. These efforts will get new and better seeds to smallholder farmers for greater local food security and nutrition. At the same time, the Lab will build local, regional and global capacities to improve plant breeding products and processes to ensure the results of this collaboration last. Cornell University leads this particular Lab, with Kansas State University and Clemson University both playing a major role in it and additional universities expected to join the effort. Also building on U.S.-based crop modelling, USAID and NASA work with regional partners to integrate the Decision Support

system for Agrotechnology Transfer (DSSAT) cropping model with NASA data to run in eastern and Southern Africa and Southeast Asia. The system provides current information on the state of maize and rice and offers seasonal outlooks of productivity. In Kenya, the Ministry of Agriculture is using this capability to produce a digital food balance sheet that incorporates productivity assessments with market analysis for policy decisions.

Another example is the USG's response to the emergence of a damaging crop pest in Africa and Asia, Fall Armyworm. Since its identification in 2016, Fall Armyworm has spread to over 54 countries in Africa, the Middle East, and Asia, impacting an estimated 20-50% of maize yields, as well as other crops, and devastating farmer incomes.

Building on decades of experience controlling the pest in the Americas, USAID and the interagency coordinated closely with U.S. companies—like Corteva, Valent, and AgBiTech—to identify safe, effective commercial products appropriate for smallholder farmers and to facilitate expedited access to innovation by strengthening the country-level regulatory environment. To accelerate adoption, we partnered broadly, including with companies, to conduct trainings on pest management approaches, create country-specific databases on registered pesticides, and develop extension flyers guiding communities on steps to safe, effective use.

USAID's new Feed the Future Innovation Lab for Markets, Risk and Resilience, led by University of California-Davis in partnership with other U.S. universities, will conduct research to better understand the root causes of persistent poverty and food insecurity, and how best to improve the resilience of individuals, households, communities, and systems, particularly in the face of recurrent crisis. This research will include developing financial and agronomic innovations such as expanding the potential of insurance and other financial services, stress-tolerant seeds and other tools to help vulnerable households better manage risk from recurrent shocks and stresses.

Farmer-to-Farmer

9. Mr. Fortenberry: As a follow-up to our discussion on innovation, I want to know how USAID and USDA may better coordinate ideas and expertise in the Farmer-to-Farmer program. We are talking about a program that connects U.S. farmers with farmers and agricultural sectors of developing countries. Does Congress need to take action or can the Administration do this on their own to give USDA – the subject matter experts – a more defined role in this program? As part of your answer, please provide the related laws and specific regulations related to the Farmer-to-Farmer program.

Mr. Isley: Since Farmer-to-Farmer is administered by USAID, USDA refers you to Mr. Hick's responses for the answer to this question on USAID's programs and activities. USDA stands ready to provide support and technical expertise as requested by USAID.

Mr. Hicks: Farmer-to-Farmer (F2F) works to support inclusive agriculture-led growth, facilitate private sector engagement, and enhance the development of local capacity. F2F is authorized by Congress in Title V of the Food for Peace Act, 7 U.S.C. 1737, and was most recently amended by Congress last year as part of the enactment of the Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018 (i.e., the Farm Bill). There are no separate specific regulations necessary to implement the F2F program. F2F volunteer assignments address host-led priorities to expand economic growth that increases incomes and improves access to nutritious food. Country programs and individual assignments are designed in close collaboration with USAID Missions and USDA agricultural attaches where applicable. This leads to particularly close collaboration with USAID- and USDA-funded activities overseas. F2F also features associate award and buy-in mechanisms to enhance scale up of successful approaches, both of which are available to USDA. USAID coordinates with USDA at the state and field level, including regular meetings with USDA representatives in Washington and the field to discuss coordination on the F2F Program, an annual presentation to USDA staff, and state-level recruitment of USDA employees. USDA employees, especially extension agents, are often cited as the most successful volunteers in-country.

U.S. Contribution as A Percentage of the Whole Need

10. Mr. Fortenberry: The United States is the largest donor of international food assistance having recently spent about $2 billion per year to provide international food assistance to food-insecure countries—in both emergency food assistance to avert humanitarian crises and development assistance to support agriculture and related sectors. What is the federal government doing to pressure other nations in the international community into contributing a larger share of resources to address short-term food insecurity, adequate nutrition during longer-term food emergencies, and sustainable agriculture in developing countries across the world?

Mr. Isley: USDA refers you to Mr. Hick's responses for the answer to this question on USAID's programs and activities.

Mr. Hicks: USAID is working closely with the U.S. Department of State to develop and implement a robust global burden-sharing strategy during FY2020 that includes determining how to best use bilateral and multilateral fora to encourage other countries and stakeholders to take on a greater share of humanitarian assistance funding. At present, the U.S. holds permanent seats on the Executive Board of the World Food Program and UNICEF, and participates in the Food Assistance Convention, a 16-member donor group committed to promoting food security, all of which provide us ongoing opportunities for donor engagement and evaluation of needs worldwide. For example, USAID's Office of Food for Peace (FFP) prioritizes burden sharing in its conversations with donor countries at the thrice-annual World Food Program (WFP) Executive Board. USAID welcomes the increased contributions many have already made to humanitarian assistance efforts in the last few years, in part due to these ongoing conversations—including by Germany, Japan, Saudi Arabia, and the European Union.

USAID is also a member of the Global Network Against Food Crises, a global forum of donors and other stakeholders aimed at analyzing acute food crises and increasing coordination at the country level for the response and prevention of food crises, based on the capacities of local actors. Through our participation and leadership in efforts like FAC and the Global Network Against Food Crises, we are building robust relationships with the private sector and civil society to increase global humanitarian contributions that go beyond emergency assistance and provide opportunities to encourage donors to support sustainable agriculture programs, as well.

Though we have much more work to do, the effects of increased coordination between donors in the field are evident in South Sudan, for example, where USAID worked with other donors the United Nations to create the Partnership for Resilience and Recovery. The partnership brings together humanitarian and development actors who are responsive to community ownership and who support interventions backed by local priorities, with the overarching goal of reducing vulnerability while increasing resilience in communities in South Sudan.

When U.S. Food Donations Are the Best Option

11. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide examples of recent situations where in-kind food aid from the U.S. has been the most effective source of nutrition to meet the demands of a region in need?

Mr. Isley: Meals provided in McGovern-Dole projects are tailored to meet the nutritional needs of the students served. Staff from USDA's Food and Nutrition Service are part of Nutrition Technical Teams that review and provide feedback on proposed daily rations. The meals are aimed at meeting one-third of the recipient's daily food requirement. An assessment of an MGD program in Tanzania, for instance, found that at baseline, about 40 percent of students recorded a Minimum Acceptable Diet (MAD). The proportion of treatment school students with a MAD increased to 57 percent to date, a statistically significant increase in comparison to non-participating schools. USDA's in-kind fortified food aid commodities used in this school feeding project targeted a nutritional gap that otherwise would have been challenging for program recipients to address with limited and inconsistent access to local agricultural commodities.

Mr. Hicks: USAID uses in-kind commodities, including from the U.S., to support our international food assistance programs when appropriate. U.S. in-kind food aid is best used to respond to an emergency where local markets are not functioning, food in local and regional markets is insufficient to meet needs, or beneficiaries do not have physical access to markets. Title II funding is prioritized based on the magnitude and severity of needs. In countries such as Yemen, food is not readily available and U.S. in-kind commodities are critical to our response. We use large amounts of Title II in some countries such as Ethiopia and South Sudan where local food is limited, although regional procurement can often be used for a large portion of these needs and has been shown to be a more cost-effective and more timely option for many key commodities. The cost-effectiveness of U.S. in-kind food assistance also depends on the commodity. For example, U.S. in-kind food aid has been important for certain commodities such as vegetable oil, which are generally less costly to procure from the U.S. than near food crises.

In FY2018, Yemen's total Title II Emergency funding was $273.2M. In FY2019, Yemen's total Title II Emergency funding was $446.5M. 75% of funds in FY2019 went toward U.S. in-kind food aid. The World Food Program aims to reach approximately 12 million severely food-insecure Yemenis monthly with in-kind food assistance and food vouchers.

In FY2018, Ethiopia's total Title II Emergency funding was $197.9M. In FY2019, Ethiopia's total Title II Emergency funding was $227.2M. 53% of funds in FY2019 went toward U.S. in-kind food aid. FFP assists food-insecure Ethiopians with long-term development interventions through the Government of Ethiopia-led Productive Safety Net Program (PSNP), with the aim to reduce chronic food insecurity. Through the use of Title II enhanced Section 202(e) resources, FFP activities help address the basic needs of chronically food-insecure people through regular seasonal transfers of food and cash resources, while supporting the creation of assets that generate economic benefit for the entire community.

In FY2018, South Sudan's total Title II Emergency funding was $334.7M. In FY2019, South Sudan's total Title II Emergency funding was $112.7M. 30% of funds in FY2019 went toward U.S. in-kind food aid. A sustained and unimpeded humanitarian response is critical to saving lives in South Sudan. Since the start of the conflict, FFP and its partners—including WFP and the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF)—have assisted the most vulnerable and conflict-affected populations through emergency food and nutrition interventions across the country. FFP supported programs provide life-saving in-kind and cash-based food assistance to an average of more than 1 million people per month.

Food Aid Data

(For the following questions, please provide separate and complete data for each of the following programs - the Food for Peace Title II program, the Food for Progress Program, and the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program)

12. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a table showing: a) the amount of total commodities by Metric Ton, b) the total cost of commodities purchased by commodity type, c) the cost of each commodity by recipient country broken down by cost, metric tonnage, and commodity type, d) the aggregate total for each country by cost, metric ton, and total U.S. commodities across all programs, and e) the cost of each commodity by recipient PVO broken down by cost, metric tonnage, and commodity type for each Fiscal Year 2015 through 2019. For the Food for Peace Title II program, please break down the data by emergency and non-emergency costs.

Mr. Isley: Attachment A provides complete data for USDA's Food for Progress Program and McGovern-Dole Program.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

FY15 Programs			
Partner	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
ACDI/VOCA		**2,860**	**$1,761,103**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	780	$264,139
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	300	$136,914
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	250	$182,018
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	520	$625,899
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,010	$552,133
ADRA		**1,690**	**$1,061,838**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	70	$69,666
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	70	$20,860
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	660	$362,328
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	190	$255,372
	RICE	700	$353,611
CRS		**152,460**	**$50,162,226**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	750	$471,169
	BULGURBAG-50 KG	610	$200,147
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	400	$151,931
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	12,220	$6,315,443
	HARD RED WHEAT	88,670	$21,277,336
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	5,190	$6,164,555
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	15,930	$8,196,410
	RICE	3,110	$1,453,370
	SORGHUM	25,580	$5,931,866
CNFA		**1,000**	**$658,769**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	810	$395,021
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	190	$263,749
CARE		**3,720**	**$1,989,180**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	1,220	$407,204
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,710	$883,701
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	380	$250,801
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	410	$447,474
FHI		**29,580**	**$8,621,004**
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	2,050	$731,916
	HARD RED WHEAT	21,350	$4,519,178
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	150	$178,923
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	300	$118,489
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	5,730	$3,072,498
MERCY CORPS		**3,230**	**$1,488,341**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	130	$50,574
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	730	$231,921
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	970	$344,740
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	600	$277,517
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	310	$218,717
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	200	$218,327
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	290	$146,546
PCI		**1,530**	**$1,142,039**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	860	$559,081
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	320	$175,117
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	350	$407,841
REST		**55,680**	**$15,785,288**
	HARD RED WHEAT	44,910	$9,779,756
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	10,770	$6,005,532
SAVE THE CHILDREN		**31,510**	**$9,876,054**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	890	$568,425

	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	400	$140,096
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,350	$712,722
	HARD RED WHEAT	14,410	$3,225,186
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	480	$546,062
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	5,410	$2,574,764
	RICE	1,260	$568,436
	SORGHUM	7,310	$1,540,363
UNICEF		**910**	**$3,039,655**
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	910	$3,039,655
WFP		**477,970**	**$165,090,251**
	BEANS, GARBANZO, KABULI BAG-50 KG	210	$145,285
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	20	$12,029
	CORN	5,330	$1,059,444
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	17,080	$8,400,293
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	16,660	$9,411,836
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	180	$448,800
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	10,910	$5,145,810
	FLOUR, BREAD	6,400	$2,992,355
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	14,660	$11,829,757
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	15,860	$18,778,633
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	28,890	$14,500,764
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	800	$341,600
	RICE	24,580	$13,461,591
	SORGHUM	267,500	$62,648,247
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	68,760	$15,823,817
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG	130	$89,990
WORLD VISION		**4,770**	**$2,043,836**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,470	$727,988
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	440	$553,786
	SORGHUM	2,860	$762,061
Grand Total		**766,910**	**$262,719,584**

FY15 PREPO			
PREPO Location	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
DOMESTIC PREPO		**21,560**	**$35,604,650**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	3,000	$1,701,409
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	3,000	$5,490,601
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	1,320	$3,762,565
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	4,500	$14,269,593
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	250	$192,333
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	7,240	$9,053,084
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,250	$1,135,066
FOREIGN PREPO		**113,790**	**$61,264,108**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	9,000	$4,534,942
	HARD RED WHEAT	4,530	$1,132,409
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	5,000	$3,666,817
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	21,000	$25,727,011
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	28,260	$14,633,289
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	1,000	$477,190
	SORGHUM	45,000	$11,092,450
Grand Total		**135,350**	**$96,868,758**

FY16 Programs			
Partner	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
ADRA		**3,140**	**$1,682,854**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	120	$108,939
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,770	$806,958
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	240	$343,340
	RICE	1,010	$423,617
CRS		**522,190**	**$131,484,473**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	50	$14,453
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	7,060	$3,185,691
	HARD RED WHEAT	448,390	$88,725,637
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	6,620	$7,860,991
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	39,770	$27,184,506
	RICE	3,880	$1,620,379
	SORGHUM	16,420	$2,892,816
CNFA		**520**	**$381,094**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	320	$149,354
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	200	$231,740
CARE		**81,500**	**$18,808,036**
	BULGURBAG-50 KG	1,200	$343,692
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	180	$162,000
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	670	$779,303
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	240	$275,695
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	710	$442,066
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	78,500	$16,805,280
HK		**11,000**	**$2,310,000**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	11,000	$2,310,000
MERCY CORPS		**900**	**$416,664**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	490	$159,021
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	30	$14,002
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	30	$37,022
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	350	$206,620
PCI		**1,550**	**$1,148,672**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	860	$565,666
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	330	$144,385
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	360	$438,620
SAVE THE CHILDREN		**530**	**$278,232**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	180	$64,123
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	250	$115,928
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	40	$48,321
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	60	$49,860
WFP		**693,860**	**$216,224,246**
	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	350	$249,340
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	6,350	$4,954,091
	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	60	$48,985
	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	1,970	$561,194
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	24,580	$8,061,661
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	11,240	$5,224,587
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	3,040	$4,567,403
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	320	$851,950
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	6,700	$2,925,297
	HARD RED WHEAT	86,900	$17,820,113
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	13,520	$17,167,405
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	24,760	$29,206,179
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	3,010	$1,321,161
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	36,620	$24,401,245
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	6,040	$2,791,411
	RICE	33,280	$14,966,759
	SORGHUM	364,960	$65,938,980

	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	4,370	$1,062,085
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	64,640	$13,338,426
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG	1,150	$765,975
WORLD VISION		**74,480**	**$15,572,320**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	74,480	$15,572,320
Grand Total		**1,389,670**	**$388,306,591**

FY16 PREPO			
PREPO Location	**Commodity Type**	**Metric Tons**	**Commodity Cost**
DOMESTIC PREPO		**50,130**	**$27,264,954**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	6,880	$2,370,413
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	6,170	$2,938,078
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	200	$325,348
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	920	$1,142,447
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	8,220	$10,122,203
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	740	$382,589
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	10,000	$5,659,476
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	2,000	$957,800
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	15,000	$3,366,600
FOREIGN PREPO		**318,650**	**$123,121,132**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	400	$356,678
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	8,000	$6,530,762
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	10,700	$3,472,728
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	12,480	$5,570,450
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	5,340	$7,921,799
	HARD RED WHEAT	82,860	$14,969,471
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	26,500	$30,838,371
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	56,300	$32,342,975
	RICE	1,000	$433,420
	RICE, FORTIFIED	1,000	$528,410
	SORGHUM	114,070	$20,156,068
Grand Total		**368,780**	**$150,386,086**

FY17 Programs			
Partner	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
ADRA		**1,300**	**$899,037**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	60	$44,970
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	430	$274,416
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	200	$307,371
	RICE	610	$272,280
CRS		**294,260**	**$73,059,614**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	210	$88,402
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	12,370	$7,789,679
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	500	$302,921
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	6,130	$7,421,039
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	18,030	$10,891,022
	RICE	1,230	$508,673
	SORGHUM	6,060	$1,175,481
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	249,730	$44,882,396
CNFA		**780**	**$584,505**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	630	$403,664
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	150	$180,842
CARE		**23,710**	**$6,514,390**
	BULGURBAG-50 KG	200	$57,118
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	400	$232,479
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	150	$95,390
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	410	$441,577
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	540	$253,087
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	22,010	$5,434,739
FHI		**22,480**	**$5,489,510**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	720	$275,365
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	590	$678,943
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	160	$87,200
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,560	$775,064
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	19,450	$3,672,938
HK		**11,430**	**$2,750,858**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	11,430	$2,750,858
MERCY CORPS		**470**	**$227,769**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	360	$147,961
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	30	$36,208
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	80	$43,600
PCI		**1,210**	**$1,093,445**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	860	$672,825
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	350	$420,621
REST		**50,470**	**$11,982,546**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,180	$1,465,023
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,930	$1,892,206
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	45,360	$8,625,316
WFP		**802,990**	**$273,994,342**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	160	$130,160
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	21,050	$8,285,192
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	28,510	$17,645,085
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	2,280	$3,468,255
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	1,240	$517,350
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	12,510	$10,330,554
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	59,080	$73,142,237

	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	18,540	$11,507,013
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	7,570	$3,537,028
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	44,400	$26,971,712
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	7,680	$3,361,719
	RICE	990	$389,149
	RICE, FORTIFIED	14,810	$6,172,778
	SORGHUM	317,880	$56,479,511
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	9,530	$2,079,128
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	256,760	$49,977,472
WORLD VISION		**70,300**	**$17,881,777**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,300	$812,692
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,180	$1,423,436
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,580	$1,291,141
	SORGHUM	600	$129,702
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	25,840	$4,879,626
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	38,800	$9,345,179
Grand Total		**1,279,400**	**$394,477,791**

FY17 PREPO			
PREPO Location	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
DOMESTIC PREPO		**14,500**	**$11,823,073**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,000	$634,110
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	2,000	$1,611,200
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,500	$5,929,579
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	2,000	$837,532
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	5,000	$2,810,652
FOREIGN PREPO		**107,340**	**$54,514,976**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	1,000	$381,581
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	10,250	$6,397,692
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	230	$334,540
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	2,500	$2,063,668
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	15,500	$19,009,085
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	5,500	$2,400,708
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	23,000	$14,441,092
	RICE	500	$195,220
	SORGHUM	40,000	$7,559,350
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	8,860	$1,732,041
Grand Total		**121,840**	**$66,338,048**

FY18 Programs			
Partner	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
ADRA		**720**	**$493,109**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	200	$139,169
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	70	$92,752
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	450	$261,189
CRS		**161,200**	**$49,571,544**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	2,910	$1,942,485
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	870	$1,708,428
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	7,780	$8,949,758
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	21,630	$9,818,553
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	2,490	$513,040
	SORGHUM BULK	7,060	$1,226,463
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	118,460	$25,412,818
CNFA		**1,590**	**$1,203,501**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	1,240	$809,533
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	350	$393,969
CARE		**46,300**	**$10,233,483**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	310	$341,569
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	460	$201,728
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BAG-50 KG	2,030	$558,149
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	43,500	$9,132,037
FHI		**3,970**	**$2,001,291**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	1,630	$675,878
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	520	$552,727
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	480	$197,703
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,340	$574,983
HK		**18,660**	**$4,417,259**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	18,660	$4,417,259
MERCY CORPS		**670**	**$349,808**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	50	$56,108
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	210	$99,184
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 K	410	$194,516
REST		**38,560**	**$10,613,902**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,020	$1,257,374
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,410	$1,431,883
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	34,130	$7,924,645
WFP		**792,080**	**$270,359,678**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	1,430	$897,198
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	11,590	$5,582,881
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	23,000	$15,899,722
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	5,030	$9,596,888
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	420	$191,990
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	23,980	$12,919,123
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	51,200	$59,407,796
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	210	$304,808
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	23,620	$12,448,801
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	7,870	$3,738,963
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	18,650	$8,534,143
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	11,030	$4,427,341
	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	3,280	$1,625,768
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	11,300	$5,347,236

	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 K	5,100	$2,634,325
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,440	$714,773
	RICE, MILLED BULK	13,430	$6,864,447
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	25,690	$5,937,677
	SORGHUM BULK	285,720	$56,563,825
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	47,450	$9,628,476
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	263,610	$56,335,055
WORLD VISION		**39,620**	**$11,230,248**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	730	$496,408
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	720	$882,404
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,130	$971,112
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	36,040	$8,880,324
Grand Total		**1,103,370**	**$360,473,824**

FY18 PREPO			
PREPO Location	**Commodity Type**	**Metric Tons**	**Commodity Cost**
DOMESTIC PREPO		**47,650**	**$35,543,982**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	9,000	$6,150,759
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	1,650	$2,989,942
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	5,000	$2,545,371
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	9,500	$11,973,592
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	8,000	$5,035,768
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	14,000	$6,593,106
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 K	500	$255,445
FOREIGN PREPO		**78,900**	**$39,149,410**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	3,000	$1,300,587
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	9,000	$6,111,739
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	500	$986,125
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	630	$296,024
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	13,770	$15,904,565
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	18,260	$8,081,590
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	740	$170,970
	SORGHUM BULK	33,000	$6,297,810
Grand Total		**126,550**	**$74,693,393**

FY19 Programs			
Partner	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
CRS		**241,080**	**$56,384,907**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,310	$800,572
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L	210	$223,803
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,610	$3,205,957
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	210	$244,906
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	13,770	$5,621,220
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	4,110	$936,538
	SORGHUM BULK	6,490	$1,392,607
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	212,370	$43,959,303
CARE		**54,420**	**$11,024,380**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	130	$72,024
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L	50	$49,711
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	30	$35,024
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	20	$9,500
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	54,190	$10,858,122
FHI		**31,930**	**$8,024,139**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	1,600	$760,910
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	560	$653,231
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	510	$235,008
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,440	$562,122
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	27,820	$5,812,868
MERCY CORPS		**450**	**$200,305**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	30	$34,133
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	90	$47,309
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	330	$118,863
REST		**39,870**	**$9,435,918**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,060	$1,272,360
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,530	$1,381,756
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	35,280	$6,781,802
SAVE THE CHILDREN		**1,150**	**$701,419**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,070	$609,696
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	30	$34,704
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	50	$57,019
WFP		**1,119,680**	**$375,576,866**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	12,370	$12,147,093
	BEANS, KIDNEY, LIGHT RED BAG-50 KG	620	$847,341
	BEANS, PEA BAG-50 KG	5,520	$4,835,596
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	1,250	$745,166
	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	2,400	$2,125,998
	BEANS, SMALL WHITE BAG-50 KG	60	$36,062
	BEANS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG (PE	7,090	$6,335,800
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	41,290	$18,637,900
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	14,670	$9,294,646
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-25 KG	2,270	$1,108,486
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	14,300	$6,605,441
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	80,650	$95,987,561
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	770	$356,641
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	40,520	$16,498,142
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	4,260	$1,510,324
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	19,110	$9,003,421

	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	660	$319,229
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	2,520	$1,370,262
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG	840	$671,950
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	18,980	$4,323,740
	SORGHUM BULK	332,820	$67,934,658
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	5,830	$1,340,259
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	510,880	$113,541,150
WORLD VISION		**87,580**	**$19,566,338**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	750	$964,878
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,390	$930,441
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	84,440	$17,671,019
Grand Total		**1,576,160**	**$480,914,271**

FY19 PREPO			
PREPO Location	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
DOMESTIC PREPO		**30,780**	**$20,372,300**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	2,100	$1,497,817
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	2,200	$1,140,570
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	2,350	$1,816,756
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	6,100	$7,535,233
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	7,500	$3,291,944
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	3,530	$1,749,550
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	7,000	$3,340,431
FOREIGN PREPO		**94,792**	**$53,935,982**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	8,500	$5,923,361
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 K	11,992	$21,983,653
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	9,500	$10,901,429
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	14,800	$6,012,940
	SORGHUM BULK	50,000	$9,114,600
Grand Total		**125,572**	**$74,308,283**

**Note: FY 19 numbers are estimates and will change as actuals are reconciled*

RUTF & RUSF Purchases			
Fiscal Year	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
FY 2016		**5,318**	**$24,598,936**
	RUSF	3,090	$20,043,068
	RUTF	2,228	$4,555,868
FY 2017		**11,850**	**$32,176,169**
	RUSF	4,375	$11,396,245
	RUTF	7,475	$20,779,924
FY 2018		**11,291**	**$30,513,644**
	RUSF	1,670	$4,073,215
	RUTF	9,621	$26,440,429
FY 2019		**18,504**	**$49,879,132**
	RUSF	9,082	$23,522,453
	RUTF	9,421	$26,356,679

Note*: Starting in FY16, the majority of ready-to-use therapeutic and supplementary food (RUTF & RUSF)were purchased by OAA/T under BPAs (Blanket Purchase Agreements). USDA no longer purchases RUSF or RUTF.

FY15 Programs			
Recipient Country Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
AFGHANISTAN		**34,900**	**$11,594,819**
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	710	$532,535
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	3,270	$3,833,649
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	30,920	$7,228,635
BURKINA FASO		**3,000**	**$1,972,523**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	150	$86,193
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	440	$540,448
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,310	$709,354
	RICE	1,100	$636,528
BURUNDI		**5,560**	**$3,066,106**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	20	$12,029
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	220	$88,888
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	750	$277,675
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	4,080	$2,068,783
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	50	$168,450
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	390	$422,708
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	50	$27,573
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC		**4,260**	**$2,008,538**
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	1,700	$609,074
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	250	$309,578
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	610	$335,274
	RICE	1,700	$754,613
CAMEROON		**11,950**	**$7,700,363**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	240	$137,909
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	490	$586,322
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,420	$757,371
	RICE	9,800	$6,218,762
CHAD		**11,340**	**$4,628,133**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	660	$392,080
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,650	$2,006,553
	SORGHUM	9,030	$2,229,500
COLOMBIA		**1,200**	**$831,525**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	200	$246,826
	RICE	1,000	$584,699
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO		**20,710**	**$10,663,167**
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	16,120	$8,068,612
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	290	$158,236
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	840	$1,026,298
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	300	$118,489
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,660	$938,043
	SORGHUM	1,500	$353,490
DJIBOUTI		**130**	**$89,990**
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG	130	$89,990
ETHIOPIA		**311,390**	**$91,891,618**
	BULGURBAG-50 KG	610	$200,147
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	7,440	$4,108,371
	HARD RED WHEAT	169,340	$38,801,456
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	5,070	$6,067,560
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	43,970	$22,714,798
	RICE	130	$67,210
	SORGHUM	84,830	$19,932,077
GUATEMALA		**5,840**	**$3,605,361**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	1,640	$1,039,593
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,460	$812,447
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	630	$797,091
	RICE	2,110	$956,229
HAITI		**3,720**	**$1,989,180**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	1,220	$407,204

	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	1,710	$883,701
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	380	$250,801
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	410	$447,474
KENYA		**57,880**	**$21,064,387**
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	80	$269,520
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	10,910	$5,145,810
	FLOUR, BREAD	1,870	$854,129
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,120	$2,364,296
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	7,810	$3,802,720
	SORGHUM	35,090	$8,627,912
LIBERIA		**3,170**	**$1,716,725**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	320	$394,752
	RICE	2,850	$1,321,973
MADAGASCAR		**7,090**	**$4,035,860**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	70	$69,666
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	3,080	$1,617,121
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	660	$771,462
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	450	$225,633
	RICE	2,830	$1,351,978
MALAWI		**4,450**	**$3,161,798**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	860	$559,081
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	1,670	$882,958
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,070	$1,272,401
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	850	$447,358
MALI		**3,620**	**$2,610,658**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	300	$178,218
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,020	$1,238,494
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,300	$1,193,945
MAURITANIA		**4,300**	**$1,882,772**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	500	$233,920
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	160	$194,028
	RICE	1,600	$710,224
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	2,040	$744,600
NIGER		**19,000**	**$10,498,818**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	710	$253,713
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	10,360	$5,709,861
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	50	$27,327
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	880	$1,002,840
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	470	$270,284
	RICE	6,530	$3,234,793
PAKISTAN		**530**	**$1,766,455**
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	530	$1,766,455
SOMALIA		**29,670**	**$10,166,288**
	CORN	5,330	$1,059,444
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KC	1,360	$768,464
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,560	$1,849,480
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	4,180	$2,137,728
	SORGHUM	17,240	$4,351,172
SOUTH SUDAN		**42,170**	**$11,559,078**
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	180	$448,800
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	540	$659,000
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,800	$917,329
	SORGHUM	39,650	$9,533,950
SUDAN		**128,950**	**$38,623,872**
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	250	$835,230
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	13,950	$11,297,223
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,040	$1,211,756
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	110	$57,674
	SORGHUM	113,600	$25,221,990

UGANDA		**4,480**	**$2,029,304**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	1,510	$496,060
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG	1,600	$542,449
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	520	$237,318
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	510	$373,408
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	340	$380,070
WEST BANK GAZA		**4,740**	**$2,283,511**
	BEANS, GARBANZO, KABULI BAG-50 K(	210	$145,285
	FLOUR, BREAD	4,530	$2,138,225
YEMEN		**36,840**	**$8,364,144**
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,040	$513,562
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	35,800	$7,850,582
ZIMBABWE		**6,020**	**$2,914,592**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	2,280	$1,123,009
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	630	$817,535
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	800	$341,600
	SORGHUM	2,310	$632,448
Grand Total		**766,910**	**$262,719,584**

FY16 Programs			
Recipient Country Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
AFGHANISTAN		**13,870**	**$7,879,301**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,090	$4,728,683
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,780	$1,784,918
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	7,000	$1,365,700
BANGLADESH		**165,160**	**$35,671,509**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	470	$541,843
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	710	$442,066
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	163,980	$34,687,600
BURKINA FASO		**1,310**	**$737,200**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	120	$52,952
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	100	$112,938
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	240	$192,405
	RICE	850	$378,905
BURUNDI		**3,720**	**$2,012,894**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	450	$276,390
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	50	$14,453
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	1,050	$311,546
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	1,880	$834,947
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	150	$424,950
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	130	$146,713
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	10	$3,897
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC		**8,270**	**$4,529,622**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	2,520	$848,184
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	1,200	$570,758
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	550	$878,094
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	300	$355,992
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,100	$740,332
	RICE	2,600	$1,136,262
CAMEROON		**14,740**	**$7,511,754**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	440	$209,194
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	120	$179,291
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,740	$1,951,615
	RICE	11,440	$5,171,654
CHAD		**22,760**	**$6,709,713**
	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	1,970	$561,194
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	2,290	$1,081,577
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	320	$394,896
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,160	$2,103,207
	SORGHUM	15,020	$2,568,840
COLOMBIA		**2,650**	**$1,314,809**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	680	$380,537
	RICE	1,970	$934,273
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO		**8,360**	**$3,689,390**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	5,740	$1,983,750
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	640	$292,277
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	170	$427,000
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,410	$795,164
	RICE	400	$191,200
CONGO (REPUBLIC OF)		**460**	**$248,424**
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	120	$88,199
	RICE	340	$160,225
DJIBOUTI		**2,010**	**$888,846**
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	1,300	$552,559
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	150	$180,311
	SORGHUM	560	$155,977
EL SALVADOR		**600**	**$257,670**
	RICE	600	$257,670
ETHIOPIA		**602,750**	**$141,826,107**

	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	1,230	$539,942
	HARD RED WHEAT	448,390	$88,725,637
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,680	$5,591,886
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	39,290	$27,337,318
	SORGHUM	109,160	$19,631,323
GUATEMALA		**710**	**$426,863**
	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	350	$249,340
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	360	$177,523
HAITI		**1,820**	**$1,018,847**
	BULGURBAG-50 KG	1,200	$343,692
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	180	$162,000
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	200	$237,460
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 67	240	$275,695
HONDURAS		**430**	**$212,286**
	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	60	$48,985
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	60	$27,459
	RICE	310	$135,842
KENYA		**41,670**	**$11,010,005**
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	5,400	$2,372,738
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,200	$1,468,152
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,020	$1,197,661
	SORGHUM	31,080	$5,492,666
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	1,970	$478,789
MADAGASCAR		**10,470**	**$5,438,305**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 K(	120	$108,939
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	510	$162,533
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	3,160	$1,430,327
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,160	$1,398,273
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	630	$294,237
	RICE	4,890	$2,043,996
MALAWI		**19,900**	**$11,498,589**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	4,030	$3,233,167
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	8,160	$2,564,891
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	2,530	$1,160,144
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,130	$2,454,344
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,050	$2,086,044
MALI		**3,630**	**$2,118,687**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	1,500	$678,511
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	370	$446,971
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	1,760	$993,205
MAURITANIA		**2,100**	**$1,468,042**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	70	$30,889
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	430	$619,328
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	100	$139,586
	RICE	1,500	$678,240
MOZAMBIQUE		**750**	**$651,135**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	750	$651,135
NIGER		**21,920**	**$11,370,921**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	670	$223,144
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	3,710	$1,748,121
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	580	$919,027
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	160	$194,065
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,530	$2,364,075
	RICE	13,270	$5,922,490
PAKISTAN		**1,150**	**$765,975**
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG	1,150	$765,975
SOMALIA		**10,430**	**$3,522,022**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	390	$169,346
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	720	$876,842

	SORGHUM	9,320	$2,475,834
SOUTH SUDAN		**111,690**	**$28,755,080**
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	2,250	$2,368,360
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,170	$5,104,646
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	4,240	$2,625,172
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	2,310	$1,093,970
	SORGHUM	98,720	$17,562,931
SUDAN		**121,250**	**$36,357,562**
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	10,840	$14,179,717
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,910	$3,253,995
	SORGHUM	107,500	$18,923,850
TANZANIA		**8,250**	**$3,940,678**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	4,360	$1,502,428
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	200	$295,628
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	680	$821,460
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	3,010	$1,321,161
UGANDA		**9,270**	**$3,903,677**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	1,300	$978,529
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	2,240	$688,330
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	1,100	$487,586
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	630	$771,057
	SORGHUM	1,600	$394,880
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	2,400	$583,296
YEMEN		**167,040**	**$48,268,726**
	HARD RED WHEAT	86,900	$17,820,113
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	8,050	$9,493,664
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	12,480	$8,277,988
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	1,970	$704,236
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	57,640	$11,972,726
ZIMBABWE		**10,530**	**$4,301,952**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	320	$149,354
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	1,590	$2,295,363
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	200	$231,740
	SORGHUM	8,420	$1,625,495
Grand Total		**1,389,670**	**$388,306,590**

PREPO Location	FY16 PREPO Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Co
DOMESTIC PREPO		**50,130**	**$27,264,954**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	6,880	$2,370,413
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	6,170	$2,938,078
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	200	$325,348
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	920	$1,142,447
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	8,220	$10,122,203
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	740	$382,589
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	10,000	$5,659,476
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	2,000	$957,800
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	15,000	$3,366,600
FOREIGN PREPO		**318,650**	**$123,121,132**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 K(	400	$356,678
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	8,000	$6,530,762
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	10,700	$3,472,728
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	12,480	$5,570,450
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	5,340	$7,921,799
	HARD RED WHEAT	82,860	$14,969,471
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	26,500	$30,838,371
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	56,300	$32,342,975
	RICE	1,000	$433,420

	RICE, FORT	1,000	$528,410
	SORGHUM	114,070	$20,156,068
Grand Total		**368,780**	**$150,386,086**

FY17 Programs			
Recipient Country Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
BANGLADESH		**73,140**	**$18,164,466**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	360	$380,603
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	540	$253,087
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	72,240	$17,530,776
BURKINA FASO		**200**	**$204,684**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	60	$36,832
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	120	$159,991
	RICE	20	$7,862
BURUNDI		**10,400**	**$6,600,574**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG	210	$88,402
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	1,540	$587,685
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	7,870	$5,000,267
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	220	$311,282
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	540	$602,587
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	20	$10,352
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC		**5,420**	**$2,656,811**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	4,400	$1,827,313
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	400	$271,277
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	120	$148,086
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	500	$410,135
CAMEROON		**16,890**	**$7,132,075**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	1,470	$993,044
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	890	$1,384,186
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	980	$1,209,369
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	2,850	$1,271,405
	SORGHUM	10,700	$2,274,071
CHAD		**17,090**	**$6,704,934**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	1,960	$1,326,920
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,060	$1,323,532
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,820	$1,420,006
	RICE, FORT	150	$62,864
	SORGHUM	12,100	$2,571,613
COLOMBIA		**1,270**	**$675,838**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	160	$130,160
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	40	$31,715
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	100	$132,676
	RICE	970	$381,288
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO		**16,680**	**$8,477,052**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	11,830	$4,632,953
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,510	$1,813,927
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	240	$130,800
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,100	$1,899,372
CONGO (REPUBLIC OF)		**540**	**$373,425**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	60	$37,652
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	10	$16,105
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	100	$129,123
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	70	$59,220
	RICE, FORT	300	$131,325
DJIBOUTI		**2,960**	**$1,227,842**
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	1,240	$517,350
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	260	$323,489
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	230	$122,236
	SORGHUM	1,230	$264,767
ETHIOPIA		**447,710**	**$103,504,130**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	1,630	$845,623
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	500	$302,921
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	9,820	$12,043,718
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	29,140	$16,958,196

	SORGHUM	66,240	$11,293,395
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	340,380	$62,060,276
HAITI		**800**	**$445,961**
	BULGURBAG-50 KG	200	$57,118
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	400	$232,479
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	150	$95,390
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	50	$60,975
KENYA		**54,030**	**$18,888,629**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	5,200	$6,458,122
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	8,580	$5,041,664
	SORGHUM	30,720	$5,309,715
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	9,530	$2,079,128
MADAGASCAR		**8,810**	**$6,013,416**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 K(	60	$44,970
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	3,700	$2,134,216
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,740	$2,151,136
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,470	$902,140
	RICE	1,840	$780,954
MALAWI		**4,110**	**$3,347,077**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	860	$672,825
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	2,200	$1,408,157
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,050	$1,266,096
MALI		**4,960**	**$3,679,376**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	2,750	$1,685,787
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	710	$943,484
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,500	$1,050,106
MAURITANIA		**2,010**	**$1,039,043**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	50	$24,584
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	50	$75,751
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	160	$212,616
	RICE, FORT	1,750	$726,093
MOZAMBIQUE		**3,810**	**$631,241**
	SORGHUM	3,810	$631,241
NIGER		**24,360**	**$15,892,699**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	4,260	$2,596,188
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	910	$1,399,830
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	4,600	$4,039,796
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,980	$2,604,389
	RICE, FORT	12,610	$5,252,497
NIGERIA		**5,600**	**$6,489,600**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	770	$483,198
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,830	$6,006,402
SOMALIA		**31,470**	**$12,788,425**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K(	7,990	$5,044,625
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,700	$2,081,798
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,140	$1,834,423
	SORGHUM	18,640	$3,827,578
SOUTH SUDAN		**109,420**	**$26,760,391**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,170	$5,085,709
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,030	$1,856,787
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	5,250	$2,271,395
	SORGHUM	96,970	$17,546,499
SUDAN		**89,470**	**$21,451,294**
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	7,870	$6,259,043
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,670	$2,102,615
	SORGHUM	79,930	$13,089,636
TANZANIA		**5,430**	**$3,200,825**
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	200	$281,102
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	510	$654,101

	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	4,720	$2,265,623
UGANDA		**15,650**	**$9,928,317**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	4,360	$1,660,567
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	6,140	$3,820,810
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,720	$3,356,616
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	2,430	$1,090,324
YEMEN		**319,580**	**$104,738,818**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	27,080	$33,349,599
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	18,540	$11,507,013
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	17,200	$9,904,734
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	256,760	$49,977,472
ZIMBABWE		**7,590**	**$3,460,848**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	1,930	$1,216,356
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	760	$916,539
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	700	$351,775
	SORGHUM	4,200	$976,178
Grand Total		**1,279,400**	**$394,477,791**

FY17 PREPO			
PREPO Location	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
DOMESTIC PREPO		**14,500**	**$11,823,073**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	1,000	$634,110
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	2,000	$1,611,200
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,500	$5,929,579
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	2,000	$837,532
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	5,000	$2,810,652
FOREIGN PREPO		**107,340**	**$54,514,976**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	1,000	$381,581
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	10,250	$6,397,692
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	230	$334,540
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	2,500	$2,063,668
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	15,500	$19,009,085
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	5,500	$2,400,708
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	23,000	$14,441,092
	RICE	500	$195,220
	SORGHUM	40,000	$7,559,350
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	8,860	$1,732,041
Grand Total		**121,840**	**$66,338,048**

FY18 Programs			
Recipient Country Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
BANGLADESH		**101,000**	**$23,531,067**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	310	$341,569
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	460	$201,728
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BAG-50 KG	2,030	$558,149
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	98,200	$22,429,621
BURKINA FASO		**810**	**$436,539**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	60	$66,922
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	130	$61,868
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	620	$307,749
BURUNDI		**4,360**	**$2,391,593**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	1,160	$732,099
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-5	3,200	$1,659,494
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC		**5,400**	**$2,643,353**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	3,790	$1,806,107
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-5	1,610	$837,246
CAMEROON		**8,840**	**$4,983,808**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	480	$303,065
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10	1,540	$2,763,117
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 K	1,520	$618,013
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	5,300	$1,299,613
CHAD		**5,800**	**$2,949,984**
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10	950	$1,840,839
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	4,850	$1,109,145
COLOMBIA		**1,090**	**$572,122**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	270	$165,099
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	820	$407,023
CONGO-DEM. REPUB.		**23,220**	**$12,047,497**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	6,460	$3,083,244
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	2,060	$1,426,942
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	50	$56,108
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-	120	$125,353
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	690	$296,887
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-5	410	$194,516
	RICE, MILLED BULK	13,430	$6,864,447
CONGO-REPUB. OF		**340**	**$157,104**
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	340	$157,104
DJIBOUTI		**900**	**$309,691**
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	420	$191,990
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	480	$117,701
ETHIOPIA		**291,610**	**$82,585,491**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	3,800	$2,492,278
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10	870	$1,708,428
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	11,050	$12,879,861
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-	400	$427,374
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	30,700	$13,848,907
	SORGHUM BULK	58,200	$10,889,220
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	186,590	$40,339,423
KENYA		**68,180**	**$16,367,916**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	470	$570,028
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	7,460	$3,416,164

	SORGHUM BULK	46,800	$9,755,209
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	13,450	$2,626,516
MADAGASCAR		**6,390**	**$1,739,189**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	200	$139,169
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	70	$92,752
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-5	290	$137,585
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	450	$261,189
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	5,380	$1,108,495
MALAWI		**1,680**	**$1,345,296**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	1,270	$887,145
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	410	$458,151
MAURITANIA		**1,790**	**$1,309,310**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	40	$25,648
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10	140	$285,154
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	210	$304,808
	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,400	$693,700
MOZAMBIQUE		**1,880**	**$932,068**
	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,880	$932,068
NIGER		**20,590**	**$13,473,440**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	3,520	$2,564,109
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10	1,100	$2,155,262
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	3,660	$2,036,497
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,350	$1,527,440
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	10,960	$5,190,133
NIGERIA		**6,260**	**$6,641,517**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	3,630	$2,521,235
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10	1,300	$2,552,516
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,330	$1,567,766
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN		**51,460**	**$11,979,853**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	930	$1,061,292
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	5,090	$2,269,787
	SORGHUM BULK	45,440	$8,648,773
SOMALIA		**42,570**	**$16,644,726**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	11,110	$7,621,786
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,120	$2,388,986
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,780	$1,733,947
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	6,720	$1,506,098
	SORGHUM BULK	18,840	$3,393,910
SUDAN		**147,470**	**$45,505,515**
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	20,320	$10,882,627
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	8,650	$10,410,213
	SORGHUM BULK	118,500	$24,212,676
TANZANIA		**8,690**	**$4,653,829**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	820	$914,866
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	7,870	$3,738,963
UGANDA		**16,020**	**$10,222,964**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	2,970	$1,369,408
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,720	$5,506,903
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	8,330	$3,346,654
YEMEN		**315,550**	**$101,377,577**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	28,320	$32,593,721
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	23,620	$12,448,801
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	263,610	$56,335,055

ZIMBABWE		**9,440**	**$4,023,432**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	1,970	$1,305,941
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	840	$945,153
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 K(	1,180	$462,674
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	5,450	$1,309,665
Grand Total		**1,141,340**	**$368,824,882**

FY18 PREPO			
PREPO Location	**Commodity Type**	**Metric Tons**	**Commodity Cost**
DOMESTIC PREPO		**47,650**	**$35,543,982**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	9,000	$6,150,759
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10	1,650	$2,989,942
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	5,000	$2,545,371
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	9,500	$11,973,592
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	8,000	$5,035,768
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	14,000	$6,593,106
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-5	500	$255,445
FOREIGN PREPO		**83,900**	**$40,039,910**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	3,000	$1,300,587
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-2	9,000	$6,111,739
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10	500	$986,125
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	630	$296,024
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	13,770	$15,904,565
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	18,260	$8,081,590
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	740	$170,970
	SORGHUM BULK	38,000	$7,188,310
Grand Total		**131,550**	**$75,583,893**

FY19 Programs			
Recipient Country Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
BANGLADESH		**92,430**	**$18,912,495**
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L	50	$49,711
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	20	$9,500
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	92,360	$18,853,285
BURKINA FASO		**3,160**	**$1,764,285**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	160	$212,403
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	480	$181,620
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	2,520	$1,370,262
BURUNDI		**1,070**	**$629,757**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	1,070	$629,757
CAMEROON		**17,060**	**$6,248,298**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	160	$207,643
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	740	$300,067
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	2,340	$911,984
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	5,370	$2,856,896
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	8,450	$1,971,707
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC		**12,950**	**$5,440,082**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	10,850	$4,544,514
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,100	$895,569
CHAD		**17,400**	**$5,641,369**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,670	$2,017,410
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,500	$1,327,654
	SORGHUM BULK	12,230	$2,296,305
COLOMBIA		**880**	**$485,381**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	180	$115,409
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	80	$33,337
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	90	$108,783
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	530	$227,852
DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF CONGO		**37,140**	**$17,023,473**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	32,040	$14,854,297
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	30	$34,133
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	120	$140,094
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	600	$282,317
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	4,020	$1,593,770
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	330	$118,863
DJIBOUTI		**2,270**	**$1,108,486**
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-25 KG	2,270	$1,108,486
ETHIOPIA		**437,230**	**$103,023,369**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	5,650	$7,023,367
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	440	$513,137
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	27,230	$11,052,335
	SORGHUM BULK	82,170	$18,204,701
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	321,740	$66,229,829
HAITI		**2,560**	**$1,310,896**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	290	$328,590
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	770	$356,641
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,500	$625,665
KENYA		**47,530**	**$16,129,915**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,930	$5,959,537
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	9,470	$4,022,083
	SORGHUM BULK	27,300	$4,808,036
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	5,830	$1,340,259
MADAGASCAR		**14,690**	**$5,108,804**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,680	$1,002,006
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L	210	$223,803
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	520	$603,642
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	210	$244,906
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,390	$499,164
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	660	$319,229

	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	10,020	$2,216,053
NIGER		**18,750**	**$11,072,155**
	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	2,400	$2,125,998
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	3,070	$1,707,655
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,490	$1,853,451
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	80	$92,044
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	11,710	$5,293,008
NIGERIA		**11,860**	**$9,569,395**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	8,030	$4,993,084
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	3,830	$4,576,311
REPUBLIC OF CONGO		**840**	**$671,950**
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG	840	$671,950
REPUBLIC OF SOUTH SUDAN		**29,890**	**$9,835,330**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	3,630	$4,218,731
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	650	$250,634
	SORGHUM BULK	25,610	$5,365,965
SOMALIA		**72,200**	**$23,393,536**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	4,400	$3,074,192
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	5,640	$6,844,341
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	7,720	$3,198,758
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	600	$139,878
	SORGHUM BULK	53,840	$10,136,367
SUDAN		**148,320**	**$41,006,668**
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	14,220	$6,572,104
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	6,940	$8,019,013
	SORGHUM BULK	127,160	$26,415,551
TANZANIA		**1,930**	**$720,449**
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,930	$720,449
UGANDA		**2,940**	**$1,778,245**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,020	$1,179,905
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	1,920	$598,340
YEMEN		**585,020**	**$195,362,942**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	12,370	$12,147,093
	BEANS, KIDNEY, LIGHT RED BAG-50 KG	620	$847,341
	BEANS, PEA BAG-50 KG	5,520	$4,835,596
	BEANS, SMALL WHITE BAG-50 KG	60	$36,062
	BEANS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG (PE	7,090	$6,335,800
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	48,480	$57,619,899
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	510,880	$113,541,150
ZIMBABWE		**18,040**	**$4,676,991**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	600	$692,433
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,420	$951,579
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	4,020	$932,640
	SORGHUM BULK	11,000	$2,100,340
Grand Total		**1,576,160**	**$480,914,271**

FY19 PREPO			
PREPO Location	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
DOMESTIC PREPO		**30,780**	**$20,372,300**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	2,100	$1,497,817
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	2,200	$1,140,570
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	2,350	$1,816,756
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	6,100	$7,535,233
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	7,500	$3,291,944
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	3,530	$1,749,550
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	7,000	$3,340,431
FOREIGN PREPO		**94,792**	**$53,935,982**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	8,500	$5,923,361
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 K	11,992	$21,983,653

	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	9,500	$10,901,429
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	14,800	$6,012,940
	SORGHUM BULK	50,000	$9,114,600
Grand Total		**125,572**	**$74,308,283**

**Note: FY 19 numbers are estimates and will change as actuals are reconciled*

RUTF & RUSF Purchases			
Fiscal Year	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity Cost
FY 2016		**5,318**	**$24,598,936**
	RUSF	3,090	$20,043,068
	RUTF	2,228	$4,555,868
FY 2017		**11,850**	**$32,176,169**
	RUSF	4,375	$11,396,245
	RUTF	7,475	$20,779,924
FY 2018		**11,291**	**$30,513,644**
	RUSF	1,670	$4,073,215
	RUTF	9,621	$26,440,429
FY 2019		**18,504**	**$49,879,132**
	RUSF	9,082	$23,522,453
	RUTF	9,421	$26,356,679

Note*: Starting in FY16, the majority of ready-to-use therapeutic and supplementary food (RUTF & RUSF)were purchased by OAA/T under BPAs (Blanket Purchase Agreements). USDA no longer purchases RUSF or RUTF.

13. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a list of all the organizations participating in each program, amounts received by each organization, locations where each organization has programs, the type of programs and a brief description of each for Fiscal Year 2015 through 2019. For the Food for Peace Title II program, please show whether the programs are designated as emergency or non-emergency.

Mr. Isley: Attachment B provides the data for USDA's Food for Progress Program and McGovern-Dole Program, both of which are non-emergency.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

ATTACHMENT B - USDA Foreign Food Assistance Programs (Participating Organizations Table)

Food for Progress **Annual Agreement Value (Millions of U.S. Dollars)[1]**

Awardee	Country	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019
Partners for Development	Benin	$15.60				
TechnoServe, Inc.		$36.00				
Lutheran World Relief	Burkina Faso		$24.20			
Cultivating New Frontiers in Agriculture	Cote d'Ivoire			$14.60		
Land O' Lakes, Inc.	East Africa Regional[2]					$ 13.32
Land O' Lakes, Inc.	Egypt				$ 12.83	
ACDI/VOCA	Ethiopia			$14.70		
Government of Ethiopia			$18.30			
TechnoServe, Inc.						$ 17.39
ACDI/VOCA	Ghana	$36.60				
American Soybean Association		$21.10				
Land O'Lakes	Malawi		$15.10			
Government of Mali	Mali	$5.40				
Land O' Lakes, Inc.	Mozambique		$27.40			
Shelf for Life	SeGaBe regional[3]			$38.70		
TechnoServe, Inc.	West African Regional4					$ 47.31
Africa Annual Total		***$114.70***	***$85.00***	***$68.00***	***$12.83***	***$78.02***
Winrock International Institute for Agricultural	Bangladesh		$24.00			
American Soybean Association	Cambodia				$ 27.94	
Land O' Lakes, Inc.	Georgia				$ 23.88	
National Cooperative Business Association	Indonesia					$ 20.61
Government of Jordan	Jordan	$25.10		$ 18.70		
Winrock International Institute for Agricultural	Laos			$ 16.80		
Winrock International Institute for Agricultural	Pakistan		$22.90			
ACDI/VOCA	Philippines				$ 25.21	
Winrock International Institute for Agricultural Development						$ 13.30
International Executive Service Corps	Sri Lanka			$ 21.20		
Asia Annual Total		***$25.10***	***$46.90***	***$56.70***	***$77.03***	***$33.91***
National Cooperative Business Association	Dominican Republic	$21.00				
International Executive Service Corporation		$18.90				
Counterpoint International	Guatemala		$18.30			
Catholic Relief Services-United States Conference of	Haiti		$9.90			
TechnoServe, Inc.	Honduras			$ 16.50		
Government of Honduras		$17.40				
International Executive Service Corporation	Paraguay					$ 13.89
TechnoServe, Inc.	LAC Regional5				$ 47.15	
Pan-American Development Foundation	Venezuela					$ 12.67
Western Hemisphere Annual Total		***$57.30***	***$28.20***	***$ 16.50***	***$ 47.15***	***$ 26.56***
WORLDWIDE ANNUAL TOTALS		$197.10	$160.10	$141.20	$137.02	$138.50

[1] Source: International Food Assistance Report

[2] Includes regions of Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, South Sudan, Tanzania and Uganda

[3] Includes regions of Republic of Senegal, The Gambia and Guinea-Bissau

4 Includes Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote D'Ivoire, Ghana and Nigeria

5 Includes Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Peru

McGovern-Dole		Annual Agreement Value (Millions of U.S. Dollars)[1]				
Awardee	Country	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	2018	2019
Catholic Relief Services-United States Conference of	Benin			$21.40		
Catholic Relief Services-United States Conference of	Burkina Faso				$ 24.00	
Nascent Solutions	Cameroon	$12.00			$ 27.00	
U.N. World Food Program	Cote d'Ivoire	$35.00				
U.N. World Food Program	Ethiopia		$12.00			$ 28.00
U.N. World Food Program			$20.00			
Catholic Relief Services-U.S. CCB	Guinea-Bissau					$ 17.00
U.N. World Food Program	Kenya		$28.00			
U.N. World Food Program	Liberia			$29.10		
U.N. World Food Program	Malawi		$15.00			
Nascent Solutions	Malawi					$ 22.00
Catholic Relief Services-U.S. CCB	Mali	$29.90				
Counterpart International, Inc.	Mauritania					$ 22.50
Planet Aid Incorporated	Mozambique	$31.80				
World Vision International		$29.00				$ 25.00
U.N. World Food Program	Republic of Congo			$30.00		
Counterpart International, Inc.	Republic of Senegal				$ 21.00	
U.N. World Food Program	Rwanda	$25.00				
Catholic Relief Services-U.S. CCB	Sierra Leone	$18.20			$ 25.00	
Project Concern International	Tanzania		$33.00			
Catholic Relief Services-U.S. CCB	Togo					$ 20.00
Africa Annual Totals		***$200.90***	***$88.00***	***$80.50***	***$ 97.00***	***$ 134.50***
U.N. World Food Program	Bangladesh			$17.10		
U.N. World Food Program	Cambodia		$15.20			$ 19.00
Mercy Corps International	Kyrgyz Republic			$15.50		
U.N. World Food Program	Laos		$27.40	$27.40		
U.N. World Food Program	Nepal			$29.30		
Save the Children	Sri Lanka				$ 26.00	
CARE, Inc	Timor-Leste				$ 26.00	
Mercy Corps International	Uzbekistan					$ 21.50
Asia Annual Totals		***$0.00***	***$42.60***	***$89.30***	***$ 52.00***	***$ 40.50***
Project Concern International	Guatemala		$24.00			
Catholic Relief Services-United States Conference of			$27.00			
Save the Children					$ 27.00	
U.N. World Food Program	Haiti	$10.00	$14.00			$ 23.00
Catholic Relief Services-United States Conference of	Honduras	$33.70				
World Vision Inc.	Nicaragua			$23.20		
Western Hemisphere Annual Totals		***$43.70***	***$65.00***	***$23.20***	***$ 27.00***	***$ 23.00***
WORLD WIDE ANNUAL TOTALS		$244.60	$195.60	$193.00	$ 176.00	$ 198.00

14. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a table showing the cost of internal transportation for each fiscal year 2015 through 2019 and tonnage of commodities shipped. These costs are to include Internal Transport, Storage, Distribution, and Handling Costs (ITSH).

Mr. Isley: Attachment C provides the data for USDA's Food for Progress Program, which incurs ITSH costs.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

ATTACHMENT C - USDA Foreign Food Assistance Programs (ITSH Table)

McGovern-Dole ITSH and Tonnage Programmed FY 2015 - FY 2019		
Fiscal Year	Tonnage Programmed	ITSH Costs
2014	78,860 MT	$6,318,398
2015	55,960 MT	$18,644,131
2016	75,960 MT	$15,044,632
2017	61,000 MT	$22,016,834
2018	60,700 MT	$19,936,925
2019	37,940 MT	$13,285,444

Note: NA for USDA's Food for Progress Program

Fiscal Year 2015		
Country	**Commodities**	**ITSH**
AFGHANISTAN	40,580	$20,808,958
BANGLADESH	75,090	$0
BURKINA FASO	4,263	$1,057,300
BURUNDI	6,590	$2,425,223
CAMEROON	11,950	$7,102,300
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	9,970	$7,672,937
CENTRAL AMERICA REGIONAL	575	$267,870
CHAD	35,500	$17,642,160
COLOMBIA	1,600	$1,015,300
DJIBOUTI	2,120	$804,160
DRC	23,670	$16,994,394
ETHIOPIA	324,520	$53,196,030
GAMBIA	120	$59,200
GUATEMALA	5,840	$0
HAITI	3,820	$1,875,100
IVORY COAST	150	$99,600
KENYA	66,940	$26,038,919
LIBERIA	4,280	$2,141,400
MADAGASCAR	9,550	$1,540,700
MALAWI	16,310	$5,389,900
MALI	9,470	$5,964,880
MAURITANIA	5,030	$2,313,900
NEPAL	1,530	$2,784,605
NIGER	31,130	$11,721,024
NIGERIA	430	$110,200
SENEGAL	1,720	$982,100
SOMALIA	40,655	$30,161,232
SOUTH SUDAN	28,395	$76,158,137
SUDAN	122,470	$67,337,417
TANZANIA	310	$146,600
UGANDA	11,530	$4,058,793
WEST AFRICA REGIONAL	1,910	$943,800
WEST BANK/GAZA	5,140	$1,800,500
YEMEN	60,290	$22,407,801
ZIMBABWE	24,130	$7,076,965
FY15 Total	**987,578**	**$400,099,405**

Fiscal Year 2016		
Country	Commodities	ITSH
AFGHANISTAN	15,870	$9,122,017
BANGLADESH	90,070	$1,204,898
BURKINA FASO	1,310	$728,853
BURMA	140	$70,848
BURUNDI	4,150	$2,129,417
CAMEROON	17,220	$9,918,184
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	12,906	$7,756,201
CHAD	29,825	$14,684,730
COLOMBIA	2,920	$1,804,300
DJIBOUTI	3,880	$1,602,700
DRC	14,310	$15,661,722
EL SALVADOR	800	$213,228
ETHIOPIA	789,456	$79,284,856
GUATEMALA	1,030	$254,689
HAITI	4,230	$2,112,200
HONDURAS	480	$124,383
KENYA	51,150	$20,911,541
LESOTHO	4,020	$783,700
MADAGASCAR	28,510	$7,073,800
MALAWI	57,080	$11,612,085
MALI	3,780	$3,125,044
MAURITANIA	2,220	$1,109,200
MOZAMBIQUE	14,650	$6,375,856
NIGER	22,908	$9,121,083
NIGERIA	1,100	$918,855
PAKISTAN	1,329	$514,780
REPUBLIC OF CONGO	510	$320,175
SOMALIA	19,990	$16,507,400
SOUTH SUDAN	124,500	$136,277,597
SUDAN	121,030	$66,742,900
SWAZILAND	2,310	$371,800
TANZANIA	9,400	$4,275,800
UGANDA	12,390	$2,633,000
WEST AFRICA REGIONAL	-	$241,700
YEMEN	154,080	$57,765,779
ZIMBABWE	54,640	$18,484,130
FY16 Total	**1,674,194**	**$511,839,451**

Fiscal Year 2017		
Country	**Commodities**	**ITSH**
AFGHANISTAN	750	$245,052
BANGLADESH	73,140	$972,768
BURKINA FASO	590	$279,400
BURMA	200	$103,260
BURUNDI	13,032	$3,792,116
CAMEROON	17,010	$8,737,126
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	7,024	$3,582,679
CHAD	17,880	$8,460,368
COLOMBIA	1,380	$650,128
DJIBOUTI	3,460	$1,513,220
DRC	16,380	$13,461,000
ETHIOPIA	487,870	$56,197,194
GUATEMALA	0	-$99,056
HAITI	4,312	$1,896,800
KENYA	55,610	$18,864,100
MADAGASCAR	9,240	$3,839,652
MALAWI	5,120	$1,485,030
MALI	5,390	$3,841,216
MAURITANIA	2,090	$1,238,773
MOZAMBIQUE	5,810	$2,984,800
NIGER	25,643	$14,857,570
NIGERIA	7,940	$4,500,665
REPUBLIC OF CONGO	540	$275,893
SOMALIA	58,968	$42,742,520
SOUTH SUDAN	125,450	$178,726,243
SUDAN	85,700	$35,974,534
TANZANIA	5,430	$2,705,900
UGANDA	15,650	$4,271,100
YEMEN	319,430	$88,630,978
ZIMBABWE	9,300	$7,500,007
FY17 Total	**1,380,339**	**$512,231,036**

Fiscal Year 2018		
Country	**Commodities**	**ITSH**
AFGHANISTAN	830	$98,963
BANGLADESH	101,690	$1,349,616
BURKINA FASO	2,830	$309,221
BURUNDI	5,050	$1,812,459
CAMEROON	9,590	$3,081,894
CAR	7,750	$4,553,687
CHAD	15,210	$6,113,197
COLOMBIA	1,210	$533,308
DJIBOUTI	2,800	$523,430
DRC	41,365	$25,851,519
ETHIOPIA	416,510	$40,676,883
GUATEMALA	0	$0
HAITI	0	$0
KENYA	65,160	$20,062,046
MADAGASCAR	14,490	$3,011,774
MALAWI	1,680	$1,240,228
MALI	5,260	$1,684,814
MAURITANIA	2,470	$450,538
MOZAMBIQUE	2,100	$1,152,102
NIGER	21,650	$10,481,590
NIGERIA	10,630	$6,503,899
PAKISTAN	450	$237,600
ROC	630	$340,340
SOMALIA	73,483	$38,351,904
SOUTH SUDAN	135,410	$129,713,274
SUDAN	156,792	$41,846,418
TANZANIA	8,690	$2,026,334
UGANDA	18,960	$1,775,035
YEMEN	329,522	$71,522,647
ZIMBABWE	10,120	$6,505,230
FY18 Total	**1,462,332**	**$421,809,950**

Fiscal Year 2019		
Country	**Commodities**	**ITSH**
BANGLADESH	92,430	$520,669
BURKINA FASO	1,810	$221,888
BURMA	140	$168,290
BURUNDI	4,760	$1,767,827
CAMEROON	20,820	$9,044,930
CAR	16,380	$10,562,685
CHAD	27,842	$7,594,714
COLOMBIA	1,880	$1,226,273
COLOMBIA (VENEZUELA REGIONAL RESPONS	30	$22,775
DJIBOUTI	3,690	$1,248,857
DRC	51,140	$45,963,656
ETHIOPIA	362,366	$70,941,967
HAITI	2,560	$1,221,399
KENYA	38,530	$10,534,795
MADAGASCAR	18,850	$5,367,939
MALAWI	230	$655,668
MALI	3,400	$884,255
MOZAMBIQUE	275	$180,849
NIGER	24,340	$7,374,242
NIGERIA	16,640	$12,947,628
PAKISTAN	336	$302,400
ROC	1,670	$1,072,938
SOMALIA	84,570	$50,653,231
SOUTH SUDAN	38,160	$36,135,554
SUDAN	125,080	$50,348,897
TANZANIA	2,820	$820,489
UGANDA	1,810	$403,819
YEMEN	587,370	$139,859,541
ZIMBABWE	28,370	$12,251,710
FY19 Total	**1,558,299**	**$480,299,885**

15. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a table showing the cost of external transportation for each fiscal year and recipient country 2014 through 2019.

Mr. Isley: Attachment D provides the data for USDA's Food for Progress Program and McGovern-Dole Program.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

ATTACHMENT D USDA's Foreign Food Assistance Programs External Transportation Table

	EXTERNAL TRANSPORTATION						
	FY 14	FY 15	FY 16	FY 17	FY 18	FY19	Grand Total
Food for Progress							
Bangladesh		$1,368,115		$4,904,110			$6,272,225
Benin			$1,889,616				$1,889,616
Burkina Faso	$2,950,420	$981,918	$780,520	$2,215,020	$2,771,854		$9,699,731
Cambodia						$1,922,528	$1,922,528
Dominican Republic			$2,583,107	$790,000	$898,590	$888,800	$5,160,497
E Africa/Tanzania		$1,569,720					$1,569,720
El Salvador	$1,245,427	$492,053	$1,682,030		$2,095,830		$5,515,340
Ethiopia	$5,487,900				$4,839,000	$4,264,100	$14,591,000
Ghana			$3,876,438	$1,668,970	$2,415,840		$7,961,248
Guatemala		$1,622,700		$2,547,130	$555,800		$4,725,630
Guinea				$7,848,360		$4,144,251	$11,992,611
Haiti				$2,030,000			$2,030,000
Honduras			$2,376,890		$2,050,000		$4,426,890
Jordan			$4,797,500	$6,358,575			$11,156,075
Kenya	$0	$1,477,210		$7,268,660		$3,595,639	$12,341,509
Liberia		$2,073,420	$1,287,750				$3,361,170
Malawi				$1,794,377		$2,078,330	$3,872,707
Mali	$1,356,500	$2,486,500			$1,911,675		$5,754,675
Mauriania		$910,736					$910,736
Mozambique	$1,720,485		$1,211,831	$2,351,722		$4,704,834	$9,988,872
Nicaragua	$2,452,520	$2,949,682		$1,219,260	$1,516,000		$8,137,462
Pakistan		$1,078,830		$2,029,644		$10,091,309	$13,199,783
Peru						$2,296,980	$2,296,980
Philippines	$2,690,717		$1,009,950			$5,947,850	$9,648,517
Senegal	$3,432,509		$582,335		$2,786,500		$6,801,344
Sri Lanka					$2,051,251		$2,051,251
Tanzania	$3,999,300	$1,569,720	$4,541,280				$10,110,300
Timor-Leste	$1,219,725						$1,219,725
McGovern-Dole							
Bangladesh		$1,373,340	$517,680		$268,249	$373,696	$2,532,965
Benin		$287,281	$96,360	$231,541	$374,475	$97,361	$1,087,018
Burkina Faso		$1,087,210	$350,740	$762,320		$1,007,885	$3,208,155
Cambodia	$1,392,130	$641,160		$410,773	$484,394		$2,928,458
Cameroon	$682,378	$486,672		$77,700	$170,741	$575,109	$1,992,599
Republic of Congo	$603,455				$958,557	$391,856	$1,953,867
Cote d'Ivoire			$1,670,780				$1,670,780
East Timor						$252,663	$252,663
Ethiopia		$876,764	$1,461,761				$2,338,524
Guatemala	$2,062,503	$784,275	$506,920	$1,049,928	$2,099,434	$1,052,488	$7,555,546
Guinea-Bissau			$1,428,427	$1,258,190	$2,193,131		$4,879,748

Haiti			$880,654	$388,109	$381,380		$1,650,142
Honduras	$497,400	$387,823	$702,560	$724,590	$1,367,757	$1,132,477	$4,812,607
Ivory Coast				$1,244,486	$1,747,968	$827,940	$3,820,393
Kenya	$3,609,572	$513,654		$2,345,011	$1,279,772		$7,748,009
Kyrgyz Republic	$276,070	$57,470		$117,400	$344,092	$551,371	$1,346,403
Laos	$61,600	$795,815	$721,460	$2,154,766	$1,006,269	$2,380,146	$7,120,056
Liberia	$895,885	$800,676			$793,598	$895,116	$3,385,274
Malawi	$1,587,373	$500,500		$2,094,455			$4,182,328
Mali	$310,440		$750,028	$388,280	$785,284	$809,157	$3,043,190
Mozambique	$177,500	$368,816	$361,910	$628,907	$655,083	$659,915	$2,852,130
Nepal		$504,496	$903,960	$65,850	$1,716,575	$526,701	$3,717,581
Nicaragua	$507,700	$660,909	$542,876	$196,680	$988,250	$1,445,468	$4,341,882
Rwanda			$152,907	$175,285	$173,683	$191,262	$693,136
Senegal	$22,450	$89,200	$93,790	$804,910		$355,300	$1,365,650
Sierra Leone	$397,497	$73,500	$205,980	$134,660	$89,299	$1,013,255	$1,914,191
Tanzania	$173,995	$367,020		$228,400	$396,300		$1,165,715
Grand Total	**$39,813,450**	**$29,237,182**	**$37,968,038**	**$58,508,068**	**$42,166,629**	**$54,473,786**	**$262,167,154**

Fiscal Year 2014		
Country	**Ocean Freight**	**Inland Freight**
AFGHANISTAN	$5,413,600	$2,910,500
ALGERIA	$614,700	$0
BANGLADESH	$6,876,000	$0
BURKINA FASO	$1,034,200	$829,000
BURUNDI	$1,516,700	$938,300
CAMEROON	$537,700	$0
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLI	$2,062,400	$2,111,700
CHAD	$9,674,000	$15,419,600
COLOMBIA	$648,900	$0
COTE D'IVOIRE	$617,600	$0
DJIBOUTI	$548,100	$0
DRC	$9,187,800	$11,023,700
ETHIOPIA	$32,401,000	$17,074,200
GUATEMALA	$1,055,300	$0
HAITI	$423,800	$29,200
KENYA	$13,651,700	$12,400
LIBERIA	$413,400	$0
MALAWI	$133,800	$155,700
MALI	$2,426,300	$1,472,300
MAURITANIA	$829,800	$31,200
NIGER	$4,253,300	$3,474,300
PAKISTAN	$6,393,200	$190,800
PHILIPPINES	$1,148,300	$0
SENEGAL	$282,900	$0
SIERRA LEONE	$236,700	$0
SOMALIA	$9,288,500	$6,804,100
SOUTH SUDAN	$6,532,000	$14,316,900
SUDAN	$15,490,600	$0
TANZANIA	$566,500	$0
UGANDA	$3,042,800	$3,404,600
WEST AFRICA REGIONAL	$1,659,800	$0
WEST BANK/GAZA	$1,370,000	$0
YEMEN	$8,084,600	$0
ZIMBABWE	$1,688,400	$1,530,500
FY14 Total	**$150,104,400**	**$81,729,000**

Fiscal Year 2015		
Country	**Ocean Freight**	**Inland Freight**
AFGHANISTAN	$5,331,824	$4,293,600
BANGLADESH	$6,415,300	$0
BURKINA FASO	$1,101,875	$713,700
BURUNDI	$1,456,423	$1,463,400
CAMEROON	$1,897,500	$0
CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC	$2,387,462	$2,783,600
CENTRAL AMERICA REGIONAL	$119,806	$0
CHAD	$7,509,737	$11,939,780
COLOMBIA	$475,500	$0
COTE D'IVOIRE	$33,099	$0
DJIBOUTI	$399,014	$0
DRC	$4,540,195	$6,334,300
ETHIOPIA	$36,199,762	$21,673,857
GAMBIA	$31,032	$0
GUATEMALA	$1,412,020	$0
HAITI	$707,400	$23,100
KENYA	$9,654,898	$0
LIBERIA	$872,300	$0
MADAGASCAR	$2,299,600	$59,400
MALAWI	$3,384,926	$2,779,757
MALI	$2,662,356	$2,429,200
MAURITANIA	$1,026,219	$58,300
NEPAL	$256,345	$0
NIGER	$5,398,141	$5,002,208
NIGERIA	$136,500	$0
SENEGAL	$455,464	$0
SOMALIA	$6,759,993	$5,725,300
SOUTH SUDAN	$8,021,073	$16,441,500
SUDAN	$10,184,510	$-
TANZANIA	$52,143	$-
UGANDA	$2,238,524	$2,782,400
WEST AFRICA REGIONAL	$430,300	$0
WEST BANK/GAZA	$686,935	$0
YEMEN	$6,780,343	$0
ZIMBABWE	$2,851,800	$4,245,200
FY15 Total	**$134,170,319**	**$88,748,602**

Fiscal Year 2016		
Country	**Ocean Freight**	**Inland Freight**
AFGHANISTAN	$1,729,391	$1,632,824
BANGLADESH	$15,941,054	$0
BURKINA FASO	$166,460	$176,339
BURMA	$34,173	$0
BURUNDI	$939,358	$793,170
CAMEROON	$2,730,116	$2,354,206
CAR	$2,351,070	$2,099,026
CHAD	$4,082,042	$8,871,485
COLOMBIA	$483,100	$0
DJIBOUTI	$570,616	$0
DRC	$3,335,263	$3,315,630
EL SALVADOR	$160,056	$0
ETHIOPIA	$93,603,600	$49,554,500
GUATEMALA	$203,878	$0
HAITI	$958,551	$0
HONDURAS	$93,366	$0
KENYA	$8,859,518	$0
LESOTHO	$976,563	$305,520
MADAGASCAR	$6,005,027	$0
MALAWI	$9,199,678	$10,975,900
MALI	$537,218	$644,800
MAURITANIA	$294,206	$0
MOZAMBIQUE	$2,006,685	$0
NIGER	$3,359,103	$4,226,495
NIGERIA	$295,928	$0
PAKISTAN	$221,648	$0
REPUBLIC OF CONGO	$88,407	$74,652
SIERRA LEONE	$0	$0
SOMALIA	$3,626,451	$1,535,300
SOUTH SUDAN	$7,618,738	$28,398,048
SUDAN	$10,722,840	$0
SWAZILAND	$402,326	$92,400
TANZANIA	$1,586,100	$0
UGANDA	$2,540,600	$1,788,100
WEST AFRICA REGIONAL	$0	$0
YEMEN	$17,652,202	$0
ZIMBABWE	$5,818,209	$9,487,082
FY16 Total	**$209,193,539**	**$126,325,477**

Fiscal Year 2017		
Country	**Ocean Freight**	**Inland Freight**
AFGHANISTAN	$367,592	$0
BANGLADESH	$9,397,562	$0
BURKINA FASO	$131,165	$73,600
BURMA	$31,604	$0
BURUNDI	$3,373,845	$929,100
CAMEROON	$2,601,963	$2,268,630
CAR	$1,622,136	$957,180
CHAD	$3,241,570	$4,678,184
COLOMBIA	$296,677	$0
DJIBOUTI	$676,442	$0
DRC	$3,572,602	$4,227,100
ETHIOPIA	$86,621,891	$7,298,400
GUATEMALA	$0	$0
HAITI	$1,132,519	$0
KENYA	$6,984,949	$0
MADAGASCAR	$1,793,330	$0
MALAWI	$1,799,996	$1,175,200
MALI	$1,254,200	$1,032,000
MAURITANIA	$566,831	$0
MOZAMBIQUE	$880,254	$0
NIGER	$4,773,391	$4,010,348
NIGERIA	$2,081,645	$443,948
ROC	$88,681	$73,710
SOMALIA	$12,748,814	$4,823,138
SOUTH SUDAN	$18,159,794	$25,000,532
SUDAN	$8,356,812	$0
TANZANIA	$919,563	$0
UGANDA	$2,903,390	$2,178,800
YEMEN	$35,077,229	$0
ZIMBABWE	$1,076,319	$1,672,141
FY17 Total	**$212,532,765**	**$60,842,011**

Fiscal Year 2018		
Country	**Ocean Freight**	**Inland Freight**
AFGHANISTAN	$375,549	$0
BANGLADESH	$11,483,499	$0
BURKINA FASO	$971,162	$418,547
BURUNDI	$1,007,531	$816,169
CAMEROON	$1,673,023	$0
CAR	$1,618,083	$1,977,175
CHAD	$3,272,226	$4,604,922
COLOMBIA	$174,691	$0
DJIBOUTI	$602,168	$0
DRC	$7,439,184	$9,334,065
ETHIOPIA	$53,188,842	$32,919,016
GUATEMALA	$0	$0
HAITI	$0	$0
KENYA	$10,576,544	$0
MADAGASCAR	$3,468,418	$0
MALAWI	$395,191	$243,605
MALI	$1,517,180	$867,178
MAURITANIA	$387,639	$0
MOZAMBIQUE	$319,520	$0
NIGER	$4,911,673	$4,020,753
NIGERIA	$2,549,175	$1,162,354
PAKISTAN	$81,000	$0
ROC	$116,857	$0
SOMALIA	$14,026,848	$4,698,787
SOUTH SUDAN	$18,443,439	$71,741,083
SUDAN	$21,387,086	$0
TANZANIA	$1,604,286	$0
UGANDA	$3,089,195	$2,192,725
YEMEN	$49,521,749	$0
ZIMBABWE	$1,339,338	$1,822,220
FY18 Total	**$215,541,095**	**$136,818,599**

Fiscal Year 2019		
Country	**Ocean Freight**	**Inland Freight**
BANGLADESH	$14,776,250	$0
BURKINA FASO	$343,900	$254,450
BURMA	$19,600	$0
BURUNDI	$993,680	$871,633
CAMEROON	$4,608,244	$0
CAR	$3,278,720	$4,646,283
CHAD	$4,127,960	$0
COLOMBIA	$582,787	$0
DJIBOUTI	$682,650	$0
DRC	$9,520,900	$9,527,428
ETHIOPIA	$52,978,196	$27,289,655
HAITI	$588,800	$0
KENYA	$5,926,300	$0
MADAGASCAR	$3,548,550	$0
MALAWI	$65,550	$0
MALI	$605,200	$536,848
MOZAMBIQUE	$74,800	$0
NIGER	$4,553,560	$4,715,301
NIGERIA	$3,161,600	$192,133
PAKISTAN	$47,040	$0
ROC	$374,530	$0
SOMALIA	$13,103,160	$1,954,264
SOUTH SUDAN	$8,696,800	$12,740,637
SUDAN	$17,505,600	$0
TANZANIA	$579,830	$0
UGANDA	$343,900	$229,074
YEMEN	$68,571,383	$0
ZIMBABWE	$5,112,710	$5,745,632
FY19 Total	**$224,772,200**	**$68,703,338**

*Note: FY 19 numbers are estimates and will change when actuals are

16. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a table showing a breakdown of Title II expenditures for each fiscal year 2014 through projected 2020 divided into commodity costs; ocean freight; inland transportation; 202 (e) costs; ITSH, and administrative costs. Please include the percentage of funds spent on each.

Mr. Isley: USDA defers to USAID, the agency administering "Title II."

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

Note: The Food for Peace Act authorizes up to 20% of the full appropriation level to be programmed as 202(e). In the chart below, the figures represent the budget categories as a percentage of FFP total obligated levels. FFP's 202(e) levels do not exceed 20% of the appropriated level.

FY	ITSH	Administrative	Enhanced	Value	Ocean Freight	Inland Freight	Total
FY 2014	$399,378,400	$196,806,650	$69,649,250	$424,156,600	$150,104,400	$81,729,000	**$1,321,824,300**
FY 2015	$400,099,405	$172,596,066	$95,205,810	$403,323,946	$134,170,319	$88,748,602	**$1,294,144,148**
FY 2016	$511,839,451	$206,024,688	$128,473,772	$554,203,663	$209,193,539	$126,325,477	**$1,736,060,590**
FY 2017	$512,231,036	$268,273,151	$84,257,580	$482,901,846	$212,532,765	$60,842,011	**$1,621,038,389**
FY 2018	$421,809,950	$305,480,601	$93,957,321	$529,392,474	$215,541,095	$136,818,599	**$1,703,000,040**
FY 2019	$480,299,885	$292,600,474	$15,442,064	$590,334,736	$224,772,200	$76,930,991	**$1,680,380,350**

**Note: FY 2019 numbers are estimates and will change as actuals are reconciled. FFP expects the trends from FY 2014 through FY2019 will continue into FY 2020.*

FY	ITSH	Administrative	Enhanced	Value	Ocean Freight	Inland Freight
FY 2014	30%	15%	5%	32%	11%	6%
FY 2015	31%	13%	7%	31%	10%	7%
FY 2016	29%	12%	7%	32%	12%	7%
FY 2017	32%	17%	5%	30%	13%	4%
FY 2018	25%	18%	6%	31%	13%	8%
FY 2019	29%	17%	1%	35%	13%	5%

**Note: FY 2019 numbers are estimates and will change as actuals are reconciled. FFP expects the trends from FY 2014 through FY2019 will continue into FY 2020.*

17. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a list of all U.S. ports that ship U.S. commodities by program including a breakdown of the total tonnage, the total cost, and the various types of commodities by port and program for each Fiscal Year 2014-2019.

Mr. Isley: Attachment E provides a list for USDA's Food for Progress Program and McGovern-Dole Program.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

ATTACHMENT E – USDA International Food Assistance Shipment Table

			2014		2015		2016		2017		2018		2019	
LOAD PORT	PROGRAM	COMMODITY	COST($)	QTY(MT)	COST($)	QTY(MT)	COST($)	QTY(MT)	COST($)	QTY(MT)	COST($)	QTY(MT)	COST($)	QTY(MT)
E-CHAR-ALL-CHARLESTON SC-NO FAS-BID	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG			107,037.00	140.00								
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG			402,916.80	760.00	270,054.00	600.00						
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG			2,293,725.60	4,780.00								
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	114,520.77	100.02	1,045,698.84	950.12	32,574.81	30.00						
		OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L-F									3,068,785.06	2,360.38		
	McGovern-Dole Total		114,520.77	100.02	[illegible]	[illegible]	302,628.81	630.00			3,068,785.06	2,360.38		
	FFPr	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L			2,683,746.21	2,360.36								
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG												
	Food for Progress Total				2,683,746.21	2,360.36								
E-CHAR-ALL-CHARLESTON SC-NO FAS-BID Total			114,520.77	100.02	6,533,174.43	8,990.49	302,628.81	630.00			3,068,785.06	2,360.38		
E-JACK-ALL-JACKSONVILLE FL-BID PT	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG			123,721.20	200.00			381,671.70	410.00	418,821.30	510.00	270,731.70	410.00
		BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG							32,543.40	30.00				
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG							106,959.60	120.00				
		BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG			263,518.50	190.00	296,858.20	350.00	142,664.40	180.00	184,386.80	220.00	217,756.06	310.00
		BULGUR BAG-50 KG					715,594.00	2,440.00	399,105.60	1,360.00				
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG					70,050.00	200.00	13,072.80	30.00	75,454.50	170.00		
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG					383,114.20	750.00	227,979.80	450.00			1,203,132.72	1,730.00
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG			149,265.00	300.00	294,127.20	580.00	734,860.90	1,160.00	1,227,842.20	1,760.00		
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG			152,757.00	300.00								
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719					359,620.62	330.04	165,884.87	140.03	399,292.24	330.06	358,624.51	510.49
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L									412,943.21	340.04	30,166.23	40.02
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L							20,451.26	20.01			50,555.70	70.00
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG									207,693.00	450.00		
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG					187,424.60	370.00	364,277.70	770.00	386,727.20	710.00	260,743.53	270.07
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG					47,651.20	80.00	98,187.10	190.00			208,617.79	300.00
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG			132,057.00	300.00	35,527.80	70.00	185,842.80	390.00				
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG					50,167.80	90.00					143,617.56	220.51
		WHEAT, HARD RED SPRING BAG-50 KG			65,449.00	160.00							290,395.55	380.06
	McGovern-Dole Total				886,759.80	1,450.00	2,440,123.82	5,260.04	2,853,492.93	5,270.04	3,313,168.45	4,490.10	2,954,287.29	4,241.16
E-JACK-ALL-JACKSONVILLE FL-BID PT Total					886,759.80	1,450.00	2,440,123.82	5,260.04	2,853,492.93	5,270.04	3,313,168.45	4,490.10	2,954,287.29	4,241.16
E-MORE-ALL-MOREHEAD CITY NC-BID POI	MD	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG			87,771.40	180.00								
		OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED CAN-6/4 L			38,955.59	20.02								
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG			26,586.40	40.00								
	McGovern-Dole Total				153,313.39	240.02								
E-MORE-ALL-MOREHEAD CITY NC-BID POI Total					153,313.39	240.02								
E-NORF-ALL-NORFOLK VA-BID POINT	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	112,648.20	140.00					263,462.80	310.00				
		BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG											18,822.57	60.02
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	125,328.00	160.00							95,416.00	160.00	31,412.91	150.00
		BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG							133,920.00	180.00	150,832.80	180.00		
		BULGUR BAG-50 KG												
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG												
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG											179,838.19	560.00
		CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG							53,930.50	130.00	49,782.00	120.00		
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	595,972.40	960.00										
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	3,282,112.50	5,460.00	1,411,710.70	2,740.00	886,994.00	2,050.00	565,764.80	890.00	90,184.90	130.00	262,553.42	930.00
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	129,733.80	230.00							58,312.00	190.00		
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG	5,146.30	10.00							75,469.10	150.00	273,147.34	890.00
		OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L												
		OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-799												
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	423,331.30	330.01	391,021.98	360.04	342,665.18	310.04	861,827.33	770.12	213,337.40	190.03	173,229.31	734.52
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-799												
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-899												
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	754,907.13	510.06			291,371.41	260.02	91,735.62	70.02	487,357.58	420.05		
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG									54,986.40	120.00	81,363.48	150.00
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	150,919.40	320.00			8,300.00	20.00						
		POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG												
		POTATO GRANULES, DEHYDRATED BAG-10 KG			709,234.50	370.00								
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	944,230.70	1,850.00										
		RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG			168,120.00	360.00								
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG												
		RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG												
	McGovern-Dole Total		6,524,329.62	9,990.07	2,680,087.18	3,830.08	1,520,330.59	2,640.06	1,870,644.03	2,350.14	1,385,678.18	1,670.08	1,020,387.22	3,474.54
	FFPr	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719												
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,121,126.56	1,600.03										
		SOYBEANS, YELLOW BAG-50 KG												
	Food for Progress Total		2,121,126.56	1,600.03										
E-NORF-ALL-NORFOLK VA-BID POINT Total			8,645,456.18	11,590.10	2,680,087.18	3,830.08	1,520,330.59	2,640.06	1,870,644.03	2,350.14	1,385,678.18	1,670.08	1,020,387.22	3,474.54
E-NORF-PER-PERDUE-CHESAPEAKE VA	FFPr	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	2,898,935.00	3,250.00	3,271,600.00	4,000.00	11,391,859.50	15,570.00						
		SOYBEAN MEAL BULK					2,112,000.00	5,000.00						
	Food for Progress Total		2,898,935.00	3,250.00	3,271,600.00	4,000.00	13,503,859.50	20,570.00						
E-NORF-PER-PERDUE-CHESAPEAKE VA Total			2,898,935.00	3,250.00	3,271,600.00	4,000.00	13,503,859.50	20,570.00						
E-NY-ALL-NEW YORK-NO FAS-BID PT	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG												
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	47,037.30	50.00	44,830.80	70.00					220,498.20	360.00		
		CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG					252,825.00	850.00						
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG					30,833.00	100.00						
		CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG			144,268.80	340.00			137,617.20	340.00				
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG			921,597.00	1,940.00	1,307,193.00	3,020.00	1,274,327.90	2,290.00			38,581.70	160.00
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	73,153.50	150.00									250,430.73	440.02
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG			42,160.80	60.00			153,737.80	260.00	199,170.80	390.00	16,934.88	100.05
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	357,521.77	310.02			458,203.07	410.04	719,478.40	620.04	511,675.51	460.04		
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	317,371.83	210.00	246,790.65	210.00	604,262.76	470.02	167,241.46	140.03				
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	40,786.20	70.00							406,526.80	920.00	45,306.73	70.01
		PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG					196,695.00	470.00	54,849.20	140.00				
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	101,737.00	190.00										
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	51,040.00	80.00										
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG			38,900.00	100.00								
	McGovern-Dole Total		988,647.30	1,060.02	1,438,348.05	2,720.00	2,848,011.83	5,320.06	2,529,251.96	3,790.07	1,337,870.31	2,130.04	351,254.04	770.18
	FFPr	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG												
	Food for Progress Total													
E-NY-ALL-NEW YORK-NO FAS-BID PT Total			988,647.30	1,060.02	1,438,348.05	2,720.00	2,848,011.83	5,320.06	2,529,251.96	3,790.07	1,337,870.31	2,130.04	351,254.04	770.18
E-SAVA-ALL-SAVANNAH GA-NO FAS-BID P	MD	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG			53,163.00	100.00								
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG			477,558.40	880.00								
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG							83,218.00	200.00				
		OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED CAN-6/4 L			38,955.59	30.02							31,541.67	170.08
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG			24,602.50	50.00								
	McGovern-Dole Total				594,279.49	1,060.02			83,218.00	200.00			31,541.67	170.08
E-SAVA-ALL-SAVANNAH GA-NO FAS-BID P Total					594,279.49	1,060.02			83,218.00	200.00			31,541.67	170.08
G-BEAU-ALL-BEAUMONT TX-BID POINT	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG	162,729.00	150.00	171,858.60	190.00								
		BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG			189,190.80	170.00								
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG			134,446.20	210.00								
		BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	140,717.20	130.00										
		BULGUR BAG-50 KG	3,706,178.00	8,250.00										
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG			570,612.70	1,410.00								
		CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG			8,480.00	30.00								
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG			115,663.80	330.00								
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	642,971.90	974.00	735,153.30	1,250.00								
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,421,406.30	2,050.00	53,742.60	90.00								
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG			81,226.80	180.00								
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG			90,514.60	110.00	106,508.80	80.00			113,240.40	210.00		
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	91,601.48	80.00	134,388.40	120.04								
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L			323,865.56	440.02	277,260.81	230.02						
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L			291,687.80	220.02								
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	351,876.60	600.00			321,129.00	450.00	107,412.80	220.00				
		POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG	199,215.80	140.00										
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	892,175.30	1,600.00	235,685.80	490.00								
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	2,135,913.40	3,940.00	156,387.60	330.00	1,028,570.40	2,430.00						
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG					1,080,816.00	2,200.00	911,214.00	2,130.00	680,279.90	1,390.00		
	McGovern-Dole Total		9,744,784.98	17,910.00	3,486,364.86	5,519.07	2,814,285.01	5,390.02	1,018,626.80	2,350.00	793,520.30	1,600.00		
G-BEAU-ALL-BEAUMONT TX-BID POINT Total			9,744,784.98	17,910.00	3,486,364.86	5,519.07	2,814,285.01	5,390.02	1,018,626.80	2,350.00	793,520.30	1,600.00		
G-BEAU-LDC-BEAUMONT TX	FFPr	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	5,419,356.00	16,800.00										
	Food for Progress Total		5,419,356.00	16,800.00										
G-BEAU-LDC-BEAUMONT TX Total			5,419,356.00	16,800.00										
G-CC-ADM-CORPUS CHRISTI TX	FFPr	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK			2,230,300.00	10,000.00								
	Food for Progress Total				2,230,300.00	10,000.00								
G-CC-ADM-CORPUS CHRISTI TX Total					2,230,300.00	10,000.00								
G-CC-INTER-CORPUS CHRISTI TX	FFPr	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK									2,786,550.00	15,000.00		
	Food for Progress Total										2,786,550.00	15,000.00		

G-CC-INTER-CORPUS CHRISTI TX Total											2,786,350.00	15,000.00		
G-GALV-ADM-GALVESTON TX	MD	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK												
	McGovern-Dole Total													
	FFPr	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	4,939,480.00	16,200.00	4,081,275.00	18,700.00								
	Food for Progress Total		4,939,480.00	16,200.00	4,081,275.00	18,700.00								
G-GALV-ADM-GALVESTON TX Total			4,939,480.00	16,200.00	4,081,275.00	18,700.00								
G-HOUS-BCC-COOPER/T SMITH (AP MOELL	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG			60,235.00	100.00							48,166.35	230.00
		BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG			203,989.50	130.00			84,622.20	90.00				
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	24,570.00	30.00	201,073.80	370.00	364,067.60	530.00	309,003.60	390.00	267,405.70	400.00	182,765.68	600.00
		BULGUR BAG-50 KG	2,242,366.40	3,920.00	507,842.00	1,150.00			496,343.90	1,600.00	1,615,913.50	4,990.00	358,316.99	800.00
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG							881,267.60	910.00				
		CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG			94,720.00	320.00			241,940.00	690.00				
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG			73,846.00	200.00			35,169.30	90.00				
		CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG			190,704.80	640.00	125,418.00	300.00			152,344.20	300.00	21,996.07	130.00
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	639,984.20	1,080.00	318,606.70	580.00	259,985.00	300.00	37,723.20	80.00				
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG			1,260,112.40	2,480.00	1,378,693.50	3,020.00	1,980,490.50	3,290.00	630,688.80	930.00	505,924.33	2,390.31
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG			47,196.00	100.00								
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG	137,586.40	210.00	164,802.40	130.00	416,075.80	350.00	371,854.30	580.00	196,729.60	370.00	218,789.18	940.20
		OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L	58,100.13	30.02	142,473.90	60.04			115,827.63	50.01	183,730.75	90.02		
		OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719									79,844.02	40.03	75,067.55	160.00
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719							169,412.17	140.01			22,271.50	90.06
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-799					111,881.29	100.02					82,758.73	230.00
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-899							166,175.92	150.02				
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	316,174.37	210.02	152,225.68	130.02	138,578.53	120.01	634,191.66	500.03	591,388.87	510.03		
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L			104,151.40	80.01	124,180.61	100.00	311,575.75	210.01	76,501.10	50.01	77,734.39	220.00
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG			29,793.00	80.00	12,409.80	30.00	79,570.50	150.00	64,946.70	140.00	18,276.79	110.00
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	977,975.20	1,600.00	34,930.00	70.00			125,364.00	250.00	88,617.50	150.00	140,312.06	780.04
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG												
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE PKG-6/4 LB												
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	812,623.70	1,070.00	1,369,010.90	2,900.00			372,716.00	950.00	2,239,746.60	4,370.00		
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD PKG-6/4 LB												
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG					379,809.00	1,060.00	427,662.20	940.00	907,179.40	1,710.00	389,359.29	820.00
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG	28,540.00	140.00	759,786.20	1,260.00								
		RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG			1,186,097.60	2,620.00							733,392.37	2,920.25
		RICE, 3/15 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG			147,210.70	260.00								
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG			192,294.20	410.00	90,590.00	200.00			695,120.80	1,460.00		
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG					822,342.60	1,580.00	828,152.00	2,080.00	1,592,109.10	3,160.00	1,767,046.83	8,764.74
		RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG			98,400.00	200.00	28,742.00	70.00	25,312.80	60.00				
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BAG-50 KG-F											208,341.18	1,230.32
		SOY PROTEIN, ISOLATE BAG-20 KG												
	McGovern-Dole Total		5,083,380.40	10,220.04	[illegible]	14,459.07	4,632,771.31	7,960.00	7,188,675.23	13,200.00	8,302,274.64	18,370.00	4,439,920.02	20,616.19
	FFPr	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L			4,372,370.37	3,640.00								
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG												
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG												
	Food for Progress Total				4,372,370.37	3,640.00								
G-HOUS-BCC-COOPER/T SMITH (AP MOELL Total			5,083,380.40	10,220.04	11,451,312.04	18,099.07	4,632,771.31	7,960.00	7,188,675.23	13,200.00	8,302,274.64	18,370.00	4,439,920.02	20,616.19
G-HOUS-BCS-SHIPPERS STEVEDORES TX	MD	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG												
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG												
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG												
	McGovern-Dole Total													
G-HOUS-BCS-SHIPPERS STEVEDORES TX Total														
G-HOUS-CAR-CARGILL-HOUSTON TX	FFPr	SOYBEAN MEAL, BULK												
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	8,724,600.00	30,000.00					4,534,800.00	20,000.00	5,848,200.00	30,000.00	5,480,710.40	33,580.00
		WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK	18,232,677.00	50,000.00			5,610,240.00	24,000.00	2,936,543.50	9,950.00			2,379,028.80	17,560.00
	Food for Progress Total		26,957,277.00	80,000.00			5,610,240.00	24,000.00	7,471,343.50	29,950.00	5,848,200.00	30,000.00	7,859,739.20	51,140.00
G-HOUS-CAR-CARGILL-HOUSTON TX Total			26,957,277.00	80,000.00			5,610,240.00	24,000.00	7,471,343.50	29,950.00	5,848,200.00	30,000.00	7,859,739.20	51,140.00
G-HOUS-CER-Ceres Gulf Inc	MD	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG											37,892.73	200.00
	McGovern-Dole Total												37,892.73	200.00
G-HOUS-CER-Ceres Gulf Inc Total													37,892.73	200.00
G-HOUS-CPA-Gulf Cooper - Ports America	MD	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L											23,930.36	150.06
	McGovern-Dole Total												23,930.36	150.06
G-HOUS-CPA-Gulf Cooper - Ports America Total													23,930.36	150.06
G-HOUS-GPI-GREENSPORT TRMNL HOUS	MD	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG												
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG												
		BULGUR BAG-50 KG												
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG												
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG												
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-899												
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L												
		POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG												
	McGovern-Dole Total													
G-HOUS-GPI-GREENSPORT TRMNL HOUS Total														
G-HOUS-HPP-PORT PACKAGING LLC	MD	BULGUR BAG-50 KG			283,046.80	870.00								
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG					97,288.80	210.00						
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG							790,682.80	1,060.00	561,112.00	1,020.00	12,185.66	90.07
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719									214,413.93	180.02		
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L			556,418.48	810.02	1,444,859.14	1,090.02	179,843.83	150.02				
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L			108,684.76	80.01								
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG							313,077.40	610.00	251,634.60	540.00		
		PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG					196,695.00	470.00			139,345.00	310.00		
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG									399,875.00	700.00		
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG	89,760.00	160.00										
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG							388,411.50	870.00				
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BAG-50 KG-F											165,354.64	1,220.32
	McGovern-Dole Total		89,760.00	160.00	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
G-HOUS-HPP-PORT PACKAGING LLC Total			89,760.00	160.00	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
G-HOUS-LDC-HOUSTON TX	FFPr	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	2,912,500.00	10,000.00	5,182,032.00	18,800.00			7,628,040.00	28,000.00				
	Food for Progress Total		2,912,500.00	10,000.00	5,182,032.00	18,800.00			7,628,040.00	28,000.00				
G-HOUS-LDC-HOUSTON TX Total			2,912,500.00	10,000.00	5,182,032.00	18,800.00			7,628,040.00	28,000.00				
G-HOUS-MAN-AGRI-GULF LOGISTICS TX	MD	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG												
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	469,778.80	550.00										
		BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	163,684.00	160.00										
		CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	89,530.00	290.00										
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG												
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	56,520.00	120.00										
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG	96,130.50	190.00										
		OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	98,613.11	50.02										
		OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-799												
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719	363,754.67	270.03										
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-799												
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	29,882.55	20.02										
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	447,719.30	310.02										
		POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG												
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG												
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG												
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG	110,840.00	290.00										
	McGovern-Dole Total		1,926,452.93	2,250.09										
G-HOUS-MAN-AGRI-GULF LOGISTICS TX Total			1,926,452.93	2,250.09										
G-HOUS-PCW-GULF WINDS-PORT CROSSING	MD	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	74,673.47	50.02										
	McGovern-Dole Total		74,673.47	50.02										
	FFPr	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,080,960.09	800.04										
	Food for Progress Total		1,080,960.09	800.04										
G-HOUS-PCW-GULF WINDS-PORT CROSSING Total			1,155,633.56	850.06										
G-HOUS-POA-PORTS AMERICA TEXAS WARE	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG							174,725.80	210.00			14,068.24	90.00
		BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG					179,215.50	200.00			123,139.90	130.00		
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG			233,290.40	370.00	153,713.00	210.00	273,080.00	360.00	126,014.00	210.00		
		BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG			147,234.10	130.00	143,694.00	180.00			165,834.00	200.00	10,571.31	50.00
		BULGUR BAG-50 KG					339,282.00	1,160.00	985,518.90	3,150.00	149,444.40	420.00	257,194.46	930.00
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG			498,331.50	1,150.00			199,530.00	450.00				
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG							82,359.00	210.00			38,037.73	220.01
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	429,968.40	680.00	548,542.50	950.00	209,571.60	420.00						
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	513,961.90	830.00	999,234.00	2,080.00	569,584.40	1,260.00			468,323.70	710.00	55,123.83	370.13
		CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F											51,102.49	250.00
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	42,839.60	90.00					39,451.80	70.00	89,239.20	190.00	127,505.52	250.00
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG			274,098.50	370.00			145,115.00	170.00	78,960.00	140.00	103,408.42	420.00
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719			33,669.03	30.00								
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	500,283.80	340.04	239,488.72	200.01	187,185.35	160.00					27,232.35	100.00
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	583,309.23	250.02			224,998.87	160.00	152,576.96	100.00				
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG			393,600.00	800.00			22,560.00	20.00	140,396.80	320.00		
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	732,847.70	1,390.00	112,870.00	250.00	272,829.90	570.00	857,060.70	2,030.00	365,973.40	690.00	197,112.10	1,110.06
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG					53,710.00	100.00	374,031.50	850.00	308,484.80	560.00	74,774.65	270.02
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG							291,347.30	770.00			291,252.70	2,130.00

		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG					90,174.80	170.00	256,698.40	560.00	1,235,460.30	2,360.00	43,682.75	80.00
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG									63,444.00	240.00		
	McGovern-Dole Total		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	FFPr	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L												
	Food for Progress Total													
G-HOUS-POA-PORTS AMERICA TEXAS WARE Total			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
G-HOUS-SHI-SHIPPERS STEVEDORES TX	MD	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	68,200.00	110.00	20,493.60	40.00								
	McGovern-Dole Total		68,200.00	110.00	20,493.60	40.00								
G-HOUS-SHI-SHIPPERS STEVEDORES TX Total			68,200.00	110.00	20,493.60	40.00								
G-JACI-ALL-JACINTO TX-BID POINT	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG									235,173.60	300.00		
		BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG												
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	170,571.40	210.00										
		BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG					16,976.20	30.00						
		BULGUR BAG-50 KG							1,086,362.60	3,559.00	306,535.60	830.00		
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG							347,862.60	810.00				
		CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG	133,900.00	410.00							164,550.00	740.00	128,337.50	460.00
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG							138,128.00	320.00				
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG			36,608.40	60.00	163,978.60	340.00	1,188,568.80	1,800.00				
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG												
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG					451,775.00	590.00	18,630.00	30.00				
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719							37,676.56	30.00				
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-799												
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-899												
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L							171,068.53	110.01	160,257.19	120.02	138,555.48	100.00
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG					90,720.00	160.00	617,437.30	1,380.00				
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG									158,471.00	300.00	19,830.00	50.00
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG												
		POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG												
		POTATO GRANULES, DEHY POUCH-10 1.36 KG	860,236.05	430.01										
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG							105,178.50	270.00	384,144.00	730.00	439,510.00	990.00
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG											372,379.20	710.00
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG							8,624.40	20.00				
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG			2,231,280.60	4,310.00					1,743,759.80	3,380.00		
		RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG							127,915.20	270.00				
		SORGHUM BAG-50 KG												
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG					32,505.00	110.00					73,016.09	210.00
	McGovern-Dole Total		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	FFPr	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L												
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG					692,780.00	1,500.00						
	Food for Progress Total						692,780.00	1,500.00						
G-JACI-ALL-JACINTO TX-BID POINT Total			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
G-LC-ALL-LAKE CHARLES LA-BID POINT	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG												
		BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG												
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	215,214.40	220.00					96,784.80	120.00				
		BULGUR BAG-50 KG			932,615.10	2,530.00			1,207,313.80	4,430.00				
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG					785,762.70	2,030.00						
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG					57,735.40	170.00	300,940.30	900.00				
		CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG			166,654.40	340.00			157,953.60	360.00			22,548.80	40.00
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG												
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG							4,574,105.00	8,560.00				
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG												
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG			75,566.00	100.00			206,156.80	220.00			333,223.30	730.00
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719			72,516.61	60.01							313,405.53	260.02
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-899												
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L			367,716.42	280.02	135,653.15	110.01	200,010.59	150.02			303,094.08	250.03
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L												
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	147,298.00	200.00					563,822.80	1,110.00			29,483.60	50.00
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG			323,122.40	680.00					31,814.30	70.00	187,000.00	450.00
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,271,976.00	2,160.00					1,370,402.00	3,490.00	130,110.00	250.00	1,011,059.70	2,330.00
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG					1,047,077.30	1,990.00	397,892.00	940.00			127,195.60	280.00
		RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG											535,002.00	930.00
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG			102,084.70	230.00	421,280.70	970.00	1,378,109.00	3,060.00	1,061,791.60	2,320.00		
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG									727,885.30	1,430.00		
	McGovern-Dole Total		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
	FFPr	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	3,306,880.00	6,000.00	1,962,123.20	4,280.00	14,112,359.80	29,820.00						
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG												
	Food for Progress Total		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]						
G-LC-ALL-LAKE CHARLES LA-BID POINT Total			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
G-MOBI-ALL-MOBILE AL-NO FAS-BID PT	MD	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG							207,830.40	260.00				
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG							44,105.00	100.00				
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L							104,923.58	70.00				
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG							39,079.80	90.00				
	McGovern-Dole Total								[illegible]	[illegible]				
G-MOBI-ALL-MOBILE AL-NO FAS-BID PT Total									[illegible]	[illegible]				
G-NO-AMA-A-ADM-AMA LA	FFPr	CORN, YELLOW BULK			3,594,180.00	30,700.00			3,861,300.00	10,000.00				
		SOYBEAN MEAL BULK							1,212,500.00	15,000.00				
	Food for Progress Total				[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]				
G-NO-AMA-A-ADM-AMA LA Total					[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]				
G-NO-DRW-DARROW LA	FFPr	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK			1,852,500.00	4,750.00			1,780,000.00	5,000.00			10,642,500.00	27,500.00
	Food for Progress Total				[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-DRW-DARROW LA Total					[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-DST-A-ADM-DESTREHAN LA	MD	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	2,803,825.00	4,750.00	729,060.00	1,740.00								
	McGovern-Dole Total		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]								
	FFPr	CORN, YELLOW BULK			1,928,800.00	10,000.00	1,101,000.00	6,000.00						
		SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	6,469,240.00	12,100.00	2,095,000.00	5,000.00	10,407,240.00	27,250.00			2,225,000.00	5,000.00		
		RICE, MILLED BULK					7,203,080.50	16,030.00	19,970,510.00	48,120.00	8,222,880.80	15,440.00	6,784,800.00	27,500.00
		WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK			7,398,480.00	24,000.00								
	Food for Progress Total		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-DST-A-ADM-DESTREHAN LA Total			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-DST-B-BUNGE-DESTREHAN LA	FFPr	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK					3,627,030.00	11,370.00						
	Food for Progress Total						[illegible]	[illegible]						
G-NO-DST-B-BUNGE-DESTREHAN LA Total							[illegible]	[illegible]						
G-NO-IMTAV-IMTT-AVONDALE LA	FFPr	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	3,067,967.50	3,250.00	2,992,500.00	4,500.00							19,901,272.10	98,140.00
	Food for Progress Total		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]							[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-IMTAV-IMTT-AVONDALE LA Total			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]							[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-IMTSR-IMTT-ST ROSE LA	FFPr	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK	7,251,351.80	7,820.00	17,384,978.10	23,800.00	5,859,920.00	8,000.00	36,658,401.90	39,760.00	7,708,640.00	10,000.00	60,659,209.30	87,920.00
	Food for Progress Total		[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-IMTSR-IMTT-ST ROSE LA Total			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-MGR-A-MGM-Myrtle Grove LA	FFPr	RICE, MILLED BULK											11,621,880.00	25,320.00
	Food for Progress Total												[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-MGR-A-MGM-Myrtle Grove LA Total													[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-MGR-C-CHS-MYRTLE GROVE LA	FFPr	WHEAT, DARK NORTHERN SPRING BULK												
		WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK			6,258,240.00	24,000.00								
	Food for Progress Total				[illegible]	[illegible]								
G-NO-MGR-C-CHS-MYRTLE GROVE LA Total					[illegible]	[illegible]								
G-TAMP-DAR-Darling-Tampa FL	FFPr	Tallow, Yellow Bulk											743,060.00	1,000.00
													[illegible]	[illegible]
G-TAMP-DAR-Darling-Tampa FL Total													[illegible]	[illegible]
G-NO-RSV-C-CARGILL-RESERVE LA	FFPr	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK												
	Food for Progress Total													
G-NO-RSV-C-CARGILL-RESERVE LA Total														
W-GRHB-AGP-GRAYS HARBOR WA	MD	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK									1,341,684.00	3,600.00		
	McGovern-Dole Total										[illegible]	[illegible]		
	FFPr	CORN, YELLOW BULK					389,800.00	2,000.00						
		SOYBEAN MEAL BULK	28,092,040.00	47,240.00			3,350,000.00	10,000.00			12,252,700.00	25,700.00	1,085,577.80	21,790.00
	Food for Progress Total		[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
W-GRHB-AGP-GRAYS HARBOR WA Total			[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]			[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]	[illegible]
W-KALA-TEMCO-KALAMA WA	MD	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK					2,541,200.00	12,000.00						
	McGovern-Dole Total						[illegible]	[illegible]						
W-KALA-TEMCO-KALAMA WA Total							[illegible]	[illegible]						
W-LA-ALL-LOS ANGELES CA-BID POINT	MD	LENTILS BAG-50 KG												
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L												
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG												
		RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG												
	McGovern-Dole Total													
W-LA-ALL-LOS ANGELES CA-BID POINT Total														
W-LONG-EGT-LONGVIEW WA	MD	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK									302,801.40	1,230.00		
	McGovern-Dole Total										[illegible]	[illegible]		
	FFPr	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK									3,723,160.00	10,860.00		
	Food for Progress Total										[illegible]	[illegible]		
W-LONG-EGT-LONGVIEW WA Total											[illegible]	[illegible]		
W-OAKL-ALL-OAKLAND CA-BID POINT	MD	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG												

		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719													
	Metrovino Bulk Total														
W-OAKL-ALL-OAKLAND CA-BID POINT Total															
W-PORO-COL-COLUMBIA GRAIN-PORTLAND	MD	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK									261,348.40	1,220.00			
	Metrovino Bulk Total										261,348.40	1,220.00			
	FFN	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK							2,968,884.10	9,950.00					
	Food for Progress Total								2,968,884.10	9,950.00					
W-PORO-COL-COLUMBIA GRAIN-PORTLAND Total									2,968,884.10	9,950.00	261,348.40	1,220.00			
W-PORO-IRV-TEMCO-IRVING-PORTLAND OR	MD	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK													
	Metrovino Bulk Total														
W-PORO-IRV-TEMCO-IRVING-PORTLAND OR Total															
W-PORO-ODK-LDC-O DOCK-PORTLAND OR	MD	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	2,351,138.60	9,740.00											
	Metrovino Bulk Total		2,351,138.60	9,740.00											
W-PORO-ODK-LDC-O DOCK-PORTLAND OR Total			2,351,138.60	9,740.00											
W-SEAT-ALL-SEATTLE WA-BID POINT	MD	SALMON, KETA CAN-24/14.75 OZ													
		SALMON, PINK CAN-24/14.75 OZ													
	Metrovino Bulk Total														
W-SEAT-ALL-SEATTLE WA-BID POINT Total															
W-SNPD-ALL-SAN PEDRO CA-NO FAS BID	MD	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG									70,750.00	250.00			
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG													
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG	53,217.00	100.00											
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG			380,952.00	880.00	259,648.00	400.00	537,735.90	840.00					
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG					89,000.00	100.00							
		OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-719							96,865.64	90.01					
		OIL, SUNFLOWER BASED CAN-6/4 L-F											22,868.39	30.06	
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L			82,249.32	70.02			111,100.37	100.02					
		PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG					155,400.00	370.00							
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG					6,110.00	10.00							
		RICE, 3/5 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG			55,280.00	110.00	24,750.00	60.00					50,016.68	270.07	
		RICE, 3/5D LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG					357,470.39	1,189.00							
		RICE, 3/5 MG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-P											21,571.19	50.02	
	Metrovino Bulk Total		53,217.00	100.00	518,481.32	1,060.02	1,062,378.38	2,129.00	814,432.91	1,380.05	70,750.00	250.00	119,456.26	350.04	
W-SNPD-ALL-SAN PEDRO CA-NO FAS BID Total			53,217.00	100.00	518,481.32	1,060.02	1,062,378.38	2,129.00	814,432.91	1,380.05	70,750.00	250.00	119,456.26	350.04	
W-VANC-UGC-UNITED GRAIN-VANCOUVER W	FFN	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK							9,633,836.60	28,940.02					
	Food for Progress Total								9,633,836.60	28,940.02					
W-VANC-UGC-UNITED GRAIN-VANCOUVER W Total									9,633,836.60	28,940.02					
Grand Total			127,369,224.20	258,780.39	191,896,821.68	252,432.76	96,393,392.12	209,568.23	113,466,239.32	258,340.19	80,802,655.61	196,180.37	149,255,898.59	98,528.40	

FY 2014			
Load Port Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Cost
Beaumont, TX		**21,520**	**$13,337,007**
	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	1,300	$1,470,930
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	360	$318,378
	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	3,710	$2,724,283
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	3,900	$2,016,698
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	3,560	$1,876,899
	RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	8,690	$4,929,819
Chicago, IL		**69,380**	**$48,602,510**
	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	170	$177,636
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	250	$227,073
	BULGURBAG-50 KG-F	580	$235,028
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	15,840	$6,538,880
	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	11,040	$7,148,217
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	940	$636,599
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	640	$293,619
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	1,550	$844,718
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	12,700	$17,931,182
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	2,620	$3,372,880
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	50	$38,433
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	21,370	$10,539,880
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG-F	1,510	$557,566
	PEAS/LENTILS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG-F	120	$60,800
Corpus Christi, TX		**229,790**	**$53,396,066**
	SORGHUM	216,620	$49,353,599
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	13,170	$4,042,467
Des Plaines, IL		**2,500**	**$3,642,085**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	2,500	$3,642,085
Houston, TX		**520,250**	**$184,760,165**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	990	$854,778
	BULGURBAG-50 KG-F	1,310	$503,499
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	1,450	$652,753
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	15,100	$6,118,454
	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	18,260	$12,227,777
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	680	$472,357
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	7,800	$3,614,877
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	7,930	$4,336,205
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	21,880	$31,070,489
	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L-F	210	$260,994
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	260	$429,933
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	440	$615,715
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	560	$428,777
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	30,740	$15,574,449
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG-F	2,020	$900,588
	PEAS/LENTILS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG-F	130	$68,431
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	6,020	$3,400,978
	RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	8,700	$4,921,875
	SORGHUM	253,690	$56,025,195
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	139,480	$40,480,225
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	880	$395,120
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,720	$1,406,697

Jacinto, TX		**23,980**	**$12,979,500**
	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	1,220	$1,178,569
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	230	$183,138
	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	600	$185,550
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,220	$483,287
	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	4,540	$3,099,890
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	7,020	$3,548,911
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	940	$1,266,077
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	2,110	$1,118,359
	RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	550	$333,780
	SORGHUM	5,550	$1,581,939
Jacintoport, TX		**160**	**$130,800**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	160	$130,800
Kalama, WA		**73,210**	**$21,844,765**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	73,210	$21,844,765
Lake Charles, LA		**13,260**	**$10,313,855**
	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	1,500	$1,584,000
	BULGURBAG-50 KG-F	420	$164,585
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	2,860	$1,264,790
	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	200	$144,496
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	2,880	$4,053,728
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	3,050	$1,739,171
	RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	1,810	$977,864
Memphis, TN		**2,120**	**$2,821,916**
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	2,040	$2,718,035
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-F	80	$103,881
Mobile, AL		**2,020**	**$1,093,107**
	BULGURBAG-50 KG-F	780	$302,039
	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,010	$651,092
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	230	$139,976
New Orleans, LA		**25,910**	**$14,385,649**
	RICE	25,910	$14,385,649
Norfolk, VA		**4,380**	**$2,656,249**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	2,120	$928,640
	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	400	$309,212
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	1,300	$769,645
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	320	$489,334
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	240	$159,418
Portland, OR		**37,480**	**$9,781,467**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	37,480	$9,781,467
Providence, RI		**300**	**$1,022,100**
	RUTF	300	$1,022,100
Grand Total		**1,026,260**	**$380,767,241**

FY 2015			
Load Port Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Cost
Beaumont, TX		**26,690**	**$14,523,717**
	BEANS, PINTO	210	$134,526
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	900	$314,878
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	8,070	$4,204,437
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	10,510	$6,027,473
	LENTILS	620	$422,760
	OIL, VEGETABLE	200	$246,826
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	2,790	$1,489,633
	RICE	3,390	$1,683,186
Chicago, IL		**45,720**	**$28,510,645**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	70	$69,666
	BEANS, PINTO	820	$497,898
	CORNMEAL	610	$191,284
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	1,300	$490,184
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	19,670	$9,817,168
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	900	$431,874
	LENTILS	990	$795,767
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	460	$343,150
	OIL, VEGETABLE	7,930	$9,055,883
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	610	$744,426
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	5,110	$2,444,580
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	7,250	$3,628,767
Corpus Christi, TX		**29,530**	**$7,095,650**
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	4,530	$1,081,900
	SORGHUM	25,000	$6,013,750
Fitzgerald, GA		**510**	**$1,699,075**
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	510	$1,699,075
Galveston, TX		**81,300**	**$21,184,775**
	SORGHUM	81,300	$21,184,775
Houston, TX		**534,220**	**$184,756,262**
	BEANS, GARBANZO	210	$145,285
	BEANS, PINTO	1,040	$684,339
	BULGUR	610	$200,147
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	800	$285,235
	CORN	5,330	$1,059,444
	CORNMEAL	900	$304,776
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	3,140	$1,107,954
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	7,090	$3,790,564
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	9,200	$4,288,386
	FLOUR, BREAD	6,400	$2,992,355
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	169,340	$38,851,966
	LENTILS	8,790	$7,009,977
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	2,540	$1,895,351
	OIL, VEGETABLE	24,700	$30,076,632
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	5,490	$6,749,804
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT	300	$118,489
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	51,830	$26,231,569
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	10,900	$5,583,787

	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	800	$341,600
	RICE	9,370	$4,413,007
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	1,000	$477,190
	SORGHUM	212,270	$47,313,816
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	2,040	$744,600
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND	130	$89,990
Jacinto, TX		**32,340**	**$17,693,351**
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	7,540	$3,649,438
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	2,440	$1,286,834
	LENTILS	7,050	$5,559,854
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	10,430	$5,959,130
	SORGHUM	4,880	$1,238,094
Jacintoport, TX		**770**	**$485,026**
	BEANS, PINTO	450	$293,941
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	320	$191,085
Kalama, WA		**71,240**	**$16,408,380**
	SORGHUM	24,800	$6,224,552
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	46,440	$10,183,828
Lake Charles, LA		**26,990**	**$17,749,950**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	2,760	$1,612,316
	OIL, VEGETABLE	3,700	$4,503,707
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	3,640	$1,893,113
	RICE	16,890	$9,740,815
Mobile, AL		**1,300**	**$608,407**
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	450	$149,693
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	700	$337,463
	LENTILS	150	$121,251
Norfolk, VA		**2,810**	**$1,652,510**
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	810	$425,550
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	2,000	$1,226,960
Portland, OR		**20,280**	**$4,895,389**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	20,280	$4,895,389
Providence, RI		**360**	**$1,048,200**
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	180	$448,800
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	180	$599,400
Savannah, GA		**5,420**	**$4,437,245**
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	120	$45,797
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	1,610	$870,627
	OIL, VEGETABLE	2,350	$2,790,354
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	1,340	$730,467
Stone Mountain, GA		**220**	**$741,180**
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	220	$741,180
Grand Total		**880,700**	**$323,983,692**

FY 2016			
Load Port Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Cost
Ama, LA		**20,000**	**$3,488,000**
	SORGHUM	20,000	$3,488,000
Beaumont, TX		**23,420**	**$12,425,260**
	CORNMEAL	2,520	$848,184
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	5,800	$2,763,925
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	740	$1,162,645
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	5,640	$3,854,275
	RICE	8,720	$3,796,230
Chicago, IL		**69,550**	**$45,956,601**
	BEANS, PINTO	2,640	$1,745,359
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	640	$512,877
	BEANS, SMALL RED	60	$48,985
	CORNMEAL	16,910	$5,372,592
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	14,510	$6,335,712
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	2,620	$3,851,022
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG-F	120	$179,291
	LENTILS	3,100	$4,340,043
	OIL, VEGETABLE	13,280	$15,400,261
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	14,870	$7,641,795
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND	800	$528,664
Corpus Christi, TX		**122,250**	**$22,262,830**
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	51,000	$9,754,770
	SORGHUM	71,250	$12,508,060
Galveston, TX		**80,270**	**$14,441,376**
	SORGHUM	80,270	$14,441,376
Gilman, IL		**50**	**$58,428**
	OIL, VEGETABLE	50	$58,428
Houston, TX		**1,016,570**	**$311,433,154**
	BEANS, BLACK	350	$249,340
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	60	$57,020
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG-F	60	$51,919
	BEANS, PINTO	2,860	$2,251,779
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	1,280	$1,083,755
	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	600	$168,078
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	720	$237,596
	CORNMEAL	5,360	$1,862,594
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	11,570	$5,332,291
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,100	$528,173
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	2,280	$3,438,171
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	6,700	$2,925,297
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	476,660	$93,156,681
	LENTILS	5,380	$7,003,407
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	1,900	$2,164,202
	OIL, VEGETABLE	43,410	$51,346,683
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	590	$690,754
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	240	$275,695
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	3,010	$1,321,161
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	105,430	$67,931,693

	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	90	$49,933
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	6,040	$2,791,411
	RICE	15,520	$6,921,874
	RICE, FORT	1,000	$528,410
	SORGHUM	320,870	$57,848,249
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	3,140	$979,680
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND	350	$237,311
Jacinto, TX		**30,050**	**$18,320,525**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	400	$356,678
	BEANS, PINTO	3,820	$3,096,994
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	2,000	$1,722,004
	CORN, YELLOW	1,970	$561,194
	CORNMEAL	2,800	$920,894
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	140	$73,732
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	220	$375,885
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	170	$477,550
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	3,320	$3,821,754
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	7,470	$4,982,108
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	310	$167,468
	SORGHUM	3,060	$702,180
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG-F	4,370	$1,062,085
Jacksonville, FL		**360**	**$177,523**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	360	$177,523
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	49,870	$10,368,400
Lake Charles, LA		**24,590**	**$10,893,948**
	BEANS, PINTO	1,970	$1,637,751
	CORNMEAL	7,690	$2,530,125
	RICE	14,930	$6,726,071
Markesan, WI		**2,400**	**$3,482,187**
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	2,400	$3,482,187
Miami, FL		**2,090**	**$2,287,762**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	2,090	$2,287,762
Mobile, AL		**600**	**$175,614**
	BULGUR	600	$175,614
Myrtle Grove, LA		**43,140**	**$8,955,676**
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	23,140	$4,870,276
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	20,000	$4,085,400
Portland, OR		**155,610**	**$32,592,546**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	155,610	$32,592,546
Providence, RI		**150**	**$374,400**
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	150	$374,400
Vancouver, CA		**37,350**	**$7,577,195**
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	37,350	$7,577,195
Grand Total		**1,708,320**	**$511,427,722**

FY 2017			
Load Port Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Cost
Beaumont, TX		**9,400**	**$4,970,338**
	CORNMEAL	5,040	$2,064,058
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	4,360	$2,906,280
Chicago, IL		**69,250**	**$48,127,849**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	60	$44,970
	CORNMEAL	12,330	$4,759,958
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	18,400	$11,150,774
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	2,160	$3,270,728
	LENTILS	2,270	$1,741,781
	OIL, VEGETABLE	13,210	$16,009,581
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT	11,240	$6,453,678
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	9,580	$4,696,379
Corpus Christi, TX		**239,610**	**$42,048,770**
	SORGHUM	191,920	$33,111,286
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	47,690	$8,937,484
Gilman, IL		**1,160**	**$1,403,693**
	OIL, VEGETABLE	1,160	$1,403,693
Houston, TX		**643,710**	**$230,786,838**
	BEANS, PINTO	860	$672,825
	BULGUR	200	$57,118
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	210	$88,402
	CORNMEAL	5,400	$2,121,247
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	28,620	$18,005,936
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	600	$241,548
	LENTILS	9,790	$7,821,520
	OIL, VEGETABLE	49,110	$60,781,401
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT	7,540	$5,184,135
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	8,640	$3,974,566
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	76,980	$46,518,149
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	7,680	$3,361,719
	RICE	2,340	$976,174
	RICE, FORT	300	$131,325
	SORGHUM	135,920	$24,315,125
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	307,120	$55,820,449
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	2,400	$715,200
Jacinto, TX		**47,220**	**$13,579,544**
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	1,230	$792,124
	LENTILS	140	$131,379
	OIL, VEGETABLE	840	$1,087,918
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	1,570	$705,460
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	2,780	$1,831,518
	SORGHUM	36,700	$7,917,633
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	3,960	$1,113,512
Lake Charles, LA		**33,650**	**$21,589,943**
	BEANS, PINTO	160	$130,160
	CORNMEAL	360	$144,835
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	1,280	$700,594
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	640	$275,802

	LENTILS	3,460	$3,097,852
	OIL, VEGETABLE	4,690	$6,083,110
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	2,860	$1,257,710
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	4,700	$3,469,279
	RICE	990	$389,149
	RICE, FORT	14,510	$6,041,453
Longview, WA		**69,840**	**$16,815,576**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	69,840	$16,815,576
Markesan, WI		**5,700**	**$6,968,937**
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	350	$532,067
	OIL, VEGETABLE	5,350	$6,436,871
Miami, FL		**10,440**	**$12,723,809**
	OIL, VEGETABLE	10,440	$12,723,809
Portland, OR		**224,560**	**$43,988,272**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	224,560	$43,988,272
Vancouver, CA		**32,200**	**$5,989,200**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	32,200	$5,989,200
Grand Total		**1,386,740**	**$448,992,767**

FY 2018			
Load Port Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Cost
Chicago, IL		**52,580**	**47,397,443**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	2,940	1,372,298
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	3,450	2,376,963
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	6,310	12,106,698
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	18,940	21,237,042
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4	520	552,727
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	13,680	6,916,269
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	6,740	2,835,447
Corpus Christi, TX		**70,550**	**12,871,798**
	SORGHUM BULK	70,550	12,871,798
Destrehan, LA		**13,430**	**6,864,447**
	RICE, MILLED BULK	13,430	6,864,447
Galveston, TX		**37,570**	**7,532,967**
	SORGHUM BULK	37,570	7,532,967
Gilman, IL		**4,920**	**5,251,687**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,920	5,251,687
Houston, TX		**575,870**	**192,225,725**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	1,430	897,198
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	11,560	5,398,619
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	26,340	17,771,674
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	740	1,411,124
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	1,050	488,015
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	2,250	1,222,430
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	34,000	40,691,108
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	210	304,808
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	8,370	4,435,112
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	7,870	3,738,963
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	43,040	19,549,852
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	9,850	3,964,666
	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	3,280	1,625,768
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	340	157,104
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 K	5,510	2,828,841
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,890	975,962
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	440	115,208
	SORGHUM BULK	217,660	43,683,334
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	200,040	42,965,939
Jacinto, TX		**85,260**	**39,615,471**
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	1,720	788,429
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	9,290	6,596,259
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	21,360	11,509,820
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,040	4,895,969
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	70	92,752
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	10,150	4,443,447
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	420	151,318
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	9,730	4,630,999
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	28,480	6,506,478
Jacintoport, TX		**11,050**	**5,466,050**
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	150	84,524

	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,260	1,394,307
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	6,650	3,116,730
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	760	311,357
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,230	559,133
Lake Charles, LA		**1,330**	**1,494,594**
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	220	102,349
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,110	1,392,244
Longview, WA		**46,270**	**11,405,049**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	46,270	11,405,049
Markesan, WI		**780**	**851,608**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	780	851,608
Miami, FL		**12,270**	**14,190,722**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	12,270	14,190,722
Norfolk, VA		**940**	**1,005,521**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	940	1,005,521
Portland, OR		**284,900**	**60,725,006**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	284,900	60,725,006
Tacoma, WA		**2,030**	**558,149**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BAG-50 KG	2,030	558,149
Vancouver, WA		**30,640**	**6,634,621**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	30,640	6,634,621
Grand Total		**1,230,390**	**$414,090,858**

FY 2019			
Load Port Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Cost
Beaumont, TX		**46,900**	**$9,590,436**
	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	270	$227,610
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	90	$36,879
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	550	$236,484
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	45,990	$9,089,464
Brevard, NC		**2,950**	**$5,863,427**
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	2,950	$5,863,427
Chicago, IL		**56,720**	**$39,237,800**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	610	$634,158
	BEANS, PEA BAG-50 KG	3,680	$3,014,430
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	860	$511,562
	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	730	$653,564
	BEANS, SMALL WHITE BAG-50 KG	60	$36,062
	BEANS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG (PEA B/	720	$659,311
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	21,960	$9,808,777
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	170	$90,629
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	3,120	$1,333,658
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L	260	$273,514
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	15,760	$18,385,344
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	820	$955,156
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	90	$36,995
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	7,610	$2,749,068
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	270	$95,572
Corpus Christi, TX		**96,300**	**$17,851,329**
	SORGHUM BULK	96,300	$17,851,329
Gilman, IL		**2,580**	**$2,739,765**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,580	$2,739,765
Houston, TX		**823,190**	**$263,891,094**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	11,080	$10,649,336
	BEANS, KIDNEY, LIGHT RED BAG-50 KG	620	$847,341
	BEANS, PEA BAG-50 KG	1,840	$1,821,166
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	210	$118,195
	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	620	$549,603
	BEANS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG (PEA B/	4,180	$3,788,978
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	20,930	$9,590,033
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	20,510	$13,527,214
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-25 KG	2,270	$1,108,486
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	4,630	$2,102,439
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	49,970	$59,867,641
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	30	$35,024
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	510	$245,323
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	770	$356,641
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	47,550	$19,397,906
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	1,920	$598,340
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	9,010	$4,461,089
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	660	$319,229
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,170	$651,117
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG	840	$671,950

	SORGHUM BULK	293,010	$60,590,536
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	350,860	$72,593,507
Jacinto, TX		**68,590**	**$29,315,575**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	680	$863,600
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	180	$115,409
	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	780	$695,221
	BEANS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG (PEA B/	2,190	$1,887,510
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	5,000	$3,082,455
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	6,550	$3,169,343
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,300	$2,767,386
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	21,310	$8,869,147
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	1,980	$779,533
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	4,530	$1,825,692
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	23,090	$5,260,278
Jacintoport, TX		**4,520**	**$3,409,472**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,500	$1,858,235
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	3,020	$1,551,237
Kalama, WA		**278,880**	**$61,946,223**
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	23,080	$4,740,401
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	255,800	$57,205,821
Lake Charles, LA		**3,680**	**$1,766,928**
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	2,330	$1,047,783
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,350	$719,145
Longview, WA		**77,260**	**$16,210,523**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	77,260	$16,210,523
Markesan, WI		**9,042**	**$16,120,226**
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	9,042	$16,120,226
Miami, FL		**22,520**	**$26,782,650**
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	22,520	$26,782,650
Portland, OR		**92,820**	**$21,313,456**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	92,820	$21,313,456
Vancouver, WA		**85,000**	**$18,811,350**
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	85,000	$18,811,350
Grand Total		**1,670,952**	**$534,850,253**

**Note: FY 19 numbers are estimates and will change as actuals are reconciled*

18. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide the tonnage per commodity type and the value per commodity type shipped on each U.S. vessel for each Fiscal Year 2014-2019.

Mr. Isley: Attachment F provides complete data for USDA's Food for Progress Program and McGovern-Dole Program.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

ATTACHMENT F - USDA Foreign Food Assistance Programs Vessel Shipment Table

Fiscal Year	Vessel Ty	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity(MT)	PO Net Amount ($)
2014	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	18100	2209242
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	18800	2312964
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	12000	1907219
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	9100	1269359
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	8800	922420
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALI	10000	1366000
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	ETHIOPIA	20000	2683400
	BULK	MORAN TOWING CORP.	MONTVILLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	4750	1565125
	BULK	MORAN TOWING CORP.	VIRGINIA	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	17300	1245427
	BULK	SEALIFT, INC	CAPT. STEVEN BENNETT	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	ETHIOPIA	16000	1625547.99
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	110.034178	16701.62
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL PHILIPPINES	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	130.812045	22265.88
	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000638	36433.12
	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	1318.001672	444630.76
	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	440.1376	164565.38
	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	180.00016	78634.52
	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	280.000875	95230.89
	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000638	35531.31
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	230.000078	149589.19
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	OIL, SUNFLWRSO BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	50.293256	47898.73
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	110.000558	80571.55
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN CHARGER	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	220.020078	70269.74
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN CHARGER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	1560.002746	486231.11
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN TITAN	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	20.000918	9008.43
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	6000.001948	2032064.79
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN TITAN	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	40.00962	9561.47
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN TITAN	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	110.000558	52189.64
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN TITAN	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	160.000358	75911.99
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	500.001389	152962.93
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	20.000918	4168.53
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	30.0006	8852.86
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	50.033536	16528.03
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	300.000796	82064.35
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DETROIT	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	5122.022426	1379452.93
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK UTAH	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	340.000036	97094.37
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	150.002008	92164.41
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	344.23515	225561.55
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.204748	47180.22
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	290.855524	128098.92
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	580.000674	262805.91
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	252.22785	52132.21
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	410.000767	184486.26
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	310.000908	136626.54
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	290.339158	70693.8
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	120.000518	25731.57
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	180.001236	74268.02
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	130.00018	38442.56
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	120.000144	50054.37
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	20.000512	10602.95
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	140.0004	194066.96
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	170.0001	41550.58
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	140.000168	92235.41
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	540.000834	343046.62
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	450.042112	91992.98
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	410.001354	184710.06
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EDT SPAR	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	290.020796	149879.77
	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	5000.001852	1947190.34
	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	2070.000762	771856.77
	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	3992.766372	1465535.08
	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	690.001232	120315.53
	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	600.002586	223798.83
	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	3940.000208	1407188.08
	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	BLACK EAGLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	5000	1757100
	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	BLACK EAGLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	PHILIPPINES	27740	2865842
	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST ARCTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	4180	1453845.8
2014								

Fiscal Year	Vessel Ty	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity(MT)	PO Net Amount
2015	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	4750	492100
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	18700	1661882
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	24000	3267900
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	CORN, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	10000	1081800
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	1740	582333.2
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	5000	540900
	BULK	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	CAPT. STEVEN BENNETT	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	9400	977130
	BULK	U.S. UNITED OCEAN SERVICES	PAT CANTRELL	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALI	10000	712000
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	100.000988	15197.7
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	2000.000541	281661.66
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	1836.891992	258451.47
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	330.207846	56228.45
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	50.011136	11107.38
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	200.000198	27853.74
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	CHARLESTON EXPRESS	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	180.047164	130936.14
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	CHARLESTON EXPRESS	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	20.022016	18435.43
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	CHARLESTON EXPRESS	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	40.000828	28862.06
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	CHARLESTON EXPRESS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	40.010818	28019.06
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	2530.000858	675390.62
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	341.377638	86959.64
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	100.003592	25794.51
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	60.000072	16751.66
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	260	83256.25
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	880.001272	181529
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	4260.000844	1001039.88
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	230.000078	59325.27

	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	250.000191	47872.38	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	173.615366	35486.36	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	100.07849	26981.52	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	84.8085	15878.09	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	79.000718	10731.57	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	1320.082544	287600.35	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 3/15 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	130.000478	29899.51	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	160.000358	37194.47	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	2050.000782	384118.38	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	190.001235	44930.16	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	250.000191	38753.83	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	250.000191	83639.98	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	1750.003311	361931.92	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	30.0096	8962.22	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	80.000678	26296.83	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	860.173008	147513.61	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	200.000198	30661.35	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DETROIT	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1550.000786	338577.30	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DETROIT	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	2060.000169	716757.69	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK HARTFORD	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	460.120914	162748.15	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK MEMPHIS	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	130.056192	31570.96	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK MEMPHIS	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	70.000718	16272.71	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	30.007864	9280.94	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	40.000838	9398.79	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	140.537362	41984.06	
	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC LUDOVICA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	380.000476	94784.26	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	180.000278	51222.52	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	120.000518	71543.4	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.000198	64178.41	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	190.000238	144118.42	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.00088	85431.04	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.000028	42141.83	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	620.000625	226280.96	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	180.000177	43586.67	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000582	47325.53	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	30.00487	9981.58	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	180.000278	43106.26	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	50.048948	20899.34	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	150.056422	108940.29	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	440.000512	230312.77	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	220.0014	73955.89	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.000158	59549.14	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	280.000876	192405.13	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	200.000198	91984.06	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	180.047184	43117.51	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	150.000398	81012.24	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	WHEAT, HARD RED SPRING BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	160.042274	126205.68	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	1410.002344	960723.04	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	160.000896	110233.44	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	140.000028	107409.05	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	110.000558	76272.93	
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	ADVANTAGE	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	350.00007	259739.27	
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	BANGLADESH	9740	1373340	
	LINE	TRANS ATLANTIC LINES L.L.C.	GEYSIR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	Food for Progress	MAURITANIA	1600.002432	959376.48	
	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST ARCTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	4000	1419600	
	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST BALTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	4000	1308000	
2013									
Fiscal Year	Vessel Type	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Commodity	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity(MT)	PO Net Amount	
2016	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	24000	3685200	
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUINEA	16030	1934660.7	
	BULK	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	CAPT. STEVEN BENNETT	CORN, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	HONDURAS	30700	1820240	
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	680.000517	195206.43	
	LINE	CMA CGM SA	APL BELGIUM	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	70.034948	25871.85	
	LINE	CMA CGM SA	APL THAILAND	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	110.026552	31420.97	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN CRESCENT	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	5880	837226.8	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	CORN, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	2000	207880	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	210.002154	94534.24	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	90.011264	26547.3	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	140	58321.68	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	180.004431	72707.99	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	450.000196	114546.34	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	1710.001144	765018.14	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	3400.000372	1421474.8	
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	10000	1039400	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	40.002832	7054.79	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	80.000768	11803.35	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	30.021242	6678.01	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	100.076646	17583.97	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	200.000198	35270.38	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	1610.002035	204486.79	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	320.00095	85876.55	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	10.002854	1433.29	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	551.262878	140252.13	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	30.000878	4298.72	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	20.00491	3888.73	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	2620.001496	586431.2	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 3/15 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	130.000478	29048.2	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	70.017684	16593.86	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	200.000198	32665.36	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	300.000624	58358.78	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	4188.887618	870359.63	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KENSINGTON	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	79.056326	17626.06	
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KINLOSS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	320.000716	66090.33	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	200.110978	62810.58	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	180.047184	87678.33	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.037244	118551.28	
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	2440.001218	426934.08	

	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	200.000745	101722.77
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.000026	42553.2
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	482.511729	196563.76
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	381.288389	282892.33
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	300.000624	80547.28
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	400.96875	194291.15
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	180.000177	91550.24
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	300.000796	79659.53
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	140.377266	72320.16
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	251.660822	205322.9
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	PEANUTS, ROASTED, UNSL PKG-500/1 OZ-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	506.686572	182980.77
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	70.000718	39829.67
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	300.001794	165662.26
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	80.000578	40240.82
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	300.000796	114226.76
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	70.000718	56253.05
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	2200.000182	1210220.54
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000538	72596.71
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	5000	1245000
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	971.345416	419425.71
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	370.000516	175576
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	3160.001332	827225.12
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	IVORY COAST	12500.00389	2442761.29
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	280.000875	256196.4
	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST ARCTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	4000	758660
	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST BALTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	4040	1243754.4
2016								

Fiscal Year	Vessel Ty	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity(MT)	PO Net Amount
2017	BULK	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	SCL BASILISK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	2079.384	393752.15
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	1118.33022	287402.16
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	750.000673	193161.23
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	200.001196	143988.83
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	70.000718	16833.84
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	120.031456	34277.52
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	1180.131008	196422.52
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	30.000878	4960.07
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	120.831254	47250.46
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	4430.001242	1193437.01
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	3418.026402	932600.08
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1110.004542	289033.89
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	220.001116	93055.18
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	2880.001454	1128077.52
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	2130.00146	900939.4
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	6000	2050020
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	12500	1209750
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUINEA	14060	3060317
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	14000	2504600
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	BANGLADESH	9950	4082485
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	520.224999	112267.4
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	240.02399	57240.19
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	100.000596	35671.56
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	600.001248	132523.08
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	400.105186	137912.01
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	50.0004	11611.2
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	130.056192	50658.05
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	280.06882	58111.57
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	460.000156	100481
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1500.000966	390200.63
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	110.000183	38338.46
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	380.000922	82755.98
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	70.017584	10593.86
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	120.084048	26960.3
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	164.689484	47692.07
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	20.00491	3026.8
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	320.000718	50681.44
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	60.000758	9799.72
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	80.000678	13066.24
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DENVER	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	300.024312	67837.2
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK HARTFORD	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	390.000436	78547.18
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KINLOSS	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	90.030664	30044.72
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KINLOSS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	200.90239	45897.54
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	10.002954	2265.24
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	70.056326	17476.09
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	670.001312	253597.71
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	30.000878	22064.77
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	120.531454	42149.78
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	180.000278	84408.95
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	1360.001546	250741.77
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	30.000852	17933.84
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	80.127621	27115.12
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	370.000638	169817.92
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	330.001476	110486.61
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	400.00149	211348.31
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	80.001285	49980.57
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100.176246	45069.27
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	50.443542	21829.69
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	90.040676	56641.64
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	90.0063	47792.21
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	770.00191	279609.9
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	190.001236	119660.08
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	480.001074	161633.69
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	813.513712	711669.62
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	30.007864	14077.84
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	30.000036	14095.46
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	30.000878	14074.58
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	3490.00101	1958603.67
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	270.000916	126687.76

	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	6000	1839000
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUINEA	10000	2280000
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	360.000354	161427.51
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	100.000598	44374.01
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	120.000518	63493.26
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	150.000256	93083.86
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	940.000232	497597.32
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	180.000278	79853.03
	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	HAITI	20000	1760000
	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	8000	825040
	TANK	US SHIPPING CORPORATION	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALAWI	2640	1417944
	TANK	US SHIPPING CORPORATION	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MOZAMBIQUE	3460	1858356
	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST PACIFIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	4000	668440
	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST PACIFIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	3500	1219350
2017								

Fiscal Year	Vessel Ty	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity(MT)	PO Net Amount
2018	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	BANGLADESH	1230	188522.1
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	15449	2771788.8
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	5000	756200
	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEANS, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	6000	906840
	BULK	United Ocean Services Inc.	TEXAS ENTERPRISE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	ETHIOPIA	15000	3202900
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	950.168147	257381.71
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	90.040676	23340.26
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	10.011008	1899.97
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	90.01215	31042.14
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	660.158278	149738.89
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	650.020354	123100.05
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	190.780714	140323.46
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	120.001516	43647.84
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	40.05982	28784.58
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	80.021636	29108.07
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN CRESCENT	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	3000	1175112
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	210.000158	122351.39
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	1380.000428	609849.35
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	30.01152	17444.2
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	70.000718	26297.42
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	450.105994	234852.36
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	250.008996	136017.58
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	1450.000168	812145.4
	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	950.25069	426851.08
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	120.000047	25167.27
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	411.724632	83505.97
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	70.000718	13186.51
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	190.000238	35791.63
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	900.00139	153306.83
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	400.000396	71342.78
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CAROLINA	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	150.000312	25987.9
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	440.004228	109019.05
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	20.000568	3363.82
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	300.000624	57142.98
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	530.572707	98373.56
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	130.000478	22536.15
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	90.033592	13620.6
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	90	20903
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	40.380976	39602.44
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	20.00491	3848.64
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	2702.011148	454947.57
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	490.128778	103624.42
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	930.000272	328947.99
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	228.001116	52765.81
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	390.000436	67605.29
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	510.000354	83396.75
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK COLUMBUS	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	3320.000992	741543.83
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KENSINGTON	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	100.026546	28163.79
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK MEMPHIS	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	70.034048	25168.49
	LINE	NATIONAL SHIPPING OF AMERICA, LLC	NATIONAL GLORY	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	830.000672	241182.88
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	300.000795	86272.77
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	40.030535	29700.02
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.00088	123323.84
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100.846364	28758.1
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	780.001425	443607.67
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	831.337632	389601.26
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	50.466592	23317.54
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	120.061918	69406.73
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	160.920568	132177.02
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	20.022016	13564.02
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	310.000756	84489.18
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	130.000478	70080.42
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	440.00323	177488.89
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	180.000278	116316.82
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	490.002775	241946.72
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	420.001671	179716.83
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	140.045608	103471.26
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	90	60400
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	300.000798	153006.42
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	40.166518	23500.74
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	270.000916	179098.5
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	40.015818	36883.27
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	2500.000978	1275050.6
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	HONDURAS	12500	1062500
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALI	7500	1357500
	LINE	US OCEAN LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	780.000672	204086.36
	LINE	US OCEAN LLC	OCEAN CRESCENT	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	6600	1240632
	LINE	US OCEAN LLC	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	2320.0007	1788074.29
	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	7000	898590
	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	6000	2236500
	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB PETROCHEM TRADER S/ROWNSVIL	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	4000	1516000

2018	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST PACIFIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	4000	555800

Fiscal Year	Vessel Ty	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity(MT)	PO Net Amount
2019	BULK	LIBERTY EAGLE CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	CAMBODIA	8500	1803680
	BULK	LIBERTY EAGLE CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	PHILIPPINES	21000	5181120
	BULK	LIBERTY GRACE CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	8980	1218610.4
	BULK	LIBERTY GRACE CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	17580	2379028.8
	BULK	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	MOKU PAHU	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	ETHIOPIA	17500	3260000
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	430.000368	125977.82
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	440.0182	250430.73
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	30.000768	22868.89
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	70.008702	45306.73
	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 3/15 MG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	50.012774	31571.19
	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	200.000745	37892.75
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	450.000198	182855.78
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	EAST TIMOR	150.000398	29609.9
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	30.000852	9669.1
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	200.000198	40881.8
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	80.000978	13948.01
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	280.000336	81344.98
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	210.0006	75600.22
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	30.000878	4328.78
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	470.000116	153527.09
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	EAST TIMOR	180.000278	35831.84
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	160.001358	27445.12
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CAROLINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	380.000922	72766.13
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CAROLINA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	220.000118	48276.58
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	230.000078	48166.35
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	800.000792	358316.98
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	560.000112	170858.19
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	130.000731	21986.07
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	430.001355	117193.98
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	130.000478	82134.5
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	110.000558	59860.22
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	310.081594	52508.81
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	350.042512	101453.46
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	60.04804	17537.84
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	80.011904	26911.1
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	10.0003	2134.08
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	80.000678	13948.01
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	150.001306	81363.48
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	140.036366	42658.37
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	700.000194	357014.13
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	100.000598	26350.85
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	1400.001386	461823.61
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	110.028502	19183.33
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUBL OF	1220.320458	248444.26
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	1720.19272	458137.61
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	680.000234	120300.04
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BANGLADESH	1230.32424	208341.18
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK COLUMBUS	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	60.841962	14131.28
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DENVER	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	EAST TIMOR	320.000716	63807.78
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DETROIT	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	420.002058	86936.6
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DETROIT	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	110.034176	23824.36
	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KENSINGTON	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	730.138834	136379.19
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	410.000335	270731.7
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	310.000756	217756.06
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	220.000326	144803.7
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	890.000843	477842.56
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	240.000894	129848.51
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	280.066564	189689.03
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	50.00606	28416.52
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	40.022328	30106.23
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	70.0002	50555.7
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	300.000796	208617.79
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	220.5081	143617.5
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUINEA	12964.982	2897907.94
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	230.060968	188030.54
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	40.001149	20363.5
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100.000866	45795.74
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	500.000382	404762.21
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	860.001352	433247.38
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	70.000718	35070.5
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	30.426	14586
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	267.948852	184294.94
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	150.00016	125822.08
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	180.045824	116547.52
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	70	41015.63
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	50.000798	29060.5
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	450.020156	250091.73
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	270.070776	169743.53
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	2330.00106	1435772.39
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	280.023833	140292.5
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MILD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	950.000192	528306.72
	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	SLNC YORK	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	150.006898	122345.01
	TANK	MORAN TOWING CORP	ATB BARBARA CAROL ANN MORAN/LO	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	PERU	14000	2268960
	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	8300	738819
	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALAWI	5270	1569169.8
	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MOZAMBIQUE	11930	3416304.1
	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB PETROCHEM TRADER/BROWNSVIL	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	PAKISTAN	19810	6359357.9

FY 2014 U.S. Flag					
Freight Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES			4,960	$5,189,242	$962,068
	APL CHINA		4,960	$5,189,242	$962,068
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	2,000	$2,898,320	$372,000
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	2,660	$1,268,822	$465,140
		RUTF	300	$1,022,100	$124,926
CRIMSON SHIPPING COMPANY			2,290	$1,473,624	$442,314
	CRIMSON CLOVER		2,290	$1,473,624	$442,314
		BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	780	$302,039	$144,682
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,010	$651,092	$187,345
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	230	$139,976	$42,663
		OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	270	$380,516	$67,624
INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS			17,510	$13,704,700	$4,469,231
	OCEAN CHARGER		2,220	$1,744,369	$720,136
		CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	600	$185,550	$203,388
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	790	$1,095,730	$251,994
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	200	$103,850	$63,796
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	630	$359,239	$200,957
	OCEAN CRESCENT		5,000	$2,324,888	$1,211,000
		BULGURBAG-50 KG-F	420	$164,585	$113,820
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	2,860	$1,264,790	$672,100
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	200	$144,496	$54,200
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	160	$207,410	$43,360
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	220	$109,263	$59,620
		RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	1,140	$634,342	$267,900
	OCEAN FREEDOM		7,500	$7,622,323	$2,066,905
		BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	2,800	$3,054,930	$750,820
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	2,350	$1,766,640	$633,153
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	1,560	$2,237,399	$430,194
		OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	120	$172,108	$64,938
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	670	$391,248	$187,701
	OCEAN TITAN		2,790	$1,893,122	$481,290
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	370	$513,190	$61,175
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	2,420	$1,379,932	$400,115
LIBERTY MARITIME			332,210	$84,956,541	$36,555,555
	LIBERTY EAGLE		125,790	$28,394,042	$13,461,310
		SORGHUM	125,790	$28,394,042	$13,461,310
	LIBERTY GLORY		140,450	$34,128,977	$16,802,195
		SORGHUM	88,840	$18,966,855	$10,046,538
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	3,450	$761,967	$229,977
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	48,160	$14,400,155	$6,525,680
	LIBERTY GRACE		65,970	$22,445,521	$6,242,183
		RICE	13,130	$7,573,909	$1,504,961
		SORGHUM	16,960	$3,752,400	$229,977
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	35,880	$11,119,212	$4,507,246
MAERSK			107,215	$72,397,626	$24,906,570
	MAERSK ATLANTA		17,590	$10,035,750	$3,810,240
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	620	$261,885	$129,960
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	4,930	$3,322,322	$1,126,030
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	800	$388,648	$151,200
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	1,100	$1,453,475	$243,560
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	5,910	$2,749,720	$1,341,400
		RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	4,000	$2,270,852	$582,000
		WHEAT-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	230	$188,848	$37,090
	MAERSK CHICAGO		33,530	$19,330,160	$8,731,080
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	10,030	$4,156,433	$2,775,150
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	3,320	$2,016,797	$960,190
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	7,000	$3,226,229	$1,778,000
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	920	$528,427	$259,770
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	3,340	$4,666,313	$908,895
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	110	$181,895	$28,435
		OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	290	$344,520	$93,960
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	50	$38,433	$15,200
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	5,350	$2,459,926	$1,387,750
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	3,010	$1,642,197	$489,850
		RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	110	$68,992	$33,880
	MAERSK DENVER		2,660	$3,404,153	$346,100
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	2,000	$3,011,460	$257,000
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	660	$392,693	$89,100
	MAERSK DETROIT		33,970	$24,645,154	$8,945,560
		BULGURBAG-50 KG-F	1,310	$503,499	$359,930
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	7,290	$2,908,871	$1,756,620
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,210	$842,897	$250,910
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	3,820	$2,133,939	$760,090
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	6,810	$9,883,857	$1,413,190
		OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	1,000	$1,330,000	$142,000
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	11,130	$5,896,205	$2,118,600
		WHEAT-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,400	$1,145,886	$144,200
	MAERSK HARTFORD		8,460	$7,080,164	$1,401,030
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	3,000	$2,026,286	$570,000
		OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	2,630	$3,454,984	$309,560
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	2,830	$1,598,894	$521,470
	MAERSK OHIO		11,000	$7,302,244	$3,006,580

		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	700	$638,922	$192,053
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	3,140	$1,322,985	$854,151
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	2,160	$1,445,446	$641,966
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	2,000	$2,491,200	$492,580
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	3,000	$1,403,692	$825,830
SCHUYLER LINE NAVIGATION			**5,510**	**$4,650,022**	**$1,815,370**
	EOT SPAR		***5,510***	***$4,650,022***	***$1,815,370***
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	690	$598,225	$202,560
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,390	$1,013,588	$473,750
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	1,300	$769,645	$451,100
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	820	$1,236,059	$325,400
		OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L-F	210	$260,994	$61,740
		OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	170	$235,198	$49,130
		RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	930	$536,312	$251,690
SEALIFT			**89,595**	**$39,711,893**	**$17,997,670**
	ADVANTAGE		***28,110***	***$14,659,106***	***$8,416,902***
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,220	$483,287	$354,660
		CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	4,250	$2,882,263	$1,390,190
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	10,920	$5,565,609	$2,919,106
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	7,770	$4,067,833	$2,497,549
		RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	1,250	$712,545	$630,699
		SORGHUM	2,700	$747,630	$624,698
	CAPT. STEVEN L. BENNETT		***60,300***	***$15,311,893***	***$8,041,069***
		SORGHUM	50,670	$12,031,393	$7,671,132
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	9,720	$3,280,500	$1,369,937
Grand Total			**658,196**	**$212,234,813**	**$85,683,209**

FY 2015 U.S. Flag					
Freight Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES			7,020	$6,909,380	$895,600
	APL CHINA		7,020	$6,909,380	$895,600
		EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	530	$1,766,455	$112,890
		OIL, VEGETABLE	2,350	$2,790,354	$365,170
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	2,140	$1,125,611	$253,540
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	2,000	$1,226,960	$164,000
CMA CGM			500	$273,620	$103,500
	APL CHINA		500	$273,620	$103,500
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	500	$273,620	$103,500
CRIMSON SHIPPING COMPANY			1,300	$608,407	$237,887
	CRIMSON TIDE		1,300	$608,407	$237,887
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT	450	$149,693	$82,346
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	700	$337,463	$128,093
		LENTILS	150	$121,251	$27,449
INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS			19,510	$12,936,250	$4,465,684
	OCEAN FREEDOM		19,510	$12,936,250	$4,465,684
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	2,760	$1,612,316	$872,322
		OIL, VEGETABLE	3,400	$4,132,214	$743,126
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	3,640	$1,893,113	$746,164
		RICE	9,710	$5,298,607	$2,104,072
LIBERTY MARITIME			274,200	$63,551,919	$27,311,382
	LIBERTY EAGLE		32,680	$7,574,488	$3,854,606
		CORN	5,330	$1,059,444	$628,674
		SORGHUM	27,350	$6,515,044	$3,225,933
	LIBERTY GLORY		100,030	$23,568,416	$11,013,651
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	31,850	$6,875,141	$3,439,800
		SORGHUM	68,180	$16,693,275	$7,573,851
	LIBERTY GRACE		141,490	$32,419,015	$12,443,126
		SORGHUM	141,490	$32,419,016	$12,443,126
MAERSK			185,850	$59,980,473	$26,871,618
	MAERSK ATLANTA		49,840	$27,096,164	$13,880,659
		BULGUR	610	$200,147	$178,650
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT	90	$31,522	$18,270
		CORNMEAL	1,230	$408,257	$284,520
		CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	230	$74,649	$52,310
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	6,770	$3,172,134	$1,539,500
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	6,500	$3,017,088	$1,640,508
		LENTILS	2,970	$2,551,397	$598,010
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	180	$133,200	$43,920
		OIL, VEGETABLE	2,740	$2,982,989	$647,510
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	21,840	$11,073,837	$6,091,782
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	6,420	$3,293,745	$2,722,489
		RICE	130	$67,210	$38,100
		WHEAT-SOY BLEND	130	$89,990	$25,090
	MAERSK CHICAGO		45,710	$31,291,443	$9,904,275
		CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	1,600	$542,449	$334,970
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	9,200	$4,840,456	$2,088,930
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	1,430	$680,394	$284,570
		LENTILS	2,000	$1,428,316	$410,340
		OIL, VEGETABLE	12,130	$14,529,114	$2,661,165
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	17,620	$8,758,635	$3,812,900
		SORGHUM	1,730	$512,080	$311,400
	MAERSK DETROIT		80	$43,268	$17,790
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	30	$16,894	$7,140
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	50	$26,375	$10,650
	MAERSK HARTFORD		10,170	$6,659,597	$2,255,895
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	2,100	$2,578,402	$467,385
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	8,070	$4,081,196	$1,801,510
SCHUYLER LINE NAVIGATION			7,610	$4,687,414	$1,943,000
	EOT SPAR		7,610	$4,687,414	$1,943,000
		BEANS, PINTO	1,260	$817,293	$368,030
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT	770	$257,511	$138,215
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	1,730	$986,959	$374,415
		LENTILS	230	$129,550	$41,285
		OIL, VEGETABLE	940	$1,128,149	$265,089
		RICE	2,680	$1,347,952	$755,975
SEALIFT			105,330	$34,145,265	$14,590,858
	ADVANTAGE		19,650	$12,757,107	$5,050,612
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT	130	$57,366	$32,495
		CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	9,420	$5,009,555	$2,151,131
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	1,680	$1,033,244	$544,687
		LENTILS	710	$532,535	$131,914
		OIL, VEGETABLE	3,320	$4,096,200	$1,089,466
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	3,030	$1,619,635	$736,923
		SORGHUM	1,360	$408,571	$363,996
	BLACK EAGLE		20,280	$4,895,389	$2,859,480
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	20,280	$4,895,389	$2,859,480
	CAPT. STEVEN L. BENNETT		65,400	$16,492,769	$6,680,764
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	33,090	$8,271,838	$3,502,577

		SORGHUM	32,310	$8,220,931	$3,178,188
Grand Total			**621,270**	**$188,192,728**	**$75,819,538**

FY 2016 U.S. Flag					
Freight Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES			**2,000**	**$1,311,595**	**$314,000**
	APL CHINA		***2,000***	***$1,311,595***	***$314,000***
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	1,200	$782,931	$186,000
		WHEAT-SOY BLEND	800	$528,664	$128,000
HAPAG-LLOYD			**60**	**$49,860**	**$13,140**
	WASHINGTON EXPRESS		***60***	***$49,860***	***$13,140***
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	60	$49,860	$13,140
INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS			**33,430**	**$17,327,855**	**$7,457,451**
	OCEAN GLOBE		***33,430***	***$17,327,855***	***$7,457,451***
		BEANS, PINTO	1,810	$1,497,878	$746,010
		CORNMEAL	5,710	$1,850,020	$1,852,458
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	5,800	$2,763,925	$1,242,413
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	850	$1,354,255	$166,780
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	5,640	$3,854,275	$1,093,652
		RICE	13,620	$6,007,502	$2,356,139
LIBERTY MARITIME			**515,050**	**$99,615,857**	**$59,623,332**
	LIBERTY EAGLE		***147,910***	***$27,779,519***	***$17,991,365***
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	95,250	$18,216,570	$11,643,523
		SORGHUM	52,660	$9,562,949	$6,347,843
	LIBERTY GLORY		***183,370***	***$36,093,930***	***$19,412,498***
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	52,020	$11,196,220	$3,531,462
		SORGHUM	88,480	$15,895,011	$9,007,688
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	42,870	$9,002,700	$6,873,347
	LIBERTY GRACE		***183,780***	***$35,742,418***	***$22,219,469***
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	84,750	$16,698,377	$10,415,975
		SORGHUM	47,500	$8,212,275	$3,798,575
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	51,530	$10,831,767	$8,004,920
MAERSK			**146,310**	**$102,547,423**	**$32,563,103**
	MAERSK ARKANSAS		***160***	***$163,700***	***$26,540***
		LENTILS	90	$119,880	$17,370
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	70	$43,820	$9,170
	MAERSK ATLANTA		***44,890***	***$27,583,254***	***$11,449,900***
		BEANS, PINTO	1,750	$1,254,919	$421,340
		CORNMEAL	9,650	$2,989,045	$2,746,450
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	1,580	$705,139	$357,750
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	1,190	$1,701,195	$365,330
		EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	150	$424,950	$27,000
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	1,300	$552,559	$271,700
		OIL, VEGETABLE	4,300	$4,938,441	$781,360
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	22,400	$14,205,274	$5,933,760
		SORGHUM	2,220	$574,422	$491,660
		WHEAT-SOY BLEND	350	$237,311	$53,550
	MAERSK CHICAGO		***87,990***	***$64,101,425***	***$18,187,295***
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT	50	$14,453	$10,150
		CORNMEAL	7,250	$2,520,360	$1,583,350
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	9,960	$4,511,443	$2,031,280
		EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	150	$374,400	$34,050
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	3,120	$1,364,943	$620,880
		LENTILS	2,250	$2,388,360	$403,060
		OIL, VEGETABLE	20,230	$23,604,038	$3,660,525
		PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	1,030	$448,230	$209,090
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	40,840	$27,528,150	$9,058,460
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	2,310	$1,093,970	$427,650
		RICE	240	$114,000	$43,440
		SORGHUM	560	$159,078	$105,360
	MAERSK COLUMBUS		***2,390***	***$1,969,307***	***$489,990***
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	400	$594,168	$78,800
		OIL, VEGETABLE	470	$541,843	$74,760
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	1,520	$833,296	$316,430
	MAERSK DETROIT		***8,720***	***$7,726,519***	***$1,896,400***
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	1,500	$629,175	$321,000
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	2,940	$4,439,612	$774,340
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	2,280	$1,007,794	$453,720
		OIL, VEGETABLE	1,000	$1,081,930	$168,500
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	1,000	$568,008	$178,840
	MAERSK KINLOSS		***2,160***	***$1,003,218***	***$532,978***
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	2,160	$1,003,218	$532,978
SCHUYLER LINE NAVIGATION			**31,010**	**$6,567,865**	**$5,053,750**
	EOT SPAR		***1,010***	***$411,565***	***$225,250***
		BULGUR	600	$175,614	$107,400
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	360	$177,523	$102,600
		OIL, VEGETABLE	50	$58,428	$15,250
	HSTC 1 / MOKU PAHU		***30,000***	***$6,156,300***	***$4,828,500***
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	30,000	$6,156,300	$4,828,500
SEALIFT			**111,530**	**$31,382,053**	**$20,604,677**
	BLACK EAGLE		***74,640***	***$24,723,039***	***$16,095,074***
		BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	400	$356,678	$81,387
		BEANS, PINTO	2,500	$2,162,445	$507,648

		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	2,000	$1,722,004	$903,959
		CORNMEAL	4,500	$1,528,290	$886,850
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	5,040	$5,823,956	$2,235,760
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	190	$222,446	$99,366
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	3,320	$1,570,471	$744,275
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	400	$217,401	$175,635
		SORGHUM	23,170	$4,019,763	$3,733,846
		SORGHUM BAG-50 KG-F	4,370	$1,062,085	$1,883,410
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	28,750	$6,037,500	$4,842,938
	CAPT. STEVEN L. BENNETT		***36,890***	***$6,659,014***	***$4,509,803***
		SORGHUM	36,890	$6,659,014	$4,509,803
TERAS BREAKBULK OCEAN			**14,500**	**$2,789,220**	**$2,871,000**
	NORFOLK		***14,500***	***$2,789,220***	***$2,871,000***
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	14,500	$2,789,220	$2,871,000
UNITED OCEAN SERVICES			**68,000**	**$13,662,648**	**$8,626,140**
	ENERGY ENTERPRISE		***34,000***	***$6,663,320***	***$4,360,840***
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	34,000	$6,663,320	$4,360,840
	TEXAS ENTERPRISE		***34,000***	***$6,999,328***	***$4,265,300***
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	23,140	$5,032,256	$2,902,913
		SORGHUM	10,860	$1,967,073	$1,362,387
Grand Total			**921,900**	**$275,254,386**	**$137,126,792**

FY 2017 U.S. Flag					
Freight Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES			13,100	$6,721,707	$2,802,720
	APL CHINA		13,100	$6,721,707	$2,802,720
		BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	60	$44,970	$18,420
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT	8,850	$5,183,175	$1,950,230
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	540	$253,087	$80,460
		RICE	1,150	$502,329	$263,610
		SORGHUM	100	$22,946	$36,400
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	2,400	$715,200	$453,600
INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS			28,620	$9,470,239	$8,021,970
	OCEAN GLOBE		17,220	$4,620,557	$3,884,640
		BEANS, PINTO	160	$130,160	$34,080
		CORNMEAL	1,000	$381,581	$386,630
		CORN-SOY BLEND +	1,000	$632,115	$386,630
		OIL, VEGETABLE	90	$119,993	$17,910
		RICE	970	$381,288	$193,030
		SORGHUM	14,000	$2,975,420	$2,866,360
	OCEAN GRAND		11,400	$4,849,682	$4,137,330
		CORNMEAL	4,040	$1,682,478	$985,154
		CORN-SOY BLEND +	3,360	$2,274,164	$819,336
		SORGHUM	4,000	$893,040	$2,332,840
LIBERTY MARITIME			433,880	$81,980,715	$55,388,617
	LIBERTY EAGLE		174,440	$32,358,919	$24,655,245
		SORGHUM	23,000	$4,418,760	$3,433,670
		WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	110,440	$20,739,329	$15,559,065
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	41,000	$7,200,830	$5,662,510
	LIBERTY GLORY		137,440	$24,851,915	$16,706,094
		SORGHUM	93,860	$16,622,268	$10,743,915
		WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	43,580	$8,229,647	$5,962,180
	LIBERTY GRACE		121,920	$24,149,881	$17,027,278
		SORGHUM	43,210	$7,223,391	$5,599,016
		WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	31,210	$5,494,665	$4,502,288
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	47,500	$11,431,825	$6,925,975
MAERSK			152,320	$187,736,938	$33,595,690
	MAERSK ARKANSAS		3,010	$1,173,208	$689,800
		CORNMEAL	3,010	$1,173,208	$689,800
	MAERSK ATLANTA		46,510	$39,625,755	$9,900,870
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT	80	$30,800	$19,440
		CORNMEAL	2,540	$980,942	$526,820
		CORN-SOY BLEND +	10,950	$6,916,407	$2,234,300
		OIL, VEGETABLE	17,710	$22,066,979	$3,825,170
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	11,030	$8,003,939	$2,552,290
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	2,910	$1,322,274	$470,660
		SORGHUM	1,290	$304,414	$272,190
	MAERSK CHICAGO		70,270	$49,737,108	$13,649,940
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT	90	$38,652	$22,320
		CORNMEAL	1,540	$587,685	$389,820
		CORN-SOY BLEND +	6,930	$4,083,831	$1,545,640
		CSB SUPER CEREAL +	650	$926,924	$154,750
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	600	$241,548	$103,800
		LENTILS	1,880	$1,532,958	$342,680
		OIL, VEGETABLE	18,480	$22,658,756	$3,379,040
		PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	4,200	$1,994,337	$763,880
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	26,620	$15,032,661	$5,089,480
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	2,900	$1,265,112	$614,370
		SORGHUM	6,380	$1,374,644	$1,244,160
	MAERSK DENVER		20,790	$10,380,260	$5,785,560
		LENTILS	70	$43,306	$21,560
		OIL, VEGETABLE	2,820	$3,427,853	$891,090
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	9,790	$4,807,890	$2,836,190
		SORGHUM	4,150	$987,700	$979,400
		WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	3,960	$1,113,512	$1,057,320
	MAERSK DETROIT		11,740	$6,820,595	$2,569,420
		BULGUR, SOY-FORT	40	$18,950	$8,520
		CORNMEAL	5,740	$2,250,759	$1,344,760
		CORN-SOY BLEND +	1,400	$898,912	$298,200
		OIL, VEGETABLE	1,460	$1,752,603	$294,840
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	3,100	$1,899,372	$623,100
NATIONAL SHIPPING OF AMERICA			800	$445,961	$146,000
	NATIONAL GLORY		800	$445,961	$146,000
		BULGUR	200	$57,118	$37,000

		CORN-SOY BLEND +	400	$232,479	$72,000
		LENTILS	150	$95,390	$27,750
		OIL, VEGETABLE	50	$60,975	$9,250
SCHUYLER LINE NAVIGATION			**72,340**	**$22,962,183**	**$14,693,074**
	HSTC 1 / MOKU PAHU		***60,000***	***$11,637,300***	***$11,670,000***
		WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	30,000	$5,057,100	$5,520,000
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	30,000	$6,580,200	$6,150,000
	NORFOLK		***12,340***	***$11,324,883***	***$3,023,074***
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	640	$275,802	$143,721
		OIL, VEGETABLE	6,960	$8,682,364	$1,780,120
		PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	2,000	$877,600	$489,127
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	2,110	$1,352,930	$484,107
		SORGHUM	630	$136,187	$126,000
SEALIFT			**17,150**	**$11,294,380**	**$4,212,182**
	BLACK EAGLE		***17,150***	***$11,294,380***	***$4,212,182***
		CORN-SOY BLEND +	900	$441,027	$211,201
		LENTILS	2,800	$2,583,183	$651,642
		OIL, VEGETABLE	2,470	$3,287,155	$690,202
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	1,500	$1,050,106	$391,256
		RICE	20	$7,862	$5,217
		RICE, FORT	9,460	$3,925,049	$2,262,663
US OCEAN			**34,000**	**$5,981,960**	**$4,742,320**
	TEXAS ENTERPRISE		***34,000***	***$5,981,960***	***$4,742,320***
		WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTER	34,000	$5,981,960	$4,742,320
Grand Total			**752,130**	**$245,974,070**	**$125,602,473**

Freight Vendor Name	Vessel Name	FY 2015 U.S. Flag Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES, LLC			7,470	$4,138,948	$1,597,331
	APL CHINA		7,470	$4,138,948	$1,597,331
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	2,440	$1,685,674	$537,239
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	180	$197,364	$58,060
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	2,820	$1,697,761	$597,254
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BAG-50 KG	2,030	$558,149	$404,778
INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C			23,640	$11,353,169	$5,646,707
	OCEAN GLOBE		13,000	$9,405,410	$3,601,699
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG	9,930	$5,717,663	$2,679,099
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	3,070	$3,687,747	$922,600
	TEXAS ENTERPRISE		10,640	$1,947,758	$2,045,008
		SORGHUM BULK	10,640	$1,947,758	$2,045,008
LIBERTY EAGLE CORPORATION			43,600	$9,837,575	$7,256,570
	LIBERTY EAGLE		8,870	$1,712,925	$1,323,435
		SORGHUM BULK	5,000	$814,350	$649,050
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	3,870	$898,575	$674,385
	LIBERTY GLORY		34,130	$7,924,645	$5,932,135
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	34,130	$7,924,645	$5,932,135
LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION			351,616	$73,713,906	$56,797,758
	LIBERTY EAGLE		107,560	$21,851,959	$16,847,525
		SORGHUM BULK	58,110	$11,076,843	$8,012,569
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	13,450	$2,626,516	$1,871,837
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	36,000	$8,148,600	$6,763,120
	LIBERTY GLORY		127,550	$27,986,882	$21,446,458
		SORGHUM BULK	24,030	$4,841,324	$2,812,952
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	57,250	$11,740,509	$11,591,334
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	46,270	$11,405,049	$7,042,173
	LIBERTY GRACE		116,500	$23,875,116	$18,703,775
		SORGHUM BULK	52,500	$10,854,556	$5,772,501
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	34,000	$7,001,960	$6,913,774
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	30,000	$6,018,600	$6,017,500
MAERSK INC.			146,408	$34,328,210	$32,389,938
	MAERSK ATLANTA		55,550	$36,503,138	$15,005,445
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	1,120	$461,971	$224,687
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	4,560	$3,014,671	$1,135,473
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	250	$479,005	$51,120
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	14,620	$16,958,725	$4,269,640
		OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4	400	$427,374	$156,074
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	130	$53,918	$31,783
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	31,330	$14,060,687	$8,516,320
		RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	110	$55,429	$20,721
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 K	1,220	$613,805	$227,915
		SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	1,810	$427,551	$371,712
	MAERSK CHICAGO		54,870	$41,789,277	$12,297,118
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	1,160	$732,099	$235,951
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	4,290	$2,127,707	$812,536
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	6,180	$4,181,911	$1,119,373
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	1,710	$3,343,163	$472,359
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	420	$191,990	$77,435
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	16,960	$19,793,022	$4,089,725
		OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	200	$291,447	$31,333
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	6,240	$3,190,732	$1,457,790
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	12,600	$5,791,723	$3,004,658
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 K	3,200	$1,659,494	$618,835
		SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	1,910	$465,986	$347,123
	MAERSK COLUMBUS		1,900	$919,542	$429,980
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	630	$296,024	$138,246
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	270	$333,478	$67,357
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	260	$119,070	$52,365
		SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	740	$170,970	$172,023
	MAERSK DENVER		15,850	$8,988,134	$2,866,438
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	2,970	$1,369,408	$507,461
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	2,160	$1,436,938	$401,491
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,390	$2,815,135	$415,814
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	8,330	$3,346,654	$1,283,672
	MAERSK DETROIT		12,290	$6,718,627	$2,379,948
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	2,000	$1,374,088	$431,623
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	840	$936,724	$203,778
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	80	$45,266	$18,720
		PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	7,870	$3,738,963	$1,405,686
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,500	$623,585	$320,140
SCHUYLER LINE NAVIGATION			94,720	$35,373,339	$19,815,997
	MOKU PAHU		59,000	$12,384,040	$9,736,280
		SORGHUM BULK	30,000	$5,895,000	$3,309,880
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	29,000	$6,489,040	$6,426,400
	NORFOLK		33,020	$21,008,408	$8,866,934
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	4,450	$3,102,533	$1,091,115
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG	12,350	$6,269,012	$3,313,938
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	5,260	$6,444,811	$1,693,564
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	10,960	$5,190,133	$2,568,316
	OCEAN GLORY		2,700	$1,982,811	$612,783
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	2,700	$1,982,811	$612,783

UNITED OCEAN SERVICES INC.			**34,970**	**$7,520,998**	**$4,521,442**
	MISSISSIPPI ENTERPRISE		***34,970***	***$7,520,998***	***$4,521,442***
		SORGHUM BULK	34,970	$7,520,998	$4,521,442
Grand Total			**695,870**	**$236,666,694**	**$127,525,743**

FY 2019 U.S. Flag					
Freight Vessel Name	Vessel Name	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
AMERICAN PRESIDENT LINES			2,226	$4,230,357	$1,019,605
	MAERSK CHICAGO		266	$461,883	$130,536
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	266	$481,883	$130,536
	MAERSK COLUMBUS		353	$638,169	$172,872
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	353	$638,169	$172,872
	MAERSK DETROIT		235	$413,334	$115,150
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	235	$413,334	$115,150
	MAERSK HARTFORD		269	$473,136	$131,810
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	269	$473,136	$131,810
	MAERSK PITTSBURGH		1,052	$1,948,444	$395,327
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	1,052	$1,948,444	$395,327
	MAERSK SENTOSA		151	$265,589	$73,990
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	151	$265,589	$73,990
HAPAG-LLOYD USA, LLC			6,300	$6,744,502	$1,217,616
	CHARLESTON EXPRESS		6,300	$6,744,502	$1,217,616
		BEANS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG (PEA BAG)	1,270	$1,132,912	$199,789
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	5,030	$5,611,590	$1,017,827
LIBERTY EAGLE CORPORATION			123,800	$26,331,474	$23,623,371
	LIBERTY EAGLE		123,800	$26,331,474	$23,623,371
		SORGHUM BULK	12,290	$2,292,989	$1,729,725
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	111,510	$24,038,485	$21,893,646
LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION			168,150	$34,177,665	$30,274,798
	LIBERTY GLORY		168,150	$34,177,665	$30,274,798
		SORGHUM BULK	71,150	$13,497,327	$11,603,062
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	97,000	$20,680,338	$18,671,736
LIBERTY GRACE CORPORATION			100,210	$21,215,632	$15,505,240
	LIBERTY GRACE		100,210	$21,215,632	$15,505,240
		SORGHUM BULK	70,210	$15,130,732	$8,881,591
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	30,000	$6,084,900	$6,623,649
MAERSK INC.			131,856	$37,859,996	$27,031,778
	MAERSK ATLANTA		53,100	$30,380,659	$12,645,860
		BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	1,620	$1,452,917	$395,289
		BEANS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG (PEA BAG)	630	$572,630	$123,727
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	17,750	$7,746,879	$3,849,856
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,920	$1,059,600	$415,037
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	7,990	$9,576,300	$2,363,340
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	90	$47,309	$21,553
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	12,600	$5,224,586	$3,033,269
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	400	$143,282	$98,236
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	7,490	$3,577,547	$1,652,709
		RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,170	$651,117	$250,881
		SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	1,440	$328,493	$341,963
	MAERSK CAROLINA		3,360	$2,442,021	$716,008
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	760	$530,997	$139,659
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	1,100	$1,274,427	$286,570
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	1,500	$636,597	$289,779
	MAERSK CHICAGO		46,590	$28,444,886	$10,202,829
		BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	150	$137,402	$30,661
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	980	$579,092	$260,540
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	12,080	$6,127,405	$2,874,874
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	3,130	$2,146,241	$616,451
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	150	$283,575	$86,100
		FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-25 KG	2,270	$1,108,486	$563,491
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG	1,760	$744,330	$324,488
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	9,220	$10,659,467	$2,077,821
		OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	150	$175,118	$47,478
		PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	510	$235,008	$119,729
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	15,300	$6,018,946	$3,002,639
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	290	$89,738	$65,090
		SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	600	$139,878	$133,466
	MAERSK DANANG		180	$82,089	$24,120
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG	180	$82,089	$24,120
	MAERSK DENVER		5,000	$2,857,525	$1,350,846
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	5,000	$2,857,525	$1,350,846
	MAERSK DETROIT		42,770	$22,093,102	$12,496,178
		CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	7,960	$3,429,669	$1,977,503
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	3,070	$2,017,731	$852,790
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	4,070	$5,068,943	$1,338,126
		OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	490	$570,156	$177,256
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	27,180	$11,006,603	$8,152,502
	MAERSK KINLOSS		503	$921,744	$290,018
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	503	$921,744	$290,018
	MAERSK SELETAR		353	$638,169	$203,918
		CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	353	$638,169	$203,918
NATIONAL SHIPPING OF AMERICA, LLC			2,560	$1,310,896	$591,376
	NATIONAL GLORY		2,560	$1,310,896	$591,376
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	290	$328,590	$84,154
		PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	770	$356,641	$172,053
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,500	$625,665	$335,169
SCHUYLER LINE NAVIGATION COMPANY			14,400	$10,964,882	$5,879,850
	MOKU PAHU		5,000	$904,300	$972,500
		SORGHUM BULK	5,000	$904,300	$972,500
	SLNC YORK		9,400	$10,060,582	$4,707,350
		BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	180	$115,409	$71,814
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	7,340	$8,998,276	$3,661,009
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	530	$227,852	$203,488
		RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	1,350	$719,145	$771,039
US OCEAN			93,690	$29,072,303	$27,712,588

	OCEAN GLOBE		***44,880***	***$14,912,333***	***$14,291,320***
		BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	780	$673,081	$232,808
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	1,000	$750,200	$893,794
		LENTILS BAG-50 KG	6,550	$3,169,343	$1,729,311
		PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	8,450	$3,571,759	$2,850,844
		PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	1,940	$768,702	$579,034
		RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	4,550	$1,834,324	$1,358,044
		SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	7,010	$1,643,214	$2,092,284
		SORGHUM BULK	14,600	$2,501,710	$4,555,200
	OCEAN GRAND		***48,810***	***$14,160,170***	***$13,421,265***
		CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	4,000	$2,332,255	$1,183,134
		OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	2,210	$2,658,603	$734,868
		WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	13,000	$2,506,026	$4,304,835
		WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	29,600	$6,663,286	$7,198,428
Grand Total			**663,292**	**$221,698,206**	**$143,456,300**

**Note: FY 19 numbers are estimates and will change as actuals are reconciled*

19. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide total tonnage by commodity type and value by commodity type shipped on U.S.-flagged carriers and non-U.S.-flagged carriers for each Fiscal Year 2013-2018.

Mr. Isley: Attachment G provides complete data for USDA's Food for Progress Program and McGovern-Dole Program.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

ATTACHMENT G - USDA Foreign Food Assistance Programs (U.S. Flag and Non-U.S. Flag Shipments)

Fiscal Year	Vessel Type	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	FFP Quantity (MT)	FFP Net Amount ($)
2013	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	18930 $ 904 037.90
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	9100 $ 1,678,222.00
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	10000 $ 1,844,200.00
	US Flag	BULK	MORAN TOWING CORP.	MONTVILLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	6000 $ 1,920,000.00
	US Flag	BULK	SEALIFT, INC	CAPT. STEVEN BENNETT	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	BANGLADESH	12710 $ 2,664,520.05
	US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL PHILIPPINES	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	210.354448 $ 55,223.31
	US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL PHILIPPINES	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	1160.00035 $ 305,691.48
	US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	PRESIDENT ADAMS	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	680.000317 $ 76,587.67
	US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	PRESIDENT ADAMS	OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	150.194366 $ 25,055.38
	US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	PRESIDENT ADAMS	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	170.110844 $ 21,383.78
	US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	PRESIDENT JACKSON	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	570.000398 $ 92,541.10
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	100.016598 $ 71,504.83
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	520.080794 $ 355,694.06
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	80.000678 $ 26,212.85
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	370.000918 $ 164,208.17
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	120.000518 $ 79,017.58
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	410.000358 $ 303,100.36
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	1640.307144 $ 706,965.91
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	250.153176 $ 186,891.40
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	440.000852 $ 292,959.30
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	370.474398 $ 235,175.91
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	180.000278 $ 133,068.54
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	170.000318 $ 103,200.17
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	141.194938 $ 94,190.23
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	440.136704 $ 208,636.28
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	450.000304 $ 283,613.63
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.000544 $ 111,807.52
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.000048 $ 49,672.34
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	1820.479744 $ 880,076.35
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	370.000516 $ 117,525.21
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	280.34818 $ 118,181.06
	US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EDT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	320.047822 $ 171,782.36
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	120.081752 $ 80,687.97
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	1410.00034 $ 254,588.77
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	460.011134 $ 197,740.28
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	120.46359 $ 80,043.26
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	300.000786 $ 177,674.11
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	240.000894 $ 101,884.98
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100.028846 $ 41,988.11
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	350.00042 $ 168,835.35
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	220.1736 $ 81,696.46
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	70.096326 $ 44,859.77
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	100.0008 $ 67,198.09
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	POTATO GRANULES, DCHY POUCH-10/1 36 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	240.000188 $ 164,444.75
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	1052.080006 $ 585,332.77
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	460.000154 $ 193,136.24
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.006318 $ 100,671.33
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	AMERICAN TRADER	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	3370.038812 $ 570,638.66
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	LIGHTNING	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	300.000798 $ 178,858.19
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	LIGHTNING	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	280.000056 $ 168,784.36
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	LIGHTNING	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	80.000678 $ 47,054.81
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	LIGHTNING	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	460.000032 $ 416,806.37
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC.	LIGHTNING	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	60.000096 $ 53,882.19
	US Flag	LINE	FOSS INTERNATIONAL, INC	LIGHTNING	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	420.000016 $ 331,383.01
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	CHARLESTON EXPRESS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	180.001278 $ 114,710.23
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	360.000556 $ 229,238.83
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	30.02032 $ 26,596.40
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	80.001676 $ 50,942.95
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	WASHINGTON EXPRESS	OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	20.028806 $ 24,190.42
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN ATLAS	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	2040.00192 $ 448,633.66
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN ATLAS	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ANGOLA	1250.000950 $ 713,053.03
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN ATLAS	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	150.000298 $ 61,183.11
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN ATLAS	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	610.001552 $ 133,552.45
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN CHARGER	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L-F	Food for Progress	MALI	2136.000941 $ 962,259.25
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN CHARGER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	2100.002578 $ 1,339,865.39
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN FREEDOM	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	790.000832 $ 505,622.18
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN FREEDOM	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	320.0004 $ 225,422.50
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN FREEDOM	POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	320.001472 $ 214,790.91
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C.	OCEAN FREEDOM	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	940.00123 $ 601,864.52
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK IOWA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	3000.001305 $ 565,947.56
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK MONTANA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	130.000298 $ 49,788.32
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK MONTANA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	110.034176 $ 37,762.85
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK MONTANA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	140.037364 $ 44,069.60
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK VIRGINIA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	720.001695 $ 227,325.76
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK VIRGINIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-F	McGovern-Dole	AFGHANISTAN	200.110088 $ 201,434.40

US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK VIRGINIA	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	50.000798	$	19,887.67
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK VIRGINIA	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE PKG-6/4 LB-F	McGovern-Dole	AFGHANISTAN	930.12544	$	792,942.74
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK VIRGINIA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD PKG-6/4 LB-F	McGovern-Dole	AFGHANISTAN	890.03328	$	838,578.23
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK WISCONSIN	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	30.207464	$	5,863.06
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK WISCONSIN	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	300.000624	$	83,282.85
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK WISCONSIN	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	870.001102	$	153,744.87
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK WISCONSIN	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	1240.000671	$	150,759.96
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK WISCONSIN	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	60.0012	$	14,133.62
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK WISCONSIN	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	710.194688	$	120,083.14
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK WISCONSIN	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRSK, BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	360.004368	$	67,833.41
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	BLACK EAGLE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	30000	$	5,202,900.00
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	NOBLE STAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	2820.35089	$	1,256,914.32
US Flag	TANK	MORAN TOWING CORP.	ATC 1800	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	12000	$	1,879,200.00
US Flag	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST BALTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	3500	$	1,067,500.00
P2	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK VIRGINIA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	130.000731	$	40,910.20
P2	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK VIRGINIA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	80.020838	$	16,276.24
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	ATLANTICA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	3130.001049	$	345,063.74
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	ATLANTICA	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	HONDURAS	7510	$	443,090.00
FF Flag	BULK	UNISHIPPING	DAWNLIGHT	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	10530	$	1,274,130.00
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	SALMON, KETA CAN-24/14.75 OZ-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	90.00074	$	11,733.62
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	SALMON, PINK CAN-24/14.75 OZ-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	10.0122	$	2,159.95
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CMA CGM GEORGIA	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	UGANDA	849.001155	$	369,851.50
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CMA CGM GEORGIA	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	UGANDA	40.010818	$	16,998.58
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CMA CGM MARLIN	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L-F	Food for Progress	MALI	2130.001842	$	483,636.02
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CMA CGM MARLIN	POTATO GRANULES, DEHY POUCH-10/1.36 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	240.000168	$	44,531.38
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CMA CGM TARPON	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ANGOLA	1200.000955	$	313,272.78
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	HS BACH	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	320.000718	$	70,541.24
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	NORTHERN GENERAL	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	140.037364	$	26,980.42
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	PAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	100.078849	$	25,724.69
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	ULF RITSCHER	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	160.000358	$	35,310.75
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	CATHRINE RICKMERS	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	120.084046	$	33,920.60
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	900.426538	$	197,918.72
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	120.336856	$	20,979.52
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	360.222112	$	71,466.91
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	550.000815	$	79,126.79
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	1410.00676	$	168,678.64
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	70.00658	$	10,250.66
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 870-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	260.173849	$	49,382.20
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	70.006326	$	16,336.35
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	70.033152	$	7,308.15
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	900.252416	$	123,091.39
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	50.033536	$	9,632.57
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	950.0004	$	188,416.75
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	100.000596	$	36,072.36
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	130.03441	$	23,843.99
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	320.000718	$	122,805.68
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	850.224144	$	256,430.33
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 5/28 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	1440.000238	$	155,831.89
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	320.184348	$	63,523.55
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DHAHRAN	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	890.003234	$	221,932.94
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DHAHRAN	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	10.002354	$	3,087.08
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	NEDLLOYD TASMAN	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 900-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	120.067988	$	40,386.40
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	KAETHE C. RICKMERS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	20.00481	$	7,758.22
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	300.000624	$	68,750.90
FF Flag	LINE	MOL AMERICA, INC.	MOL EFFICIENCY	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	1030.000629	$	137,750.84
FF Flag	LINE	SAFMARINE, INC.	SAFMARINE SUMBA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	2430.001896	$	662,042.99
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	160.001356	$	33,427.14
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	70.000718	$	17,880.96
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.000438	$	30,060.18
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	80.000078	$	20,441.06
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	290.001634	$	41,553.36
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	140.000438	$	35,771.68
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	230.00061	$	30,662.99
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	110.000163	$	27,305.81
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	310.201368	$	43,737.72
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.000544	$	58,357.32
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	490.000076	$	83,967.95
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	130.03441	$	30,779.76
FF Flag	TANK	Nordic Tankers Trading A/S	CLIPPER LANCER	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MOZAMBIQUE	4870	$	1,273,505.00
FF Flag	TANK	Nordic Tankers Trading A/S	CLIPPER OCEANICA	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MOZAMBIQUE	9000	$	1,433,970.00

2013

Fiscal Y Service	Vessel Type	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity (MT)	PO Net Amount (US
2014	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	16100	2208242
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	19800	2312964
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	13900	1987219
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	9100	1269358
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	6850	922420

US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALI	10000	1358500
US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	ETHIOPIA	20000	2885400
US Flag	BULK	MORAN TOWING CORP.	MONTVILLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	4750	1565125
US Flag	BULK	MORAN TOWING CORP.	VIRGINIA	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	17300	1245437
US Flag	BULK	SEALIFT, INC	CAPT. STEVEN BENNETT	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	ETHIOPIA	10000	1625947.59
US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	110.034176	16701.82
US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL PHILIPPINES	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	130.812045	22395.89
US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000038	36433.12
US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	1310.001672	644630.76
US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	440.1376	184560.38
US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EOT SPAR	POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	190.00016	78634.52
US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	280.000078	95290.89
US Flag	LINE	DOME CHARTERING & TRADING CORP.	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000038	35531.31
US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	230.000078	145669.19
US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	50.293256	47898.73
US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	110.000058	90571.55
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN CHARGER	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	220.020078	70289.74
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN CHARGER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	1560.000746	498231.1
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	20.000918	9008.43
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	6000.001948	2032084.79
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN TITAN	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	40.00982	9561.47
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN TITAN	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	110.000558	52169.64
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN TITAN	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	160.000358	75911.99
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	500.001989	150962.93
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	20.000918	4188.53
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	30.0096	8952.86
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	50.033536	10526.03
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	300.000796	82064.35
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DETROIT	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	5122.022426	1375452.92
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK UTAH	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	340.000636	97094.37
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	150.000398	32184.41
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	344.23515	223501.55
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.294748	47190.22
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	290.655524	128098.92
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	580.000674	252805.91
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	252.22785	52132.2
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	410.000787	190458.26
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	310.000909	139626.54
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	290.330158	70093.8
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	120.000518	25731.57
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	190.001236	74268.02
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	150.00018	36442.96
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	120.000144	55064.3
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	30.000512	10602.95
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	140.0004	104366.96
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	170.0001	41558.58
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	POTATO FLAKES, DEHYDRATED BAG-20 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	140.000168	93235.41
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	540.000834	343048.62
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	450.042112	91992.58
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	410.001334	184710.06
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	280.020796	149679.77
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	5600.001552	1947160.34
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	2070.000702	771956.77
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	2892.786372	1483535.08
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	660.001232	170315.53
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	600.003588	223798.89
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	ADVANTAGE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	2840.000208	1407188.05
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	BLACK EAGLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	9000	1757100
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT, INC	BLACK EAGLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	PHILIPPINES	27740	2885542
US Flag	TANK	USB HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST ARCTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	4180	1453845.8
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	ATLANTICA	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	PHILIPPINES	13500	1044900
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	ATLANTICA	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	ETHIOPIA	10000	1630000
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	150.000398	86972.17
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	320.000716	47134.38
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	80.013652	56202.42
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	80.020638	44580.64
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL AMAZONITE	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	120.000447	20425.61
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CENTAURUS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	410.10614	149989.45
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CMA CGM GEORGIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	130.056192	49091.38
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CMA CGM GEORGIA	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	90	17500
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CMA CGM GEORGIA	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	160.0002	24844.48
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	CMA CGM SAPPHIRE	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	110.034176	47034.7
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	FRISIA LISSABON	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	230.934312	47965.09
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	FRISIA LISSABON	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	130.03441	29316.36
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	NORTHERN GENERAL	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	480.000233	67112.5
FF Flag	LINE	CMA-CGM	ULF RITSCHER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.056044	28640.26
FF Flag	LINE	EVERGREEN LINE	EVER DEVELOP	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	330.000489	75220.18

FF Flag	LINE	EVERGREEN LINE	EVER RACER	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.000028	24388.66
FF Flag	LINE	EVERGREEN LINE	EVER RACER	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	50.033539	9213.77
FF Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN TITAN	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	70.000718	31528.36
FF Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN TITAN	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	440.000236	198178.46
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	OMA CGM MELISANDE	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	80.000256	27142.94
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	160.000358	47134.37
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	800.000752	134889.47
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	501.931941	145460.38
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	3410.000118	670251.32
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	70.011696	10873.96
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	60.003752	12515.88
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	160.046258	22236.56
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	170.05032	26286.61
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	220.000256	58192.03
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1600.378828	250940.01
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	POTATO GRANULES, DRY POUCH-10/1.36 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	439.582904	110713.13
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	170.000318	43096.27
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DENPASAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	260.000056	71643.95
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DETROIT	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	510.000604	91473.12
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	BEANS PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	90.000798	11488.62
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	570.810723	115267.47
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	240	45485.18
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	110.000558	21137.09
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC LORETTA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	50.033536	10335.81
FF Flag	LINE	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	POTOSI	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	3000	338700
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.013133	27987.72
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SHIPPAN ISLAND	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	410.001354	53270.73
FF Flag	TANK	Navigit Chemicals	NORDISLE	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MOZAMBIQUE	3350	778992.5
FF Flag	TANK	Navigit Chemicals	NORDISLE	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	4180	768304.2
FF Flag	TANK	Navigit Chemicals	SLOMAN HERA	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MOZAMBIQUE	3250	941492.5
FF Flag	TANK	Nordic Tankers Trading A/S	HARBOUR FASHION	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	3640	354720

2014

Fiscal Y	Sponsor	Vessel Type	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity (MT)	PO Net Amount ($)
2015	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	4750	492100
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	18700	1661682
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	24000	3267980
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	CORN, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	10000	1061600
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	1740	186633.2
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	5000	540900
	US Flag	BULK	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	CAPT. STEVEN BENNETT	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	9400	977130
	US Flag	BULK	U.S. UNITED OCEAN SERVICES	PAT CANTRELL	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALI	10000	71200
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	100.000896	15197.7
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	2000.000041	281981.99
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	1838.881882	259461.47
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	330.207848	90228.45
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	50.011136	11107.38
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	200.000158	27855.74
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	CHARLESTON EXPRESS	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	180.047184	130936.14
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	CHARLESTON EXPRESS	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	20.022016	18435.45
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	CHARLESTON EXPRESS	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	40.005828	28982.08
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	CHARLESTON EXPRESS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	40.010818	28019.06
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	2530.008858	675360.62
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	341.377638	96958.84
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	100.003982	25784.51
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	80.000072	18751.86
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	280	83256.25
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	680.001272	191529
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	4280.000344	1001039.38
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN FREEDOM	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	330.000078	98325.27
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	260.000191	47872.38
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	170.013368	35486.96
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	100.01949	28981.52
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	84.6066	15878.09
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	70.000718	10731.57
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	1320.082544	287600.35
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/15 MG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	130.000478	29959.51
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	180.000358	37194.47
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MILD, PORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	2050.000762	384118.38
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	190.001236	44930.16
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	250.000191	36753.83
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	250.000191	43639.98
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	1750.503311	391631.92
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	30.0096	6952.22
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	80.000678	28298.83
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD, PRBL BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	880.173008	147513.61
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	200.000198	30891.35
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DETROIT	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1530.000786	338577.33

US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DETROIT	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	2662.000169	718757.69
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK HARTFORD	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	460.120914	162748.19
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK MEMPHIS	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	130.056152	31570.96
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK MEMPHIS	RICE, 3/20 LG, W-MILD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	70.000718	16272.71
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	30.007864	9260.94
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	40.000638	9298.79
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	140.537352	41964.06
US Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC LUDOVICA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	386.000476	84784.28
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	180.000276	51222.52
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	120.000518	71543.4
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.000158	64178.41
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	190.000238	144118.42
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.000688	83431.04
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.000028	40141.85
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	826.000829	229280.96
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	180.000177	43398.87
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000582	47325.53
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	30.00487	9981.58
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	180.000278	43106.28
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	50.043848	20899.34
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	150.066422	108940.29
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	440.000512	230312.77
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	220.0014	73955.99
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.000158	39549.14
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	290.000876	102405.13
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	200.000168	91984.06
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 3/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	180.047184	43117.51
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 3/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	150.000398	81012.24
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	WHEAT, HARD RED SPRING BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	180.042274	126238.68
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	1410.002344	980723.04
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	160.000596	110233.44
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	140.000028	107409.96
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	110.000558	76272.93
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	ADVANTAGE	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	350.00007	259709.27
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	BANGLADESH	9740	1373340
US Flag	LINE	TRANS ATLANTIC LINES L.L.C.	GEYSIR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	Food for Progress	MAURITANIA	1600.002432	959379.48
US Flag	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST ARCTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	4000	1419800
US Flag	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST BALTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	4000	1308000
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	ATLANTICA	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	9400	513240
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	20.020016	16676.82
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	80.000798	38076.76
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	AKRITAS	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	230.002074	50566.63
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	AKRITAS	POTATO GRANULES, DEHYDRATED BAG-10 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	370.001604	68113.86
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	AXEL MAERSK	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	70.000718	17787.78
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	CENTAURUS	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	1020.001332	171188.68
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	CENTAURUS	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	100.028546	23347.88
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	CMA CGM GEORGIA	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	90.073492	14779.09
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	CMA CGM GEORGIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	30.021242	8026.29
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	CMA CGM GEORGIA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.000438	22835.94
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	CMA CGM MARLIN	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	1660.001384	205423.52
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	CMA CGM NEW JERSEY	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	830.000474	147021.15
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	CMA CGM WHITE SHARK	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	100.023158	27729.64
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	HS BACH	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	130.000478	31988.05
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	HS BACH	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	150.232257	16249.05
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	NORTHERN DELEGATION	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	954.180397	125444.22
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	NORTHERN DEXTERITY	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	342.778529	100110.17
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM	PARTICI	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	250.000191	34293.24
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	AS ARIES	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	90.000638	24619.41
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	AS ARIES	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	120.048184	33494.75
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	AS PEGASUS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	210.002154	57445.47
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	RICE, 3/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	2080.542858	286473.34
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM JAMAICA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	210.001156	41710.58
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM JAMAICA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	30.022164	11394.14
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM JAMAICA	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	200.001196	23647.84
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	GALANI	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	1150.00030	314579.27
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	JONNI RITSCHER	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	70.018882	19153.41
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	NORTHERN DEXTERITY	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	10.000384	3010.72
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	PARTICI	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	870.000033	118596.24
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	PARTICI	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	80.022658	14379.57
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	PARTICI	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	600.001592	109811.91
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	PARTICI	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	250.000996	53396.93
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	ROTTERDAM BRIDGE	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	101.945243	14253.68
FF Flag	LINE	EVERGREEN LINE	EVER DIAMOND	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.0184	33194.98
FF Flag	LINE	EVERGREEN LINE	EVER DIAMOND	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	90.000582	20666.22
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	130.006731	29635.43
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK COLUMBUS	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	75.393784	14900.73
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.000438	25110.3

FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	130.03441	25537.82
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	180.000278	31202.45
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORNMEAL, BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	200.000745	37692.11
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	190.000481	21175.33
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100.000806	13981.68
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	250.000191	42808.52
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	20.71544	7748.88
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	1730.00035	299645.45
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	180.479937	34010.29
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	320.000716	49659.51
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100.000598	14428.94
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	90.023552	8749.79
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	30.0096	5785.18
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	30.021242	6512.2
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	50.049648	9065.43
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	82.344742	19201.87
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	110.000132	18583.53
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L-F	Food for Progress	MALI	6000.000468	823174.31
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	60.000758	6613.31
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	340.143548	106410.58
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	240.000036	33198.38
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	260.047862	36804.04
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	600.000594	113095.18
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	180.000278	33547.15
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DENPASAR	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	70.018682	26379.79
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	670.000512	158552.6
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	1940.006811	372885.08
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	280.179204	54501.24
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	1020.2976	185358.08
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	Food for Progress	MAURITANIA	899.251548	185254.68
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	80.0001	17218.91
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	160.042274	27422.07
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC MICHAELA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	60.000758	12386.29
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	PANGAL	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	340.050773	67466.21
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	60.000717	12422.64
FF Flag	TANK	HANSA TANKERS A/S	MID OSPREY	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	PAKISTAN	4500	1078830
FF Flag	TANK	MTM Trading, LLC	MTM HAMBURG	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	6000	653820
FF Flag	TANK	MTM Trading, LLC	MTM SOUTHPORT	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	PAKISTAN	9190	1368113.3
2015							193386.3501	31588746.79

Fiscal Y	Service	Vessel Type	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity (MT)	PO Net Amount (U
2018	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY EAGLE	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	24000	3680200
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUINEA	18030	1034080.7
	US Flag	BULK	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC	CAPT. STEVEN BENNETT	CORN, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	HONDURAS	30700	1620240
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	880.000317	195256.43
	US Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	APL BELGIUM	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	70.034048	25871.95
	US Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	APL THAILAND	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	110.028502	31420.97
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN CRESCENT	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	5690	837228.8
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	CORN, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	2000	207980
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	210.002154	94334.24
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	90.011264	38547.3
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	140	58321.68
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	160.02431	72707.09
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	450.000196	114848.34
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	1710.001144	785015.14
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	3400.000372	1421474.8
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	10000	1039400
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	40.003832	7854.79
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	60.000758	11603.35
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	30.021242	6875.01
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	100.076846	17583.97
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	200.000198	35270.59
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	1010.002039	204488.79
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	520.00016	85876.55
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	10.002954	1433.29
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	351.262878	140252.15
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	30.000878	4298.72
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	20.00491	3908.73
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	2820.001499	565431.2
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 3/15 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	130.000478	29048.2
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	70.017684	15943.86
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	200.000198	32895.36
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	300.000624	56358.79
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	4188.687618	870369.85
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KENSINGTON	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	70.054326	17629.06
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KINLOSS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	320.000716	63092.03
	US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	200.112976	82810.58
	US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL, RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	180.047184	87678.33

US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.037244	118551.28
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	2440.001218	428004.08
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	200.000745	101722.77
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.000028	42533.2
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	492.511729	180963.79
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	361.288389	282692.33
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	300.000624	80547.28
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	400.96875	194291.15
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	180.000177	91550.24
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	300.000798	79658.53
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	140.372998	73320.18
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	251.860822	205302.9
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	PEANUTS, ROASTED, UNSL PKG-300/1 OZ-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	506.686572	162880.77
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	70.000718	39629.67
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	300.001794	169862.26
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	80.000678	40240.82
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	300.000798	114228.76
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	70.000718	56253.08
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	2200.000162	1210220.54
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000638	72593.71
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	5000	1945000
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	971.345416	419429.71
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	370.000516	175576
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	3180.001332	637229.12
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	IVORY COAST	12500.00389	2442761.29
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	280.000676	258196.4
US Flag	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST ARCTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	4000	758880
US Flag	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST BALTIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	4040	1243734.4
FF Flag	BULK	MLE Logistic & Chartering Corp.	OCEAN BEAUTY	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	TANZANIA	24000	858080
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	1050.885378	229567.18
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	170.000668	37293.94
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	CORN, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	HONDURAS	6000	108500
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	110.000128	32165.22
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	3180.000334	243807.64
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	Food for Progress	IVORY COAST	12500.0973	1006391.91
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	5680	348480
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	HONDURAS	18000	319500
FF Flag	BULK	UNISHIPPING	DD VOGUE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	9250	432437.5
FF Flag	BULK	UNIVERSAL NAVIGATION PTE LTD	OCEAN LUCK	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	BANGLADESH	12000	517680
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	AS PEGASUS	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	1130.000508	178601.9
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CHATEAU D'IF	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	340.224622	104474.5
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CHATEAU D'IF	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	840.000168	114893.64
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	130.000478	38857.28
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	210.002154	30403.17
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	180.000578	38768.64
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	420.000384	77021.29
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	350.124349	53335.55
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	500.085624	90446.38
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100.078646	23662.37
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	140.090524	37833.56
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	180.0002	25777.81
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.000438	22583.24
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	340.00391	48184.64
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	190.000238	33507.06
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM FLORIDA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	100.228546	20065.83
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	CMA CGM JAMAICA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	160.045312	25007.06
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	DERBY D	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	70.000718	27705.7
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	DERBY D	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	1160.00038	174348.79
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	DERBY D	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	870.000033	146302.19
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	DERBY D	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	470.12287	65476.04
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	DERBY D	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.000318	41563.2
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	FRISIA LISSABON	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	100.000668	38604.79
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	NS BAGH	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000582	29270.71
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	NORTHERN GENERAL	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	330.939853	96579.1
FF Flag	LINE	EVERGREEN LINE	EVER RACER	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	1890.001365	223927.82
FF Flag	LINE	EVERGREEN LINE	EVER RACER	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	370.42733	44194.15
FF Flag	LINE	EVERGREEN LINE	EVER RACER	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	360.000556	42182.83
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	CARDIFF	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	380.000476	69679.45
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	330.018838	71386.13
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	300.000624	45286.65
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	800.723516	124830.75
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	60.000758	9078.88
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	30.007864	3698.38
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	60.015726	12806.97
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	70.055404	11548.28
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	10.014764	4594.93
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	260.000384	44107.21

FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	380 000556	66012.19
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	1380.000666	194720.54
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DENPASAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100 000598	12825.73
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DENPASAR	OIL, VEGETABLE PAL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100 0008	11500.09
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	NORTHERN MAGNUM	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	90 023592	15424.88
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	NORTHERN MONUMENT	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	120.045184	34030.97
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	1950 000106	347750.9
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	410 000797	84893.75
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	174.99099	33190.98
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	ETHIOPIA	2330.334978	330897.93
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	110.034178	15254.81
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	470.121972	59250.43
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	20 00491	4296.65
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	110.028932	22029.36
FF Flag	TANK	MTM Trading, LLC	MTM HAMBURG	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MOZAMBIQUE	4610	1211800.7
FF Flag	TANK	Navigo Chemicals	NAVIGO AXINITE	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	PAKISTAN	7500	1009650
FF Flag	TANK	UNI-CHARTERING USA, LLC	SWAN BISCAY	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	4000	525000
FF Flag	TANK	UNI-CHARTERING USA, LLC	SWAN BISCAY	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	4030	563335
FF Flag	TANK	UNI-CHARTERING USA, LLC	SWAN BISCAY	TALLOW, TECHNICAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	1100	120549
FF Flag	TANK	UNI-CHARTERING USA, LLC	SWAN BISCAY	TALLOW, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	1061.272	128017.52

2016

Flight Y Service	Vessel Type	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity(MT)	PO Net Amount (U
2017 US Flag	BULK	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	SCI BASILISK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	2670.384	383752.15
US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	1118.33022	267402.16
US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	750.000573	183181.23
US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL CHINA	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	300.001196	143998.83
US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL CHINA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	70.000718	18833.84
US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	120.031436	34277.52
US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	1190.131008	196422.52
US Flag	LINE	APL LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	30.000878	4980.07
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	120.631254	47290.46
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	4430.001342	1190437.01
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	3418.024432	932906.08
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1110.004342	298033.89
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	220.001116	93055.18
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	2880.001454	1128077.92
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	2130.00146	903539.4
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	6000	2250020
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	12500	1209750
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUINEA	14000	3950217
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	14000	2504600
US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	BANGLADESH	9950	4083485
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ARKANSAS	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	320.224999	112287.4
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	340.03399	57240.19
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	100.000598	35671.56
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	890.001248	1225213.08
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	400.108196	137912.01
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	90.0004	11611.2
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	130.090192	50658.05
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	380.08882	58111.57
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	480.000136	100481
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1500.000886	350200.63
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	110.000163	36336.46
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	360.000922	62755.98
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	70.017884	10593.86
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	120.084045	35980.3
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	164.689434	47892.07
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	20.00481	3026.8
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	320.000716	50861.44
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	60.000756	9798.72
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	80.000678	13096.24
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DENVER	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	300.024312	67837.2
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK HARTFORD	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	380.000436	78547.18
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KINLOSS	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	90.033984	30084.72
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KINLOSS	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	200 00239	43897.54
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	10.003954	2285.24
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK PITTSBURGH	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	70.056326	17478.09
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	670.061312	253597.71
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	30 000876	23054.77
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	120.031454	42149.78
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	180.000276	84408.95
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	1360.001546	250741.77
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	30.000852	17933.94
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	80.127821	27115.12
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	370.000636	169817.92
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	330.001478	110486.81
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	400.00149	211348.31

US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	360.000334	161427.51
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	100.000696	44374.01
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	120.000516	53403.26
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	150.000256	93083.96
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	940.000232	497597.32
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	180.000278	76853.03
US Flag	LINE	SEALIFT HOLDINGS INC.	BLACK EAGLE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	HAITI	20000	1780000
US Flag	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	9000	825040
US Flag	TANK	US SHIPPING CORPORATION	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALAWI	2840	1417944
US Flag	TANK	US SHIPPING CORPORATION	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MOZAMBIQUE	3450	1858366
US Flag	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST PACIFIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	4000	693440
US Flag	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST PACIFIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	3500	1219260
FF Flag	BULK	BROBULK LTD	INLACO EXPRESS	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	8000	632820
FF Flag	BULK	BROBULK LTD	INLACO EXPRESS	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	5000	433750
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	CORN, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	10000	502000
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	AEC DILIGENCE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	2500	130000
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	M/V MARCARDLINA	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUINEA	14080	1195100
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	NS TRADER 1	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	BANGLADESH	5650	521671
FF Flag	BULK	Thorco Shipping A/S	THORCO LOGIC	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	3550.000077	531250.12
FF Flag	BULK	Thorco Shipping A/S	THORCO LOGIC	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	1671.26736	220126.4
FF Flag	BULK	Thorco Shipping A/S	THORCO LOGIC	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALAWI	4600.001967	545280.33
FF Flag	BULK	Thorco Shipping A/S	THORCO LOGIC	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1350.001598	202028.79
FF Flag	BULK	Tradewinds Shipping Inc.	GANT FLAIR	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	KENYA	14000	869480
FF Flag	BULK	UNISHIPPING	DD VOGUE	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUINEA	12000	914500
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	540.000634	84009.16
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	160.047154	34297.11
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	690.518238	171146.77
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	450.000196	142485.03
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	180.441398	35576.67
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	30.000852	9544.34
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	340.000773	57453.51
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	30.000853	6352.76
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	70.000716	42014.46
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	150.389618	24261.25
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	30.293332	39980.11
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	62.344742	19918.35
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	50.049848	10802.52
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	194.689484	26579.52
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100.0008	22111.29
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	310.098762	78541.88
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	30.003672	23921.76
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	70.002718	11152.42
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	90.028756	45892.17
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	690.106018	100334.11
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	550.144506	56149.64
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	180.042274	23252.64
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	170.000318	48711.5
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL AMAZONITE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	110.000598	20501.11
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL AMAZONITE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	100.000598	17635.38
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL FRANCE	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000638	26962.31
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL FRANCE	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000592	24893.78
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL FRANCE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	90.000592	35353.21
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM CORNEILLE	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1470.001109	185991.32
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM CORNEILLE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	100.026548	35279.9
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM CORNEILLE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	750.197598	261991.35
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM MOLIERE	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	130.037868	24975.41
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM SAPPHIRE	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	360.000596	62689.88
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM SAPPHIRE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	350.000595	59035.66
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM SEINE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	560.003754	98122.73
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HAMBURG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	130.026546	21849.71
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HAMBURG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	90.033664	32054.4

FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HAMBURG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	600.003589	137676.19
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HAMMONIA VENETIA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	90.003592	11636.32
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	50.049849	21713.6
FF Flag	LINE	CMA CGM SA	DERBY D	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	660.000978	189609.1
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	150.003398	22906.05
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	100.025548	18837.97
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BURKINA FASO	810.000752	272705.66
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	130.000731	26845.15
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	80.078271	17362.46
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	400.000503	76190.57
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	841.222074	122231.63
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	221.56176	26853.84
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	190.015208	31605.74
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	500.041912	108726.54
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	10.013842	2031.01
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	140.090934	30368.4
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	SENEGAL	20.029806	4713.89
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 800-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	154.411028	20788.78
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	340.089472	44826.34
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	110.034176	44701.38
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	70.0002	9644.47
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	140.0004	23177.84
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	150.021358	49706.52
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	230.059958	31303.66
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	100.000598	13827.74
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	270.000916	57805.99
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	1620.000508	340246.56
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	90.000635	12895.98
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MSC LAURA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	350.000596	63477.06
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	SEALAND NEW YORK	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	130.026546	18938.36
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	300.000624	63522.93
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	190.000401	30415.47
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	1050.278194	110521.78
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	92.845248	21535.73
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	220.138564	32365.87
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	238.75577	34902.22
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	200.022144	28443.91
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	110.034170	13294.98
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	610.182234	87452.22
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	870.000512	121565.9
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	110.0007	12833.42
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	270.000916	43697.26
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	20.00401	2184.96
FF Flag	TANK	FAIRFIELD CHEMICAL CARRIERS B.V.	FAIRCHEM COLT	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALAWI	3260	752875.2
FF Flag	TANK	FAIRFIELD CHEMICAL CARRIERS B.V.	FAIRCHEM COLT	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	MOZAMBIQUE	6920	906722.8
FF Flag	TANK	Nordic Tankers Trading A/S	MT NORDIC MARI	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	5810	933290
FF Flag	TANK	NORSTAR CHARTERING (USA) LLC	NCC NOOR	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	PAKISTAN	7120	951872.9
FF Flag	TANK	UNI-CHARTERING USA, LLC	ANHOUT SWAN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	PAKISTAN	7130	1077770.8

2017

Fiscal Y	Service	Vessel Type	Vendor Name	Vessel Name	Material	Functional Area	Recipient Country	PO Quantity(MT)	PO Net Amount (U
2018	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GLORY	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	BANGLADESH	1230	188622.1
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	RICE, MILLED BULK-F	Food for Progress	BURKINA FASO	15440	2771766.8
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	5000	758200
	US Flag	BULK	LIBERTY GLORY CORPORATION	LIBERTY GRACE	SOYBEANS, YELLOW BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	6000	909840
	US Flag	BULK	United Ocean Services Inc.	TEXAS ENTERPRISE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	ETHIOPIA	15000	2202900
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	950.166147	257381.71
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	90.040676	23340.26
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	10.011908	1899.97
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	90.01216	31042.14
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	600.158278	149738.69
	US Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL CHINA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	650.020354	123100.05
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	190.785714	140023.46
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	120.001516	43647.84
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	40.009952	28704.59
	US Flag	LINE	HAPAG-LLOYD	PHILADELPHIA EXPRESS	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	80.021836	25106.07
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN CRESCENT	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	3600	1175112
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	210.000158	122351.39
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	1360.000428	303849.35
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	30.01152	17444.2
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	70.050218	38207.42
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	450.105994	234882.38
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	250.000996	136217.58
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	1450.000168	812145.4
	US Flag	LINE	INDUSTRIAL MARITIME CARRIERS, L.L.C	OCEAN GRAND	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	650.25065	428851.08
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	120.000447	25167.27
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	411.724632	83505.97
	US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	70.005718	13196.51

US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	190.000238	35791.63
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	900.00139	133306.85
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK ATLANTA	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	400.000306	71342.78
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CAROLINA	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	150.000312	25987.9
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	440.094228	109019.05
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	20.002968	3363.82
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	300.000624	57142.98
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	530.572707	96373.66
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	130.000478	22335.15
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	90.023592	13630.8
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, SUNFLOWERSEED PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	90	20900
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	OIL, SUNFLWRSD BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	40.390978	39932.44
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	20.00491	3848.84
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	2702.011149	454847.57
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	490.126776	103624.42
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	930.000272	328947.99
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	220.001116	52765.81
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	390.000436	67805.29
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK CHICAGO	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	510.000854	93296.75
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK COLUMBUS	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	3320.000892	741843.85
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK KENSINGTON	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	100.026546	28163.79
US Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK MEMPHIS	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	70.034048	25168.49
US Flag	LINE	NATIONAL SHIPPING OF AMERICA, LLC	NATIONAL GLORY	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	830.000672	241182.56
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	300.000796	58272.77
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	40.000838	26700.02
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	170.00088	123323.84
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	100.946364	28756.1
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	780.001425	443607.67
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	531.337632	389031.26
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	50.468592	23317.54
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	120.061918	69406.73
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	160.929598	132177.02
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	20.022016	13964.02
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	310.000758	84439.16
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	EOT SPAR	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	130.000478	70980.42
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	440.00323	177488.89
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	180.000278	118338.82
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	450.002775	241946.72
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	420.001871	178716.83
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	140.045696	103471.28
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	90	60400
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	300.000798	153008.42
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	40.180518	23990.74
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	270.000916	179098.6
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	40.010818	35883.27
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	2500.000978	1275050.6
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	HONDURAS	12500	1062500
US Flag	LINE	Schuyler Line Navigation Co., LLC	NORFOLK	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALI	7500	1357500
US Flag	LINE	US OCEAN LLC	NORFOLK	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	780.000672	204006.56
US Flag	LINE	US OCEAN LLC	OCEAN CRESCENT	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	6500	1240032
US Flag	LINE	US OCEAN LLC	OCEAN GLOBE	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	2320.0007	1798874.28
US Flag	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	DOMINICAN REPUBLIC	7000	868500
US Flag	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB CORPUS CHRISTI/PETROCHEM S	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	8000	2238500
US Flag	TANK	USS CHARTERING LLC	ATB PETROCHEM TRADER BROWNSVIL	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	NICARAGUA	4000	1518000
US Flag	TANK	USS HOLDING LLC	SEA CREST PACIFIC DAWN	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	GUATEMALA	4000	555800
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	CONSOLIDATOR	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK-F	McGovern-Dole	BANGLADESH	1220	76727
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	M/V NIKI C	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	HONDURAS	12500	987500
FF Flag	BULK	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	NS TRADER 1	WHEAT, NORTHERN SPRING BULK-F	Food for Progress	SRI LANKA	39800	2051251
FF Flag	BULK	Thoreo Shipping A/S	THOREO ACE	SOYBEAN MEAL BULK-F	Food for Progress	EL SALVADOR	6600	587400
FF Flag	BULK	Tradewords Shipping Inc.	FAIRY ISLAND	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	MALI	7500	554175
FF Flag	BULK	UNISHIPPING	DD VOGUE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	ETHIOPIA	15000	1630050
FF Flag	BULK	UNISHIPPING	DD VOGUE	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK-F	Food for Progress	GHANA	10000	747800
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	APL ALEXANDRITE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	390.000219	110243.23
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM AMBER	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	LIBERIA	150.000298	49721.07
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM MOLIERE	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	180.000278	44008.06
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM MOLIERE	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	460.00122	69311.3
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM MOLIERE	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	250.042912	62631.65
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	CMA CGM MOLIERE	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	140.037364	31992.5
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	BEANS, KIDNEY, DARK RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	130.000478	32605.51
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	200.003198	55110.28
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HONDURAS	250.020056	53962.23
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	190.000236	67384.88
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	140.000438	26653.39
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	320.000718	70861.88
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	550.000794	95340.92
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	460.001154	118357.01
FF Flag	LINE	APL, LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	100.000598	17535.18

FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	RICE, 3/15 MG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KYRGYZSTAN	80.001678	48017.04
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	560.000794	71092.20
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	210.154848	29270.06
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	HARRIER HUNTER	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NICARAGUA	240.000036	70701.41
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	LISBON	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	570.001712	109449.22
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	LISBON	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	420.000316	74909.88
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	LISBON	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MOZAMBIQUE	700.002114	131003.47
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	LISBON	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	710.104644	103771.33
FF Flag	LINE	APL LTD	LISBON	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	2290.00082	313917.96
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	ASTRID SCHULTE	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	30.021242	8088.91
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	CONTI EVEREST	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	30.007964	10794.41
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	120.001518	18196.54
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1670.001304	272755.73
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	630.0021	94559.99
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	400.000503	57953.47
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	70.000718	23006.25
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	110.028002	14442.62
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	60.04604	12067.98
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	10.013842	1509.88
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	CONGO-REPUB. OF	154.411028	36341.86
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	150.001152	32288.18
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	280.08	40857.5
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	150.098704	28605.53
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	280.079744	103288.23
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	50.0004	6888.94
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	70.000718	23006.25
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	160.03932	19694.56
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMEROON	70.000718	9679.46
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	TANZANIA	1010.26542	142732.89
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	MALI	880.000274	223487.08
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	SIERRA LEONE	120.000516	18998.08
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUINEA-BISSAU	1460.001148	240771.74
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	BENIN	190.002238	31984.01
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	900.000392	86196.44
FF Flag	LINE	MAERSK LINE	MAERSK DANANG	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	IVORY COAST	470.000116	67344.71
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	1020.268374	88354.77
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	80.000678	13586.49
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	102.502578	19862.07
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	185.292496	25365.83
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	370.503796	49996.54
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	CAMBODIA	90.033864	10871.36
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	NEPAL	400.114176	57818.12
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	McGovern-Dole	RWANDA	120.045184	17355.64
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	KENYA	1460.142862	242786.92
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	HAITI	310.081594	45804.99
FF Flag	LINE	MEDITERRANEAN SHIPPING COMPANY	MSC ALESSIA	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	LAOS	700.193828	56263.06
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	300.060796	42084.28
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	700.190612	98223.18
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	120.0006	16000.08
FF Flag	LINE	SEABOARD MARINE	SEABOARD OCEAN	RICE, 2/7 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	McGovern-Dole	GUATEMALA	321.233242	41644.27
FF Flag	TANK	Nordic Tankers Trading A/S	GT STAR	OIL, SOYBEAN, CRUDE, DEGUMMED BULK-F	Food for Progress	SENEGAL	5000	560000

2018

FY 2014				
Flagging	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
Foreign Flag		**468,070**	**$168,532,427**	**$37,977,378**
	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	1,390	$1,356,205	$209,433
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	600	$477,020	$92,288
	BULGURBAG-50 KG-F	580	$235,028	$134,856
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT BAG-50 KG-F	1,450	$652,753	$573,095
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	11,980	$4,935,800	$1,910,810
	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	15,340	$10,193,141	$3,107,646
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,620	$1,108,957	$388,594
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	640	$293,619	$110,234
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	4,740	$2,518,558	$745,644
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	20,270	$28,758,483	$3,125,183
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	150	$248,039	$22,500
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	740	$961,411	$181,086
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 720-F	80	$103,881	$14,000
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	560	$428,777	$82,040
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	18,040	$9,039,972	$3,181,355
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG-F	3,530	$1,458,153	$437,362
	PEAS/LENTILS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 K	250	$129,231	$42,894
	RICE	12,780	$6,811,740	$932,940
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	3,010	$1,758,781	$361,200
	RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	12,320	$6,940,295	$2,126,257
	SORGHUM	190,900	$43,068,413	$11,004,171
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	103,600	$29,361,013	$3,902,899
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	63,410	$17,621,196	$5,280,272
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	90	$71,963	$10,620
US Flag		**558,190**	**$212,234,813**	**$85,683,209**
	BEANS, BLACK BAG-50 KG-F	2,800	$3,054,930	$750,820
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	1,390	$1,237,147	$394,613
	BULGURBAG-50 KG-F	2,510	$970,124	$618,432
	CORN, YELLOW BAG-50 KG-F	600	$185,550	$203,388
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG-F	25,160	$10,398,252	$6,541,640
	CORN-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	23,820	$16,111,826	$6,287,734
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG-F	18,720	$9,180,485	$4,848,306
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	6,270	$3,571,986	$1,513,623
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	20,950	$29,694,412	$4,799,348
	OIL, VEGETABLE DRUM-208 L-F	210	$260,994	$61,740
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L-F	110	$181,895	$28,435
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L-F	4,480	$5,917,326	$727,212
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	50	$38,433	$15,200
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	40,400	$20,442,145	$9,557,956
	RICE	13,130	$7,573,909	$1,504,961
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	6,060	$3,381,368	$1,090,923
	RICE, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-F	7,430	$4,223,042	$1,766,169
	RUTF	300	$1,022,100	$124,926
	SORGHUM	284,960	$63,892,320	$32,033,655
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	49,050	$15,161,679	$6,107,159
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	48,160	$14,400,155	$6,525,680
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND BAG-HP-25 KG-F	1,630	$1,334,734	$181,290
Grand Total		**1,026,260**	**$380,767,241**	**$123,660,587**

FY 2015				
Flagging	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
Foreign Flag		**359,430**	**$135,790,964**	**$34,079,391**
	BEANS, GARBANZO	210	$145,285	$24,660
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	70	$69,666	$21,496
	BEANS, PINTO	1,260	$793,410	$292,140
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	710	$253,713	$242,750
	CORNMEAL	280	$87,802	$48,720
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	8,920	$3,871,157	$1,213,795
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	21,730	$11,660,443	$3,721,875
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	180	$448,800	$28,980
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	380	$1,273,200	$99,451
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	2,980	$1,448,328	$481,082
	FLOUR, BREAD	6,400	$2,992,355	$817,700
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	108,930	$24,786,886	$6,126,822
	LENTILS	11,540	$9,146,560	$1,607,705
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	2,820	$2,105,301	$419,363
	OIL, VEGETABLE	14,000	$17,014,383	$2,108,288
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	4,000	$4,915,828	$474,660
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT	300	$118,489	$45,900
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	27,820	$14,745,216	$5,227,484
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	3,660	$1,837,614	$748,104
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	800	$341,600	$80,000
	RICE	17,130	$9,123,239	$2,599,057
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG-	1,000	$477,190	$119,000
	SORGHUM	75,830	$17,206,071	$5,265,090
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	48,480	$10,928,428	$2,265,270
US Flag		**521,270**	**$188,192,728**	**$75,619,538**
	BEANS, PINTO	1,260	$817,293	$368,030
	BULGUR	610	$200,147	$178,650
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	1,440	$496,092	$271,325
	CORN	5,330	$1,059,444	$628,674
	CORNMEAL	1,230	$408,257	$284,520
	CORNMEAL, SOY-FORT	11,250	$5,626,652	$2,538,411
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	23,370	$12,273,086	$5,658,588
	EMERGNCY FD, RUTF	530	$1,766,455	$112,890
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	7,930	$3,697,482	$1,925,078
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	64,940	$15,146,979	$6,942,377
	LENTILS	6,060	$4,763,049	$1,208,998
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	180	$133,200	$43,920
	OIL, VEGETABLE	24,880	$29,659,019	$5,771,527
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	2,100	$2,578,402	$467,385
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	48,320	$24,497,206	$11,651,959
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	16,490	$8,601,900	$4,687,999
	RICE	12,520	$6,713,769	$2,898,147
	SORGHUM	272,420	$64,768,916	$27,096,492
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	20,280	$4,895,389	$2,859,480
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND	130	$89,990	$25,090
Grand Total		**880,700**	**$323,983,692**	**$109,698,929**

FY 2016				
Flagging	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
Foreign Flag		**786,420**	**$236,173,336**	**$54,142,375**
	BEANS, BLACK	350	$249,340	$50,050
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	60	$57,020	$19,680
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG-	60	$51,919	$8,280
	BEANS, PINTO	5,230	$3,816,642	$837,707
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	1,920	$1,596,632	$323,200
	BEANS, SMALL RED	60	$48,985	$10,440
	BULGUR BAG-50 KG-F	600	$168,078	$121,200
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	670	$223,144	$243,700
	CORN, YELLOW	1,970	$561,194	$173,890
	CORNMEAL	8,170	$2,646,674	$1,179,481
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	13,180	$5,895,977	$2,403,727
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG-	1,100	$528,173	$353,100
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	2,880	$4,220,681	$621,396
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 K	120	$179,291	$17,640
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	20	$52,600	$3,100
	WHEAT, HARD RED	284,490	$54,762,959	$13,220,081
	LENTILS	6,140	$8,855,209	$864,699
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	180	$162,000	$36,990
	OIL, VEGETABLE	30,690	$36,580,691	$4,204,443
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	2,490	$2,756,070	$411,965
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L 670-	240	$275,695	$47,280
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	1,980	$872,932	$258,998
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	55,270	$34,014,389	$10,379,369
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	3,660	$1,653,621	$578,550
	RICE	25,310	$11,322,673	$3,148,064
	RICE, FORT	1,000	$528,410	$99,000
	SORGHUM	233,110	$41,938,280	$9,237,759
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	105,470	$22,154,059	$5,288,585
US Flag		**921,900**	**$275,254,386**	**$137,126,792**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	400	$356,678	$81,387
	BEANS, PINTO	6,060	$4,915,242	$1,674,998
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG-F	2,000	$1,722,004	$903,959
	BULGUR	600	$175,614	$107,400
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	50	$14,453	$10,150
	CORNMEAL	27,110	$8,887,715	$7,069,108
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	19,200	$8,787,205	$4,055,043
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	5,380	$8,089,230	$1,385,250
	EMERGNCY FD, RUSF	300	$799,350	$61,050
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	6,700	$2,925,297	$1,346,300
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER	333,660	$66,752,262	$40,554,212
	LENTILS	2,340	$2,488,240	$420,430
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG-F	5,040	$5,823,956	$2,235,760
	OIL, VEGETABLE	26,050	$30,224,680	$4,700,395
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L-F	190	$222,446	$99,366
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	1,030	$448,230	$209,090
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	78,140	$50,395,483	$18,057,535
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG-F	400	$217,401	$175,635
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	2,380	$1,137,790	$436,820
	RICE	13,860	$6,121,502	$2,399,579
	SORGHUM	262,340	$47,049,584	$29,357,161
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG-F	4,370	$1,062,085	$1,883,410

	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	123,150	$25,871,967	$19,721,204
	WHEAT-SOY BLEND	1,150	$765,975	$181,550
Grand Total		**1,708,320**	**$511,427,722**	**$191,269,167**

FY 2017				
Flagging	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
Foreign Flag		**634,610**	**$203,018,697**	**$51,773,322**
	BEANS, PINTO	860	$672,825	$241,660
	CORNMEAL	5,260	$2,033,446	$772,260
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	28,950	$18,076,771	$4,569,697
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	1,860	$2,875,871	$266,750
	LENTILS	10,760	$8,537,697	$1,212,908
	OIL, VEGETABLE	34,760	$42,469,704	$5,329,970
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT	9,930	$6,454,639	$1,488,580
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	6,870	$3,065,799	$737,507
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	39,350	$24,115,340	$5,998,884
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	1,870	$774,333	$192,426
	RICE	1,190	$473,845	$174,880
	RICE, FORT	5,350	$2,247,730	$587,100
	SORGHUM	173,920	$30,385,274	$11,621,937
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTE	105,580	$19,255,232	$6,937,191
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	208,100	$41,580,193	$11,641,573
US Flag		**752,130**	**$245,974,070**	**$125,602,473**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN	60	$44,970	$18,420
	BEANS, PINTO	160	$130,160	$34,080
	BULGUR	200	$57,118	$37,000
	BULGUR, SOY-FORT	210	$88,402	$50,280
	CORNMEAL	17,870	Z	$4,322,984
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS	24,940	$15,478,936	$5,567,307
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS	650	$926,924	$154,750
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE	1,240	$517,350	$247,521
	LENTILS	4,900	$4,254,836	$1,043,632
	OIL, VEGETABLE	50,040	$62,056,676	$10,887,622
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT	8,850	$5,183,175	$1,950,230
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE	6,200	$2,871,937	$1,253,007
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT	54,690	$32,399,985	$12,056,883
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE	5,810	$2,587,386	$1,085,030
	RICE	2,140	$891,478	$461,857
	RICE, FORT	9,460	$3,925,049	$2,262,663
	SORGHUM	190,620	$34,958,770	$27,633,950
	WHEAT, SOFT RED WINTE	253,190	$46,616,213	$37,343,172
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE	120,900	$25,928,055	$19,192,085
Grand Total		**1,386,740**	**$448,992,767**	**$177,375,795**

FY 2018				
Flagging	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
Foreign Flag		**529,370**	**$172,198,101**	**$58,824,800**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	$270	$165,099	$38,687
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	$7,840	$3,600,260	$1,096,043
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	$12,590	$8,620,430	$1,895,510
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	$4,440	$8,469,273	$839,180
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	$1,700	$932,448	$200,099
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	$31,610	$36,026,537	$5,514,974
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	$80	$106,113	$18,511
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4	$120	$125,353	$23,688
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	$15,040	$7,758,010	$2,731,289
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	$20,190	$9,018,926	$3,081,956
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	$2,700	$1,080,687	$348,091
	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	$3,170	$1,570,339	$443,816
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	$340	$157,104	$50,421
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 K	$1,090	$555,543	$167,104
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	$1,890	$975,962	$298,766
	RICE, MILLED BULK	$13,430	$6,864,447	$1,512,978
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	$24,460	$5,557,179	$4,222,857
	SORGHUM BULK	$110,530	$21,137,270	$11,008,196
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	$57,340	$12,773,734	$7,538,542
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	$220,540	$46,703,387	$17,794,092
US Flag		**695,870**	**$236,666,696**	**$127,525,743**
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	$1,160	$732,099	$235,951
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	$8,380	$3,959,086	$1,544,684
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 K	$24,490	$16,778,626	$5,329,098
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5	$1,960	$3,822,168	$523,479
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-50 KG	$1,050	$488,015	$215,681
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	$22,280	$11,986,675	$5,993,038
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	$43,590	$51,167,007	$11,720,537
	OIL, VEGETABLE PAIL-20 L	$200	$291,447	$31,333
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4	$400	$427,374	$156,074
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	$9,270	$4,987,677	$2,105,547
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	$7,870	$3,738,963	$1,405,686
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	$45,690	$20,595,065	$11,893,482
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	$8,330	$3,346,654	$1,283,672
	RICE, 3/15 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	$110	$55,429	$20,721
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	$10,960	$5,190,133	$2,568,316
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 K	4,420	$2,273,299	$846,750
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	4,460	$1,064,507	$890,858
	SORGHUM BULK	215,250	$42,950,829	$27,123,401
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	142,700	$30,192,205	$26,983,464
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BAG-50 KG	2,030	$558,149	$404,778
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	141,270	$32,061,289	$26,249,193
Grand Total		**1,225,240**	**$408,864,793**	**$186,350,542**

FY 2019				
Flagging	Commodity Type	Metric Tons	Commodity	Freight Cost
Foreign Flag		**1,007,660**	**$313,152,049**	**$94,152,431**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	12,220	$12,009,692	$2,171,134
	BEANS, KIDNEY, LIGHT RED BAG-50 KG	620	$847,341	$79,519
	BEANS, PEA BAG-50 KG	5,520	$4,835,596	$914,285
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	90	$50,665	$15,240
	BEANS, SMALL WHITE BAG-50 KG	60	$36,062	$10,581
	BEANS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG (PEA BA	5,190	$4,630,258	$798,384
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	5,100	$2,094,858	$801,695
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	11,800	$7,863,275	$1,860,843
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	8,660	$15,919,608	$2,367,188
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	5,810	$2,609,679	$907,634
	OIL, VEGETABLE BOTTLE, PLS-6/4 L	260	$273,514	$62,495
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	57,380	$68,224,825	$9,933,323
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	210	$244,906	$55,119
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	11,440	$4,557,630	$1,640,967
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	1,630	$508,602	$235,189
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	370	$199,371	$60,801
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD, FORT BAG-50 KG	660	$319,229	$101,843
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD, PRBL BAG-50 KG	840	$671,950	$159,919
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	14,040	$3,148,693	$2,653,271
	SORGHUM BULK	216,060	$44,114,808	$14,792,883
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	168,420	$33,113,623	$19,428,570
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	481,280	$106,877,864	$35,101,546
US Flag		**663,292**	**$221,698,205**	**$143,456,300**
	BEANS, GREAT NORTHERN BAG-50 KG	150	$137,402	$30,661
	BEANS, PINTO BAG-50 KG	1,160	$694,501	$332,354
	BEANS, SMALL RED BAG-50 KG	2,400	$2,125,998	$628,097
	BEANS, SUBSTITUTABLE BAG-50 KG (PEA BA	1,900	$1,705,541	$323,516
	CORNMEAL BAG-HP-25 KG	37,790	$17,303,952	$8,702,233
	CORN-SOY BLEND PLUS BAG-HP-25 KG	13,880	$8,837,023	$4,100,866
	CSB SUPER CEREAL PLUS BOX-10/1.5 KG	3,332	$6,064,045	$1,599,722
	FLOUR, ALL PURPOSE BAG-25 KG	2,270	$1,108,486	$563,491
	LENTILS BAG-50 KG	8,490	$3,995,762	$2,077,919
	OIL, VEGETABLE CAN-6/4 L	37,250	$44,176,197	$11,563,716
	OIL, VEGETABLE SUBSTITUTABLE-6/4 L	640	$745,274	$224,735
	PEAS, GREEN, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	600	$282,317	$141,282
	PEAS, GREEN, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	770	$356,641	$172,053
	PEAS, YELLOW, SPLIT BAG-50 KG	65,030	$26,458,492	17329033.89
	PEAS, YELLOW, WHOLE BAG-50 KG	2,630	$1,001,722	742360.2841
	RICE, 5/20 LG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	19,070	$8,922,913	4900256.077
	RICE, 5/20 MG, W-MLD BAG-50 KG	2,520	$1,370,262	1021919.76
	SORGHUM BAG-50 KG	9,050	$2,111,585	2567712.636
	SORGHUM BULK	173,250	$34,327,057	27742077.82
	WHEAT, HARD RED WINTER BULK	251,510	$53,309,749	51493865.98
	WHEAT, SOFT WHITE BULK	29,600	$6,663,286	7198428
Grand Total		**1,670,952**	**$534,850,254**	**$237,608,731**

**Note: FY 19 numbers are estimates and will change as actuals are reconciled*

20. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide information regarding cargoes carried on foreign-flag vessels pursuant to Determinations of Non-Availability of U.S.-flag vessels, including dates, cargo details, and the facts underlying or justifying such determinations.

Mr. Isley: Attachment H provides the information for USDA's Food for Progress Program and McGovern-Dole Program.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

ATTACHMENT H - Foreign Food Assistance Programs Non-Availability U.S. Flag Vessel Shipments

FISCAL YEAR	CARGO	QUANTITY (MT)	COMMODITY VALUE	COUNTRY	VESSEL	FLAG	FREIGHT VALUE ($)
FY 18	WHEAT, DARK NORTHERN SPRING	39,800.00	$ 12,956,996.60	SRI LANKA	RELIANCE BULK CARRIERS L.L.C.	FOREIGN	$ 2,051,251.00

Determination of Non-availability of U.S. Flag: Award made to foreign flag (P3) Reliance Bulk Carriers (vessel: NS Trader1) out of the Pacific Northwest (Longview & Vancouver). US Flag (P1) options "non-available" at Pacific Northwest. P1 OSG offer only originated for US Gulf Coast. Commodity bids showed that only 21,500 MTs of wheat was available for US Gulf delivery, and was more expensive than delivery to Pacific Northwest. Commodity awarded for delivery to Pacific Northwest Port Terminals due to commodity availability and lowest projected landed cost. Furthermore, all calculated award options to the P1 OSG offer was over the $7.2M available for freight. OSG only offered shipping a minimum of 18,000 MTs up to a maximum of 23,500 MTs from the US Gulf however, based on their minimum bid for 18,000 MT, the rate would have been $437.37/MT which would have exhausted the entire budget and would only ship 18,000 MT out of the awarded 39,800 MT. Awarded commodity cost was approxmiately $325 per MT

FY19 Determinations of Non-Availability (DNA)						
Date	IP	Country	MTs	Vessel	Operator	Determination Basis
1/11/2019	WFP	Yemen	45,200	MV Bliss/ Bonnie Venture	Reliance Bulk Carriers	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
1/23/2019	WFP	Yemen	25,000	Pan Kristine	Universal Navigation PTE	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
			24,900	King Felipe	Reliance Bulk Carriers	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
4/26/2019	WFP/CRS	Ethiopia/South Sudan/Somalia	87,080	Seaboni	Universal Navigation	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
				Binun Brave/ Seaboni	Tradewinds Shipping	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
8/7/2019	WFP	Kenya/Somalia	4/30/1997	Consolidator	Reliance Bulk Carriers	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule

8/28/2019	WFP	Yemen	115,580	Charlie/ New Legacy/ Eriksay/ Fairy Island	Tradewinds Shipping	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
9/20/2019	CRS/WV/REST/FHI	Ethiopia	10,000	Olympic Ride	Tradewinds Shipping Inc.	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
			69,350	Consolidator	Reliance Bulk Carriers	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
9/24/2019	WV/CARE	Bangladesh	69,070	Friendly Islands/ Bao Run	Sealift Holdings Inc.	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
10/16/2019	WFP/Djibouti Prepo	Ethiopia/Sudan/Somalia/ Djibouti Prepo	67,200	Consolidator /TR Princess	Reliance Bulk Carriers	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule
10/30/2019	WFP	Yemen	109,800	Ocean Beauty/ ER Bordeaux/ Global Coral/ Eurosun	Sealift Holdings Inc.	Non-availability of a US Flag service low cost carrier/vessel capacity/schedule

Determinations of Non-Availability (DNA) are made by USAID contracting officers in instances when our implementing partners do not receive any offers from U.S. flagged ships/operators in response to tenders they issue. DOT/MARAD requires that we notify them in writing once an implementing partner has awarded a freight contract to a foreign flag carrier in the absence of bids/availability from U.S. flagged carrier. In these instances, the tonnage carried by these foreign flagged vessels is not included in Cargo Preference calculations. DNA letters serve as the official record of these determinations and are signed by the FFP Agreement Officer.

Food for Peace Title II

21. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a table showing a breakdown of the "Safebox" for fiscal years 2014 through 2019 including the source of funds (monetization, 202(e), non-monetized costs, associated costs, and the Community Development fund), the legislative authority, the amount spent on each and the percentage of each.

Mr. Isley: Since USAID administers Food for Peace Title II, USDA refers you to Mr. Hick's responses for the answer to this question on USAID's programs and activities.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

Authority	Food for Peace Act									the Foreign
	Commodity & Freight - Direct		Commodity & Freight -		ITSH		Section 202(e)*		Total Title II	Development
Fiscal Year	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Percentage	Amount	Amount
2014	$88,957,800	35%	$23,713,300	9%	$34,356,200	13%	$109,556,900	43%	**$256,584,200**	$58,664,000
2015	$191,494,024	50%	$22,064,807	6%	$70,040,039	18%	$101,099,061	26%	**$384,697,931**	$72,713,820
2016	$141,893,627	37%	$31,233,354	8%	$63,518,334	17%	$142,525,481	38%	**$379,170,796**	$80,000,000
2017	$114,340,238	29%	$26,240,581	7%	$45,770,848	12%	$205,816,872	52%	**$392,168,539**	$80,000,000
2018	$91,630,553	27%	$33,297,150	10%	$42,602,697	12%	$174,138,253	51%	**$341,668,653**	$80,000,000
2019	$85,737,402	30%	$35,468,681	12%	$32,895,346	11%	$132,843,640	46%	**$286,945,069**	$80,000,000

Note: FY 19 numbers are estimates and will change when actuals are reconciled

**The 20% maximum requirement for 202(e) is calculated based on the full Title II appropriation. The amount of 202(e) in the "safebox" will be higher than 20%.*

22. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a table showing the breakdown of spending of "202(e) funds" by voucher, cash, Local and Regional Purchase of commodities, and actual overhead or administrative costs incurred by PVOs for fiscal years 2017 through 2019. How much and what percentage was spent on emergency and how much on non-emergency?

Mr. Isley: USDA refers you to Mr. Hick's responses for the answer to this question on USAID's programs and activities.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

Fiscal Year 2017 - Non-Emergency							
Partner	Administrative 202(e)	Local Procurement	Regional / International Procurement	Cash Transfers	Food Vouchers	Complementary and Program Costs*	Total 202(e)
ACDI/VOCA	$4,785,297	$0	$0	$0	$0	$464,523	**$5,249,820**
ADRA	$4,349,500	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$4,349,500**
AVSI	$3,883,069	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$3,883,069**
CARE	$25,967,680	$0	$0	$0	$1,000,000	$0	**$26,967,680**
CNFA	$3,463,377	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$3,463,377**
CRS	$39,426,347	$0	$0	$4,016,562	$5,000,000	$7,449,500	**$55,892,409**
FHI	$11,339,400	$0	$0	$0	$0	$21,491,800	**$32,831,200**
HK	$4,809,144	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$4,809,144**
Mercy Corps	$5,769,900	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,486,800	**$9,256,700**
PCI	$1,116,583	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$1,116,583**
REST	$2,431,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$8,341,000	**$10,772,000**
Children	$13,339,382	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$13,339,382**
WFP	$9,859,797	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$9,859,797**
World Vision	$10,259,630	$0	$0	$0	$0	$13,766,581	**$24,026,211**
Emergency	**$140,800,106**	**$0**	**$0**	**$4,016,562**	**$6,000,000**	**$55,000,204**	**$205,816,872**

Fiscal Year 2017 - Emergency							
Partner	Administrative 202(e)	Local Procurement	Regional / International Procurement	Cash Transfers	Food Vouchers	Complementary and Program Costs*	Total 202(e)
CRS	$11,883,258	$0	$2,278,905	$0	$215,675	$346,263	**$14,724,101**
Mercy Corps	$154,372	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$154,372**
UNICEF	$22,158,726	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$22,158,726**
WFP	$93,276,689	$6,000,000	$0	$8,000,000	$706,971	$1,693,000	**$109,676,660**
Emergency	**$127,473,045**	**$6,000,000**	**$2,278,905**	**$8,000,000**	**$922,646**	**$2,039,263**	**$146,713,859**

*Complementary and Program Costs include evaluations, capacity building, training, seed distribution, etc., as well as other

Fiscal Year 2018 - Non-Emergency							
Partner	Administrative 202(e)	Local Procurement	Regional / International Procurement	Cash Transfers	Food Vouchers	Complementary and Program Costs*	Total 202(e)
ACDI/VOCA	$6,209,743	$0	$0	$0	$369,262	$3,420,995	**$10,000,000**
ADRA	$3,781,048	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$3,781,048**
AVSI	$2,419,909	$0	$0	$3,960,000	$0	$1,237,218	**$7,617,127**
CARE	$3,974,800	$0	$0	$0	$0	$3,000,000	**$6,974,800**
CNFA	$3,444,096	$0	$0	$0	$0	$6,830,499	**$10,274,595**
CRS	$14,752,595	$3,463,878	$0	$3,211,832	$0	$15,853,338	**$37,281,643**
Hungry	$6,612,683	$0	$0	$826,223	$0	$5,454,592	**$12,893,498**
Mercy Corps	$5,210,707	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,459,166	**$9,669,873**
PCI	$1,636,594	$0	$0	$0	$0		**$1,636,594**
REST	$1,971,449	$0	$0	$991,772	$0	$5,314,289	**$8,277,510**
Children	$10,000,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$8,927,347	**$18,927,347**
WFP	$9,249,442	$0	$0	$8,000,000	$0	$60,000	**$17,309,442**
World Vision	$12,692,768	$0	$0	$0	$0	$16,802,008	**$29,494,776**
Emergency	**$81,955,834**	**$3,463,878**	**$0**	**$16,989,827**	**$369,262**	**$71,359,452**	**$174,138,253**

Fiscal Year 2018 - Emergency							
Partner	Administrative 202(e)	Local Procurement	Regional / International Procurement	Cash Transfers	Food Vouchers	Complementary and Program Costs*	Total 202(e)
CRS	$29,990,573	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$29,990,573**
IRC	$184,801	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$184,801**
UNICEF	$25,677,889	$0	$189,000	$0	$0	$1,585,902	**$27,452,791**
WFP	$167,671,504	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	**$167,671,504**
Emergency	**$223,524,767**	**$0**	**$189,000**	**$0**	**$0**	**$1,585,902**	**$225,299,669**

Fiscal Year 2019 - Non-Emergency							
Partner	Administrative 202(e)	Local Procurement	Regional / International Procurement	Cash Transfers	Food Vouchers	Complementary and Program Costs*	Total 202(e)
ACDI/VOCA	$8,271,677	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$8,271,677
ADRA	$7,469,537	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,718,314	$9,187,850
AVSI	$4,810,495	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,810,495
CARE	$10,463,777	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$10,463,777
CNFA	$4,436,677	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,436,677
CRS	$21,336,608	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,545,786	$25,882,394
FHI	$8,563,309	$0	$0	$0	$2,101,501	$106,106	$10,770,916
HK	$809,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$809,000
Mercy Corps	$9,474,255	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$9,474,255
PCI	$718,400	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$718,400
REST	$4,155,963	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$4,155,963
Save the Childr	$5,007,732	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$5,007,732
WFP	$21,868,769	$0	$0	$3,873,947	$0	$0	$25,742,716
World Vision	$11,917,216	$0	$0	$1,194,571	$0	$0	$13,111,787
Emergency	**$119,303,415**	**$0**	**$0**	**$5,068,518**	**$2,101,501**	**$6,370,206**	**$132,843,639**

Fiscal Year 2019 - Emergency							
Partner	Administrative 202(e)	Local Procurement	Regional / International Procurement	Cash Transfers	Food Vouchers	Complementary and Program Costs*	Total 202(e)
CRS	$19,284,164	$0	$801,839	$0	$0	$0	$20,086,003
IRC	$153,267	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$153,267
Save the Childr	$2,999,793	$0	$0	$0	$0	$1,100,000	$4,099,793
UNICEF	$29,210,323	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$29,210,323
WFP	$121,649,512	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$121,649,512
Emergency	**$173,297,059**	**$0**	**$801,839**	**$0**	**$0**	**$1,100,000**	**$175,198,898**

23. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a breakdown by country and PVO of the emergency "202(e) funds" that are not used for direct PVO overhead for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

24. "202(e) funds" that are not used for direct PVO overhead for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

25. Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a five-year funding table for 202(e) funds that were used for each Fiscal Year in the Safebox.

Mr. Isley: USDA refers you to Mr. Hick's responses for the answer to this question on USAID's programs and activities.

Mr. Hicks: We look forward to providing your office with data tables containing this information.

Fiscal Year 2018			
Country	**Partner**	**Modality**	**202(e) Enhanced**
Bangladesh	**UNICEF**	Regional Procurement	$189,000
Afghanistan	**UNICEF**	Other/Program	$462,871
CAR	**UNICEF**	Support SMART Surveys and NGO capacity building	$970,000
DRC	**UNICEF**	Other/Program	$153,031
FY18 Emergency Total			**$1,774,902**

Fiscal Year 2018			
Country	**Partner**	**Modality**	**202(e) Enhanced**
Burkina Faso	**ACDI/VOCA**	Food Vouchers, Other/Program	$3,790,257
Burundi	**CRS**	Local Procurement/, Other/Program	$6,189,597
DRC	**FHI**	Complementary Services	$323,068
DRC	**MC**	Other/Program	$4,459,166
DRC	**CRS**	Other/Program	$5,354,434
Ethiopia	**CRS**	Cash Transfers, Other/Program	$3,143,370
Ethiopia	**FHI**	Cash Transfers, Other/Program	$5,957,747
Ethiopia	**WV**	Other/Program	$13,944,068
Ethiopia	**REST**	Cash Transfer, Complementary Services, Other/Program	$6,306,061
Global	**Save the Children**	Other (TOPS WASH, TOPS SCALE, TOPS Bridge Associate Award)	$2,500,000
Guatemala	**Save the Children**	Cash Transfers, Program Costs	$5,240,000
Guatemala	**CRS**	Food Vouchers, Program Costs	$6,288,500
Haiti	**CARE**	Food Vouchers, Program Costs	$3,000,000
Kenya	**WFP**	Cash Transfers	$8,000,000
Madagascar	**CRS**	Other/Program	$1,553,147
Uganda	**Save the Children**	Other (Cost-Effectivess Study of Refugee and Host Community Programming)	$1,187,347
Uganda	**AVSI**	Cash Transfer, Other/Program	$5,197,218
Zimbabwe	**WFP**	Other (ZimVAC Rural Livelihood Assessment)	$60,000
Zimbabwe	**CNFA**	Other/Program	$6,830,499
Zimbabwe	**WV**	Other/Program	$2,857,940
FY18 Non-Emergency Total			**$92,182,419**

Fiscal Year 2019			
Country	**Partner**	**Modality**	**202(e) Enhanced**
Global	Save the Childre	Other (TOPS SCALE)	$1,100,000
Madagascar	CRS	Regional/Interna	$801,839
FY19 Emergency Total			**$1,901,839**

Fiscal Year 2019			
Country	**Partner**	**Modality**	**202(e) Enhanced**
Bangladesh	**WV**	Cash Transfers	$1,194,571
DRC	**FHI**	Other/Program	$106,106
Ethiopia	**FHI**	Food Voucher	$2,101,501
Ethiopia	**CRS**	Other/Program	$4,545,786
Kenya	**WFP**	Cash Transfers	$3,873,947
Madagascar	**ADRA**	Other/Program	$1,718,314
FY19 Non-Emergency Total			**$13,540,225**

QUESTIONS FROM CONGRESSMAN ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

Impact of Proposed Organizational Changes

1. Mr. Aderholt: How does the proposed USAID transformation impact the internal decision making around food and non-food humanitarian assistance? As a follow-up, some in the humanitarian food assistance community are concerned that the nutrition programs will be overshadowed by non-food programs. How would you respond?

Mr. Isley: USDA defers to USAID on this question.

Mr. Hicks: In practice, we have seen significant benefits in consolidating the administration of humanitarian assistance at USAID. Over the past several years, we have seen how the sharing of the IDA account between OFDA and FFP has allowed funds to be used more effectively and to shift between the offices to meet the evolving food and non-food needs of internally displaced persons (IDPs) and other affected populations. By sharing this account, OFDA and FFP significantly strengthened their ability to address funding gaps and recognized the need to merge the offices so that there is one management structure and one set of policies, procedures, systems, support structures and staff to address the same sets of problems. The creation of the new USAID Bureau for Humanitarian Assistance (BHA) strengthens USAID's role and creates a unified and singular USAID humanitarian voice on the global stage, eliminating confusion among partners and other actors on USAID's approach to humanitarian assistance.

By unifying and elevating humanitarian assistance in BHA, USAID is eliminating the artificial distinction between food aid and non-food aid, creating a strong platform for USAID humanitarian leadership and policy, and optimizing resources to ensure concentrated, undivided work on effective and fully accountable humanitarian programs and leadership. It is enhancing the provision of the full-spectrum of humanitarian-assistance activities from prevention, mitigation, and disaster risk-reduction to reduce humanitarian assistance needs over time, particularly in areas of recurrent crises. By adopting the best methods and processes from each office, USAID can save programmatic and operational costs (both time and money) as well as duplicative support costs, and can support more beneficiaries within the same level of funding.

To determine BHA processes and procedures, OFDA and FFP staff are drafting a USAID International Response Framework, response policies, and award management procedures.

While some humanitarian food assistance community members are concerned that nutrition programs will be over overshadowed by non-food programs, this will not happen. The new Bureau will take on all operational aspects of OFDA and FFP for dealing with sudden or large-scale emergencies, including any food assistance and nutrition needs. FFP currently provides significant support for emergency nutrition programming, treatment for acute malnutrition through the UN Children's Fund (UNICEF) and the World Food Program, as well as prevention through behavior change and food distribution efforts, which are nutrition-sensitive programs. FFP also has processes and decision trees in place for how we currently leverage our strengths and support with OFDA's for nutrition programs and this practice will continue under BHA. Most importantly, merging the offices will allow USAID to more accurately prioritize

needs, identify gaps, avoid duplication, and target responses as well as speak with a unified USAID voice with its partners and with other donors for the populations that OFDA and USAID jointly oversee, allowing for more effective and efficient responses.

Interagency Collaboration to Identify Vulnerable Regions

2. Mr. Aderholt: You have both noted in your testimonies the importance of collaborating across federal agencies to identify areas of need. You also discussed the significance of food assistance as a tool to advance national security. What collaborative work currently exists to identify key regions where food assistance can help prevent conflict and radicalization in potentially vulnerable communities?

Mr. Isley: USDA defers to USAID to respond and coordinate with the U.S. Department of State on this question.

Mr. Hicks: USDA and USAID share goals and strategies through Feed the Future Global Food Security Strategy, which brings together several agencies, including both USAID as well as USDA. USAID, through the Bureau for Food Security, which leads Feed the Future, and FFP work in close collaboration to support these efforts.

Year-to-Year Carryovers

3. Mr. Aderholt: How do the year-to-year carryovers under P.L.480 (and EFSP) under this administration compare with those of other administrations? The number of people facing emergency levels of food security has almost never been higher, yet carry over balances appear to be growing each year—why is this?

Mr. Isley: USDA defers to USAID, which administers "P.L.480 Title II (and EFSP)."

Mr. Hicks: When making funding decisions, USAID carefully considers many factors, including the severity of needs, funding availability, contributions from other donors, access and security constraints in affected countries, as well as the absorptive capacity of implementing partners, all in order to ensure that humanitarian resources are programmed responsibly and effectively.

Each year, the Administration carries over Title II and International Disaster Assistance (IDA) funds in an effort to ensure sufficient resources are available in the first quarter of the fiscal year. Carryover levels for Title II and Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP) resources over the past decade are generally 20 percent or less of available resources. Variability in Title II carryover is primarily related to end-of-year fluctuations in commodity and freight pricing when compared to planning estimates. Appropriations for the IDA account, and the proportion of the account funding EFSP activities, have increased significantly over the past decade in response to growing food insecurity and humanitarian needs. Carryover also tends to increase the later the timing of full-year appropriations.

We appreciate the no-year availability of humanitarian assistance funds and the flexibility it provides to respond to changing and evolving emergency contexts. The availability of carryover is integral to our ability to seamlessly continue ongoing responses, or to mount a humanitarian response to an unexpected disaster at the beginning of the fiscal year. These funds are also critical to addressing urgent and unexpected needs under continuing resolutions and in the event of government shutdowns.

The U.S. Government remains the largest donor to humanitarian agencies, shouldering approximately one third of global humanitarian funding in 2018. Along with the State Department, USAID is working toward diversifying the global humanitarian donor base and bringing new donors into the current international system.

WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 16, 2019.

FOOD AND NUTRITION SERVICE: POLICY AND PROGRAM OVERVIEW

WITNESS

BRANDON LIPPS, DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY, FOOD, NUTRITION, AND CONSUMER SERVICES

Mr. BISHOP. The subcommittee will come to order.

Good morning and welcome to today's hearing.

Testifying before the subcommittee today is Mr. Brandon Lipps, the Deputy Under Secretary for the Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services.

Thank you for being here, Mr. Lipps. I am looking forward to today's discussion.

The Food and Nutrition and Consumer Services (FNCS) is the largest mission area at the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) in terms of its budget size. In the fiscal year 2020 appropriations bill that was passed by the House in June, the Food and Nutrition Services' budget, including the mandatory and the discretionary resources totaled more than a hundred billion dollars. FNS is responsible for overseeing 15 domestic nutrition assistance programs, which millions of our Nation's most vulnerable population rely on to feed their children and to put a good, healthy meal on the table.

I often say that the work of this subcommittee touches the lives of every citizen on a daily basis. This is especially true for the programs that are administered by the Food and Nutrition Service. In fiscal year 2020, nearly 6.4 million women, infants, and children are estimated to participate in the Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC) program. For the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), formerly known as Food Stamps, the number is 38 million. And in 2020, an estimated 5.28 billion school lunches and snacks will be served for the National School Lunch Program (NSLP).

The research is clear: Providing and expanding access to healthy, nutritious food improves children's academics and their overall health.

Food insecurity is not only a health issue, but it is also a national security issue. Fort Benning is in my district, and I often hear from the trainers there that bone density in the young recruits is not good because, growing up, they did not have enough nutritious food, and this lack of bone density causes an increased number of stress fractures during the training. And, of course, this ultimately costs the Department of Defense and taxpayers a lot of money, and it limits the pool of potential all-volunteer recruits for our military.

Unfortunately, I think there is a tendency by some to want to reflexively reduce the cost of programs without thinking about the individuals who will be harmed by such actions. That is why I was very alarmed when the administration proposed the rule that would essentially eliminate broad-based categorical eligibility, a move that could kick an estimated 3.1 million people off of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program and jeopardize school meals for almost a million children.

Congress had this debate during the Farm Bill. The final bill did not include these tightened eligibility criteria, nor did it include stricter work requirements for able-bodied adults without dependents. Yet the Administration is ignoring Congress and, instead, moving forward with executive action to address these policies on their own.

Now, it may be easy and politically expedient to point to one millionaire in Minnesota who purposefully defrauded the American government and taxpayers as a publicity stunt, but that one individual is not representative of all SNAP recipients, and we all know the truth is much more complicated than that.

I, like everyone else, believe in program integrity. But let's be clear: USDA is not kicking 3.1 millionaires off of SNAP. It is kicking 3.1 million vulnerable people off of SNAP.

I am concerned and I worry that this will disproportionately impact working families with children trying to climb out of poverty. In 2017, SNAP lifted 3.4 million people, including 1½ million children, out of poverty. The economy is still not working for everyone, and the Administration should not make it worse by decimating one of our most effective safety net programs.

The Secretary's motto is "do right and feed everyone." I like that saying and I feel that it is a very, very worthy goal, but when children are going hungry because of your policy proposals, you are failing to live up to your own standard.

Finally, I want to conclude with how alarmed and troubled I am at the constant stream of news articles about school districts shaming low-income students over their school lunch debt. It is unfathomable to me that anyone would shame and punish children for their parents' or their guardians' inability to afford school meals. Shaming students is not going to solve the problem, and it is certainly not going to make the youngsters feel more food-secure.

As you can tell, there is a lot to discuss today, and I again want to thank our witness, Deputy Under Secretary Lipps, for being with us, and I look forward to our discussion.

Before we begin, I want to say that I am very proud of the Agriculture Appropriations bill that was passed by the House in June, and I look forward to conferencing with the Senate this fall in enacting a very strong fiscal year 2020 budget for the Food and Nutrition Service and all of USDA programs.

Now I would like to ask our distinguished ranking member, Mr. Fortenberry, if he has any opening remarks.

Mr. Fortenberry.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, so much for holding this very important hearing. And I will just make a few brief remarks.

I think that most Americans would be very surprised by the size of the agricultural budget, and very pleased, frankly, with the types of policies that have been enacted by this Committee and by the entire Congress over the years to do really two things. It is to mitigate risk, to reduce the risk for farmers and ranchers and those who provide our food, which results in some of the lowest food prices in the world, and to protect those who are vulnerable, who have food insecurity. That is the dual goal that we work on here. I am very proud of that. We spend a lot of money doing it. I think most Americans would be surprised by the amount of money we spend doing it, but when we go deeper and we peel back what we are doing and why and the benefits to society as a whole, I think most Americans would be very proud of this work, as I am.

Now, what we have to do, as you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, is to look at the issues of program integrity. And I think as a future goal for all of us in Congress, particularly this Committee, is to look at the alignment, the possibilities of a new type of alignment between food and nutrition and health. That ought to be the objective, because the majority of the expenditures in this bill are for food and nutrition. The other programs, of course, being essential for our farmers and ranchers, but the majority of expenditures here are food and nutrition. And so in the old days, just counting calories, we want to just get people as many calories as possible, but ignoring the reality of what it means to have nutritious food and also to view this program through the lens of how it is transitory.

Some people need this type of assistance and are going to permanently need this type of assistance. Other people—and we have some good news in this regard—need it as a transition because, for whatever happened, the contingencies in life happened to them, they became vulnerable, and we do not want to see anyone in America go hungry.

The good news is, in the last several years, the SNAP program rolls have dropped by about 24 percent, as I understand it. That is because people are finding access to meaningful work. That is something to celebrate. So we have got a dual role here; again, a program that protects people in vulnerable circumstances, and also gives some people the opportunity to immediately rise out of that vulnerability into meaningful work. That is a bit of good news that we can all celebrate.

So, thank you again, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to participate in the hearing.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Fortenberry.

Mr. Lipps, without objection, your entire written testimony will be included in the record, and I recognize you now for your statement, and then we will proceed with questions.

Mr. LIPPS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Fortenberry, members of the Subcommittee, for the opportunity to discuss the Administration's fiscal year 2020 budget request for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's Food and Nutrition and Consumer Services, as well as our priorities and recent activities.

I am Brandon Lipps, the Deputy Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services. FNS is responsible for administering America's nutrition assistance programs, which leverage our Nation's agricultural abundance to ensure that every American

has access to a wholesome, nutritious diet, even when they face challenging circumstances.

Let me underscore at the outset that the President's Budget Request for fiscal year 2020 fully funds the major nutrition assistance programs to support projected participation of all of those who are eligible and participate. As you know, you and your colleagues in the Senate have already reported out fiscal year 2020 appropriations legislation for the Department in advance of today's hearing. Though final action by Congress is still ahead, I am in the somewhat unusual position of already being able to thank you for your support of several initiatives in our requests, particularly those related to customer service and program integrity across the 15 programs that we administer at the Food and Nutrition Service.

This committee has expressed interest in USDA's recent regulatory actions related to SNAP. While I cannot discuss the content of the final rules or the comments we have received on them before they are published, I would like to take a moment and talk about our objectives in this area.

Americans, as you note, are a generous people who believe in helping those who have fallen on hard times, but we all agree that those who can provide for themselves should. SNAP and other programs are critical to millions of Americans, and we should be proud to have the abundance to come alongside them in these hard times. In order to do that, we have a responsibility to be good stewards of every dollar.

For far too long, negative press has weakened American's confidence in many of these important programs that you have charged us with administering at the Food and Nutrition Service. Stories that are sometimes so egregious they appear surely to be only rumors are unfortunately verified as factual, jeopardizing the future of these important programs for millions of families.

Let's first take a look at the millionaire that the chairman mentioned who was legally authorized for SNAP. He was not the only millionaire that has been mentioned in the news for being able to access the SNAP program. There are others as well who have created negative news stories on this important program.

This loophole was first exposed by Congress on oversight authority, the Government Accountability Office, in a 2012 report as having, quote, a negative effect on SNAP program integrity, as some States are designating SNAP applicants as categorically eligible without providing them the service required to make that determination".

This loophole received greater scrutiny in 2015 by USDA's Office of Inspector General that described how one State conferred eligibility by providing recipients, quote, "with a brochure for social services," with the OIG further noting that the State only mailed the brochure to applicants after it conferred confirmed their eligibility for SNAP. This is not categorical eligibility.

Next, let's look at families living across the State line from each other, just miles apart. We have learned that one family is receiving 2½ times less in SNAP benefits simply because one State uses an inflated and inaccurate utility deduction. What begins as a series of observations from frontline staff at Food and Nutrition Serv-

ice about potential irregularities, then became a full-blown USDA study initiated in 2014.

We have since confirmed these irregularities because many States cannot cite the source of their base calculation for these deductions or the year in which they were established. This not only creates an uneven patchwork for the administration of a Federal program, but it is morally unfair to those recipients.

And, finally, with the lowest unemployment rate in 50 years, we have employers across this country who cannot find enough workers, yet States are continuing to waive the congressionally mandated work requirements by stating that 3.6 percent unemployment is a lack of sufficient jobs. Egregious program abuses such as these leave dark clouds over these important programs, risking future support and reflecting negatively on the recipients who are in need of these programs.

Families on these programs and the taxpayers who fund them expect better from their government. We at USDA are dedicated to ensuring these important programs are preserved for those in need and that they are administered equitably, with integrity, and with the eligibility standards that Congress has provided.

I remain committed to listening to and collaborating with all stakeholders, including each of you on this Committee. Working together, we can improve the lives of those who fall on hard times and come in contact with this critical program.

Thank you for having me. And, with that, Mr. Chairman, I am happy to answer any questions.

[The information follows:]

FOOD, NUTRITION, AND CONSUMER SERVICES
Statement of Brandon Lipps, Deputy Under Secretary for
Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services
Before the Subcommittee on Agriculture, Rural Development,
Food and Drug Administration and Related Agencies
House Committee on Appropriations
October 16, 2019

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Fortenberry, and members of the Subcommittee for the opportunity to discuss the Administration's fiscal year (FY) 2020 Budget request for the U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA's) Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services (FNCS) as well as our priorities and recent activities. I am Brandon Lipps, the Deputy Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services. FNS is responsible for administering America's nutrition assistance programs, which leverage the nation's agricultural abundance to ensure every American has access to wholesome, nutritious food, even when they face challenging circumstances.

As you know, the Appropriations Committees in both the House and Senate have already reported out FY 2020 appropriations legislation for the Department in advance of today's hearing. Though final action by Congress is still ahead, I am in the somewhat unusual position of already being able to thank you for your support of a number of specific initiatives in our request.

Let me underscore at the outset that the President's budget request for FY 2020 fully funds the major nutrition assistance programs to support projected participation for all those

who are eligible and wish to participate. This reflects average monthly participation of 36.3 million in SNAP and 6.4 million in WIC, along with average daily participation of over 30 million in the National School Lunch Program and over 15 million in the School Breakfast Program during the school year.

At the same time, the request includes proposals and initiatives that are intended to advance this Administration's nutrition assistance priorities – to improve customer service for our partners and participants, to protect and enhance integrity, and to strengthen the bonds between FNS programs and self-sufficiency.

It has been my privilege over the last two years to lead our efforts to move these priorities forward. In my view, and in the view of Secretary Sonny Perdue, all three are fundamental to the ongoing effectiveness of all nutrition assistance programs. Good customer service is essential to efficient operations that achieve the programs' missions. Strong integrity safeguards for taxpayer investments in nutrition are fundamental to earning and keeping the public confidence that make these programs possible. And every government action ought to align with and support a self-sufficient future, because long-term reliance on government assistance has never been a part of the American dream.

Customer Service

Secretary Perdue has directed a robust focus on customer service at USDA. Given the number and diversity of nutrition assistance customers – those who receive benefits, and

those on the front lines of delivering them – we are appropriately at the center of that effort. Great customer service starts with listening to customers of our programs, to understand their needs, their challenges, and the choices available to address them within the existing program authorities.

One example of improving our customer service to those we serve is through the implementation of the online purchasing pilot authorized in the Farm Bill. The Secretary articulated the core principle behind this innovative effort, noting that " as technology advances, it is important for SNAP to advance too." The pilot began this spring, and is already paying dividends to SNAP clients in areas where it is operating. Our budget request for FY 2020 included $1 million to support online retailer technical readiness, and I appreciate that. both this Committee and the Senate have included this funding in their legislation. These funds will help the Agency ensure that online retailers meet technical requirements regarding SNAP, such as split tenders and sales tax exemptions, just as brick-and-mortar stores do.

The budget also requests a legislative change to FNS's Farm to School program authority – to increase the maximum amount of such a grant from $100,000 to $500,000 – that responds directly to customer feedback from States and other stakeholders. They have told us that $100,000 is often not adequate to launch or expand Farm to School programming. We think this is a wise adjustment, and look forward to working with you to address this concern.

Program Integrity

Just as good customer service is critical to program effectiveness, strong integrity is essential to use taxpayer resources wisely, reach the right people with the right benefits, operate efficiently, and ensure the public's trust in our work. Without this public trust, we cannot sustain the multi-billion dollar investment in these programs for the future.

The FY 2020 budget request included a number of proposals to advance integrity. For Child Nutrition, we sought $20 million in additional funding for technology grants to States. These grants will assist every State in developing, improving and maintaining information systems to operate and manage all these programs. Improved technologies will increase data accuracy, allow more robust performance measurement and build capacity to identify and target error prone aspects of CN operations. We are again grateful for the support of both House and Senate appropriations committees in providing funding for this initiative.

Turning to SNAP integrity, the request includes additional funds to increase the number of on-site store visits to ensure participating retailers meet eligibility requirements and to enhance FNS' ability to conduct undercover investigations. It seeks funds for grants to States to help them implement the SNAP Fraud Framework, which harnesses innovative analytics techniques and private-sector best practices to more effectively detect potential fraud and improve oversight. We request resources to evaluate available automated income data sources that may help States make rigorous SNAP eligibility determinations more efficiently. Finally, the budget requests funds for an evaluation of SNAP-authorized group homes and treatment centers to ensure that benefits are being utilized properly on behalf of the residents and that these facilities are not utilizing more than one source of Federal funding for the same

purpose. We are pleased that both the House and Senate Committee bills support each of these initiatives – clear evidence that integrity is a bipartisan and bicameral priority.

Supporting a Self-Sufficient Future

As I noted previously, this Administration's orientation, and my approach in administering the nutrition assistance programs, is that every government action should fully align the concept that the people we serve want and deserve an independent future that does not rely on government benefits. Secretary Perdue has stated it plainly: "The dignity of work and responsibility makes lives better." I frankly know few who would disagree. More often, differences emerge over ***how*** best to advance self-sufficiency.

At USDA, we view nutrition assistance programs as springboards for those facing difficult times to get back on their feet. Just recently the Department of Labor announced that the unemployment rate had reached a new 50 year low, and the number of job openings has exceeded the number of job seekers for 18 consecutive months. There is no time better than now to focus on the opportunities our families have to improve their lives and those of their children.

That is why Secretary Perdue has made SNAP Employment and Training (E&T) – perhaps our most direct effort to connect participants to work opportunities – an important USDA priority.

Expanding the reach and effectiveness of SNAP E&T has long been a focus of effort at USDA. In FY 2015, USDA launched the SNAP to Skills Project to bring new tools, resources and capacity to States to build stronger E&T programs. We have continued to build and enhance

this project. To date, USDA has provided enhanced technical assistance to over 21 State agencies to build employer-driven E&T programs and to develop tools and resources that are available to all States and stakeholders to support their efforts.

The FY 2020 Budget requests funds to improve SNAP E&T programs through national leadership activities that would take our efforts to the next level by providing States technical assistance and professional development in E&T. This in turn would ensure that they are using the most effective strategies to help SNAP participants achieve economic self-sufficiency. The request also proposes grant funds for States to strengthen their SNAP E&T data collection — which is so important when making policy decisions. We are grateful that both the House and Senate committees support these two initiatives, which will help SNAP E&T better meet the needs of participants, employers, and the community.

Achieving a Modern, Equitable SNAP Program

This Subcommittee has expressed interest in USDA's recent regulatory actions related to SNAP. While I cannot discuss the content of the final rules in development or the comments we have received on them before they are published, I would like to take a moment to talk about the Department's intended objectives in this area.

The first "food stamp" program was launched in the 1930's, and today's nationwide program was created in the 1970's. While it has a long record of effectiveness, even the most effective programs can benefit from reforms to correct problems or adapt to changing times. In SNAP, the law that authorizes the program provides USDA discretion to allow state agencies –

SNAP's front-line customer service organizations – flexibility in certain aspects of administration. While this continues to work well in many areas, in some it has compromised the consistency of operations over time, and even led to disparities in benefits for individuals and households simply because of the state where they live.

For this reason, and in recognition of our responsibility to ensure the program operates consistent with the law, a major portion of the Administration's SNAP agenda seeks is to strike a better balance between practical operational flexibility and the national standards that define the program's purpose and support its effectiveness. We have focused in three key areas.

First, the SNAP law sets a reasonable expectation for able-bodied adults without dependents – "ABAWDs" –to work, look for work, train for work, or volunteer to continue to receive benefits for more than three months over a 36-month period. States may waive these limits in areas with an unemployment rate above 10 percent or where there are "not sufficient jobs". However, current rules are defined so loosely that time limits are waived for 40 percent of ABAWDs, in the midst of the strongest economy in a generation. This is unacceptable to most Americans and belies common sense. Earlier this year, we proposed a rule to limit the ability of states to waive these time limits, and to ensure that those that do so use a clear and consistent data-driven approach. We are working to finalize that rule now.

More recently, we proposed to eliminate a loophole called "broad-based categorical eligibility" that has been used to provide SNAP benefits to households who otherwise might not meet SNAP eligibility criteria. This would end the practice of allowing households to be eligible

for SNAP by simply being handed a brochure from another federal program. Limiting this eligibility rule to those receiving specific, concrete, and work-supporting benefits would retain categorical eligibility's advantage of streamlining program administration, but in a fiscally prudent way.

Earlier this month, we proposed changes to truly *standardize* state SNAP utility allowances across the country. For many years, SNAP rules have allowed states to establish a self-defined standard utility allowance (SUA) in lieu of documenting actual utility costs. It has been so long since state SUA methodologies were developed that some states cannot explain their original SUA or even provide the year it was set. USDA recently proposed a reform to replace the patchwork of outdated and inconsistent state allowances with a modernized, uniform approach based on up-to-date data on actual household utility costs in each state. The proposal would also replace an antiquated "telephone allowance" with a telecommunications allowance that includes the cost of basic internet service – no longer a luxury, but often a necessity for school, work, and job search.

Secretary Perdue and I see these changes as fully in line with USDA's discretion under the law, and our responsibility to work within that law to use modern and consistent standards that manage resources prudently. That said, the Department wants to hear from all those who care about SNAP about the changes we have proposed. USDA presented each proposal for public comment, and thousands have responded with their ideas. We remain committed to listening to and collaborating with all of our stakeholders, including this committee, to manage this critical program responsibly.

Let me turn finally to the forthcoming reauthorization of the Child Nutrition Programs and the Women, Infants and Children Program, which were last reauthorized over eight years ago. Reflecting the scope and significance of these programs to families and local communities across America, there is a long history of constructive bipartisan action to support and strengthen them. I am pleased to offer to you, as I have to the authorizing committees, our willingness to join the Congress in that spirit to contribute to a reauthorization process that builds on the programs' history of success, while also advancing the Administration's nutrition assistance priorities. We have been providing technical assistance to staff on request, and we will continue to do so in whatever way may be helpful.

In closing, I would like to thank the Committee for your continued support for the nutrition assistance programs. We at the Department stand ready to provide any technical assistance that you need in completing your appropriations deliberations. I am happy to answer any questions you may have.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Lipps.

SNAP—BROAD-BASED CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY

As you heard from me earlier, I am very troubled by the Administration's proposed broad-based categorical eligibility rule. The Department's own analysis is that the rule will drop 9 percent of the current recipients from the rolls, including 2.2 percent of all households with one or more elderly person, and 7.4 percent of all households with children. It admits that the rule may negatively impact food security among people who do not meet the proposed income and resource eligibility requirements.

Your testimony frames this as a way to end the practice of allowing households to be eligible for SNAP by simply being handed a brochure from another Federal program. You know, as well as I do, that this is a vast oversimplification of that issue. If you are applying for SNAP, you and your family are either teetering on the brink of food insecurity or you are already food insecure.

Contrary to what I hear, I would argue that the broad-based categorical eligibility actually promotes the goals of all Americans, rewarding hard work and encouraging self-sufficiency. It allows States to protect recipients from being thrown off SNAP because of a minor increase in their pay. This rewards the working poor for working harder. It allows States to protect recipients who have very modest levels of savings. This promotes self-efficiency, helping families to weather emergencies such as an unexpected car repair or some unexpected medical expenses.

States still fully review each person's application. They interview the applicant. The applicant has to submit full documentation in support of their application. This is not an automatic green light to get SNAP, as you may seem to imply. Why is it that you insist that the current practice is inconsistent with these goals? And, of course, one of the concerns is that the impact that the proposed rule would have on the eligibility for free school meals. How many children will lose access to free school meals under the proposed rule?

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Mr. Chairman, with regard to your first question about why we proposed these, I will go back to your statement about this not being a simple issue. It is not a simple issue. The issues you raised are important issues that I think we can have important conversations about. The reality is that under the Administration's proposal, categorical eligibility will be maintained in the form that it existed prior to the expansion of categorical eligibility to qualifying people by the receipt of a brochure.

Unfortunately, that has moved to a level that it is a negative reflection on the program. It has been. Over time, it continues to be culled out by oversight agencies of the Congress and the USDA as we move forward. Congress has provided asset and income tests in statute, and it is our job at USDA to ensure that those are abided by as we move forward on that front.

So we put this rule forward to work on the integrity of the program, to ensure that it is administered with the confidence of all of the American people as we move forward, and the issues you raised are important and we would be happy to engage with you on those looking forward.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. Have you pulled back the rule temporarily as a result of some data that you learned that would increase the number of children that will be kicked off of the school lunch program?

Mr. LIPPS. We have not pulled back the rule, no, sir. The rule is advancing. The comment period has closed on the rule. We did release an analysis that was requested on the indirect effect on direct eligibility for school meals. We have shared that information publicly. It will be published in the Federal Register later this week, and we will have a comment period on that for 14 days, which will conclude the finality of comments on that rule.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. My time has expired.

Mr. Fortenberry.

SNAP—EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Again, I think what we are talking about here is the fundamental value proposition of fairness.

I think you mentioned, Mr. Lipps, in your opening statement, that Americans are quite generous, and we fundamentally believe that if someone is in vulnerable circumstances, they deserve help. They deserve heart.

Mr. LIPPS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. And that is the core of this program. So we help those in need, and at the same time we stop those who cheat, and at the same time we encourage those who need opportunity. So when we struggle through that dynamic, you can pluck one or two incidences that were brought to you by the Inspector General. I think it needs to be pointed out.

But what I would like to use my time more so for—and we wrestle through where those lines are. But, again, back to the point. When we have a flourishing economy which, when labor participation rates are going up, where people are finding access to meaningful work, this hopefully will begin to translate really soon into upward pressure on wages. So it is not—it is not the Commerce Department or the Labor Department's issue set; it is this issue set as well.

How do we protect those most in need who may need to be permanently on this program and we not only accept that, we embrace that as part of our safety net? How do we, through job training and other innovative ideas, potentially help those who can successfully transition off and celebrate this moment because the opportunity for meaningful work and hopefully rising wages soon is on the horizon? That is the architecture of the main question.

The second question is, I want to go back to what I said earlier. You cannot have a food and nutrition program in isolation from the concepts of health; food as medicine. And I think we are all learning very, very rapidly that a holistic approach to health demands that food be an integral part of the approach here.

So would you comment on both of those, the prospect for both of those outcomes?

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Thanks for that, Mr. Fortenberry.

I will say one thing that I think all of us in this room can agree on and that we can rally behind is the Employment and Training

Program that Congress has authorized for the SNAP program. We got a small increase in that in the Farm Bill. The agency has taken a number of actions, prior to my arrival and since my arrival, to focus our efforts on that front. It is a good time in this economy for people to move back in to work and for them to find economic mobility on that front.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Let's say meaningful work. It is very important that we make a distinction here. Not just labor force participation. That is impersonal. Meaningful work where people have real opportunity to advance.

Mr. LIPPS. That is right. Let me talk about that for a minute.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. And that has been one of the structural constraints that don't allow people to move forward.

Mr. LIPPS. Right. With regard to the Employment and Training Program, the Agency has taken a very specific focus in ensuring that individuals are moved into the type of an employment and training program that moves them into meaningful work, that we are not just putting them on a job search.

That may be an important component of what they are doing, but I have had the great pleasure in my job of going around and seeing these individuals participating in the Employment and Training Program and hearing the stories of formerly incarcerated individuals who were estranged from their families going through these training programs and learning not only a particular skill set that gets them meaningful work, but the basics of being able to hold on and to keep a job and being reunited with their family that they are then providing for.

I had the opportunity to meet those people. Employment and Training is doing that. It is wonderful program that Congress has funded and provided us some additional money in the Farm Bill. We continue——

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Are your successes manifesting themselves in aggregate statistics versus anecdotes yet?

Mr. LIPPS. I think we are on the verge of that happening. In some States we see that happen.

One of the initiatives that you-all provided some funds for in the appropriations bill was one of the problems that States have in advancing this program is tracking this and being able to report what is required to receive these Federal dollars. So you-all provided some money for us to be able to help States with the IT on that side.

NUTRITION PROGRAMS AND HEALTH

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Okay. Let's come back to that perhaps later, but talk again about the alignment of food nutrition and health and what you are doing in terms of policy planning in this regard.

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. That starts at FNS with our youngest population in WIC. We all know, there is a lot of data out there that if the youngest of these children don't get the nutrition they need at that early age, there is no way to correct that. Later in the life, some of that can be corrected but not on WIC. And so we look at that as an across-the-lifespan perspective, both as we produce the Dietary Guidelines for Americans, but also as we look at our programs in ensuring that that nutrition is——

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Okay. As one of the early founders of the Farm to School Program and movement, again, you can see what we are trying to do: Provide nutritious, fresh options, enculturating it, socializing it, and creating actually the infrastructure that makes it possible for this type of linkage to occur in an ongoing fashion in the future. That is one of the program areas, I think, we need to build on to accomplish this goal of nutritious food.

Mr. LIPPS. Anecdotally Farm to School is having great success on our children's health.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. Ms. Pingree.

SNAP—PARTICIPATION

Ms. PINGREE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

Thank you, Mr. Lipps, for being with us today. I just want to start by echoing the chair's—and I am sure some of my other colleagues feel the same way—having these significant concerns about the suite of the USDA's proposed rules that will negatively impact SNAP participation.

Last month, a bipartisan delegation from my State sent a letter to the USDA expressing our opposition to the proposed rule on categorical eligibility. According to the USDA's own estimate, seven States, including Maine, would see more than a 15 percent—would see more than 15 percent of SNAP households lose eligibility if that rule moves forward. The Maine Department of Health and Human Services found that nearly 27 percent of all SNAP participants in our State are at risk of losing benefits under the proposed rule.

In the delegation's letter we wrote: For a State like Maine that is already struggling with food insecurity, these changes would be detrimental to the very population the program is designed to support.

I just want to reemphasize that point. We are just talking about food here. I believe that everyone has the right to healthy and nutritious food. So these SNAP-proposed rules are just unconscionable to me. They are only going to worsen the hunger in Maine's most vulnerable populations.

Having anyone go hungry is inexcusable in the world's wealthiest Nation. I think you should rescind all of these proposals. I am appalled that we even have to have this hearing and defend this to the USDA and the Administration. Congress already spoke about what we thought we should do, and it is appalling that you are trying to reverse that.

But I am going to leave it there and move on, because I am pretty sure you and I not going to agree on this and you are going to move forward, but we are going do whatever we can.

WATER CONSUMPTION IN NUTRITION PROGRAMS

So completely on a different topic, but also about food and hunger, I am also a big believer that food is medicine, as the Ranking Member mentioned. And I want to switch gears and talk about the consumption of sugar-sweetened beverages. Sugar-sweetened beverages have been causally linked to obesity, type 2 diabetes, heart disease, and dental decay. The healthcare costs associated with diet-related diseases is an incredible burden to our country, and

these diet-related diseases are especially prevalent in our youth population, robs many of our young people of the health—with the healthy future they deserve.

I know everybody is familiar with the MyPlate and how it informs programs like the National School Lunch Program, but if you look at this, something you don't see in here is a glass of water. One in five United States youth and young adults did not drink any water yesterday. We need to encourage kids to drink more water. It is essential for their good health, and it also helps reduce the intake of sugar-sweetened beverages.

So what actions are the USDA taking to better encourage water consumption in our younger populations, whether that is the National School Lunch Program, WIC, or the Child and Adult Care Food Program? And beyond the access to water, what is the USDA doing to make sure that that water is safe?

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Ms. Pingree, I agree with you about those statements on the importance of the dietary guidelines and the concerns that you mentioned around sugar-sweetened beverages. As you know, the school meals program has specific requirements with regard to added sugars within the school meals program and what can be sold in schools, even outside the school meals program on that front.

With regard to the scientific evidence that supported these GHDs (ph) in the past, I think you know the importance of the milk being on MyPlate. Water is important. We give a lot of technical assistance and advice to schools on ensuring that children are drinking water and staying hydrated, in addition to the milk that is an important part of the dietary guidelines. And our WIC nutritionists do work across that front as well.

Ms. PINGREE. Would you send me more information about what kind of technical assistance you provide, also what you are doing to make sure that water is safe in schools and other places where children would be drinking it?

Mr. LIPPS. Sure.

[The information follows:]

In 2016, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) issued a memorandum to remind Child Nutrition Program operators that children must have access to drinking water and to identify resources that can be used by schools and child care facilities in meeting this requirement. The memorandum also notes that operators may use program funds for costs related to obtaining drinking water or testing the safety of water supplies. This memorandum also includes links to resources on safe drinking water and testing for lead and other contaminants, as well as additional technical assistance related to water quality.

- SP 49—2016, CACFP 18—2016 [https://www.fns.usda.gov/resources-making-potable-water-available-schools-and-child-care-facilities-0]: Resources for Making Potable Water Available in Schools and Child Care Facilities

Ms. PINGREE. Okay. I will leave it with that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. LIPPS. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP. The gentlelady from California, Ms. Lee.

Ms. LEE. Good morning.

Mr. LIPPS. Good morning.

SNAP—BROAD-BASED CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY

Ms. LEE. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for this hearing.

I am glad to get to know you. And I want to just say a couple of things, associating myself with the remarks of my colleagues already. The cases you cited early on, I am not an attorney. By profession, I am a clinical social worker, but I do know that law students are taught that worst case makes bad law. And so you cited maybe 3, 5 percent of the worst cases to justify many of these very terrible, terrible policies that you are putting forward.

USDA has issued the three proposed rules to SNAP now. I also have to say that I am a former food stamp recipient. So personally, I am deeply disturbed by these proposals, because I know what this means for people who are living on the edge.

Three quarters of a million people will lose their SNAP benefits on the work requirements. And think, 3.1 million people, that is including, by your own analysis released yesterday, it is 1 million children that will lose automatic access to free school meals, even worse than we feared. And most recently as of this month, 800,000 households would lose SNAP eligibility under the standard utility allowance.

Yesterday, I received a copy of your response to my letter with Majority Leader Steny Hoyer opposing the SNAP categorical eligibility rule, which I find to be incredibly lacking in substance. You mentioned in your response in the letter that these revisions will, and I will quote, "maintain categorical eligibility's dual purpose of streamlining program administration, while ensuring that SNAP benefits are provided to those most in need."

So, Mr. Lipps, exactly how would you maintain these provisions if you are taking away assistance from 3.1 million individuals, including 1 million children, by your own analysis, and taking important folks' States rights away? Has USDA done an impact analysis of the administrative burden that this would actually place on States?

Also, let me just ask you, because I want to complete my questions, share with the Committee clear evidence, clear evidence that cutting people off of food benefits removes barriers to work. How does this really help them find a job? Actually, 50, 60 percent of people who are eligible for SNAP benefits are working. They are working two or three jobs because they can't afford to survive with the economy being what it is.

And you mention formerly incarcerated individuals. And I am wondering, are you helpful and being supportive of the several programs that are circulating—several policies in legislation to lift the ban on SNAP benefits which was put into place which prevent formerly incarcerated individuals from accessing SNAP benefits?

Mr. LIPPS. Thanks, Representative. First, with regard to categorical eligibility, I do want to clarify that the rule the Administration is proposing is refining categorical eligibility. So with regard to broad-based categorical eligibility, we are returning to categorical eligibility as it was originally implemented. Categorical eligibility is generally implemented in such that a program with the same eligibility standards or more restrictive eligibility standards confers

eligibility on programs that have broader eligibility standards to ensure that people can get around having to fill out multiple applications to access those programs.

We have an instance now where programs who are not making an eligibility determination but are handing out brochures are conferring eligibility for other programs, which is causing the negative news stories on this program that we see over and over.

Even under the rule, as it was proposed—and we are considering the comments now—individuals who qualify for TANF services, as they did when categorical eligibility was initiated, will continue to qualify for SNAP. And that dual purpose will be maintained, ensuring that both we have integrity but that individuals continue to have categorical eligibility for both TANF and SNAP.

With regard to your question on the impact for burden on States—I tried to write down all your questions, but if I miss some, I am sure you will remind me. Impact with burden on States, there is an analysis of that in the Regulatory Impact Analysis that accompanies the rule. We can follow up with you on those exact numbers. I don't have them offhand.

[The information follows:]

The Regulatory Impact Analysis published with the proposed rule, Revision of Categorical Eligibility in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) estimates that States will incur additional administrative costs of $1.157 billion over five years. This estimate includes both the ongoing administrative costs per case, as well as one-time costs to make required system changes and updates to handbooks and other materials.

Furthermore, in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) prepared an analysis estimating the proposed rule's additional burden on State Agencies. Notice of this information collection was included in the July 24, 2019, Federal Register notice regarding the proposed rule. FNS' analysis estimated that compliance with the information collection requirements associated with the proposed rule would add an annual 3,622,736.20 burden hours to the 53 State SNAP Agencies to conduct additional required verifications.

Proposed Rule, Revision of Categorical Eligibility in the SNAP:
https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/07/24/2019-15670/revision-of-categorical-eligibility-in-the-supplemental-nutrition-assistance-program-snap

Regulatory Impact Analysis:
https://www.regulations.gov/document?D=FNS-2018-0037-0002

Certainly, when States conduct an actual eligibility determination, there is an additional step, and there is some required assessment for the States to put them in the program. But, again, we believe, per this rule, that it is an important step to ensure that individuals are eligible for the program benefits that they are receiving, and that is a protection as much for the people on the program as it is for the tax dollars as well.

SNAP ELIGIBILITY

Ms. LEE. Formerly incarcerated individuals with eligibility for SNAP benefits.

Mr. LIPPS. Yes. I am not familiar with the particular proposals with which you refer, but the Agency does work with States on this. There are some that are working, that have received waivers to sign people up for SNAP prior to their release from prison to ensure that they have those supports as they come out. And we have issued some waivers on that front and are generally supportive of those type policies.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS ON RESERVATIONS

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to say a couple of words.

What this witness just said, I don't understand then why, by your own analysis, 1 million children are going to lose their automatic benefits to free meals based on your presentation.

Thank you very much.

Mr. LIPPS. Sure.

Mr. BISHOP. Ms. McCollum.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I am assuming we will have an opportunity for two questions, so I will just stick to my first one here.

Taking you back to what happened during the shutdown and looking at 2018, the Farm Bill authorized a new program that allowed tribal organizations to enter into self-determination contracts to oversee food distribution on Indian reservations, promoting tribal sovereignty, and helping to meet specific tribal and cultural needs.

The committee included $3 million for this demonstration project, and the demonstration project ran into a huge problem because you didn't have a program that you would work with the Tribes for contingency of a planned shutdown. This left families that were already vulnerable to food shortages facing additional uncertainty.

So can you please provide us any update on any conversations, consultations that you have had with tribal organizations, what USDA has put in progress to implement the new demonstration project, in general, but any safeguards you would have during a shutdown?

And, Mr. Chair, I have with me what was submitted to another Committee, testimony from Mary Greene Trottier from the Spirit Lake Nation, president of the National Association of Food Distribution Programs on Indian Reservations (FDPIR).

Another issue that they had on Tribal reservations were the best used-by dates. And when best used-by dates for delivery of food that wasn't given to the Tribes wasn't met, the food was donated to food shelves rather than the buffalo meat go to the Tribes.

Could you just fill in here what is going on with Tribal consultation and how this will never happen again in the future?

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Thank you, Representative. First with regard to the shutdown, we all acknowledge that those are very difficult times, particularly in programs that ensure that individuals have access to food. It wasn't a time that any of us enjoyed. You are right about the difficulties that the Tribes have raised with the concern over having access to food during that time.

I don't believe that we resulted in any actual issues with being able to get food out this round. There was an issue in the past that has caused great concern for the Tribes for right reasons, and we continue to work with them on that.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Excuse me, sir. When you said food this round, are you talking about the current shutdown—the last shutdown?

Mr. LIPPS. Yes, ma'am, during the shutdown.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. There were Federal facilities controlled by the USDA that were locked on Tribal reservations and the Tribes

couldn't even get the food out themselves when they offered to remove food from there, and I have this in the testimony. So I don't know what you are referring to.

Mr. LIPPS. I am not aware of that issue, Representative. We will look into that and get back with you on that answer. I was not aware that that became an issue for FDPIR during the most recent shutdown, but we will look into that and get back with you on an answer on that.

[The information follows:]

There are no existing federal facilities controlled by USDA on tribal lands. USDA food were available and tribes had the ability to order and receive food from USDA during the shutdown. USDA does operate two warehouses in the country that house and ship food ordered by tribes; both were open during the shutdown. We did learn that some tribes were unable to open their tribal owned storage and food facilities due to a lack of administrative funding. This resulted in tribes' inability to pay staff who worked in those facilities.

FDPIR—SELF DETERMINATION PILOT

I will say, with regard to self-determination, which the Tribes do believe will help solve this and other issues for them, we are excited to work with the Tribes on this self-determination pilot and to, hopefully, prove successful for them on that front. I believe we have had—I have had personally seven consultations with the Tribes in my 2 years at Food and Nutrition Service, and we are working very hard on that relationship to make sure that we understand their needs and that we are listening and being attentive to those. Ms. Trottier is at most of those consultations, and we have had great discussions on that front.

Unfortunately, we can't take significant action on the self-determination project until it is funded, because it was authorized and we are prohibited from doing that, but we are excited to see that money in the appropriations bill and did start discussing that specifically with the Tribes at the last consultation.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I have another question, but—I have another question but I don't have enough time in this round, so I will yield back.

PUERTO RICO

Mr. BISHOP. I thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Lipps, I want to take a moment to focus on Puerto Rico. In 2017, in wake of Hurricane Maria, Congress made available an additional $1.27 billion in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program funding for Puerto Rico. Then in June, Congress provided another $600 million. Unlike States, Puerto Rico is uniquely dependent on Congress for funds in the event of an emergency or a natural disaster. Even with these additional benefits, Puerto Rican households barely manage to receive comparable benefits as compared to the households in the 50 States.

Given that fact, the continued recovery from Hurricane Maria and the high level of poverty in Puerto Rico, what are your specific recommendations for reducing food insecurity in Puerto Rico?

Mr. LIPPS. Thanks for that question, Mr. Chairman. We at FNS do a lot of work with Puerto Rico on that front. We have five staff permanently on the ground in Puerto Rico who work with them on

a regular occasion, and we provide a lot of technical assistance and advice in carrying out the Nutrition Assistance Program (NAP), which Congress has funded for them, to help ensure that that works, and WIC and our other programs that operate across Puerto Rico.

As you noted, they are not authorized in the SNAP program. They have a NAP grant, which operates differently than the SNAP program, and so we do everything that we can to help them within the confines of what Congress has provided for them.

FOOD PURCHASE AND DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. Let me switch gears and talk about the Food Purchase and Distribution Program. This summer, USDA announced the details for a second farmer relief package in response to the ongoing trade war. The Market Facilitation Program, which accounts for most of the money, is understandably getting the most attention. However, the Food Purchase and Distribution Program has received $1.4 billion for the purchase and distribution of surplus commodities that were affected by trade disruptions.

In fiscal year 2019—while in the fiscal year 2019 bill, in response to the first farmer assistance package, which provided $1.2 billion for the Food Purchase and Distribution Program, Congress provided nearly $110 million for The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP) administration. This included a one-time $30 million transfer for some unobligated balances to help manage all of the product that was being purchased and flowing into the food banks. Did FNS utilize all of that $110 million?

And now that there is a second round, what are the resources that are needed for this fiscal year, and what are you hearing from the food banks?

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Thanks for that question, Mr. Chairman. We will get back with you on an exact number on that $110 million. I expect that we used most, if not all of it, as we were very successful in the partnership with food banks and schools and Tribes and others on moving out funds—moving out food on that first round of the food distribution program related to mitigation.

And as we move into the second round, we have been in conversation with food banks about their needs in this round. The first round ensured that we had a specific amount of money that we said followed the truck to ensure that that money made it to the end location for whoever was delivering that food had the resources that they need to get it out. We are working with food banks to figure out what that right number is and make sure that they have the resources to help us deliver that food to folks in need.

[The information follows:]

As is the case in most years, TEFAP State and local agencies used nearly all the TEFAP administrative funding provided to them in FY2019. Because the amount of TEFAP commodities, including bonus and other commodities, has not changed from FY 2019, FNS anticipates a need for a commensurate level of TEFAP administrative funding in FY 2020.

SCHOOL LUNCH SHAMING

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. As I indicated, Mr. Lipps, in my opening statement, I am increasingly alarmed by the reports of schools pub-

licly shaming children over their school lunch debt. No person, let alone a child, should be subject to that type of ridicule and embarrassment.

What tools does FNS have in place that can be used to address this problem, and do you need more authorities from Congress?

Mr. LIPPS. Yes, sir, Mr. Chairman. One of the more important questions I think that we discussed on this front is certainly lunch shaming. Obviously, we all know that the overwhelming majority of schools do a great job administering the program. There have been too many news stories for sure about children who have been the subject of lunch shaming, and we need to do all that we can on that front.

The agency has taken a number of steps over the years to work on that and I believe has taken all of the action that we feel we can at this point, the most significant being that schools have to have a policy for unpaid lunch debt. They have to communicate that with their workers and they have to communicate that with the parents so that everybody understands.

And there is a prohibition about identifying children in the free or reduced-price program. So to the extent that there are reduced-price students being identified, there is already a prohibition against that.

But it is an important, difficult subject we talk to schools about regularly, and I think it is an important issue on which USDA will engage on technical assistance as Congress looks at reauthorizing child nutrition.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Lipps.

Mr. Fortenberry.

FARM TO SCHOOL

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Again, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Let's return to the Farm to School Program. I would like to hear your analysis of the success of the program and any challenges that you are facing.

Again, I think this is exciting at many levels, introducing local, nutritious foods into the diets of young people, creating that linkage back to farmer to family, rural to urban. It has a lot of levels of social meaning beyond just the nutritional outcome.

So talk about the implementation of the program. I have the basic statistics, 3.2 million students served, but the possibilities for further expansion, as well as any problems you are encountering. And let's do that for 1 minute, then I am going to turn to a couple of other things.

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Mr. Fortenberry, it is another wonderful thing I get to see out on the road is Farm to School Program. And I have seen anecdotally, when you talk to the kids participating in those programs, it is inspiring them not only to better health as they talk about new fruits and vegetables they have tried and those that they now continue to eat.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. It is amazing how the nutritionists in schools know how to place certain foods that create a, I guess, psychological preference. I have learned this too.

Mr. LIPPS. They do a wonderful job, and you can see it at really about any of those locations. But also, it inspires in those kids, you

know, talking to kids who come from low-income families about aspirations to be botanists and careers in agriculture and different types of things. So there is success across with Farm to School. And I think that it is having anecdotally a greater effect on schools—on children's healthy choices, being able to participate in that than any of the programs that we run. So we are very excited about that.

The additional money that Congress has provided, the $5 million the last 2 years, has really helped expand that program. One request that we do have from the agency and the President's budget is that the limit of $100,000 be able to be moved up to $500,000. It will allow schools to operate programs over—have funds to operate those programs over a longer term as they get them established, but also as you look at some of your larger school districts, to have projects that can serve——

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Mr. Chairman, maybe we can make note of that. I think that is an important point that was just made, so as we work on the next bill. I think that is a good point. Thank you.

Mr. LIPPS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Secondly, while—let me wrap this up with by saying, again, there is a tendency in government to define our activities around the lanes in which they have traditionally been defined which met a type of need sometime in the past. So it is easier to be confined to what is than to think about what could be.

And, again, this alignment of food, nutrition, and health is absolutely critical if we are going to take a holistic approach to the ecosystem of livability for persons which fundamentally centers around health and nutrition, food, as well as the possibilities of, in constrained budget times, moving across sectors to improve outcomes while reducing costs. And, third, resocializing concepts, which used to be the norm; again, the farmer connected to the family, the rural urban integration which we have lost.

The next iteration of this—and I will talk to you about it some point, Mr. Chairman—is the idea of agricultural programs either revitalized or embedded in schools. Why in the world botany can't be about growing things at school that then get fed to kids. We are exploring this back home. That is mostly local issues, but there is a Federal role here as well.

DIETARY GUIDELINES

I am going to divert for a moment to a recent study in the Annals of Internal Medicine that says that red meat consumption may very well be okay after all. Now, I come from cattle country, as you are quite aware, and this is important to us, because when we are talking about the multitude of studies and information that comes at people, at some point in time one thing is bad, then suddenly it is good.

Now, are you familiar with this study, and will the new dietary guidelines look at animal protein consumption as an important part of that guideline versus heavy carbohydrates?

Mr. LIPPS. Yes, sir. Again, I appreciate that question. As you all know, we are in the middle of the dietary guidelines process. The advisory committee is reviewing the evidence now. One of the problems that we have with Americans' health is that we hear these

different headlines all the time. Today something is good; tomorrow it is bad. Americans don't know what to do with that. The dietary guidelines process should help clear that out for everyone, and that is what the process is designed to do.

So they will consider issues such as these as they consider the dietary patterns of Americans and what the research shows on that front. And all of the evidence that was considered in that recent headline is available for consideration per the committee. They will set their own protocol for the systematic reviews that they will review, but they are not excluding any of that evidence.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. The same thing could be said for whole milk or 2 percent milk, that the rates of obesity took off prior to when there were higher levels—I mean—I am sorry—after there were higher levels of actual high levels of consumption of whole milk and 2 percent milk. This is another thing that I think that needs to be reexamined that has possibly gotten confused over the last few years.

Mr. LIPPS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. BISHOP. Ms. Pingree.

FOOD WASTE IN SCHOOLS

Ms. PINGREE. Thank you very much.

And I do want to echo the remarks of the ranking member on this. I agree on the great value in Farm to School. It is all the things you said. Kids benefit from having more interaction with local farms. It is good for the rural economy and, increasingly, the interest in school gardens, more school food preparation that kids are engaged in, education around agriculture and gardening; all very good things and I think really engage kids in that.

And I have seen a lot of examples of it visiting school lunch programs where kids, you know, think every carrot is the one that they grew, think, you know, kale is actually tasty now, you know, lots of great things. And I hear it from parents too, say, my kids came home and told me about a vegetable we don't normally eat. So anyway, I think that is all very good, and I encourage even more of it.

I want to just ask a quick question on food waste reduction. I am very interested in that. Something like 30 percent of the food in this country is wasted. That is an environmental issue. It is a huge challenge when so many people are going hungry and don't have access to healthy food, and we need to do a lot more to fix the problem.

I am a co-chair of the Food Recovery Caucus with Mr. Newhouse, and we have been looking for ways to reduce food waste all across the supply chain. I know there have been a lot of concerns about food waste in schools, sometimes just because kids don't have enough time to eat their meal. Waste audits can help schools better understand waste in schools, what is being wasted, how much is being wasted, and why. This information can be really valuable in changing the behavior or identifying opportunities to reduce waste.

Does FNS provide schools with any resources or technical assistance to the schools so that they can conduct waste audits?

Mr. LIPPS. Representative, I am not sure we do specifically with regard to waste audits, but I know that we give a lot of technical assistance on that front. We can get you a list of what those things are. And certainly, the Secretary has made food waste a priority. We are looking at more opportunities to help schools with that now, and I agree with you that it is an important issue that we can address together.

[The information follows:]

In addition to supporting USDA's central resource website on Food Loss and Waste, which provides information about food loss and waste for farmers, schools, businesses, and consumers; the Food and Nutrition Service also has a number of policy guidance and materials in support of food waste reduction in Child Nutrition Programs. These resources include guidance on the use of Share Tables, guidance on the food donation program, and guidance on food consumption outside of the foodservice area.

Furthermore, USDA's Team Nutrition initiative has a number of technical assistance resources to support school nutrition operators and other stakeholders reduce food waste in schools. The Team Nutrition initiative supports the Child Nutrition Programs by: 1) providing job skills training and technical assistance to food service staff who prepare meals for the programs; 2) developing nutrition education resources that help children learn about agriculture and become self-sufficient in making informed food choices; and 3) providing the programs with resources to support healthy school and child care environments.

USDA is committed to food waste reduction and provides technical assistance resources and policy guidance related to reducing food waste in schools. These resources and guidance include:

- **Food Loss and Waste**
  https://www.usda.gov/foodlossandwaste
  This USDA website provides information about food loss and waste for farmers, schools, businesses, and consumers. It also provides resources for donating food and finding USDA funding for research and projects related to food loss and waste.

- **Guide to Conducting Student Food Waste Audits**
  https://www.usda.gov/oce/foodwaste/Guide_to_Conducting_Student_Food_Waste_Audit_11-20-2017.pdf
  This guide is intended to help educate students about the amount of food they waste in their school cafeterias and to encourage them to reduce waste and eat more of the nutritious foods provided through USDA's school meals programs.

- **Creative Solutions to Ending School Food Waste**
  https://www.usda.gov/media/blog/2014/08/26/creative-solutions-ending-school-food-waste
  This infographic provides statistics on food waste and ideas schools can use to address this issue.

- **Guidance on the Food Donation Program in Child Nutrition Programs**
  https://www.usda.gov/oce/foodwaste/FNS_Guidance.pdf
  This memorandum provides clarification and guidance related to the Bill Emerson Good Samaritan Food Donation Act. Under this Act, as long as the donor has not acted with negligence or intentional misconduct, the company is not liable for damage incurred as the result of illness. As

such, schools may donate leftover food or beverage items to a nonprofit organization, such as a community food bank, homeless shelter, or other nonprofit charitable organization.

- **Guidance on the Use of Share Tables in Child Nutrition Programs**
  https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/cn/SP41_CACFP13_SFSP15_2016os.pdf
  This memorandum reminds operators of the opportunities presented by share tables, extends the use of share tables to the at-risk afterschool component of the Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP), and gives an overview of the food safety requirements Child Nutrition Program (CNP) operators must follow when choosing to include share tables in their meal service. This memo highlights several helpful resources regarding plate waste and share tables.

- **Guidance on Food Consumption Outside of Foodservice Area, and the Whole Grain-Rich Requirement**
  https://fns-prod.azureedge.net/sites/default/files/cn/SP41-2014os.pdf
  This memorandum clarifies FNS' policy on Food Consumption Outside of Foodservice Area. Meals offered in the NSLP and SBP are intended to be consumed at school in a designated foodservice area during the established meal service period. However, with time limited lunch periods, some students may be inclined to save some items for consumption at a later time. This memorandum reminds operators there is no Federal prohibition of this practice, and FNS encourages it as a means of reducing potential food waste and encouraging consumption of healthy school meals. In addition, schools may also wish to set up sharing tables for appropriate items to minimize food waste.

- **Team Nutrition's "What You Can Do To Help Prevent Wasted Food" booklet**
  https://www.fns.usda.gov/tn/what-you-can-do-help-prevent-wasted-food
  This Team Nutrition booklet discusses ways to reduce, recover, and recycle food before it goes to waste. The booklet contains tips for school nutrition professionals, teachers, parents, students, and school administrators; it will be updated and published in Spring 2020.

- **Offer versus Serve (OVS) Tip Sheets for School Lunch and Breakfast**
  https://www.fns.usda.gov/tn/offer-versus-serve-national-school-lunch-program-posters
  Team Nutrition has developed new tip sheets to guide students and school nutrition professionals in effectively implementing OVS in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and School Breakfast Program (SBP). OVS Tip sheets for lunch and breakfast communicate the requirements of OVS to school nutrition professionals.

- **Offer versus Serve (OVS) National School Lunch (NSLP) Posters for School Lunch**
  https://www.fns.usda.gov/tn/offer-versus-serve-national-school-lunch-program-posters
  Team Nutrition has developed new posters to visually guide students and school nutrition professionals in effectively implementing OVS in the NSLP. The OVS posters for lunch are to be used as signage to educate students in selecting a reimbursable lunch under OVS. OVS breakfast posters are currently under development and will be available by Summer 2020.

Ms. PINGREE. Great. Well, let's be in touch with this. I agree that the Secretary has been very supportive on this and worked on it and certainly has some, you know, serious goals about reducing food waste, but we have to move faster and we have to confront it on all fronts. So I hope we can continue to discuss that.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. BISHOP. Ms. Lee.

SCHOOL LUNCH SHAMING

Ms. LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Once again, I would like to bring—you raised this in your opening statement, the issue around lunch shaming and what is taking place right now, because far too many children find themselves humiliated and ashamed in classrooms for owing money for school lunches. What is worse, many of these children are forced to go hungry for unpaid school meals, which is just plain wrong.

Unfortunately—and this is according to the School Nutrition Association—it is not an uncommon issue. Three quarters of school districts have unpaid meal—student meal debt, and we don't even know how many students are being turned away because of this very shameful policy.

Now, in California, just this last Saturday, Governor Newsom signed into law a measure banning this practice for all K–12 school children. In my own district, where the school meal program—and let me remind you that the School Breakfast Program was actually started by the Black Panther Party. In my district, they have banned this practice for over a decade at both Oakland and Berkeley schools.

So I am wondering what the administration is doing to address lunch shaming with the national policy to end it and, if so, when you are going to do this and how you are going to do it. And also, how we are going to ensure that schools communicate to parents and families who have outstanding debt that they are not going to be able to—they are not going to shame the students and pressure them to collect this debt.

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Again, Representative Lee, I agree this is a very important issue and one that we all need to be working carefully on. The agency has—first, let me say statutorily that schools may not overtly identify low-income participants in the school meals program. So there is a statutory requirement on that front.

With regard to lunch shaming generally, the agency has held a number of roundtables and sessions with schools to talk about this issue and the complications with which to resolving this issue, both with regard to their debt and ensuring that children have access to food and that they are not shamed.

The agency requires that every school district have a policy on unpaid school lunch debt and that they communicate that policy to all of their workers and to all of their parents so that everyone is of the understanding on how these communications will happen and that the communication should happen with the parents and not with the children. So FNS has put that out and is working with States and school districts to ensure that it is enforced.

Ms. LEE. Do you provide oversight for that to make sure that it is enforced?

Mr. LIPPS. Yes, ma'am. We check—the States do, but we provide oversight to the States to ensure that it is enforced with regard to that policy. We believe that that is the extent. We continue to work on technical assistance and resources for schools on how to deal with these issues but, with that, we believe that that is as far as the agency can go, and we do stand ready to provide technical assistance to anybody who is ready to look at that issue, particularly——

Ms. LEE. Okay. I would like to follow up with you, because I think we need some more sticks on this policy.

Mr. LIPPS. Okay.

[The information follows:]

When a child does not have the funds to pay for their school meal, it is difficult for both the child and the school. Schools must balance their desire to provide nutritious meals for children with the demands of maintaining the financial viability of a school food operation. USDA has consistently discouraged the tactics referred to as "lunch shaming," such as denying children meals or using hand stamps, stickers, or other methods to identify children with unpaid meal charges. Instead, schools are encouraged to ensure that all eligible children are receiving free and reduced price meals, communicate directly with parents and guardians regarding meal debt, and allow families to add money to their children's accounts online.

The Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 contained language stating that no funds provided may be used in contravention of statutory and regulatory prohibitions on discrimination, physical separation, or overt identification of children eligible for free or reduced price meals. Existing Federal law and USDA regulations prohibit the "overt identification" of children certified for free or reduced price meals. The issue of school meal debt does not impact children certified as eligible for free meals. Schools may never deny these children a meal or force them to take an "alternate" meal.

USDA requires school districts to develop a policy addressing situations where children participating in the school meal programs at the reduced price or paid rate do not have money at the time of the meal service. Schools must ensure the policy is provided in writing to all families at the start of each school year and to families transferring to the school during the school year. Additionally, schools must ensure school food service professionals responsible for collecting payment for meals at the point of service and staff involved in notifying families of low or negative balances are aware of the policy and trained on its proper implementation. Instituting and clearly communicating a local policy prevents confusion for families, ensures a consistent approach, and gives school officials leverage to address the issue. USDA does not impose a uniform Federal policy on schools for handling these situations. School officials have expressed a preference for local policies, and USDA agrees school districts are best positioned to develop the right policy for their communities based on their real-world experience managing the school meal programs.

Report language in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2018 directed USDA to issue recommended standards schools may adopt to address the issue of "lunch shaming." In response, and in an effort to provide high-quality customer service, USDA has developed numerous resources to support schools, including policy guidance, webinars, handbooks, trainings, and

checklists. These resources are available on a web page devoted to this issue on the FNS website. See https://www.fns.usda.gov/school-meals/unpaid-meal-charges.

Federal school meal program regulations require Federal and State oversight to ensure local schools operate the meal programs according to Federal requirements. During regular reviews of school meal operations, State agencies provide oversight for the school lunch debt policy requirement. Schools are required to maintain records to ensure they have a policy in place, and that they have communicated the policy to families and staff members responsible for enforcing the policy. If schools do not meet this requirement, State agencies provide individualized technical assistance and require corrective action.

FOOD BANKS

Ms. LEE. Let me ask you one more question. With regard to just some information I have received from my Alameda County Food Bank, which serves my congressional district, they have informed me that the shutdown earlier this year has had a long-lasting impact on hunger. And so I am wondering if USDA has done anything to help food banks catch up with this unexpected hit on their food supplies, which came right after, of course, the holiday season was ending. And are you responding to this issue in a way to really try to stop this increase in hunger because of the unfortunate decisions that was made—that had been made by the President?

Mr. LIPPS. Ms. Lee, again, I would acknowledge that shutdowns are difficult in all programs, particularly in those that provide food; and there are difficult issues in those that are hard for everyone to work through. We worked with all of our programs—FDPIR, TEFAP—to do the best we could to ensure that food got out to those folks in need. We have worked to ensure that food banks are receiving all of their shipments that are due to them to make sure they have the food that is expected.

And also, I do think that the food that we have been able to provide through the Trade Mitigation Program has been a great opportunity for food banks to receive additional support to help those in need.

Ms. LEE. Okay. But I think the issue is the longer-lasting impact now on hunger. We are going to have to catch up now, and we are going to have to do more to make sure food security doesn't become even a larger problem in this country as a result directly from the shutdown. So we are going to have to come up with new ideas to mitigate against this long term.

Thank you very much.

Mr. BISHOP. Ms. McCollum.

SNAP—BROAD-BASED CATEGORICAL ELIGIBILITY

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you.

I want to go back to the broad-based categorical eligibility rule. And I am going to use Minnesota as an example so that, you know, we can have it in bite-sized pieces, so to speak.

The flexibility to raise SNAP income guideline from 130 percent of Federal poverty—and I am going to put it in real household numbers—for a family of three, that is $27,000. So the Federal poverty guideline of 165, that is for a family of three, for a family of three in the Twin Cities, where we are having huge problems with people being able to afford housing, shelter right now, $34,000.

So we are not talking about a lot of money for families. So these are not wealthy families. And as my colleague from California pointed out, sometimes they are already working sometimes one or two jobs while they are taking care of their children.

Minnesota adopted this policy for the flexibility to raise the SNAP income guidelines in 2010, and it helped streamline our State's management for delivery of SNAP. It increased access to basic food assistance to low-income families.

On September 6, a letter from the commissioner of Minnesota's Department of Human Services went to the office, your office,

about this proposed rule. And I read from it, quote: Apart from increasing hunger and reducing poverty efficiency, this program—proposed rule will leave Minnesota's vulnerable during an economic crisis.

Right now, our economy is good, but it takes away that immediate, immediate flexibility for a State to respond when there is an economic downturn, whether it is in the State, regionally, or nationally. And your mission on your home page is, and I quote: Our mission is to increase food security and to reduce hunger by providing food to low-income people across with access.

So under this rule, our State has proposed that up to 350,000 Minnesotans—nearly 70 percent of these people are children, seniors, and adults with disabilities—would lose their SNAP benefits. So we have done a deep dive into who this is going to affect: children, seniors, and adults with disabilities.

And I am going to take the adults with disabilities one step farther and then let you respond in general. Under current law, in order to receive more than 3 months of SNAP benefits in a 3-year time period, a group of adults must either be employed or enrolled in efficiently organized employment training for 20 hours a week. That is current law. Three months of SNAP benefits, 3-year time program, you must be employed or officially recognized employment for 20 hours.

States like Minnesota currently have flexibility to waive these time limits in certain geographic areas. We have very rural parts of the district. We have very dense parts. We have labor intensive. We have farming. We have mining. So we have very des—you know, disbursed employment. So we like to have the flexibility for our State to be resilient in a time of process. So your rule would limit the existing criteria for granting SNAP waivers, causing many Minnesotans, simply by where they live, to be at great risk of losing their SNAP benefits.

So here again, March 29, the commissioner of Minnesota's Department of Human Services said that if the State's rule were to go into effect, workers, and I quote, would be forced to find jobs that are not available to enroll in our employment services that simply don't exist.

So what are you going to do, as you go back and look at this for these public comments, for seniors, for children, and for people working with disabilities?

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Representative, first of all, we are going to consider all of those comments. We are required to do so and will do so, and we will review those comments and respond to each of them as we proceed to the final rule.

With regard to the ABAWD rule, which you mentioned last, States will still have flexibility. The rule just ensures that States are not exempting counties of 3–1/2 percent unemployment from the work requirement that Congress imposed. States also retain a 12 percent exemption that they can use for any of their population, particularly for those in rural areas or particular areas where there may be a pronounced effect that is not under a waiver.

So there is flexibility maintained in that. We are just ensuring that the work requirement that Congress put in statute is enforced as we move forward.

And with regard to broad-based categorical eligibility, I think that there is an important discussion about what the right asset and income standards are. We are ensuring that what Congress has provided in statute for the families we serve is abided by. And there is an important intersection of other Federal programs that work to support those things, and there is always a great discussion to be had about how we can better support families in those intersections. And certainly, we would be willing to provide technical assistance on any of those fronts.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. My time has expired. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SUMMER EBT PROGRAM

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Lipps, it has been almost a decade since Congress authorized what has become known as the Summer EBT program. The evaluation of this program has been rigorous and the findings unambiguous that the results of the Summer EBT demonstration are clear that the program is feasible, and the impacts on food security and children's nutrition are positive and substantial.

Despite the successful results and the fact that summer months can be some of the most uncertain times for children that are facing food insecurity, last year, USDA changed this approach to focus on new projects that will test, quote, innovative strategies. The request for applications also stated that the projects will be competitively selected.

Over the summer, FNS published a blog, by you, detailing a collaboration between USDA and Baylor University to demonstrate a summer meals project. Will you describe this project in Texas and tell us whether it was competitively selected or how the funding was approved? And is this an attempt to pilot the Harvest Box program which received such strong opposition here in this committee and in the authorizing committee?

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Mr. Chairman, that was not an attempt to pilot the Harvest Box program. That was an attempt to solve an issue that Congress has asked us to work on in a number of appropriations bills and for which we have not found a solution, which is rural and frontier hunger in the summer meals program.

That was funded. We funded it under a competitive process. I think you all are aware that this program, Summer EBT as it has become known, is a demonstration project that has been running for a number of years. And we have great data on that—you are correct—and we reported that back to Congress, and we continue to fund those pilots for a number of States, while leaving the rest of the States without and without having a discussion about that.

And so we at USDA decided that we should start testing new methodologies as we move forward to provide Congress more information so we can make a decision—so that Congress can make a decision with our technical assistance on how best to move forward in solving summer hunger, which we all agree is an issue.

This proposal came to us with an opportunity to provide food to those in rural and frontier communities, an opportunity to solve that problem. We think that it had an opportunity to meet a number of those needs, and we have proceeded forward on that front. It is going to have an evaluation run by the Urban Institute, that

is going tell us how that works. And anecdotally, we got very great reviews from the participants in the program and the schools that participated in that, a school which also runs the summer feeding program, I might add, but they note that this is a separate issue that hasn't been solved and for which everybody talks about but we haven't seen any solutions.

And so we are excited to see if the data shows what we are seeing anecdotally, that this may be an opportunity, not to change the summer meals program overall, but particularly for those rural and frontier communities where we have been asked to work.

Mr. BISHOP. I am going to yield the remainder of my time at this point to Mr. Fortenberry, and I will come back after Ms. McCollum with one more question.

SNAP—IMPROPER PAYMENTS

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Lipps, let's talk about the—I think it is 6.8 percent error rate that has been mentioned in the program, improper payment rate, either those receiving too much or those not receiving enough.

So—okay. I am going to make you a deal, and I am sorry Ms. Pingree is gone, because I think she would like this. Why don't you get that error rate down from seven to five, recognizing any program is going to have some error, some slippage? You are dealing with States and human contingencies and on and on. You get it from seven to five, about a third reduction, and we will take that one-third and move it into the Farm to School Program, which is about $1.2 billion, by the way. So the total error rate problem translates into over $4 billion. So will you take that deal?

Mr. LIPPS. I don't have authority to agree to that, Mr. Fortenberry, but I like it.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Okay.

Mr. LIPPS. I will say that.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Here is the goal. Obviously, this is a bit tongue in cheek, but the goal is to—nobody wants to waste money. Nobody wants to see people cheating the system. To the degree that we can reduce that error, you actually empower other programs that are producing significantly good results, Farm to School being one of them.

DIETARY GUIDELINES

Let me turn back, though, to the issue of dietary guidelines, which we touched on a moment ago. So these began in 1980, and there is a correlation to increasing obesity rates that began at the same time. Now, there is probably a lot of complex variables in there, so you can't blame it exclusively on the dietary guidelines. But what type of correlation do you see?

In 1980, we saw obesity at rates of 15 percent and—for adults, 5 percent for children. Now it is staggering, 40 percent for adults and 19 percent for youth. What do you attribute that to?

Mr. LIPPS. This is always an important part of the discussion with regard to science, Mr. Fortenberry, is correlation versus causation, and it is an important issue that we have to continue to look at and discuss.

What you said about dietary guidelines is true. What we also know is that most Americans don't abide by the dietary guidelines. I think the agency has a lot of work to do on that front. We have started some different initiatives called Start Simple, just trying to get Americans to do a few things. We make them too complex and they ignore them.

So there is much work to be done across that front. We want to make sure that the science is analyzed in an open and transparent way and that all science is considered and they are making recommendations based on the whole of the science and not the headline of the day, which is what we talked about earlier. So it is an important issue, and we will continue to look at those.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Well, I think it begs the question as to how much authority you now have in the space, because you have been subsumed into the information age where there is so much competing dynamics. Yeah, a new study will come out by a new institute almost on a daily basis that says something that contradicts prevailing thought processes.

So how do you reposition yourself in terms of being the authoritative guideline and have the humility to be continuously self-reflective to make sure that we aren't making some error here and that we aren't part of the causation with some dietary guideline that is maybe partially misinformed?

Mr. LIPPS. Right. And if, you know, there is a suggestion that that is the case, then we should review that carefully. I think with regard to people trusting what the government has to say in this space, the process has to be open, transparent, inclusive, and based on science. And when we set out in this process, that is what USDA set out to do. I think that is what they set out to do last time. There were a lot of concerns about that.

So we are doing everything we can to increase transparency and opportunity for input in the process to make sure that everybody cease that sausage as it is made. And one of the things that the secretaries—this is not just USDA, it is HHS—but are committed to, we talked about at the beginning, is that if the government is not sure, that we ought not to speak.

And so we need to make sure that when we are looking at the science, that we are speaking on those things of which we have great data to show that that may affect health or not, and that we are not moving back and forth with the headline of the day when the government speaks.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Well, I think it is a good news and bad news story. I think there is a growing awareness of this problem, again, of food and health relationship. I think there is a growing awareness again of the word "wellness" has been fully incorporated into most vocabularies. People are very much aware that the stressful dynamics of our overbusyness and scheduling are taking us away from what used to be traditional times for meals and socialization around meals, and yet at the same time, interestingly, the market dynamics that drove that problem are driving it back, as people are looking for, again, places that serve quality fresh food, particularly in restaurants, at affordable prices. But this is changing in terms of the grocery dynamics as well.

So there is some good news on this front, but I am fearful that, again, the government has lost a certain amount of authority in this regard that, again, the dynamics of too much information being out there confuse it, combined with the modern life, has put increasing pressure on people and is resulting in this health decline.

So I know it is a considered part of your agency to look at this, but I do worry that in the midst of all of this chaos and turmoil and information overflow, you have lost authority in this regard.

Mr. LIPPS. I think you are right to have some concern on that front. Again, we want to make sure that folks know what is happening in the process, and then we have got to talk about how we talk to people about that.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Yeah. Yes.

Mr. LIPPS. It is the same as Farm to School.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Yes.

Mr. LIPPS. You, know, anecdotally, we can change kids by participating them in the process.

Mr. FORTENBERRY. Thank you, Mr. Lipps.

I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. BISHOP. Ms. McCollum.

CHILD NUTRITION AND HUNGER

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you. And thank you for bringing up the summer challenge that children have with nutrition, Mr. Chair.

I want to take this a step farther. We have weekends sometimes where we know children are facing food insecurity. We have 3-day, 4-day weekends. Then we have winter break, we have spring break, and then we have the summer.

I have had the opportunity to go out and be at some of the schools that are doing some of the feeding programs, but those are for children sometimes who can find a way to get to the summer school program to even participate, because there is lack of transportation and families being able to get their children there and then work out the flexibility of daycare for the rest of the day. And the amount of food that is served is limited as to what the school is going to be able to prepare because they are running on a skeleton staff.

What are the real discussions that are taking place behind the scenes over in the Department? Is this just like, well, if the kids are in school, are we going to do this? Or are we really having a conversation, a serious conversation, about the lack of nutrition that these children are basically going without, which means they will eat something that will fill them? And I am not going to mention any brand names and get somebody in trouble. But, you know, drinking something, eating something that many people would call junk food becomes something that is just filling and gets them through the day.

What is really happening? Because our school districts, we can't put this all on the schools, and that is what is happening. Our schools are being tasked to do more and more and criticized for not delivering, you know, a utopia. What are we doing? What is the USDA doing to really address childhood nutrition and hunger in this country?

Mr. LIPPS. Sure. Representative, you know, this is one of the more complicated issues that deserves a lot of discussion as Child Nutrition Reauthorization comes forward. As you know, that expired in 2016, and it is one of the pivotal issues that need to be looked at. There are a number of programs out there to serve children, certainly the school meals programs. Child and Adult Food Program operates after school, sometimes summer programs or summer feeding. We don't have authority to run weekend programs.

So you may know, a lot of nonprofit volunteers, food banks, et cetera, are running backpack programs on weekends, those types of things. We have authority to run holidays but not back ends—sorry—weekends or these breaks. And so that is a very important issue.

And you know, as I do, you talk to teachers, and they talk about kids coming back on Monday, having had that gap in the middle. It is an important issue. We don't have authority to solve that issue at USDA, but as we are looking at how we provide food across these fronts, I think it is extremely important.

And as I talked about, you know, we continue to test these methodologies on how to get food to the kids. The congregate sites work very well in some places. I have seen them work very well citywide. They run busses in the summer to get all the kids there, but you get outside those city limits and those kids don't have access and the parents can't get them there.

So we are continuing to innovate on that front to provide information to Congress as they consider that, but certainly, hunger outside of school is an issue that is complicated to solve and one we need to continue to engage in.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

SNAP—STATE CERTIFICATION PRIVATIZATION

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

Mr. Lipps, yesterday, we received notification that FNS approved a demonstration waiver for the Kentucky Department for Community Based Services. The waiver allows for the privatization of core SNAP functions that are currently administered by civil servants. I think it will come as a shock to some of my colleagues that vital responsibilities, such as conducting SNAP eligibility interviews, application assistance, and application submission, will be contracted out to private for-profit companies.

Understand this waiver is limited to just one county, but we already have examples from Texas and Indiana where the privatization of these services ultimately hurt people and households that were seeking SNAP. In Texas, for example, applicants waited longer than the required 30-day eligibility determination. In both cases, it is my understanding that the States ultimately stopped these experiments.

Shifting services from public to private contractors shifts the incentives and it eliminates program expertise. Now, the Kentucky Department for Community Based Services requested the waiver in part to improve customer service.

Is that a failure on the part of the Food and Nutrition Service? What can FNS do to help State agencies improve the customer

service so that they don't have to resort to this extreme remedy of contracting out? And can this be terminated before 24 months if it is not working appropriately?

Mr. LIPPS. Mr. Chairman, we are working to ensure that we have all appropriate oversight measures in place to ensure that this is working. Certainly, if it is showing a negative effect on recipients an earlier time, we will do everything necessary to ensure that the recipients are protected and receive their benefits moving forward.

What Kentucky is asking to do are things that Congress has allowed them to do in many of the other low-income programs. And I hear continually when I am out, from various different States, about the difficulty in trying to administer these programs when they are allowed to use one type of contractor in one situation and not in another. And some of that is on situations as simple as a SNAP recipient calling into a State call center and not being able to get basic information on their SNAP case or the status of their application. So that is step 1 of that.

This waiver does allow Kentucky to go a little bit further with that same staff conducting the interview on SNAP that they are conducting across other programs. A similar type of waiver has been operated in four other States for quite sometime successfully. With non-profits—you note that this is a for-profit. States—this State, Kentucky believes that they can provide better service to the recipient on this front. It has been a long time since some other States failed on similar but different measures, and we think it is important that States have the opportunity to see if they can serve recipients better.

The waiver is limited to one county. FNS is providing extensive technical assistance and oversight on this and has two on-the-ground visits planned as soon as the pilot launches, and we will keep you all advised on those.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Lipps.

Okay. Thank you so much for being here today. The Food and Nutrition Service has an enormous responsibility for administering our Nation's nutrition programs. I appreciate your taking time to hear our concerns and to answer our questions. We will forward any additional questions that we may have for the record, and we appreciate your diligence in getting responses to us in a timely manner.

Again, thank you for continuing to work with us, and we look forward to continuing your mission in providing safe and nutritious food to the American people.

With that, the subcommittee is adjourned.

Mr. LIPPS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Questions and answers submitted for the record follow:]

FOOD, NUTRITION AND CONSUMER SERVICES
QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING ON FNS PROGRAMS AND POLICY
OCTOBER 28TH, 2019

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CHAIRMAN SANFORD BISHOP

OFFICE OF THE UNDER SECRETARY

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a table with all mandatory funding that is provided in authorizing language for FNS programs per the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018. List the name, program and amounts for fiscal years 2019, 2020, 2021 and 2022.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

Direct Appropriations for FNS from the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018
(Dollars in Millions)

Title IV Nutrition	Program	2019	2020	2021	2022
Longitudial Data For Research	SNAP	20.0	0.0	0.0	5.0
TEFAP	CAP	4.0	4.0	4.0	4.0
Senior Farmers Market	CAP	20.6	20.6	20.6	20.6
Total		**44.6**	**24.6**	**24.6**	**29.6**

Mr. Bishop: Please explain and justify on a scientific basis FNS' decision to limit the scope and scientific input to the 2020 dietary guidelines.

Response: The Federal Advisory Committee Act requires the Federal government to define the mission and specific duties of each federal advisory committee. Prior to call for nominations for the 2020 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee, USDA and HHS established a transparent and inclusive process to identify the topics and scientific questions for the 2020 Committee to answer. This new step of identifying topics and questions was added to promote a deliberate and transparent process; respond to feedback on our process; identify the expertise needed on the Committee; help manage resources; and ensure the Committee's scientific review addresses Federal nutrition policy and program needs, while avoiding duplication of other Federal efforts, such as not re-examining studies on sodium because a comprehensive scientific review was already under way by the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering and Medicine.

The process used to identify topics and scientific questions involved input from scientists across multiple Federal agencies within USDA and HHS and input from the public through a public call for comments. USDA and HHS received more than 12,000 comments via more than 6,000 submissions from the public on the topics and questions to be answered by the Committee. The scientific questions were prioritized based on four publicly available criteria, and all public comments were reviewed and continue to remain publicly available.

It is important to note that the 2020 Committee has an unprecedented, expanded scope to examine diet and health across the human lifespan, including pregnant women, infants, and toddlers, per the Agricultural Act of 2014. Thus, the 2020 Committee has been tasked with addressing a broad range of high-priority topics and an extensive number of questions that are relevant and important to the Dietary Guidelines.

Further, USDA and HHS are not limiting the scientific input of the 2020 Committee. As the 2020 Committee works to answer the scientific questions from USDA and HHS, they are using three rigorous approaches to examine the evidence: data analysis, systematic reviews, and food pattern modeling. Each of these approaches has a unique, complementary role in examining the science. USDA and HHS established the 2020 Committee with the purpose of ensuring the Dietary Guidelines are grounded in scientific advice from independent experts. USDA and HHS respect and value the independent nature of the 2020 Committee's scientific review.

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a list of all ongoing studies and evaluations that are being conducted in all areas of FNCS including the Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion. Include a brief description of the study, the total projected cost, the amount spent to date, when it started, when it will be completed, whether it is being done in-house or contracted out, who the contractor is, and whether it was mandated by law or not. Also include studies that were completed in fiscal year 2018.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

ONGOING STUDIES:
An updated list of all ongoing studies and evaluations conducted by FNS and the Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion is included for the record. Unless an item specifically says that it is being done in-house, the research is supported by contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements with public and private organizations.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

Extent of Trafficking in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: 2015-2017
This study will update estimates of the extent of trafficking – the exchange of food benefits for cash – using the results of undercover investigations and EBT-based administrative case actions against retailers suspected of trafficking. The update of this key program performance metric will cover the period 2015-2017.

Total Projected Cost:	$162,367
Amount Spent to Date:	$119,581
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	February 2020
Name of Contractor:	Manhattan Strategy Group
Congressional Mandate:	No

Study of Third-Party Processor Services, Fees, and Business Practices
Section 4002 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 requires all authorized retailers (except farmers markets and certain other store types) to pay 100 percent of the costs of EBT point-of-sale equipment and related services. Many smaller stores that had previously received EBT equipment and services free-of-charge through EBT vendors are now required to procure equipment and services independently. In most cases, retailers procure both the equipment and related payment card services through a Third Party Processor (TPP), often in combination with credit and debit card services. There is considerable variation among TPPs in terms of the types of services offered, pricing structures, and contractual requirements. This study collected information from retailers and TPPs on typical services offered and purchased, pricing models, and other best practices that would facilitate improved FNS guidance to authorized retailers and inform future FNS policy regarding requirements for TPPs.

Total Projected Cost:	$684,607
Amount Spent to Date:	$615,295
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	February 2020
Name of Contractor:	Manhattan Strategy Group
Congressional Mandate:	No

Assess the Barriers that Constrain the Adequacy of SNAP Allotments
The Institute of Medicine (IOM) committee report *SNAP: Examining the Evidence to Define Benefit Adequacy* recommended that FNS assess the individual, household, and environmental factors that limit adequacy of the SNAP allotment. This study developed a new data collection to survey SNAP participants to determine these factors. The survey included questions about cooking skills, shopping patterns, nutritional literacy, financial literacy, time available for preparing food, and other constraints.

Total Projected Cost:	$2,138,955
Amount Spent to Date:	$2,120,302
Start Date:	September 2014
Projected Completion Date:	February 2020
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	No

Evaluation of the Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive Grant Program
The Food Insecurity Nutrition Incentive (FINI) grant program provided $100 million to fund and evaluate projects that were intended to increase fruit and vegetable purchases among SNAP participants by providing incentives at the point of purchase. The evaluation is assessing the impact of grants awarded in Fiscal Years (FYs) 2015, 2016, 2017, and 2018 to State and local governmental entities and nonprofit organizations. An interim report was published in May 2019.

Total Projected Cost:	$5,735,062
Amount Spent to Date:	$3,866,754
Start Date:	June 2015
Projected Completion Date:	July 2020
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, Agricultural Act of 2014

Technology Modernization for SNAP Benefit Redemption
Section 4011 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 amended SNAP authorizing legislation to allow the use of SNAP Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) benefits through mobile technologies and online transactions. FNS will carry out pilot projects to test the feasibility of redeeming SNAP benefits through online transactions and will assess the impacts on participant access, ease of use, and program integrity. The study includes interviews with relevant stakeholders to gather lessons learned and implementation challenges.

Total Projected Cost:	$2,533,688
Amount Spent to Date:	$239,140
Start Date:	May 2018
Projected Completion Date:	May 2021
Name of Contractor:	Abt Associates
Congressional Mandate:	No

Survey of SNAP and Work
About one-third of SNAP households have earnings from employment, and improving the job prospects of SNAP participants is a major priority. But little is known about the types of jobs held by these participants or the work histories of both the employed and those not currently working. This study will develop and conduct a nationally representative survey of SNAP participants (age 18 and older) to better understand their current and past work experience, education level, language skills, military service, and barriers to work (including disability). The survey will include participants from all 50 States and DC and have a large enough sample to produce State-level estimates. Results will be used to inform employment and training strategies, and may be useful in ensuring that SNAP customer service meets the needs of the working poor.

Total Projected Cost:	$8,386,100
Amount Spent to Date:	$387,047
Start Date:	September 2017

Projected Completion Date:	December 2021
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	No

Evaluation of Alternatives to Improve Elderly Access
States currently operate a number of demonstration projects designed to improve program access among the elderly and disabled. These include Combined Application Projects, Elderly Simplified Application Projects, and Standard Medical Deduction projects. While these projects vary in terms of how they operate, all are intended to simplify program access for vulnerable populations. States are required to periodically submit project data to FNS, but this data is often focused on cost-neutrality requirements, and thus it does not provide the information needed to assess whether these projects increase participation, reduce churning, or otherwise simplify program access. This study fills that gap by collecting survey data from participants and administrative data from States operating one or more of these projects to evaluate the extent to which these projects improve program access, whether certain program models or combinations of projects are more effective than others, and what tradeoffs exist between program simplification/access goals and ensuring benefit adequacy. The study will include interviews with State or local staff who operate these programs.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,815,446
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,615,676
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	March 2020
Name of Contractor:	Social Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Analysis of the Impact of the Expiration of Time-Limit Waivers on ABAWD Participation
As the economy has continued to improve, few States qualify for statewide waivers of Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents (ABAWD) time limits. While many States have sought waivers for particular geographic areas, others no longer have any waived areas, subjecting all ABAWD within those States to the 3-month time limit if they do not meet SNAP work or training requirements. This study uses extant data, including SNAP administrative data, Quality Control (QC) data, and labor force data, to estimate the impacts of newly introduced time limits on ABAWD in unwaived areas. The results of this analysis, while descriptive in nature, will provide information on whether ABAWD leave SNAP due to employment, leave SNAP due to time limits, or remain on SNAP while working or participating in a qualifying employment or training activity.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,506,309
Amount Spent to Date:	$180,274
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	August 2020
Name of Contractor:	Urban Institute
Congressional Mandate:	No

Assessment of States' Use of Computer-Matching Protocols in SNAP
This study developed and administered a survey to all 53 SNAP State agencies to catalog how States are currently using or planning to use computer-matching strategies to reduce recipient fraud, payment errors, and administrative burden for both applicants and eligibility workers. Some systems must be used by law, such as the Prisoner Verification System, the Social Security Administration Death Match, and, more recently, the National Directory of New Hires. The use of other matching systems varies by State. The assessment will also quantify the cost of computer-matching and the number of matches by system.

Total Projected Cost:	$942,000
Amount Spent to Date:	$645,563
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	September 2020
Name of Contractor:	Avar Consulting
Congressional Mandate:	No

Evaluation of Pilot Projects to Promote Work and Increase State Accountability in SNAP
The Agricultural Act of 2014 authorizes USDA to enter into cooperative agreements with State agencies to carry out pilot projects designed to raise employment, increase earnings, and reduce reliance on public assistance, including the benefits provided by SNAP. It also directs USDA to undertake an independent longitudinal evaluation of each pilot project using statistical methods that can determine differences in employment, earnings, and public assistance expenditures between those who receive the employment and training programs and services offered under the pilots and a control group that does not receive such services. This study is a multi-site, random assignment evaluation to measure the short- and long-term impacts of the ten State-operated employment and training pilots.

Total Projected Cost:	$28,187,102
Amount Spent to Date:	$20,226,580
Start Date:	December 2014
Projected Completion Date:	January 2022
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, Agricultural Act of 2014

Measuring SNAP Access, Trends, and Impacts
This contract provides support for estimating effects of potential program changes and for short-turnaround analyses of current issues from February 2016 through July 2021. In addition, it includes analysis of participation rates for 2015 to 2019, household characteristics for 2015 to 2019, and for regular updates of the two microsimulation models. Impact analyses under the contract support many FNS legislative and budgetary proposals every year. Other organizations, such as the Congressional Budget Office, community organizations, and private research firms, rely on the regular publication of these studies.

Total Projected Cost:	$7,778,129
Amount Spent to Date:	$4,665,910
Start Date:	February 2016
Projected Completion Date:	July 2021
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Modernizing Channels of Communication with SNAP Participants
In recent years, many States have enhanced their use of mobile communication strategies (MCS) to enable SNAP participants to access information about SNAP, receive alerts and notifications, and perform certain case management functions. These MCS offer SNAP participants an alternative means of interacting with SNAP agencies and have the potential to improve customer access and streamline case management activities. This study will highlight lessons learned from MCS implementation and identify best practices that lead to improved program outcomes. The study will also collect data on States' and program recipients' use of and satisfaction with MCS.

Total Projected Cost:	$406,739
Amount Spent to Date:	$119,828
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	September 2021
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Assessing the Reasons Behind Atypical SNAP Account Activity
This study will update previous analyses of SNAP benefit redemption patterns. In addition, it seeks to understand and define unusual account activity and the reasons such activity may occur by analyzing EBT transaction data, with the option of collecting State SNAP administrative data and conducting interviews with State SNAP officials.

Total Projected Cost:	$382,198
Amount Spent to Date:	$187,516
Start Date:	September 2018

Projected Completion Date:	March 2020
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

How States Safeguard SNAP Participation Personally-Identifiable Information
This study seeks to understand how States currently protect SNAP applicant and participant personally-identifiable information (PII) submitted through SNAP applications or maintained in State case files. The study will administer a survey to all 53 SNAP State agencies. In addition, the study will include interviews with industry experts and follow-up interviews with State SNAP or information technology staff to identify best practices.

Total Projected Cost:	$437,509
Amount Spent to Date:	$116,525
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	May 2021
Name of Contractor:	2M Research Group
Congressional Mandate:	No

The Role of Job Search as a SNAP Employment and Training Component
Job search is the most offered component of SNAP E&T services, but little is known about its effectiveness at connecting SNAP participants to employment, particularly when it isn't linked to other education or skills training. The study seeks to collect similar outcome data across States that offer job search services to assess its overall effectiveness, particularly as a stand-alone intervention, and whether certain types of job search are more effective than others. In a limited number of States, a process evaluation will be conducted to understand how job search services operate and where there are areas for improvement.

Total Projected Cost:	$839,257
Amount Spent to Date:	$139,964
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	September 2021
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Understanding the Impact of SNAP Online Applications
The opportunity to apply for SNAP without needing to visit an office or be seen in person, may have unintended consequences for both eligible individuals and program integrity. This study will assess the potential impact(s) of online applications in terms of customer service, identity theft, dual participation in more than one State, payment errors, and other concerns. Also, the study will look at the impact of other State factors, such as service kiosks and the number of SNAP offices.

Total Projected Cost:	$426,296
Amount Spent to Date:	$180,070
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	July 2020
Name of Contractor:	Summit
Congressional Mandate:	No

Diet Quality of Americans by Program Participation Status: 2011-2014
All of the major Federal nutrition assistance programs include improved nutrition among their goals. A critical research question when studying the effectiveness of these programs, therefore, is the relationship between program participation and dietary outcomes. This project will address what low-income Americans eat, compare their diets to accepted standards for healthy eating, and examine the relationship between program participation and dietary intake. It will build on the existing research by using the most current information from the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey to compare the diets of SNAP, NSLP, and WIC participants to non-participants. The study will produce separate reports for each of the three programs.

Total Projected Cost:	$738,755

Amount Spent to Date:	$155,195
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	June 2020
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Understanding Food Related Hardship Among Older Americans
Historically eligible older Americans (age 60+) have participated in SNAP at half the rate of other eligible individuals. There is still much to learn about the factors that contribute to food insecurity and other food-related hardships among older adults in the United States, and the role that nutrition assistance programs such as SNAP may play in ameliorating these conditions. This project will conduct a research grant program to examine food insecurity in seniors and the implications for nutrition assistance programs through analysis of extant data and some small scale primary data collection. The results of the analyses will be summarized in an integrated research review.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,499,959
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,394,110
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	March 2022
Name of Contractor:	University of Kentucky
Congressional Mandate:	No

Best Practices in Disaster Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (D-SNAP) Operations and Planning
While all SNAP State agencies have disaster plans that are updated annually, many States find it challenging to implement a D-SNAP efficiently in the event of an actual disaster. This study will use case studies for States that have recently implemented D-SNAP to highlight best practices and lessons learned by disaster type, policy choices (e.g. food loss only, automatic supplements), and state versus county administered programs. The study will also analyze the economic and demographic characteristics of D-SNAP participants before and after the disaster and estimate the economic impact of D-SNAP benefits.

Total Projected Cost:	$877,594
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	September 2019
Projected Completion Date:	September 2023
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Survey of Employment and Training Case Management
The Agency has long encouraged case management as a best practice within SNAP employment and training (E&T) programs, and case management is an allowable expense for which States may receive reimbursement. The Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 now requires case management to be a part of all State E&T programs. This study will survey all SNAP State agencies to better understand what constitutes case management at the State level, and how that varies from State to State.

Total Projected Cost:	$580,530
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	September 2019
Projected Completion Date:	September 2022
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Evaluation of Child Support Cooperation Requirements in SNAP
The Agricultural Improvement Act of 2018 requires that USDA in cooperation with the Department of Health and Human Services conduct an independent evaluation in a sample of States that currently or formerly sanction participants for failure to cooperate with child support enforcement. The evaluation will include the procedures used by each State to implement the policy, how good cause for noncooperation is determined, the costs associated with

the policy, and impacts on participants such as SNAP eligibility, food security, income, and economic stability.

Total Projected Cost:	$2,106,042
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	September 2019
Projected Completion Date:	September 2022
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	Yes

Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)

National and State-level Estimates of WIC Eligibles and WIC Program Reach, 2017 Update
This study will update the estimates of the WIC-eligible population for the U.S., for each of the 7 FNS regions, and for each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and five U.S. territories: the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Estimates will include breakdowns of each of the eight participant subgroups: pregnant women, infants, children at each year of age (ages 1, 2, 3, and 4), breastfeeding women, and postpartum non-breastfeeding women. These estimates are used to help allocate funding in the WIC funding formula and to track the national WIC coverage rate.

Total Projected Cost:	$154,059.66
Amount Spent to Date:	$125,649.20
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	December 2019
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

National and State-level Estimates of WIC Eligibility and WIC Program Reach, 2018 Update
This study will update the estimates of the WIC-eligible population for the U.S., for each of the 7 FNS regions, and for each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and five U.S. territories: the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Estimates will include breakdowns of each of the eight participant subgroups: pregnant women, infants, children at each year of age (ages 1, 2, 3, and 4), breastfeeding women, and postpartum non-breastfeeding women. These estimates are used to help allocate funding in the WIC funding formula and to track the national WIC coverage rate.

Total Projected Cost:	$154,869.10
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	September 2019
Projected Completion Date:	September 2020
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

Enhancements to the WIC Eligibility Report
This study will provide certain enhancements to the series of WIC eligibility reports to improve the transparency of the estimation process and improve the accuracy of the estimates in future years. Specifically, the study will streamline and modernize SAS programs and processes used to produce estimates, update and expand the adjustment factors for multiple births and infant deaths, obtain information on how frequently individuals are denied WIC due to not being at nutritional risk, and assess feasibility of producing coverage rates by income as a percentage of poverty.

Total Projected Cost:	$ 96,049.00
Amount Spent to Date:	$ 58,715.00
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	May 2020
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

Competitive Grant to Establish a USDA Center for Behavioral Economics and Healthy Food Choice Research

Jointly funded by USDA's Economic Research Services (ERS) and Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), this grant establishes the USDA Behavioral Economics Center for Healthy Food Choice Research (BECR). The objective of BECR is to develop a program of new and innovative research that applies behavioral economics theory to food choice behavior of adults in the marketplace. Researchers will place special emphasis on facilitating food choice behaviors that promote healthy eating and cost-effective program operations within the existing legislation and regulations of SNAP and WIC.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,250,000
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,250,000
Start Date:	September 2014
Projected Completion Date:	September 2019
Name of Contractor:	Duke University and University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC Participant and Program Characteristics (WIC PC) - 2018

The project will generate two reports and supporting datasets using information from State management information systems based on a near census of WIC participants. One report will provide summary information on participant income, nutrition risk, breastfeeding initiation, and demographic characteristics. The second will summarize types and quantities of food prescribed to participants. The results provide a wide range of demographic information on WIC clients and measures of program performance.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,706,725
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,024,169
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	February 2020
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC Food Package Costs and Cost Containment Study

Since the last assessment of WIC cost-containment practices in 2003, there have been substantial changes within WIC, including revisions to food packages, expansion of EBT, and improvements in vendor management. This study will provide a national picture of the food package cost-containment practices that are currently in place, as well as an analysis of the impact of six cost-containment practices on: program participation; access and availability of prescribed foods; redemption rates; participants on special diets or with specific food allergies; participant satisfaction; health outcomes; and program costs. This report will ultimately produce a list of effective food package cost containment best practices that can be implemented by States.

Total Projected Cost:	$2,379,194
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,707,028
Start Date:	September 2015
Projected Completion Date:	April 2020
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC EBT Issuance and Transaction Database (eBIRT)

Every WIC State agency is required to implement EBT statewide by October 1, 2020. WIC EBT systems gather transaction data, including information on the specific items, quantities, and prices of foods selected when benefits are redeemed. This project will explore the feasibility of compiling national WIC EBT issuance and transaction data; linking it to participant, vendor, and program characteristics data; and generating public and restricted use data sets and analytical reports. This feasibility study will gather stakeholder perspectives, consider the strengths and weaknesses of establishing such a system, and estimate potential costs for various design options and features.

Total Projected Cost:	$938,514

Amount Spent to Date:	$115,513
Start Date:	July 2017
Projected Completion Date:	September 2020
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

The Third National Survey of WIC Participants (NSWP-III)
The goal of NSWP-III is to explore characteristics and experiences of WIC participants, State and local WIC agency policies and operations, and levels of improper payments and case errors. To accomplish this, the objectives of NSWP-III are to: (1) estimate certification-related errors and improper payments; (2) develop an aging model for error and improper payment estimates between survey administrations; (3) collect information on State agency (SA) and local WIC agency (LA) certification-related policies and operations to understand those policies and their potential association with errors; (4) provide estimates of size and characteristics of LAs nationwide through a statistical sample; and (5) gather information from a nationally-representative sample of WIC participants about their experiences with WIC.

Total Projected Cost:	$3,380,582
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,876,055
Start Date:	September 2015
Projected Completion Date:	March 2021
Name of Contractor:	Capital Consulting Corporation
Congressional Mandate:	Yes (supports compliance with the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act (IPERA) 2010/12)

WIC Infant and Toddler Feeding Practices Study-2 (WIC ITFPS-2)
This longitudinal, national study updates and expands upon research conducted in the 1990s. The WIC Infant Toddler Feeding Practices Study (WIC ITFPS–2) examines the feeding practices of a national sample of infants who were enrolled in WIC near their births and follows these children through their sixth birthdays. It will determine the prevalence of particular feeding practices in this WIC population as they relate to weight status, and assess how the WIC food packages, instituted in 2009, have influenced feeding practices, including breastfeeding. This study will also examine the circumstances and influences that shape a mother's feeding decisions for their toddler to assist in further improvement of WIC nutrition education.

Total Projected Cost:	$24,242,479
Amount Spent to Date:	$19,157,079
Start Date:	September 2011
Projected Completion Date:	September 2022
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	No

Support for NHANES Diet Quality of WIC Participants
This project provides support for the addition of data elements (including preschool iron status measures) to the HHS-conducted National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) to ensure that the resulting dataset can be used for rigorous analysis of WIC participants' nutrition and health status. The NHANES data enables tracking of changes over time in the comparison of WIC participating children to low income non-participants and higher income children.

Total Projected Cost:	$550,000
Amount Spent to Date:	$267,393
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	December 2020
Name of Contractor:	IAA
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC Nutrition Assessment and Tailoring Study (WIC NATS)
This study will provide a comprehensive account of the WIC nutrition assessment process as it unfolds at the site-

level by documenting how nutrition risk assessments are conducted and examining how the information gathered during the assessment is used to tailor Program benefits (including the WIC food package, nutrition education, and referrals) to the individual needs of participants. The study will also identify promising practices in the nutrition assessment process associated with participant and staff satisfaction, improved efficiency, and reduced staff burden. The tiered study design includes the use of extant information in state and local policy documents, analysis of MIS data, as well as direct observations and interviews at the site-level. The findings from this study can be used to develop guidance to enhance service delivery to improve program satisfaction, retention, and participant health and nutrition outcomes.

Total Projected Cost:	$2,275,956
Amount Spent to Date:	$147,654
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	September 2022
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	No

Quick Response Survey (QRS) on WIC Child Retention
Retaining children (ages 1 to 4 years) has been a primary concern of the WIC Program. Under this QRS task order, a nationally representative sample of WIC local agency staff will be surveyed to examine why child participants leave the WIC Program and to identify staff recommendations for improving child retention. The findings from the study will help to better understand the barriers to child retention in WIC and identify promising local policies and practices that help to promote continued child participation in the Program.

Total Projected Cost:	$295,498
Amount Spent to Date:	$113,410
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	July 2020
Name of Contractor:	2M Research Services, LLC
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC Cash Value Benefit Redemption Study
Despite the widespread popularity of the WIC cash-value benefit (CVB) for fruits and vegetables, it has consistently been under-redeemed. This study will explore reasons for under redemption of the WIC CVB in EBT States. The study will identify participant and State-level factors which may be associated with CVB under redemption (e.g., fruit and vegetable types allowed, minimum stocking requirements, vendor types authorized, use of WIC Smartphone apps) in order to improve guidance to State agencies for increasing redemption of the CVB.

Total Projected Cost:	$538,859
Amount Spent to Date:	$97,342
Start Date:	September 2018
Projected Completion Date:	September 2021
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC State Plan Abstraction Task
Currently, FNS does not systematically summarize or analyze WIC State Plan policy information at a national level. This effort will compile and abstract information from WIC State Plans submitted by all 90 State agencies for 2020 (or the most recent year available). The policy information will be compiled in a database that will enable FNS to summarize and understand select policies and practices described in the State Plans.

Total Projected Cost: $245,479
Amount Spent to Date: $0
Start Date: September 2019
Projected Completion Date: September 2020
Name of Contractor: Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate: No

Hopkins/USDA Participant Research Innovation Laboratory for Enhancing WIC Services
This cooperative agreement establishes the Hopkins/USDA Participant Research Innovation Laboratory for Enhancing WIC Services (HPRIL). HPRIL's main objective is to support and evaluate WIC local agency-initiated projects that design and implement innovative tools aimed at improving participation and retention of children 1-4 years of age. HPRIL selected five WIC local agencies as sub-grantees following a national competition. HPRIL sub-grantees will use their clinic-based management information system (MIS) to obtain data on WIC child participation and retention. Results will be published and widely disseminated. Additionally, a final product of this effort will be a manual developed for WIC agencies on how to utilize the MIS to monitor and track participation, identify clients at risk for early intervention and develop enhanced WIC service strategies to enhance participant satisfaction and improve retention.

Total Projected Cost: $1,999,999
Amount Spent to Date: $199,927
Start Date: September 2018
Projected Completion Date: September 2021
Name of Contractor: Johns Hopkins University
Congressional Mandate: No

WIC Telehealth Innovations Project
This cooperative agreement with Tufts University aims to create, disseminate, and administer competitive awards to WIC State Agencies (SAs) for telehealth technologies that supplement nutrition education and breastfeeding support services and decrease barriers to access. This funding will be used to comprehensively evaluate the impact of the awards and disseminate the promising and successful initiatives broadly. Tufts University will also provide technical support to WIC SAs during the awards process and throughout implementation of the interventions. This project seeks to develop an evidence base to support cost-effective telehealth interventions in WIC, improve client outcomes, and increase client retention in the program.

Total Projected Cost: $3,500,000
Amount Spent to Date: $0
Start Date: September 2019
Projected Completion Date: September 2024
Name of Contractor: Tufts University
Congressional Mandate: No

Child Nutrition Programs

Child Nutrition Programs Operations Study
The objective of the Child Nutrition Programs Operations Study II (CNOPS-II) is to collect timely data on policy, administrative, and operational issues within the CN programs. The study has collected data via online survey for SY 2015-16, SY 2016-17, and SY 2017-18. An additional year of data collection is underway for SY 2018-19. FNS will identify the most relevant policy needs for each of the four years of data collection. The contractor will develop survey instruments to address these policy needs. Each year, the survey instruments will include some repeated questions as well as modules of survey items for specific policy needs relevant to that year. The study will obtain data for each school year individually and will examine trends over the 4 years.

Total Projected Cost: $3,050,670
Amount Spent to Date: $2,033,921

Start Date:	June 2015
Projected Completion Date:	June 2020
Name of Contractor:	2M Research Services, LLC
Congressional Mandate:	No

School Nutrition and Meal Cost Study II (SNMCS-II)
Given FNS's commitment to periodically review the school meal programs and provide critical information to policymakers and other stakeholders, this study will build on the results of initial School Nutrition and Meal Cost Study conducted in School Year 2014-2015. It will provide a comprehensive picture of the school meal programs in School Year 2019-2020 and will provide critical information about the nutritional quality, cost, acceptability of school meals, and the contribution of school meals to students' daily dietary intakes. The integrated structure of this study support analysis of the relationships among key domains including the relationship between the nutritional quality and cost of school meals. This study will also assess the need for meal reimbursement adjustments for five outlying areas (Alaska, Guam, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands). Estimates of the costs to produce school lunches and breakfasts in these outlying areas will be compared to those costs in the contiguous 48 States.

Total Projected Cost:	$19,696,236
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,668,047
Start Date:	September 2017
Projected Completion Date:	September 2022
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

The Summer Meals Study
This is the first national study to simultaneously examine the facilitators and barriers to program participation among participating and non-participating families, sponsors, and sites. This study will also provide up-to-date, nationally representative data on the quality of meals served in the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) and Seamless Summer Option (SSO).

Total Projected Cost:	$4,209,586
Amount Spent to Date:	$2,391,792
Start Date:	August 2016
Projected Completion Date:	Fall 2020
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate	No

Direct Certification Report to Congress SY 2017-2018 & 2018-2019
This study responds to the legislative requirement of Public Law 110-246 to assess the effectiveness of State and local efforts to directly certify children for free school meals. Under direct certification, children are determined eligible for free school meals without the need for household applications by using data from other means-tested programs. The 2004 Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act required local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish a system of direct certification of children from households that receive SNAP benefits by School Year (SY) 2008-2009.

Total Projected Cost:	$0
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	October 2019
Projected Completion Date:	May 2020
Name of Contractor:	N/A (In House)
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law [P.L.] 110-234), also known as the 2008 Farm Bill

Review of Child Nutrition Data & Analysis for Program Management
This project calls for the review and documentation of School Food Authority (SFA) and State NSLP and SBP management information systems. This baseline "as is" review shall document overall NSLP/SBP system design,

capabilities, functions, development/replacement and maintenance costs, typical lifespan, and how the data systems are used by State and SFA officials beyond fulfilling reporting requirements to FNS. The "as is" review will focus particular attention on NSLP and SBP program management data that is collected or generated at the SFA or State agency levels but is not reported to FNS on any of FNS's program forms. The selected contractor will fully document and describe these data elements, how they are used to support management of the NSLP, SBP, or State or local programs, and how commonly each of these elements is collected or generated by SFAs and State agencies.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,099,787
Amount Spent to Date:	$991,003
Start Date:	October 2014
Projected Completion Date:	August 2020
Name of Contractor:	IMPAQ
Congressional Mandate:	No

Special Nutrition Programs Quick Response Surveys (SNP-QRS)
The purpose of SNP-QRS is to develop a system to facilitate shorter, quick-turnaround studies in FNS's Special Nutrition Programs. This project gives FNS the capacity to field single-topic studies that respond to current policy needs in support of its practice of evidence-based decision making.

Total Projected Cost:	$390,341
Amount Spent to Date:	$128,251
Start Date:	May 2015
Projected Completion Date:	May 2020
Name of Contractor:	2M Research Services, LLC
Congressional Mandate:	No

Characteristics of Community Eligibility Provision Schools
The Community Eligibility Provision allows schools and districts with high concentrations of low-income students to offer free meals to all students and eliminates the need for household school meal applications. All local education agencies (LEAs) and schools may participate in CEP if they meet certain criteria. This study examines the characteristics of eligible schools and LEAs that are participating and not participating in CEP. The study will also examine how participation in CEP impacts student participation in the National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program and how it impacts per meal revenues.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,000,369
Amount Spent to Date:	$808,046
Start Date:	September 2015
Projected Completion Date:	Spring 2020
Name of Contractor:	2M Research Services, LLC
Congressional Mandate:	No

CACFP Erroneous Payments in Childcare Centers Study (EPICCS)
This study will produce the first national estimates of erroneous payments in CACFP Childcare centers. This study will provide national estimates for overpayments, underpayments and overall erroneous payments made to CACFP centers based on onsite data collection, web surveys and/or key informant interviews, and review of administrative data. Separate estimates will be made for certification error and meal counting and claiming errors. It will also provide estimation models for use to annually update erroneous payment estimates for CACFP using available extant data (routine administrative records etc.), i.e. without the need for any additional data collection.

Total Projected Cost:	$6,490,808
Amount Spent to Date:	$5,967,124
Start Date:	September 2014
Projected Completion Date:	March 2020
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	Yes (supports compliance with Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 PL 10712-300248)

Study on Nutrition and Wellness Quality in Child Care Settings (SNAQCS)
One portion of this study responds to the requirements of Section 223 of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 to assess: the nutritional quality of foods provided in CACFP-participating child care settings (as compared to the recommendations in the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans and the Dietary Reference Intakes); children's opportunities for physical activity while in child care; and facilitators and barriers to providing healthy foods and physical activity in licensed child care. The second portion of this study will conduct a dietary intake assessment of participants in CACFP and calculate the average meal and snack costs, including indirect and local administrative costs, for CACFP.

Total Projected Cost:	$11,932,344
Amount Spent to Date:	$8,885,304
Start Date:	September 2014
Projected Completion Date:	March 2021
Name of Contractor:	Abt Associates
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010, Section 223

National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program Access, Participation, Eligibility, and Certification Study III (APEC–III)
The Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010 (IPERA) requires the Department of Agriculture (USDA) to identify and reduce improper payments in major Federal programs. APEC III will be the third in the APEC series, and collected data during the 2017-18 School Year. The study will measure certification error and meal counting and claiming error and compare these results with those found in APEC I and II. It will also develop and validate estimation models for updating the erroneous payment estimates annually with NSLP and SBP administrative records and extant data between national studies.

Total Projected Cost:	$11,728,218
Amount Spent to Date:	$9,957,471
Start Date:	September 2015
Projected Completion Date:	September 2020
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act of 2010

Study of Non-Response to NSLP Income Verification
One concern about the impact of the school meals verification process is the potential for children in low income families to lose benefits for which they are eligible due to non-response to a verification request. This study will use a prior study of verification outcomes in large metropolitan school districts to provide a current picture of the verification results in contrast to an independently determined measure of family income. Where possible, the study will re-visit the same communities studied in 2002 and determine if verification accuracy has changed. Additional sites will also be selected to provide a diverse selection of metropolitan areas in terms of geographic region, size and direct certification coverage.

Total Projected Cost:	$2,863,854
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,993,772
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	December 2020
Name of Contractor:	MPR
Congressional Mandate:	No

Evaluation of the Child Nutrition Special Grants
The authorizing legislation for the Child Nutrition Programs provides funding for a number of different grants intended to stimulate program improvement. Currently studies include evaluations of Team Nutrition Grants, Team Nutrition E-STAR Training Evaluation, Administrative Reviews and Training Grants, and Farm to School Grants (combined with Farm to School Census). This project will independently evaluate the impacts of these grants on their intended outcomes, to inform decision-making on continuing these grants or changing their size or scope. As part of the project it will frame revisions to grant requirements to improve grantee reporting and participation in the evaluation. Each evaluation is described separately below:

Evaluation of the Child Nutrition Special Grants – Team Nutrition Training Grants
This independent evaluation of the TN Training Grant program will provide FNS with a comprehensive description of FY16 grant recipients' activities over their three-year award period, including implementation and evaluation strategies, interventions, and characteristics of program participants. The current evaluation coincides with the introduction of a more comprehensive self-evaluation component required of grantees. Therefore, FNS expects that strategies and instruments developed and implemented by FY16 grantees with technical support from the contractor will inform future outcome and impact evaluations carried out by grantees and FNS respectively. The independent impact evaluation to be designed for a sub-set of subsequent grantees should be informed by the FY 2016 evaluation and technical assistance activities, and, in turn, provide rigorous evidence to strengthen the program in the future.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,389,430
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,015,317
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	September 2020
Name of Contractor:	Abt Associates
Congressional Mandate:	No

Evaluation of the Child Nutrition Special Grants - Team Nutrition E-STAR Training Grant Program
This evaluation will examine the implementation and effectiveness of the Team Nutrition Enhanced Strategies, Training, Action Plans, and Resources (E-STAR) Training Grant program. E-STAR, a school food service curriculum developed by the Institute of Child Nutrition, will be implemented starting in SY 2020-21 by Michigan Department of Education (MDE), the State agency that received the FY 2019 Team Nutrition E-STAR Training Grant. This project includes the following arms: (1) a pre/post-test evaluation of E-STAR training received by school nutrition managers (SNMs); (2) a process evaluation of the E-STAR training as implemented and experienced; and (3) evaluation support for MDE, which will assist the grantee in evaluating school-based interventions carried out by the trained SNMs.

Total projected cost:	$2,236,867
Amount spent to date:	$19,217
Start date:	August 2019
Projected Completion date:	January 2024
Name of Contractor:	Abt Associates
Congressional mandate:	No

Evaluation of the Child Nutrition Special Grants - Administrative Review & Training Grants
The independent research on ART Grants will provide FNS with an in-depth understanding of their long-term impact on administrative error rates and administrative review processes. This will provide a base of knowledge for future interventions intended to reduce administrative error and improve State agency data systems, whether funded through ART Grants or otherwise.

Total Projected Cost:	$994,483
Amount Spent to Date:	$926,942
Start Date:	October 2017
Projected Completion Date:	October 2020
Name of Contractor:	Abt Associates
Congressional Mandate:	No

Farm to School Census and Comprehensive Review of Farm to School Grant Program
In addition to conducting a census of Farm to School activities across the country, this study will review and describe the multiple facets of farm to school, including the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm to School Grant Program and other data sources. The final report will comprehensively examine farm to school and its progress since 2010.

Total projected cost:	$2,097,096
Amount spent to date:	$691,966
Start date:	October 2017
Projected Completion date:	November 2020
Name of Contractor:	Abt Associates
Congressional mandate:	No

Assessment of Alternatives to the SAE Formula
The Child Nutrition programs have changed substantially since the SAE formula was last revised in the 1990s. This project will assess the effectiveness of the current formula used for State administrative expense fund allocations, and develop and test a range of possible alternative algorithms to improve the formula.

Total Projected Cost:	$605,535
Amount Spent to Date:	$583,713
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	February 2020
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	No

Study of SFA Procurement Practices
This study is a nationally representative descriptive study of current procurement practices used by SFAs including the scope and nature of food service management company contracts, cooperative buying arrangements, recordkeeping used to track rebates, discounts, and credits, local purchasing preferences, and food purchasing specifications.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,037,290
Amount Spent to Date:	$713,110
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	September 2020
Name of Contractor:	2M Research Services LLC
Congressional Mandate:	No

Assessment of the Administrative Review Process
In school year 2013-2014, FNS launched a new Administrative Review process for the school meals programs. This study assesses the extent to which these reviews effectively identify risk areas and noncompliance with program requirements. Findings will help to ensure that State agencies are able to provide meaningful technical assistance and appropriate corrective action for noncompliance. The study will also examine the management of review and oversight resources. Where weaknesses in process or outcomes are found, the project will seek to identify more effective methods already in use in government and/or industry for application in school meals.

Total Projected Cost:	$941,369
Amount Spent to Date:	$935,046
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	January 2020
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	No

Evaluation of the Independent Review Process
The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010(HHFKA) included several provisions to help increase effectiveness and integrity in Child Nutrition Programs. As part of an effort to decrease certification error during the eligibility

determination process, Section 304 of the HHFKA requires local educational agencies (LEAs) that demonstrate high levels of, or a high risk for administrative error associated with certification, verification and other administrative processes to conduct an independent review of the initial eligibility determinations for free and reduced price school meal applications for accuracy prior to notifying households of eligibility. The final rule *Independent Review of Applications Required by the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010,* published in the Federal Register on February 6, 2014, established in 7 CFR parts 210 and 245 the requirements related to the second review of applications process, which became effective in School Year (SY) 2014-2015. FNS is interested in learning more about the process and the reporting procedures to determine the influence of the independent review of applications (IRA) and the accuracy of the reporting. This study will assess the value and effectiveness of the Independent Review process (second, independent review of applications) in reducing administrative error occurring in the certification of applications for free and reduced price school meal benefits.

Total Projected Cost:	$850,585
Amount Spent to Date:	$344,278
Start Date:	September 2017
Projected Completion Date:	May 2021
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	No

Evaluation of the Direct Certification with Medicaid for Free and Reduced-Price Meal (DCM-F/RP) Demonstrations

Beginning in school year (SY) 2016-2017, FNS began to conduct new demonstrations to evaluate direct certification with Medicaid in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and School Breakfast Program (SBP). Because direct certification has the potential to improve student access to school meals, reduce administrative burden for schools and LEAs, and improve certification accuracy, FNS awarded demonstrations to a first cohort of seven states to evaluate the impact of using Medicaid data to directly certify students for both free and reduced price meal eligibility in SY 2016-2017. In SY 2017-2018, an additional cohort of eight states were awarded demonstration projects to evaluate the impact of using Medicaid data to directly certify students for both free and reduced price meal eligibility. As of SY 2019-20, fifteen (15) States are participating in the DCM-F/RP demonstrations.

Total Projected Cost:	$5,124,249
Amount Spent to Date:	$3,191,092
Start Date:	September 2016
Projected Completion Date:	February 2022
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, demonstration authority provided in Section 9(b) of the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act (42 U.S.C. 1758(b), as amended by Sec. 103 of the Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010.

School Food Purchase IV Study

The School Food Purchase Study series is designed to provide the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Food and Nutrition Service (FNS), with statistically valid national estimates of food acquisitions (both purchased foods and USDA Foods) made by school districts participating in federally supported school feeding programs. These estimates can be used to examine the type and volume of foods purchased directly by schools and the relative importance of foods donated by USDA. In addition, there is a desire to assess changes in food acquisitions over time and provide comparisons of foods purchased by various subgroups including districts managed by Food Service Management Companies (FSMCs) with those that are non-FSMC districts. The study is also designed to collect data about food purchase practices so that information associated with food buying efficiency can be provided to school districts. This study will compare food acquisitions from this study's data collection in School Year (SY) 2020-2021 to the data collection from the previous School Food Purchase Study (SFP-III) in SY 2009-2010. During the time between the two data collections, updated meal standards were implemented; therefore, this study also will compare food acquisitions pre- and post- updated school meal standards.

Total projected cost:	$2,816,233
Amount spent to date:	$0

Start date: September 2019
Projected Completion date: September 2023
Name of Contractor: Westat
Congressional mandate: No

Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Integrity Study
This national study will examine how various State Agencies successfully administer and provide effective Program oversight. The study will consider Program characteristics, location – such as differences in rural and urban areas, and best practices and challenges associated with each model. It will also focus on identifying potential barriers to ensuring the integrity and effective management of Program operations. The survey will provide additional insight into nationwide integrity challenges existing in the SFSP. The study results will help FNS identify what resources, training, or technical assistance may be necessary to provide State Agencies in their effective administration and monitoring of the SFSP.

Total Projected Cost: $1,199,885
Amount Spent to Date: $277,334
Start Date: September 2018
Projected Completion Date: September 2021
Name of Contractor: Westat
Congressional Mandate: Yes (supports compliance with Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 [PL 112-248])

2018 Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) for Children Evaluation
The Summer EBT for Children demonstrations were authorized and funded by Congress in 2010 as a complement to traditional summer meal programs. A rigorous evaluation showed that Summer EBT substantially reduced food insecurity among children and increased the consumption of healthy foods. This study will continue to examine benefit use (participation, redemption). Also, as new grantees were added in 2018(Tennessee and Texas), the study will provide an examination of the start-up challenges and costs experienced by these new grantees, as well as those that have expanded to additional areas. Data will be collected via surveys of 2015-2018 grantees; semi-structured phone interviews with grantees and FNS staff; and "cost data forms" completed by the 2018 grantees. In additional, the EBT transaction data will be collected from the grantees.

Total Projected Cost: $1,255,645
Amount Spent to Date: $436,107
Start Date: October 2018
Projected Completion Date: September 2020
Name of Contractor: Abt Associates
Congressional Mandate: Yes (2010 Agriculture Appropriations Act [P.L. 111-80] provided authority and funding for USDA FNS to demonstrate and evaluate methods of reducing or preventing food insecurity and hunger among children in the summer months)

2019 Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer (EBT) for Children Evaluation
This study will document how the Summer Electronic Benefit Transfer ("Summer EBT") expansion projects were implemented and administered in 2019 through 2022 by 4 grantees (2 existing grantees, Chickasaw Nation and Michigan, expanded in FY2019 while 2 new grantees, Inter Tribal Council of Arizona and Wisconsin, begin implementation in FY2020) and to describe the participants' and retailers' experiences with Summer EBT in these States/ITOs. The study will also collect and analyze EBT data from the grantees in order to describe and assess participant benefit use across the 3 summers that each project will offer benefits. The funds awarded in September 2019 will support the evaluation through FY2022.

Total Projected Cost: $5,063,728
Amount Spent to Date: $0
Start Date: September 2019
Projected Completion Date: September 2024
Name of Contractor: Abt Associates

Congressional Mandate:	Yes (2010 Agriculture Appropriations Act [P.L. 111-80] provided authority and funding for USDA FNS to demonstrate and evaluate methods of reducing or preventing food insecurity and hunger among children in the summer months)

Food Distribution Programs

USDA Foods State of Origin Report Fiscal Year 2017
The Federal Food Distribution Programs provide food and nutrition assistance to school children and families and support American agriculture by distributing high quality, 100 percent American-grown USDA Foods. This report analyzes State of origin data for Fiscal Year (FY) 2017, which captures the State where USDA purchased USDA Foods during FY 2017. Purchased USDA Foods included both raw food products such as meats, vegetables, and fruits, as well as finished food products like cereal, crackers, and pasta.

Total Projected Cost:	$0
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	November 2019
Projected Completion Date:	January 2020
Name of Contractor:	N/A (In House)
Congressional Mandate:	No

Retail Value of the FDPIR Food Package
This project will update the estimates of the retail value of the average 2017 Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) food package. The resulting estimates will be compared to the level of benefits provided to SNAP participants.

Total Projected Cost:	$0
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	February 2019
Projected Completion Date:	September 2020
Name of Contractor:	N/A (In House)
Congressional Mandate:	No

COMPLETED STUDIES:
An updated list of studies completed in fiscal years 2018 and 2019 is provided for the record. Published reports can be downloaded at https://www.fns.usda.gov/research-analysis.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)

Feasibility of Revising the SNAP Quality Control (QC) Review Process
The Office of the Inspector General (OIG) recommended that FNS conduct a cost/benefit analysis of changing the QC system from a two-tier process that relies on States to review SNAP cases and make payment error determinations with a subsample re-reviewed by FNS employees to a one-tier process, where only FNS or an unaffiliated, contracted third-party reviews SNAP cases for errors. This study identified the components and processes required by a one-tier process where one central organization within FNS conducts the QC reviews for all 53 State agencies. This feasibility study assessed the costs, staffing and organization changes, system requirements, data-sharing agreements, and access to State or other databases that would be needed to convert the current QC review process to a one-tier review process conducted by Federal reviewers.

Total Projected Cost:	$756,899
Amount Spent to Date:	$754,131
Start Date:	July 2017
Completion Date:	December 2019
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Assessment of Small Retailers' Scanner Capabilities
Section 4002 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 requires all SNAP authorized retailers to use scanner or product lookup entry technologies when redeeming SNAP benefits, unless the retailer is located in an area with significantly limited access to food. This study provided current information on adoption of scanning technology among small SNAP-authorized retailers to assess readiness for meeting the Farm Bill requirement, barriers and benefits to adopting scanning technologies, and costs for non-adopting retailers to comply with this requirement.

Total Projected Cost:	$880,919
Amount Spent to Date:	$871,283
Start Date:	September 2016
Completion Date:	August 2019
Name of Contractor:	RTI
Congressional Mandate:	No

Exploring the Causes of State Variances in SNAP Administrative Costs
The Federal Government fully funds SNAP benefits, but FNS and State agencies share administrative expenses, with each paying about 50 percent. State administrative costs per case varies widely by state. This study explores a number of factors, including State economic conditions, SNAP caseload characteristics, and State SNAP policies, to try to explain the variation by State.

Total Projected Cost:	$343,817
Amount Spent to Date:	$343,504
Start Date:	September 2017
Completion Date:	June 2019
Name of Contractor:	Manhattan Strategy Group
Congressional Mandate:	No

An Estimate of Potential Identity Theft in SNAP in Two States
This exploratory study estimated the extent to which potential identity theft was used to obtain SNAP benefits in Florida and Missouri during a 12-month period (June 2016 to May 2017). The prevalence of potential identity theft was estimated from examining the SNAP caseload data for cases with data discrepancies requiring referral to the state SNAP agency for further investigation. Because identity theft can be truly determined only after a detailed fraud investigation is conducted, the study estimates are to be considered potential identity theft rather than true identity theft.

Total Projected Cost:	$517,592
Amount Spent to Date:	$517,591
Start Date:	September 2016
Completion Date:	May 2019
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Demonstration Projects to End Childhood Hunger
The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act (HHFKA) of 2010 (Public Law 111-296), under Section 141, added a new Section 23 on Childhood Hunger Research to the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act. This section provides substantial new mandatory funding to research the causes and consequences of childhood hunger and to test innovative strategies to end child hunger and food insecurity. This provision provided $40 million to USDA to conduct and evaluate the demonstration projects. Cooperative agreements totaling nearly $30 million were awarded to three States (Kentucky, Nevada, Virginia) and two Tribes (Chickasaw Nation, Navajo Nation). The HHFKA required a rigorous evaluation to assess the impact of the demonstration projects on the prevalence of child food insecurity, and other relevant outcomes.

Total Projected Cost:	$10,566,718
Amount Spent to Date:	$10,539,451

Start Date:	September 2014
Completion Date:	April 2018
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act (HHFKA) of 2010

Identifying Program Components and Practices that Influence Application Processing Time and Timeliness Rates
This study sought to better understand the root causes of SNAP application timeliness concerns. A comprehensive study of program components and practices adopted by the 50 States and the District of Columbia to process SNAP applications was conducted. The study objectives were to understand the characteristics of States' application processing procedures and examine what facilitates or impedes States' ability to meet Federal requirements for application timeliness.

Total Projected Cost:	$922,870
Amount Spent to Date:	$921,640
Start Date:	September 2015
Completion Date:	February 2019
Name of Contractor:	WRMA
Congressional Mandate:	No

Understanding the Antifraud Measures of Large SNAP Retailers
Traditionally, FNS has concentrated its fraud prevention efforts on eliminating retailer-level trafficking and other SNAP fraud in smaller stores. This is because no available research has suggested large amounts of trafficking at large national retail chains, and because large national retail chains have internal loss-prevention systems designed to eliminate many kinds of loss and to prevent fraud, including SNAP fraud. This study sought to describe the kinds of SNAP fraud that occur in large retailers; describe the methods large retailers use to prevent, detect, and report fraud in general, and SNAP benefit trafficking.

Total Projected Cost:	$843,152
Amount Spent to Date:	$683,191
Start Date:	September 2015
Completion Date:	September 2018
Name of Contractor:	Economic Systems Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants and Children (WIC)

National and State-level Estimates of WIC Eligibility and WIC Program Reach, 2016 Update
This study will update the estimates of the WIC-eligible population for the U.S., for each of the 7 FNS regions, and for each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and five U.S. territories: the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the United States Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Estimates will include breakdowns of each of the eight participant subgroups: pregnant women, infants, children at each year of age (ages 1, 2, 3, and 4), breastfeeding women, and postpartum non-breastfeeding women. These estimates are used to help allocate funding in the WIC funding formula and to track the national WIC coverage rate.

Total Projected Cost:	$152,686
Amount Spent to Date:	$126,158
Start Date:	September 2017
Completion Date:	February 2019
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC Participant and Program Characteristics (WIC PC) - 2016
The project will generate two reports and supporting datasets using information from State management information

systems based on a near census of WIC participants. One report will provide summary information on participant income, nutrition risk, breastfeeding initiation, and demographic characteristics. The second will summarize types and quantities of food prescribed to participants. The results provide a wide range of demographic information on WIC clients and measures of program performance.

Total Projected Cost:	$995,641
Amount Spent to Date:	$957,190
Start Date:	September 2015
Completion Date:	April 2018
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC Food Package Cost Report
This report series determines the pre- and post-rebate cost to WIC of providing foods for 17 food categories. The most recent report, for FY 2010, estimated the national average food package cost by participant category. These estimates contribute to WIC cost projections and costing of legislative and regulatory alternatives. This project would provide estimates for FY 2014 and the contract vehicle to obtain additional years estimates.

Total Projected Cost:	$287,564
Amount Spent to Date:	$182,707
Start Date:	September 2016
Completion Date:	October 2018
Name of Contractor:	Insight Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC Medicaid II Feasibility Study
The first FNS-sponsored WIC Medicaid Study, published in 1991, found that in 1987-88, every dollar spent on WIC services to low-income pregnant women saved $1.77 to $3.13 in Medicaid cost during the first 60 days following delivery. The present study will explore the feasibility of 1) replicating this study to update the findings, and 2) extending the exploration of WIC cost-benefit and cost-effectiveness for pregnant women and other categories of WIC participants. The contract includes an option to extend the study to additional States if the analysis proves feasible. The cost and timing information provided below includes only the feasibility study.

Total Projected Cost:	$2,236,018
Amount Spent to Date:	$2,236,018
Start Date:	August 2010
Completion Date:	September 2018
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica Policy Research, Inc.
Congressional Mandate:	No

WIC Nutrition Education Study
The main objectives of this study are to provide a nationally representative description of WIC nutrition education and to perform a pilot study on the impact of WIC nutrition education on behavioral and physical activity outcomes in six sites. The descriptive findings will be used to inform and refine the pilot study. This study used multiple modes of data collection from state agencies, local agencies, nutrition educators, and WIC participants to fully capture WIC nutrition education dosage, duration, and frequency of use by geographic distribution and local agency characteristics.

Total Projected Cost:	$3,709,677
Amount Spent to Date:	$3,709,675
Start Date:	September 2012
Completion Date:	September 2018
Name of Contractor:	Research Triangle Institute
Congressionally Mandated:	No

WIC Nutrition Services and Administration (NSA) Cost Study
The WIC Nutrition Services and Administration (NSA) Cost Study examines how program funds are expended by State and local agencies to support the management and operation of WIC. The study analyzed data from a national survey of State and local agencies, cases studies, and FY 2013 WIC administrative data (FNS-798 and FNS-798A).

Total Projected Cost:	$1,804,555
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,804,555
Start Date:	September 2012
Completion Date:	November 2017
Name of Contractor:	Altarum Institute
Congressional Mandated:	No

Aligning Food Package Prescription to Actual Breastfeeding Practice
The WIC food packages for breastfeeding women vary in foods and quantities depending upon breastfeeding exclusivity or supplementation with infant formula. Previous research found that the questions used to determine the extent of breastfeeding in prescribing packages vary among local WIC agencies. This study leveraged data collected by ITFPS-2 to estimate alignment of food packages with reported feeding behaviors. This secondary data analysis explored alignment between food package issuance, as indicated by administrative data, with breastfeeding behaviors, as indicated through 24-hour dietary recalls, and survey questions.

Total Projected Cost:	$503,654
Amount Spent to Date:	$503,654
Start Date:	August 2016
Completion Date:	October 2017
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	No

Child Nutrition Programs

USDA Foods Trends Analysis
The contractor used USDA Foods data collected via the Web-Based Supply Chain Management (WBSCM) System and the Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Order Receipt System (FFAVORS) to conduct analyses on food purchases and spending at the national and State levels for four school years. This research was an extension of the analyses conducted as part of the Evaluation of the USDA Pilot Project for the Procurement of Unprocessed Fruits and Vegetables.

Total projected cost:	$545,869
Amount spent to date:	$545,869
Start date:	September 2017
Completion date:	December 2019
Name of Contractor:	Econometrica
Congressional Mandate:	No

School Nutrition and Meal Cost Study (SNMCS-I)
The National School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program are designed to provide nutritionally balanced, low cost or free meals to children. With the implementation of the updated meal standards, there is considerable interest in research on the success of school meals meeting these new program goals, the cost of serving healthful meals that are acceptable to children, and the relationship of school menus and competitive foods to children's participation and diets. This study, which includes the fifth cycle of the periodic School Nutrition Dietary Assessment, will examine the relationships between school environment and school food service operations, nutritional quality of meals offered and served in school meal programs, plate waste, costs to produce reimbursable meals, student participation, participant characteristics, satisfaction and related attitudes toward the school lunch and breakfast programs. Primary data collection occurred in School Year 2014/15, with follow up collection in School Year 2015/16.

Total Projected Cost:	$18,844,011

Amount Spent to Date:	$18,711,412
Start Date:	February 2013
Completion Date:	October 2019
Name of Contractor:	Mathematica Policy Research
Congressional Mandate:	No

Center for Behavioral Economics in Child Nutrition Programs
USDA funded a cooperative agreement with the Cornell Center for Behavioral Economics in Child Nutrition Programs (BEN Center) through a partnership between ERS and FNS. The agreement supported the development, expansion, and evaluation of the BEN Center's Smarter Lunchrooms initiative to encourage healthy eating choices in school cafeterias.

Total Projected Cost:	$8,396,807
Amount Spent to Date:	$8,396,807
Start Date:	September 2010
Completion Date:	September 2019
Name of Contractor:	Cornell University
Congressional Mandate:	No

Evaluation of the School Meal Data Collection Process
The Evaluation of the School Meal Data Collection Process study describes and evaluates the methodologies and processes used by schools, school food authorities (SFAs), and state agencies to collect and report data on three Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) forms used for the federal school meal programs: the Report of School Program Operations (FNS-10), the SFA Verification Collection Report (FNS-742), and the State Agency Direct Certification Rate Data Element Report (FNS-834). In addition to describing the processes, the study identifies potential sources of error when completing the three forms and provides useful practices and recommendations for improving data collection processes.

Total Projected Cost:	$995,802
Amount Spent to Date:	$977,771
Start Date:	September 2016
Completion Date:	August 2019
Name of Contractor:	Westat
Congressional Mandate:	No

Child Nutrition Reporting Burden Analysis Study
The Child Nutrition Reporting Burden Analysis Study was commissioned by the USDA Food and Nutrition Service in response to a legislative requirement of House Report 114-531. The study examined challenges faced by state agencies (SAs) and School Food Authorities (SFAs) related to child nutrition (CN) program administrative and reporting requirements and identifying those that contribute most to the workload for SAs and SFAs that operate CN programs.

Total Projected Cost:	$944,203
Amount Spent to Date:	$889,203
Start Date:	September 2017
Completion Date:	July 2019
Name of Contractor:	2M Research Services, LLC
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, Public Law 115–31

Successful Approaches to Reduce Sodium in School Meals Study
This study was designed to provide information on (1) the market availability of foods that meet the sodium standards for school meal programs set by regulation in 2012, (2) the strategies most often used by schools that have met the sodium targets, and (3) the technical assistance needs of schools and districts working to develop lower sodium menus.

Total Projected Cost:	$661,944
Amount Spent to Date:	$661,944
Start Date:	September 2016
Completion Date:	June 2019
Name of Contractor:	2M Research Services, LLC
Congressional Mandate:	No

The Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Characteristics Study
The Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) Characteristics Study presents findings from the SFSP Provider and Characteristics Study completed in FY 2017 under a contract with Optimal Solutions Group. It is the first comprehensive evaluation of the program since 2003. The study was designed to describe SFSP operations and characteristics at the State, sponsor, and site levels. Survey data was collected in the summer of 2015 from a census of the 53 State Agencies (all 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico); a nationally representative sample of 307 SFSP sponsors; and a nationally representative sample of 320 SFSP sites.

Total Projected Cost:	$15,804.98
Amount Spent to Date:	$15,804.98
Start Date:	August 2018
Completion Date:	June 2019
Name of Contractor:	Fors Marsh Group
Congressional Mandate:	No

School Wellness Policy Cooperative Agreement
The Healthy, Hunger-Free Kids Act of 2010 requires that each local education agency (LEA) participating in the National School Lunch Program (NSLP) and/or School Breakfast Program (SBP) establish, for all schools under its jurisdiction, a local wellness policy (LWP). The objective of the current project is to provide an in-depth, national examination of LWPs and any associated state laws and/or district policies. In addition, the influence of the state laws and/or district policies on school practices and student outcomes will be examined.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,695,511
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,695,511
Start Date:	February 2015
Completion Date:	June 2019
Name of Contractor:	University of Illinois at Chicago and the Rudd Center for Food Policy and Obesity at the University of Connecticut
Congressional Mandate:	No

CACFP Improper Payments Meal Claims Feasibility Study 2014
The USDA's Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) sponsored the 2010 CACFP Assessment of Meal Claims Improper Payments, which tested the feasibility of using parent recall as a component of measuring erroneous payments for meals served and claimed at family day care homes (FDCHs). The results showed that parent recall of meals served was a poor proxy measure for actual meals served at FDCHs and thus did not provide a viable method for estimating erroneous payments of CACFP meal claims. The purpose of this study is to establish a method for accurately estimating meals served at FDCHs and comparing those to meals claimed and calculating error, and tests the viability of this method on a sample of FDCHs for the purpose of estimating the rate of improper payments for CACFP meal claims.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,157,700
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,156,800
Start Date:	September 2014
Completion Date:	May 2019
Name of Contractor:	Manhattan Strategy Group
Congressional Mandate:	Yes (supports compliance with Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Improvement Act of 2012 PL 112-248)

Rural Child Poverty Nutrition Center 2015
The University of Kentucky was awarded a $2.5 million grant to establish the USDA Rural Child Poverty Nutrition Center (RCPNC). The goal of the RCPNC is to reduce child food insecurity in persistently poor rural counties. The RCPNC developed and administered competitive sub-grants aimed at increasing coordination in Child Nutrition programs in persistently-poor, rural areas. In March, 2016, approximately $1.3 million was awarded to 17 organizations working in 12 states. The RCPNC conducted an evaluation of sub-grantees' programs, and disseminated information on communities' implementation strategies and evaluation findings. Grant funding enabled communities to better coordinate various nutrition assistance programs, which is expected to result in improved program participation rates.

Total Projected Cost:	$2,500,000
Amount Spent to Date:	$2,500,000
Start Date:	April 2015
Completion Date:	March 2019
Name of Grantee:	University of Kentucky
Congressional Mandate:	No

CACFP Sponsor and Provider Characteristics Study
The goal of this study is to conduct a national survey of CACFP sponsors and providers that will provide policy-makers, advocates, and the general public with up-to-date information about sponsoring organizations for child care providers; the type of training and technical assistance sponsors receive from their State Child Nutrition Agency; how often and what aspects of the program States monitor; how sponsors operate and manage the program to ensure its integrity, as well as compliance with Federal and State regulation; and what types of providers do sponsors serve.

Total Projected Cost:	$1,776,757
Amount Spent to Date:	$1,717,355
Start Date:	September 2013
Completion Date:	August 2018
Name of Contractor:	Kokopelli Associates, LLC
Congressional Mandate:	No

Direct Certification Report to Congress SY 2015-2016 & 2016-2017
This study responds to the legislative requirement of Public Law 110-246 to assess the effectiveness of State and local efforts to directly certify children for free school meals. Under direct certification, children are determined eligible for free school meals without the need for household applications by using data from other means-tested programs. The 2004 Child Nutrition and WIC Reauthorization Act required local educational agencies (LEAs) to establish a system of direct certification of children from households that receive SNAP benefits by School Year (SY) 2008-2009.

Total Projected Cost:	$0
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	April 2018
Completion Date:	November 2018
Name of Contractor:	N/A (In House)
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, The Food, Conservation, and Energy Act of 2008 (Public Law [P.L.] 110-234), also known as the 2008 Farm Bill

Evaluation of Pilot Project for Procurement of Unprocessed Fruits and Vegetables
Authorized by Section 4202 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-79, the 2014 Farm Bill), the USDA Pilot Project for Procurement of Unprocessed Fruits and Vegetables was designed to provide States with additional flexibility in the procurement of unprocessed fruits and vegetables. Participating States and school food authorities (SFAs) can purchase approved items with existing USDA Foods National School Lunch Program entitlement funds from any USDA Pilot-authorized vendor in support of the school meal standards. Using administrative purchase data from three school years (SY 2013-2014, 2014-2015, 2015-2016) and qualitative interview data with State Distributing Agency officials, the evaluation examines the quantity and cost of each type of fruit and vegetable in the Pilot, characteristics of participating school food authorities, States' perceptions of the challenges and benefits to

participation, and comparisons to USDA Foods and USDA Department of Defense Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program.

Total Projected Cost:	$545,302
Amount Spent to Date:	$545,302
Start Date:	September 2015
Completion Date:	March 2018
Name of Grantee:	Econometrica
Congressional Mandate:	Yes, Section 4202 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-79, the 2014 Farm Bill)

Food Distribution Programs

Retail Value of the FDPIR Food Package
This project updated the estimates of the retail value of the average Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations (FDPIR) food package. As with a previous report on this subject, the resulting estimates were compared to the level of benefits provided to SNAP participants.

Total Projected Cost:	$0
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	June 2015
Completion Date:	September 2018
Name of Contractor:	N/A (In House)
Congressional Mandate:	No

USDA Foods State of Origin Report Fiscal Year 2016
The Federal Food Distribution Programs provide food and nutrition assistance to school children and families and support American agriculture by distributing high quality, 100 percent American-grown USDA Foods. This report analyzed State of origin data for Fiscal Year (FY) 2015, which captured the State where USDA purchased USDA Foods during FY 2015. Purchased USDA Foods included both raw food products such as meats, vegetables, and fruits, as well as finished food products like cereal, crackers, and pasta.

Total Projected Cost:	$0
Amount Spent to Date:	$0
Start Date:	January 2018
Completion Date:	August 2018
Name of Contractor:	N/A (In House)
Congressional Mandate:	No

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a table for fiscal years 2018 and 2019 that shows the number of staff funded by each appropriation provided under the Food, Nutrition and Consumer Services heading broken out by discretionary and mandatory funds. Please show the CNPP staff years on separate lines.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information is as follows:]

	FY 2018 Actual			FY 2019 Actual		
Appropriation/ Organization	Mand.	Disc.	Total	Mand.	Disc.	Total
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program	362	0	362	339	0	339
Child Nutrition Programs	276	0	276	260	0	260
Commodity Assistance	0	3	3	0	3	3

Supplemental Nutrition Program – WIC	0	40	40	0	38	38
Nutrition Programs Administration	0	789	789	0	738	738
Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion	0	23	23	0	21	21
Total	**638**	**855**	**1,493**	**599**	**800**	**1,399**

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a full list of employees and positions assigned and detailed to the Office of the Under Secretary for Food, Nutrition, and Consumer Services for fiscal years 2019 and 2020. This list should be comprehensive and include those positions providing a majority of their support to the office in an official and unofficial capacity. If paid through reimbursable agreements, indicate the funding account.

Response: The requested information is submitted for the record.

[The information follows:]

FY 19

For Fiscal year 2019, Administrator Brandon Lipps was funded by the Food and Nutrition Service in his capacity as Administrator. Then in September of 2019, the end of Fiscal Year 19, he became the Deputy Under Secretary and was funded by the Office of the Under Secretary. Maggie Lyons, Chief of Staff, and Wes Gwynn, Confidential Assistant, were both directly funded for the entire fiscal year. Per the appropriations language, Chatavia Young was detailed as an Administrative Officer from the Food and Nutrition Service and her salary was funded out of the Food and Nutrition Service.

For Fiscal year 2020, the Office of the Under Secretary for Food Nutrition and Consumer Services funded Deputy Under Secretary Brandon Lipps, Director of Policy and Regulation Anne DeCesaro, and Confidential Assistant Wes Gwynn. Per the appropriations language, Chatavia Young is detailed as an Administrative Officer from the Food and Nutrition Service and her salary is funded out of the Food and Nutrition Service

CHILD NUTRITION PROGRAMS

Mr. Bishop: To date, how many schools and students have taken advantage of USDA's Community Eligibility Provision?

Response: As of school year 2018-2019, 13.6 million children attended 28,492 Community Eligibility Provision schools in 4,633 school districts.

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a chart showing how much equipment grant funding has been distributed by state from the FY 2019 appropriation.

Response: The requested information is submitted for the record.

[The information follows:]

State Agency	FY 2019 NSLP Equipment Funding
ALABAMA	$533,703
ALASKA	$92,086
ARIZONA	$679,531
ARKANSAS	$347,324
CALIFORNIA	$3,620,159
COLORADO	$343,919
CONNECTICUT	$243,820
DELAWARE	$93,841
DC	$70,451
FLORIDA	$1,901,083
GEORGIA	$1,294,715
GUAM	$36,771
HAWAII	$100,288
IDAHO	$129,298
ILLINOIS	$1,102,040
INDIANA	$624,307
IOWA	$250,023
KANSAS	$252,204
KENTUCKY	$584,820
LOUISIANA	$602,468
MAINE	$85,469
MARYLAND	$436,614
MASSACHUSETTS	$471,722
MICHIGAN	$676,687
MINNESOTA	$403,904
MISSISSIPPI	$436,199
MISSOURI	$531,795
MONTANA	$69,878
NEBRASKA	$169,376
NEVADA	$271,761
NEW HAMPSHIRE	$50,707
NEW JERSEY	$646,209
NEW MEXICO	$263,355
NEW YORK	$1,692,719
NORTH CAROLINA	$962,408
NORTH DAKOTA	$48,429
OHIO	$911,443
OKLAHOMA	$425,491
OREGON	$282,318

PENNSYLVANIA	$930,292
PUERTO RICO	$244,998
RHODE ISLAND	$75,724
SOUTH CAROLINA	$511,547
SOUTH DAKOTA	$68,563
TENNESSEE	$732,608
TEXAS	$3,632,279
UTAH	$225,930
VERMONT	$40,498
VIRGIN ISLANDS	$36,771
VIRGINIA	$626,277
WASHINGTON	$466,960
WEST VIRGINIA	$225,501
WISCONSIN	$405,946
WYOMING	$36,771
TOTAL	**$30,000,000**

Mr. Bishop: For each category, paid lunch, free meals, and reduced price meals, what were the federal costs for FY 2018 and 2019?

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

National School Lunch Program Costs, by Category
(Millions of Dollars)

	Paid	Reduced Price	Free	Total
FY 2018	$491	$960	$11,310	$12,761
FY 2019*	$471	$832	$11,597	$12,900

*Estimated

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a table showing the number of schools, institutions, and summer camps that participate in the Special Milk Program for FY 2018-2019. Please provide the amount spent on this program for those fiscal years.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

Fiscal Year	Schools	Institutions	Summer Camps	Total
2018	2,507	426	352	3,285

2019*	2,287	381	229	2,897

The amounts obligated are as follows:

FY 2018--$7,888,000

FY 2019--$7,395,000*

*Estimated

Source: NDB

Mr. Bishop: Please list all state, Indian Tribal Organizations, territories, and private institutions that have received Summer EBT funding since FY 2010. Include the award amount.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

Summer EBT Funding by Entity and Award Amount

Year	Entity	Amount Awarded*
2011	Connecticut Department of Social Services	$643,854
	Michigan Department of Health and Human Services	$1,271,210
	Missouri Department of Social Services	$718,873
	Oregon Department of Human Services	$708,323
	Texas Department of Agriculture and Texas Department of Health & Human Services	$1,297,895
2012	Cherokee Nation	$1,172,646
	Chickasaw Nation	$1,692,684
	Connecticut Department of Social Services	$2,309,441
	Delaware Division of Social Services	$1,403,609
	Michigan Department of Health and Human Services	$2,749,490
	Missouri Department of Social Services	$2,584,867
	Nevada Department of Health and Human Services	$1,432,150
	Oregon Department of Human Services	$2,384,260
	Texas Department of Agriculture and Texas Department of Health & Human Services	$1,383,302
	Washington State Department of Social and Health Services	$1,842,121
2013	Cherokee Nation	$1,005,529
	Chickasaw Nation	$1,749,328
	Connecticut Department of Social Services	$1,395,026
	Delaware Division of Social Services	$2,737,247
	Michigan Department of Health and Human Services	$5,366,757
	Missouri Department of Social Services	$1,782.861
	Nevada Department of Health and Human Services	$1,023,472
	Oregon Department of Human Services	$2,647,145
	Texas Department of Agriculture and Texas Department of Health & Human Services	$995,168
	Washington State Department of Social and Health Services	$1,028,574
2014	Cherokee Nation	$878,110
	Michigan Department of Health and Human Services	$1,262,343
	Oregon Department of Human Services	$979,349
2015	Cherokee Nation	$2,131,427
	Chickasaw Nation	$2,454,831
	Connecticut Department of Social Services	$1,600,435
	Delaware Division of Social Services	$2,046,068
	Michigan Department of Health and Human Services	$5,556,507
	Missouri Department of Social Services	$1,553,495
	Nevada Department of Health and Human Services	$1,883,384
	Oregon Department of Human Services	$5,059,075
2016	Cherokee Nation	$2,343,456
	Chickasaw Nation	$3,368,440
	Connecticut Department of Social Services	$1,178,232
	Delaware Division of Social Services	$2,143,958
	Michigan Department of Health and Human Services	$8,627,205
	Missouri Department of Social Services	$2,049,526
	Nevada Department of Health and Human Services	$2,449,920
	Oregon Department of Human Services	$6,464,322
2017	Cherokee Nation	$2,455,467
	Chickasaw Nation	$3,948,895
	Connecticut Department of Social Services	$855,095

	Delaware Division of Social Services	$2,421,150
	Michigan Department of Health and Human Services	$8,192,426
	Missouri Department of Social Services	$2,540,532
	Nevada Department of Health and Human Services	$2,300,876
	Oregon Department of Human Services	$6,639,395
	Virginia Department of Social Services	$934,962
2018	Cherokee Nation	$2,127,536
	Chickasaw Nation	$4,488,383
	Connecticut Department of Social Services	$1,116,499
	Michigan Department of Health and Human Services	$10,127,906
	Missouri Department of Social Services	$2,734,413
	Nevada Department of Health and Human Services	$3,021,889
	Oregon Department of Human Services	$7,929,273
	Tennessee Department of Human Services	$1,381,711
	Texas Department of Agriculture and Texas Department of Health & Human Services	$1,387,292
	Virginia Department of Social Services	$1,222,505
2019 (Funding to support 3 summers)	Chickasaw Nation	$14,774,197
	Inter Tribal Council of Arizona	$2,047,929
	Michigan Department of Human Services	$10,000,000
	Wisconsin Department of Health Services	$2,644,299

*Funding amount awarded to grantees. Actual spending varies.

Mr. Bishop: What was the total Summer EBT amount awarded to Baylor University's Texas Hunger Initiative (THI)? Please provide a detailed breakout of project costs, including food purchase, administrative, evaluation, equipment, and shipping and delivery costs? What was the food cost per box?

Response: Through the summer demonstration authority provided by Sec. 749(g) of Public Law 111-80, FNS in FY 2019 awarded THI $5 million to support three summers of project implementation including food costs, administrative costs, and project evaluation. Of this total, approximately $3.6 million is expected to support food and delivery costs, about $500,000 will support evaluation efforts, and the remainder is for administrative costs. The cost of the box is about equal to the Summer Food Service Program (SFSP) reimbursement rate that other sponsors receive. THI and the project's evaluator, Urban Institute, are including a more detailed cost analysis as part of their evaluation efforts. USDA will report to Congress on the findings of that analysis when they are available.

Mr. Bishop: What was the process for identifying Texas as the state for the project and for choosing Texas Hunger Initiative to receive the funding? Why was the funding not provided to the state child nutrition agency? What is or was the role of the state agency?

Response: THI approached FNS with an unsolicited proposal for the Meals-to-You project. FNS determined that the project could serve the public interest through making important contributions to FNS' research on methods of reducing or preventing food insecurity and hunger among children in the summer months, would reach an in-need population in rural areas, and could be funded through the summer demonstration authority provided through Sec. 749(g) of Public Law 111-80. FNS believes this project can provide insight into how children in rural as well as frontier communities have access to food in summer months. In these communities there are additional obstacles for children to access USDA's summer meal programs. THI has consulted with Texas

Department of Agriculture on project implementation. FNS is always looking for ways to leverage innovative ideas, data-driven strategies, and new technology to improve the customer service our programs provide. FNS relies on rigorous data, as will be provided through this project, to identify and test new approaches to improve program delivery. Baylor has contracted with a research team at the Urban Institute to conduct an evaluation of the project. The evaluation will initially look at project implementation and logistics, and will assess the impact on participating children in subsequent years.

Mr. Bishop: How many children and how many households were served in the summer of 2019? How many weeks did families receive food boxes? How many total food boxes were provided? How many children are expected to be served in future summers? Does THI intend to serve counties outside of Texas in future summers?

Response: In summer 2019, approximately 4,000 children in 1,700 households participated in the demonstration. The service period varied by school district, based on when school was out for the summer. Participating students received up to ten weeks of food boxes. In total, 32,596 boxes of food were delivered, at a cost about equal to the SFSP reimbursement rate that other sponsors receive.

FNS awarded funds to THI to support three years of project implementation. This multi-year approach will allow THI and the project's evaluator time to build and refine the project, identify challenges and best practices, and make programmatic changes to improve service delivery and project integrity. The number of children and communities served in future summers will be based on the project's administration and the needs of the evaluation.

Anecdotal response was overwhelmingly positive. The project served five counties covering 20 school districts in Texas where traditional congregate summer meals programs were either not offered or not accessible for all or part of the summer and where the Summer EBT model is not well suited for communities due to a lack of access to retailers where benefits can be redeemed. On a visit to one of the counties served through this program, one Eustace mother of three active teenage boys participating in the program shared how the program helped her family. "I'm a single mother who works full-time as a teacher, as well as other seasonal jobs. The participation in Meals-to-You had a tremendous impact on our household," said Wendy Gonzales, Eustace ISD parent. "As a family who goes through 7-8 gallons of milk a week, the milk alone was a helpful addition. The money saved on milk was allocated to purchasing fresh vegetables to provide an even more balanced meal."

Mr. Bishop: What standards were applied to the THI project in order to ensure nutrition quality? Were there any requirements on quality?

Response: In summer 2019, the Meals-to-You boxes met the meal pattern requirements of the Summer Food Service Program, consistent with the Dietary Guidelines for Americans.

Mr. Bishop: Did FNS or THI identify any areas of risk associated with the project. If so, please describe and provide the offered mitigation plan.

Response: THI and the project's evaluator, Urban Institute, are including an analysis of risk associated with the project as part of their evaluation efforts. USDA will report to Congress on the findings of that analysis when they are available.

Mr. Bishop: Is the work with Texas Hunger Initiative the result of a competitive bidding process or was it a sole source award? If it was sole source, please provide the legal justification for that. If competitive, what made THI the winning bid?

Response: THI approached FNS with an unsolicited proposal for the Meals-to-You project. FNS

determined that the project could make important contributions to FNS' research on methods of reducing or preventing food insecurity and hunger among children in the summer months, and could be funded through the summer demonstration authority provided through Sec. 749(g) of Public Law 111-80. Pursuant to 2 CFR 415.1(d), FNS noncompetitively awarded this discretionary grant as a unique and innovative unsolicited application.

Mr. Bishop: Is the work with THI, specifically the delivery of specific foods to individual households, intended as a pilot for the Harvest Box proposal in SNAP?

Response: No. Through the Meals-to-You demonstration project, USDA is testing alternative strategies for reducing or preventing food insecurity and hunger among low-income children in the summer months in rural communities for which existing options are not a good fit or simply not available. The ultimate goal is to demonstrate additional methods of providing nutrition assistance to children that could complement other summer feeding efforts, including the summer meal programs and Summer EBT, or that could be replicated in hard to reach urban, rural or frontier communities.

SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Bishop: Last year, USDA stated it invested $5.5 million between FY 2015-FY 2018 for the SNAP to Skills (S2S) initiative. Please provide an updated status to include FY 2019.

Response: At the end of FY19, FNS invested $1.7 million to extend the SNAP to Skills (S2S) Project for an additional 2 years, FY 2020 and FY 2021. This brings the total investment in the S2S initiative to $7.2 million. During this time, S2S will support States to increase participation and engagement in the SNAP E&T program among eligible SNAP participants. Through S2S, FNS will provide direct technical assistance to 7 States to help them use behaviorally informed strategies to improve recruitment and engagement in SNAP E&T. S2S will also produce new resources and host learning opportunities for all States.

Mr. Bishop: How many SNAP participants have been served through SNAP E&T programs for FY 2015 through FY 2019?

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
613,831	692,462	536,959	458,660	Not available

*Data for FY 2019 should be available by February 2020.

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a table showing FDPIR participation levels from fiscal years 2015 through 2019 and estimates for fiscal year 2020.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information is as follows:]

Fiscal Year	FDPIR Participation (thousands)
FY 2015	88.6
FY 2016	93.0
FY 2017	90.1
FY 2018	87.2
FY 2019*	83.8
FY 2020*	90.0

* FYs 2019 and 2020 information is estimated.

SPECIAL SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR WOMEN, INFANTS AND CHILDREN (WIC)

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a table showing which state agencies received Breastfeeding Peer Counselor funding for FY 2015-2019, including the number of counselors funded.

Response: The information is provided for the record.
[The information follows:]

WIC Breastfeeding Peer Counselor Funding (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
ACL, NM	$45,518	$44,889	$44,916	$45,489	$46,142
Alabama	$500,000	$500,000	0	$500,000	0
Alaska	$200,142	$207,991	$217,466	$216,560	$213,141
American Samoa	$83,836	$80,614	$82,041	0	0
Arizona	$1,078,443	$1,069,919	$1,201,765	$1,063,375	$1,099,816
Arkansas	$562,653	$593,860	$594,915	$599,549	$595,629
California	$9,291,085	$8,818,442	$8,731,149	$8,364,780	$8,233,128
Cherokee	$80,999	$83,406	$89,493	$90,915	$91,029
Cheyenne River	$45,559	$45,833	0	0	$47,233
Chickasaw	$63,099	$65,256	$69,900	$68,686	$67,794
Choctaw, MS	$45,919	$45,381	$46,582	$46,412	$47,183
Choctaw, OK	$60,182	$60,780	$63,939	$63,337	$67,347
Colorado	$659,996	$671,675	$696,417	$710,116	$749,590
Connecticut	$397,301	$397,018	$426,183	$448,344	$474,360

WIC Breastfeeding Peer Counselor Funding (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Delaware	$167,007	$172,404	$168,417	$179,404	$186,541
District of Columbia	$175,129	$189,114	$197,151	$196,848	$192,820
Eastern Cherokee	$44,879	$45,423	$45,836	$46,734	$47,034
Eastern Shoshone	0	0	0	0	0
Eight Northern	$42,279	$42,264	$40,179	$40,577	$44,656
Five Sandoval	$43,081	$43,000	$42,541	$42,907	$44,359
Florida	$3,261,413	$3,599,119	$3,784,409	$3,992,758	$4,138,519
Georgia	$1,682,833	$1,677,936	$1,808,503	$1,668,947	$1,893,340
Guam	$85,953	$86,526	$89,756	$85,517	$90,832
Hawaii	$306,553	$299,428	$311,133	$200,000	$310,884
Idaho	$349,525	$340,123	$340,908	$330,093	$324,426
Illinois	$1,923,472	$1,767,071	$1,731,485	$1,678,234	$1,652,422
Indian Township, ME	0	0	0	0	0
Indiana	$940,681	$905,168	$926,836	$1,063,115	$1,121,200
Iowa	$416,825	$421,050	$427,838	$461,941	$469,968
Isleta	$47,756	$49,159	$49,913	$52,038	$52,286
ITC, OK	$45,679	$45,833	$46,143	$46,919	$47,876
ITCA	$95,782	$95,478	$97,953	$92,574	$96,925
ITCN	$50,074	$49,570	$21,000	$18,000	0
Kansas	$468,961	$447,438	$448,127	$432,768	$452,308
Kentucky	$804,853	$772,279	$764,477	$800,955	$790,078
Louisiana	$797,344	$787,013	$831,510	$838,637	$829,464
Maine	0	$172,744	$173,650	$177,465	$181,656
Maryland	$1,078,375	$1,106,798	$1,164,813	$1,151,951	$1,247,101
Massachusetts	$838,161	$838,835	$893,368	$913,076	$934,721
Michigan	$1,605,786	$1,530,329	$1,545,126	$1,527,291	$1,553,054
Minnesota	$875,157	$864,007	$901,300	$898,723	$898,260
Mississippi	$523,973	$519,809	$537,346	$559,628	$597,673
Missouri	$984,558	$942,430	$947,911	$964,272	$995,907
Montana	$172,710	$170,959	$176,666	$169,774	$175,308
Muscogee Creek	$55,468	$56,058	$56,137	$55,865	$57,538
Navajo Nation	$118,996	$110,302	$107,070	$102,951	$104,258
Nebraska	$279,379	$264,773	$291,669	$298,797	$308,501
Nevada	$512,579	$519,378	$524,796	$515,177	$493,286

WIC Breastfeeding Peer Counselor Funding (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
New Hampshire	$137,335	$138,802	$138,185	$135,793	$136,645
New Jersey	$1,167,948	$1,219,755	$1,271,526	$1,274,566	$1,307,980
New Mexico	$449,644	$428,603	$439,028	$447,701	$426,552
New York	$3,768,133	$3,748,550	$3,830,814	$3,830,426	$3,935,687
North Carolina	$1,585,498	$1,728,517	$1,842,004	$1,909,901	$1,924,580
North Dakota	$106,119	$107,327	$116,261	$50,000	$121,041
Northern Arapaho	$44,200	$44,150	$44,171	$44,797	$44,706
Northern Mariana Islands	$63,618	$53,618	$64,815	0	0
Ohio	$1,573,798	$1,583,144	$1,760,212	$1,776,416	$1,798,310
Oklahoma	$660,627	$655,566	$680,719	$704,676	$688,213
Omaha	0	$42,631	0	0	0
Oregon	$844,848	$817,033	$776,058	$762,422	$754,988
Osage	$52,631	$54,785	$56,268	$57,894	$60,312
Otoe-Missouria	$44,480	$44,479	$43,733	$45,305	$45,548
Pennsylvania	$1,391,258	$1,558,372	$1,648,924	$1,529,661	$1,504,929
Pleasant Point	0	0	0	0	0
Potawatomi	$49,274	$49,037	$50,789	$52,498	$55,606
Puerto Rico	$1,006,742	$978,816	$500,000	$500,000	$500,000
Rhode Island	$185,088	$179,243	$185,109	$185,811	$192,376
Rosebud	$49,314	$48,215	$48,291	$51,023	$50,651
San Felipe	$35,256	$35,243	$33,505	$36,574	$40,255
Santee	0	0	0	0	0
Santo Domingo	$25,010	$25,001	$23,713	$23,916	$30,275
Seneca Nation, NY	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	$840,909	$858,393	$818,950	$802,070	$793,171
South Dakota	$141,586	$139,803	0	$144,561	$154,844
Standing Rock	$45,239	$44,273	0	$45,628	$45,747
Tennessee	$1,174,205	$1,134,765	$1,172,613	$1,180,970	$1,200,818
Texas	$7,965,564	$7,994,287	$8,349,259	$8,373,735	$7,996,420
Three Affiliated Tribes	$42,762	$43,082	$43,513	$43,783	0
Utah	$490,778	$471,366	$479,350	$461,689	$441,585
Ute Mountain	$23,180	$24,087	0	$23,042	0
Vermont	$129,185	$127,808	$130,832	$131,583	$138,040
Virgin Islands	0	0	$79,324	$40,000	$73,590

WIC Breastfeeding Peer Counselor Funding (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Virginia	$903,497	$961,970	$951,064	$933,000	$928,609
Washington	$1,383,343	$1,359,801	$1,373,593	$1,318,273	$1,286,951
WCD	$62,939	$62,218	$65,035	$66,196	$65,663
West Virginia	$278,664	$275,512	$285,865	$284,827	$273,644
Winnebago	$35,900	$35,887	$34,117	0	0
Wisconsin	$670,010	$647,296	$639,625	$648,575	$657,802
Wyoming	$114,068	$114,987	$117,465	$114,732	$111,290
Zuni	$47,397	$46,696	$46,537	$46,457	$47,579
U.S.	**$59,500,000**	**$59,500,000**	**$59,900,000**	**$59,900,000**	**$59,900,000**

Number of WIC Breastfeeding Peer Counselors (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
ACL, NM	2	2	2	2	2
Alabama	24	32	0	34	35
Alaska	9	12	11	15	19
American Samoa	4	4	4	0	0
Arizona	29	35	10	17	20
Arkansas	14	14	15	18	19
California	206	205	201	207	212
Cherokee	3	3	3	3	3
Cheyenne River	1	1	0	0	1
Chickasaw	6	6	3	5	5
Choctaw, MS	1	1	1	1	1
Choctaw, OK	3	3	3	4	4
Colorado	28	44	14	34	34
Connecticut	9	9	9	9	11
Delaware	12	12	15	16	16
District of Columbia	5	5	6	9	7
Eastern Cherokee	1	1	1	1	1
Eastern Shoshone	0	0	0	0	0
Eight Northern	2	2	2	2	2
Five Sandoval	1	1	2	2	1
Florida	158	135	142	146	144
Georgia	117	133	149	117	120

Number of WIC Breastfeeding Peer Counselors (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Guam	2	2	4	6	6
Hawaii	7	6	7	6	5
Idaho	36	37	32	34	35
Illinois	150	130	120	130	120
Indian Township, ME	0	0	0	0	0
Indiana	100	100	100	100	100
Iowa	26	24	25	38	38
Isleta	1	1	1	1	1
ITC, OK	1	1	1	2	2
ITCA	4	5	3	2	2
ITCN	3	4	3	3	0
Kansas	39	36	40	41	44
Kentucky	56	55	62	62	62
Louisiana	23	25	32	20	14
Maine	10	8	11	11	9
Maryland	32	40	40	41	36
Massachusetts	95	90	85	90	70
Michigan	100	105	99	110	129
Minnesota	82	86	80	88	92
Mississippi	56	65	42	53	56
Missouri	131	150	134	130	130
Montana	10	12	14	15	15
Muscogee Creek	1	1	1	1	1
Navajo Nation	3	3	3	3	3
Nebraska	37	18	18	18	17
Nevada	28	29	29	19	25
New Hampshire	15	14	16	17	12
New Jersey	44	46	52	51	50
New Mexico	60	55	70	67	70
New York	306	317	342	310	319
North Carolina	135	132	132	122	133
North Dakota	5	5	5	4	4
Northern Arapaho	1	1	1	1	1
Northern Mariana	1	1	1	0	0

Number of WIC Breastfeeding Peer Counselors (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Ohio	135	135	120	130	130
Oklahoma	40	45	52	46	43
Omaha	0	1	0	0	0
Oregon	22	23	22	19	19
Osage	1	1	2	2	4
Otoe-Missouria	1	1	1	1	1
Pennsylvania	75	68	65	64	40
Pleasant Point	0	0	0	0	0
Potawatomi	3	3	3	3	2
Puerto Rico	94	90	46	93	95
Rhode Island	15	14	15	17	15
Rosebud	1	1	1	1	1
San Felipe	1	1	1	2	1
Santee	0	0	0	0	0
Santo Domingo	1	1	1	1	1
Seneca Nation	0	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	28	25	28	33	41
South Dakota	7	6	0	8	8
Standing Rock	1	1	0	1	1
Tennessee	62	68	65	65	63
Texas	617	400	400	351	370
Three Affiliated Tribes	1	2	1	1	0
Utah	41	41	40	39	34
Ute Mountain	1	1	0	2	0
Vermont	25	30	20	21	9
Virgin Islands	0	0	5	4	3
Virginia	107	111	107	65	58
Washington	73	63	61	61	66
WCD	5	5	3	1	1
West Virginia	36	8	36	38	34
Winnebago	1	1	1	0	0
Wisconsin	80	79	66	63	67
Wyoming	12	12	12	12	5
Zuni	1	1	1	1	1

Number of WIC Breastfeeding Peer Counselors (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
U.S.	**3,722**	**3,502**	**3,373**	**3,383**	**3,371**

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a table showing which state agencies received WIC Breastfeeding Performance Bonus Awards for FY 2015-2019.

Response: The information is provided for the record.
[The information follows:]

WIC Breastfeeding Performance Bonus Awards (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
ACL, NM	0	$3,981	0	$500	$2,000
Alaska	0	0	0	0	9,490
American Samoa	$4,748	0	0	0	0
Cherokee	2,157	0	0	0	0
Cheyenne River	0	0	0	790	0
District of Columbia	0	44,525	0	0	0
Eastern Cherokee	0	0	$2,435	0	0
Five Sandoval	0	0	1,348	0	0
Georgia	290,785	0	0	0	0
Idaho	0	103,882	0	0	23,490
Indian Township, ME	0	0	0	500	2,000
Indiana	0	0	0	57,098	0
Iowa	0	0	13,189	22,902	0
ITC, OK	0	0	0	970	0
Nevada	78,737	0	0	0	0
Northern Arapaho	0	0	0	530	0
Northern Mariana Islands	0	0	0	3,323	0
Ohio	0	0	60,195	0	0
Oregon	0	0	0	0	46,186
Osage	100,980	0	0	0	0
Pleasant Point, ME	0	880	0	0	2,000
Potawatomi	0	0	0	0	0
Puerto Rico	0	315,641	21,616	0	0

WIC Breastfeeding Performance Bonus Awards (FYs 2015-2019)					
State Agency	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Rosebud	0	0	0	1,697	0
San Felipe	0	0	1,217	0	2,000
Santo Domingo	604	0	0	0	0
Seneca Nation, NY	0	2,639	0	0	0
South Dakota	19,750	0	0	0	0
Standing Rock	0	0	0	883	0
Ute Mountain	0	2,500	0	500	0
Vermont	0	0	0	0	5,918
Virgin Islands	0	0	0	4,828	0
WCD	0	0	0	4,979	0
Winnebago	0	0	0	500	0
Wyoming	0	25,952	0	0	4,916
Zuni	2,239	0	0	0	2,000
U.S.	**$500,000**	**$500,000**	**$100,000**	**$100,000**	**$100,000**

Mr. Bishop: Please provide the Subcommittee with the most current status of WIC EBT implementation, including which, if any, states, Indian Tribal Organizations, or territories are not on target to meet the October 1, 2020, deadline.

Response: FNS expects most but not all WIC State agencies will meet the statutory mandate of full statewide implementation by October 1, 2020. As of November 2019, 53 State agencies have achieved statewide WIC electronic benefit transfer (EBT). Thirty-six (36) State agencies have not implemented EBT statewide. Twenty-five (25) of these 36 State agencies have the capability to meet the statutory deadline based on current project status.

There are two EBT technologies in use in WIC: (1) offline, smart card technology with an embedded microchip that stores the participant's food benefits information on the chip; and (2) online, magnetic stripe technology similar to a traditional debit card that accesses an online database where the participant's benefit account is maintained. Of the 53 State agencies with statewide EBT, 46 use online technology.

The Department continues to promote the implementation of WIC EBT through technical assistance to WIC State agencies and provides funding to support the planning and implementation of WIC EBT systems. Currently, 13 WIC State agencies have statewide implementation dates in advance of the statutory deadline. Twelve (12) of the remaining WIC State agencies, including Indian Tribal Organizations (ITOs), are currently establishing or confirming EBT implementation timelines and are not yet considered at high risk of missing the statutory deadline.

At this time, based on current project status, FNS has identified 11 State agencies at high risk of not meeting the mandate: the District of Columbia; Georgia; Mississippi; New Jersey; Puerto Rico; and six ITOs in New Mexico including Acoma, Canoncito, and Laguna; Eight Northern Indian Pueblos; Five Sandoval Indian Pueblos; Pueblo of San Felipe; Pueblo of Zuni; and Santo Domingo Pueblo. This list is subject to change as the EBT statutory deadline approaches.

Statute allows States to request an exemption from the required statutory timeframe for EBT implementation (i.e., an extension request), not a wholesale exemption from EBT implementation. FNS will set forth a standard approach by which WIC State agencies may request an extension to the October 1, 2020 statutory deadline if needed.

Recent technical assistance activities to help support EBT advancement included training for WIC State agencies and EBT industry partners at two national stakeholder conferences. FNS will continue to provide technical assistance to all WIC State agencies working to implement EBT.

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a table showing, by state, the final unspent recoverable funds for FY 2018 for WIC.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

State/Territory	Total Unspent Funds
Alabama	7,361,309
Alaska	1,106,593
American Samoa	1,090,541
Arizona	17,015,980
Arkansas	2,585,858
California	98,249,854
Colorado	1,652,509
Connecticut	1,544,485
Delaware	2,843,687
District of Columbia	1,351,530
Florida	15,013,277
Georgia	20,504,469
Guam	645,069
Hawaii	796,905
Idaho	3,387,576
Illinois	25,766,294
Indiana	7,831,580
Iowa	1,058,509
Kansas	2,081,927
Kentucky	10,387,995
Louisiana	18,159,094
Maine	359,011
Maryland	9,476,793
Massachusetts	2,648,693
Michigan	11,580,404
Minnesota	4,583,729
Mississippi	5,345,064
Missouri	5,596,133
Montana	1,631,732
Nebraska	2,191,749
Nevada	6,759,589
New Hampshire	475,683
New Jersey	9,775,585
New Mexico	2,347,869
New York	42,240,795
North Carolina	12,674,622
North Dakota	1,058,763
Ohio	14,897,457
Oklahoma	7,076,888
Oregon	3,861,403
Pennsylvania	7,580,768
Puerto Rico	43,857,813
Rhode Island	679,692
South Carolina	7,930,796
South Dakota	842,778
Tennessee	8,643,070
Texas	69,256,209
Utah	1,872,891
Vermont	1,711,709
Virginia	4,097,598
Virgin Islands	2,276,186
Washington	6,628,553
West Virginia	3,603,228
Wisconsin	9,921,101
Wyoming	928,865
Commonwealth of N	566,248
US	**555,414,508**

Mr. Bishop: Please provide for the record, the amount of Nutrition Services and Administration (NSA) funds obligated for FY 2019. Include the amounts spent on program management, client services, nutrition education, and breastfeeding promotion within the total.

Response: WIC NSA costs extend beyond program administration. Two-thirds of the total NSA costs are

used to provide legislatively mandated non-monetary program benefits. These benefits include nutrition education, breastfeeding promotion and support, and client services. Examples of client service include activities such as healthcare referrals and immunization screening, which have shown to improve birth outcomes and reduce the incidence of health problems for WIC participants.

The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

Fiscal Year	Program Management	Client Services	Nutrition Education	Breastfeeding Promotion	Total NSA Expenditures
2018*	$646,254,110	$739,520,018	$436,393,682	$165,052,897	$1,987,220,707
2019	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA

* Data Source: National Data Bank - WIC Program SNFA013 Report for FY 2018 (Report Date: 11/07/19). FY 2019 NSA data is not available until March 2020.

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Bishop: Please explain how many people, not caseload, USDA served or will serve in the CSFP for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information is as follows:]

Fiscal Year	CSFP Participation
2018	675,998
2019*	702,546
2020*	736,110

*2019 and 2020 are estimates

Mr. Bishop: Please provide a table, by state, which includes grants for the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program for fiscal years 2018, 2019, and 2020.

Response: The information is provided for the record. Data is unavailable for fiscal year (FY) 2020. FY 2020 program funds have not been allocated to date.

[The information follows:]

Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP) Grant Amounts FY 2018 - FY 2020

State Agency	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020**
Alabama	$1,574,072	$1,562,717	
Alaska	85,129	84,515	

Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP) Grant Amounts FY 2018 - FY 2020

State Agency	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020**
Arizona	143,967	142,928	
Arkansas	115,036	114,206	
California	773,431	767,851	
Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma	159,044	157,897	
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	$31,476	31,476	
Connecticut	81,080	80,495	
Delaware	30,000	30,000	
District of Columbia	143,252	142,219	
Five Sandoval Indian Pueblos, Inc.	19,240	19,240	
Florida	120,662	119,792	
Georgia	255,020	253,180	
Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa & Chippewa Indians	9,925	9,925	
Hawaii	498,746	495,148	
Illinois	813,115	807,249	
Indiana	85,199	84,584	
Iowa	530,676	526,848	
Kansas	192,281	190,894	
Kentucky	316,480	314,197	
Louisiana	379,160	376,425	
Maine	943,429	936,623	
Maryland	208,000	206,499	

Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP) Grant Amounts
FY 2018 - FY 2020

State Agency	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020**
Massachusetts	538,299	534,416	
Michigan	247,338	245,554	
Minnesota	129,061	128,130	
Mississippi	115,149	114,318	
Mississippi Choctaw	29,440	29,440	
Missouri	*	229,012	
Montana	95,433	94,745	
Nebraska	232,407	230,730	
Nevada	151,758	150,663	
New Hampshire	90,636	89,982	
New Jersey	1,083,013	1,075,200	
New Mexico	324,663	322,321	
New York	1,788,983	1,776,076	
North Carolina	83,940	83,334	
Ohio	1,616,092	1,604,434	
Oklahoma	78,110	77,547	
Oregon	859,064	852,867	
Osage Nation	38,140	38,140	
Pennsylvania	1,770,555	1,757,782	
Pueblo of San Felipe	36,770	36,770	
Puerto Rico	924,646	917,976	
Rhode Island	279,783	277,765	
Standing Rock	22,200	22,200	
South Carolina	614,991	610,554	

Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP) Grant Amounts FY 2018 - FY 2020

State Agency	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020**
Tennessee	509,718	506,041	
Texas	115,288	114,456	
Vermont	88,937	88,295	
Virginia	462,758	459,420	
Washington	247,223	245,440	
West Virginia	487,383	483,867	
Wisconsin	342,015	339,548	
U.S.	**20,912,213**	**20,991,931**	

* Did not participate in the program.
** Data is unavailable. FY 2020 SFMNP funds have not been allocated to date.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY RANKING MEMBER JEFF FORTENBERRY

INCREASING RATES OF OBESITY & FEDERAL NUTRITION POLICIES

Mr. Fortenberry: As I mentioned in my opening remarks, the federal nutrition policies over the past several decades have generally failed. Maybe it is a coincidence or maybe there is a correlation between when the Dietary Guidelines for Americans began in 1980 AND the ever-increasing obesity rates since that time. In 1980, we saw obesity prevalence rates of 15 percent for adults and around 5 percent for youth. Now it is estimated at a staggering 40 percent for adults and 19 percent for youth. Assuming that the federal government can impact obesity rates or other chronic disease rates, what is this Administration doing and what drastic changes are needed to see improvements in National health measures and outcomes?

Response: Every year we track the average American diet and we can see that the vast majority of people in the U.S. are not eating according to the Dietary Guidelines. The average American diet scores a 59 out of a possible 100 points on the Healthy Eating Index (HEI), which measures how closely a diet aligns with the Dietary Guidelines. Research indicates that higher HEI scores are associated with lower risk for cardiovascular disease, diabetes, and certain cancers. Furthermore, there are economic benefits to following the Dietary Guidelines. According to a recent article, healthcare spending would decrease between $31.5 billion and $55.1 billion dollars every year[1] if Americans improved their HEI score and more closely follow the Dietary Guidelines.

FNS, along with our Federal partners, works hard to move the needle on healthy eating. FNS programs and policies are grounded in the key recommendations of the Dietary Guidelines to ensure healthy eating forms the foundation of food and nutrition programs. Additionally, MyPlate is the Federal nutrition symbol that translates the Dietary Guidelines into easy-to-understand consumer messages to help people eat healthier. MyPlate and its messages are also used throughout FNS programs to communicate to various audiences on how to choose healthier options that work for them and their families.

To make an even greater impact, FNS collaborates with the private sector. The MyPlate National Strategic Partnership is a public-private partnership that works together to amplify MyPlate messages. There are over 114 National Strategic Partners, companies and organizations national in scope who reach consumers and health professionals.

To drive improvements in nutrition, continued coordination across Federal agencies and national organizations is needed – to speak with one voice, minimize confusion around healthy eating, and help people eat healthier. Improvements in health outcomes will require shifts towards a healthier diet as well as other aspects of a healthy lifestyle, including increasing physical activity and smoking cessation.

Mr. Fortenberry: I have been a proponent of the Farm-to-School Program since I introduced an amendment to the program in the 2008 Farm Bill. This program and many like them have proven to help students build healthy eating habits and to support family farmers by expanding market opportunities. Just this year, the grant program will support 126 grants serving more than 5,400 schools and 3.2 million students. What would you describe as the benefits and challenges of the Farm to School program?

Response: There are many benefits of the Farm to School Program. In addition to providing kids access to nutritious and high quality local foods, farm to school helps connect producers to stable school foodservice markets and enhances classroom and agriculture education through experiential learning opportunities such as school gardens, taste tests, and visiting local farms. Everyone wins with farm to school; connecting students and teachers to local producers builds strong communities and connects children to the source of their food.

---

[1] Scrafford CG, et al. *Health Economic Evaluation Modeling Shows Potential Health Care Cost Savings with Increased Conformance with Healthy Dietary Patterns among Adults in the United States*. JAND 2019; 119 (4): 599-616.

One challenge FNS faces in implementing the Farm to School Grant Program, is the maximum grant level established in Section 18(g)(3)(C) the Richard B. Russell National School Lunch Act, which limits grants to a maximum of $100,000. FNS has received feedback from State agencies and other stakeholders that $100,000 is often not adequate to launch or expand farm to school programming, hire and retain staff to oversee and sustain the work, or to cover administrative expenses and programmatic expenses for a statewide program. The FY 2020 Budget includes a proposal to raise the maximum award limit to $500,000 per grantee. This would enable grantees to implement and expand farm to school strategies and infrastructure that is likely to last beyond the end of the grant term, increase the reach, scope, and impact of funded activities, and allow collaboration among multiple partners, districts, and States.

Mr. Fortenberry: How can USDA expand use of this and other like programs to more schools and communities?

Response: The FNS Office of Community Food Systems (OCFS) supports expansion of Farm to School efforts nationwide through three pillars of work – grant making, research and evaluation, and training and technical assistance.

OCFS seeks to award an additional $10 million in Farm to School grant funding in FY 2020. On October 8, 2019, OCFS published the 2020 Farm to School Grant Program request for applications, and expects to announce awards in July 2020. A second request for applications targeting Regional Farm to School Institutes was published on October 22, 2019, and OCFS expects to make these awards by March 1, 2020.

The third Farm to School Census was launched in October 2019. The USDA Farm to School Census is the only national survey that captures the farm to school activity of school food authorities such as local food purchasing, school gardens, and agricultural-education. The Census allows USDA to track progress and measure the growth of the farm to school movement across the nation and over time. Farm to School Census data helps inform USDA, key farm to school stakeholders, and policymakers about trends and best practices.

Finally, OCFS has developed a variety of resources (e.g. factsheets, tool kits, and webinars) to help program operators and other stakeholders start, expand and sustain their farm to school efforts. Staff track and share best practices, provide hands-on training and technical assistance, and help State agencies integrate farm to school principles into their policies and structures.

KIDS EAT LOCAL ACT

Mr. Fortenberry: A couple of months ago, Congresswoman Pingree, Congressman Harder, and I introduced the Kids Eat Local Act. There is a bi-partisan bill on the Senate side as well. This legislation aims to lessen the administrative burden in finding local food suppliers. This is a win-win for both schools and local farmers, ranchers, and dairies. Does the Administration support the Kids Eat Local Act and if not, what can the Administration do to make purchasing local foods less burdensome?

Response: Supporting American agriculture is a core function of the Child Nutrition Programs (CNPs). We welcome the opportunity to work with Congress to reduce the burden program operators face when procuring local foods.

The FNS Office of Community Food Systems (OCFS) works to increase access to local food for children participating in CNPs. FNS provides direct training and technical assistance to program operators, through in-person meetings, webinars, and conference calls, on topics related to local procurement, micro-purchasing, and geographic preference. OCFS has developed a series of fact sheets and a procurement guide book that provide CN program operators guidance on how to purchase and incorporate local foods into the school menus. The procurement guide book covers the basic principles on procurement regulations and walks participants through strategies for buying local.

To further support connecting farmers to the child nutrition market, OCFS recently established a three-year cooperative agreement with the National Center for Appropriate Technology to develop training to help agricultural producers build their capacity to launch and expand efforts to sell to schools. A train-the-trainer model will be used to prepare State agencies and their representatives with the knowledge and skills necessary to deliver the producer-focused training curriculum to agricultural producers in their state.

IMPETUS FOR NEW SNAP REGULATIONS

Mr. Fortenberry: Explain to me why the Administration issued the three controversial SNAP regulations. Is the Administration driven by cost savings, improved integrity of the programs, or some combination of the two?

Response: In proposing and implementing SNAP reforms, the Administration's goal is to align the program with the statute established by Congress to reduce inequalities among participants and encourage households towards self-sufficiency. Those who are eligible to receive nutrition assistance should be treated fairly and equitably across the country. Over the years, we have seen States implement policies that compromise consistency with certain standards defined in statute; thereby allowing households in one state to be eligible for SNAP or to receive more in SNAP benefits than households in another state. USDA wants to ensure all Americans have access to food when they are in need using fair, modern and consistent standards.

ANIMAL PROTEINS IN THE DIET

Mr. Fortenberry: In my home district and state, we produce quite a bit of cattle. So, it was welcome news when we heard that a consortium of scientists just released a study in the Annals of Internal Medicine that seems to say that red meat consumption is ok after all. Are you familiar with this study and if so, will the new Dietary Guidelines group look at animal protein consumption vs. heavy carbohydrate diets. This seems to be a source of great confusion out there.

Response: USDA and HHS have established a federal advisory committee – the 2020 Dietary Guidelines Advisory Committee – to examine the scientific evidence on specific topics and scientific questions. Among the questions for the Committee to examine is a set of dietary patterns questions which will consider all aspects of the diet, including meats, fruits, vegetables, grains, and dairy in all forms people consume. Additionally, the dietary patterns questions will consider the quantities, proportions, variety, or combination of different foods, drinks, and nutrients when examining relationships. Therefore, the Committee will examine evidence on diets with varying levels of consumption of animal protein as well as carbohydrates.

The *Annals of Internal Medicine* publication was a set of systematic reviews of studies on meat. Original studies examined in those systematic reviews that meet the criteria the 2020 Committee has set will be considered by the Committee.

Mr. Fortenberry: Many of us grew up on whole milk or 2 percent milk and we drank this type of milk on a regular basis. The benefits seem to outweigh the downsides. I will also point out that higher milk consumption levels occurred prior to the spike in obesity. Does USDA have the option to serve whole milk or 2 percent milk in school lunch or breakfast programs? If not, can the Department change that without a change in law?

Response: The National School Lunch and School Breakfast Program regulations require schools to offer students ages two and older only fat-free or reduced-fat (1 percent) milk. Schools serving preschool children ages 1-5 must provide whole milk for children age one. The regulations are based on the National School Lunch Act (NSLA), which requires schools to offer milk that is "consistent with the most recent Dietary Guidelines for Americans". The Dietary Guidelines for Americans recommend whole milk for children age one only and fat-free or low-fat (1 percent) milk for children ages two and older. Additionally, the NSLA states that the Secretary may not grant a waiver of program requirements related to the nutritional content of meals served.

SNAP ERROR RATES & SNAP PROGRAMS

Mr. Fortenberry: It's my understanding that USDA stopped reporting its error rate for SNAP payments because the calculations over the past several years were faulty. In fact, some claim that the States manipulated the data to win bonuses. Is this accurate and if so, what have you done to fix this problem?

Response: In fiscal year 2015, FNS initiated a nationwide review of State operating procedures for quality control. FNS found numerous incidents of State policies or procedures that resulted in States underreporting errors to FNS. USDA's Office of Inspector General (OIG) released an audit in September 2015 that found similar issues. Due to the unreliability of State reported data, FNS was unable to report a national payment error rate for fiscal years 2015 and 2016.

FNS undertook a number of measures to strengthen the integrity of the quality control system and prevent future reoccurrences of these issues. These include policy changes, extensive staff training; new tools to independently validate State reported data, increased controls over third party consultants, and new oversight mechanisms to better monitor State operations. Additional integrity provisions were included in the 2018 Farm Bill. FNS is working towards publishing a rule to implement these provisions as well as further reform SNAP's quality control system.

Mr. Fortenberry: What are the current SNAP error rates and how does that translate to improper payment dollars? Are we talking millions or hundreds of millions of dollars?

Response: For fiscal year 2018, the most recent year available, SNAP's reported payment error rate was 6.80 percent, which equates to $4,021,704,651 in improperly paid dollars. This amount includes both overpayments and underpayments. The FY 2018 overpayment rate is 5.59 percent and the underpayment rate is 1.22 percent. Please note that there is a slight difference between the combined over and underpayment rates and the final total payment error rate due to rounding. The total SNAP issuance for FY 2018 was approximately $56 billion.

Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide an update on the progress of the 10 SNAP work pilots established through the 2014 farm bill.

Response: Section 4022 of the Agricultural Act of 2014 authorized and funded up to 10 pilots to expand SNAP E&T programs and test innovative strategies to connect SNAP participants with good-paying jobs, thereby increasing their incomes and reducing the need for nutrition assistance benefits. In March 2015, through a competitive solicitation, USDA awarded grants to California, Delaware, Georgia, Illinois, Kansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington. Pilot staff began enrolling SNAP participants into the pilots in early 2016. Pilots completed enrollment between July 2017 and September 2018. All pilot sites completed service delivery by FY 2019.

The Agriculture Act of 2014 also funded a rigorous, longitudinal evaluation of these pilots. In 2015, USDA contracted with Mathematica to conduct the evaluation. USDA expects to publish the final evaluation reports in 2021.

Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide an update on the SNAP to Skills initiative. How much funding was spent on this initiative in FY 2018 and FY 2019? Is the initiative continuing in FY 2020?

Response: At the end of FY 2019, FNS invested $1.7 million to extend the SNAP to Skills (S2S) Project for an additional 2 years, FY 2020 and FY 2021. This brings total investment in SNAP to Skills to $7.2 million. During this time, S2S will support States to increase participation and engagement in the SNAP E&T program among eligible SNAP participants. Through S2S, FNS will provide direct technical assistance to 7 States to help them use behaviorally informed strategies to improve recruitment and engagement in SNAP E&T. S2S will also produce new resources and host learning opportunities for all States.

Mr. Fortenberry: How many SNAP participants have been served through SNAP E&T programs for FY 2013 through FY 2019?

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
634,516	590,635	613,831	692,462	536,959	458,660	Not Available

*Data for FY 2019 should be available by February, 2020.

Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a table showing a breakout of how the employment and training funds were spent by each state to include fiscal year 2013 through 2019 actuals and plans for fiscal year 2020.

Response: The information is provided for the record. Data on 100 percent funding for fiscal year 2020 is provided below; however, information on 50/50 administrative reimbursement funding is unavailable for fiscal year (FY) 2020. FY 2020 administrative funds have not been allocated to date.

[The information follows:]

FY 2013: Federal E&T Outlays				
State Agency	E&T Grant	E&T ABAWD Grant	Federal 50% Administrative Reimbursement	Federal 50% Reimbursement for Participant Expenses
Alabama	1,393,380	0	0	179,301
Alaska	124,045	0	2,491	31,015
Arizona	2,774,684			175,374
Arkansas	816,170	0	0	103,683
California	6,468,563	0	31,489,629	10,342,509
Colorado	3,491,902	1,388,175	444,912	229,886
Connecticut	561,029	0	468,104	3,820
Delaware	35,950	414,590	65,778	8,000
District of Columbia	154,057		547,118	470,868
Florida	8,739,523	0	0	294,808
Georgia	41,362			890
Guam	43,658		11,954	52,640
Hawaii	212,943		460,030	53,696
Idaho	261,251		93,556	174,611
Illinois	5,399,346		9,506,547	735,487
Indiana	130,675		0	1,209
Iowa	265,191			36,708
Kansas	340,890			41,182
Kentucky	15,354			0
Louisiana	1,654,266			36,445
Maine	371,433			47,554
Maryland	776,565	0	187,648	8,606
Massachusetts	936,775		859,504	0
Michigan	4,341,352			40,312
Minnesota	681,192		2,700,861	2,558,015
Mississippi	384,579			17,958
Missouri	1,288,026		0	159,913
Montana	255,730	0	137,878	34,676
Nebraska	73,753		0	1,309
Nevada	590,811			25,654
New Hampshire	68,618	0	0	1,626
New Jersey	558,182		15,655,103	2,569,778
New Mexico	553,002			271,178
New York	4,960,328	10,282,776	67,676,686	17,500,176
North Carolina	425,998	0	263,009	13,272
North Dakota	94,790			6,170
Ohio	3,510,129	0	2,130,157	1,292,740
Oklahoma	81,470		0	1,030
Oregon	2,189,664		118,097	319,697
Pennsylvania	2,411,810		698,765	4,579,788
Rhode Island	275,111		275,918	0
South Carolina	2,247,332		1,147,157	39,105
South Dakota	305,824	185,572		24,681
Tennessee	3,149,922			322,851
Texas	5,956,945	6,306,561	4,158,231	1,048,616
Utah	632,659	1,079,692	1,198,367	160,932
Vermont	225,961	0	4,529,408	428,613
Virginia	1,490,452		1,134,968	124,601
Virgin Islands	0		0	0
Washington	3,985,415	0	9,091,873	1,593,022
West Virginia	482,245			3,088
Wisconsin	1,585,705		3,462,116	550,746
Wyoming	20,120	0	0	0
National Total	**77,836,137**	**19,657,366**	**158,515,865**	**46,717,839**
Source: FNS-778 Federal Financial Report				

FY 2014: Federal E&T Outlays				
State Agency	E&T Grant	E&T ABAWD Grant	Federal 50% Administrative Reimbursement	Federal 50% Reimbursement for Participant Expenses
Alabama	1,396,344	0	0	175,306
Alaska	0	0	6,732	1,252
Arizona	2,545,781			244,824
Arkansas	651,171	0	0	81,874
California	6,852,802	0	28,014,255	8,908,926
Colorado	2,268,806	1,355,401	667,633	181,105
Connecticut	613,445	0	1,080,934	4,898
Delaware	58,244	472,445	65,724	8,000
District of Columbia	308,710		745,294	462,425
Florida	7,840,600			267,037
Georgia	772,436		0	49,157
Guam	50,000		7,396	65,752
Hawaii	230,225		471,087	58,518
Idaho	286,580		290,519	165,783
Illinois	6,447,297		7,987,344	654,234
Indiana	110,059			351
Iowa	265,139			24,790
Kansas	448,497			30,800
Kentucky	50,804			0
Louisiana	1,451,149	0	0	29,577
Maine	132,744			217
Maryland	989,039	0	0	14,866
Massachusetts	275,535		678,172	0
Michigan	3,399,509	0	0	21,335
Minnesota	839,238		2,692,277	2,522,084
Mississippi	375,520			28,236
Missouri	522,194			40,188
Montana	267,824	0	110,738	31,776
Nebraska	79,584			5,470
Nevada	554,566			41,392
New Hampshire	141,958	0	0	953
New Jersey	803,699		16,667,521	2,389,677
New Mexico	795,496	0	71,500	592
New York	7,274,081	10,796,456	55,939,860	16,896,007
North Carolina	772,883			6,083
North Dakota	94,790			4,060
Ohio	5,237,762	0	4,059,350	4,151,846
Oklahoma	81,228		150	3,800
Oregon	2,145,062	0	166,610	344,826
Pennsylvania	1,408,512		1,571,102	2,475,965
Rhode Island	244,457		265,707	988
South Carolina	1,969,814		7,672,214	66,519
South Dakota	319,819	167,471		8,760
Tennessee	1,372,496			149,425
Texas	5,790,731	5,734,243	3,353,583	733,766
Utah	726,516	1,106,195	956,583	145,285
Vermont	202,895	0	4,047,297	581,951
Virginia	1,142,203		1,068,807	106,007
Virgin Islands	0		7,500	0
Washington	4,282,040		9,443,351	2,396,094
West Virginia	408,511		0	2,287
Wisconsin	1,727,380		6,751,797	506,891
Wyoming	27,295	0	0	0
National Total	**77,053,470**	**19,632,211**	**154,861,037**	**45,091,955**
Source: FNS-778 Federal Financial Report				

FY 2015: Federal E&T Outlays				
State Agency	E&T Grant	E&T ABAWD Grant	Federal 50% Administrative Reimbursement	Federal 50% Reimbursement for Participant Expenses
Alabama	1,680,280	0	0	154,792
Alaska	8,043	0	5,961	3,990
Arizona	2,540,342	0	0	264,599
Arkansas	822,674	0	0	67,742
California	7,603,298		27,339,539	8,530,459
Colorado	2,967,258	2,008,140	532,686	225,759
Connecticut	633,646	0	1,285,230	7,038
Delaware	51,211	542,682	34,849	10,229
District of Columbia	224,044		2,075,764	152,610
Florida	8,663,430			275,114
Georgia	1,627,082		0	97,949
Guam	50,000		22,762	43,486
Hawaii	262,960		436,578	38,879
Idaho	275,806	0	158,291	164,758
Illinois	6,316,744		7,223,874	608,583
Indiana	1,910,069	0	1,269,829	33,642
Iowa	245,402		70,428	4,940
Kansas	550,705			51,727
Kentucky	209,435			0
Louisiana	1,533,769	0	0	34,396
Maine	375,224			2,865
Maryland	711,919	0	71,353	22,162
Massachusetts	241,015		527,163	5,452
Michigan	2,922,978	0	0	17,701
Minnesota	1,283,805		2,733,533	2,517,314
Mississippi	443,072			24,891
Missouri	1,136,539			18,707
Montana	220,990	0	165,503	31,199
Nebraska	81,733		1,986	2,978
Nevada	389,324			31,604
New Hampshire	114,673	0	0	578
New Jersey	692,334		17,322,516	2,222,016
New Mexico	948,515	0	53,486	49,500
New York	10,415,262	0	57,989,839	17,834,619
North Carolina	1,370,510			8,447
North Dakota	94,790			9,680
Ohio	7,634,428		1,185,523	5,400,113
Oklahoma	77,802		0	766
Oregon	2,073,710	0	527,039	296,699
Pennsylvania	2,584,883		737,019	1,592,708
Rhode Island	349,440	0	493,254	11,321
South Carolina	2,069,087		4,986,773	84,204
South Dakota	322,678	190,366		5,384
Tennessee	1,480,260			127,042
Texas	6,547,308	9,331,797	3,559,223	1,017,603
Utah	561,787		213,787	58,034
Vermont	246,016	0	3,449,276	629,235
Virginia	1,970,314		892,314	162,321
Virgin Islands	50,000		3,750	0
Washington	4,082,068	0	12,015,536	1,791,389
West Virginia	394,643		0	1,758
Wisconsin	2,059,581	6,041,972	8,216,207	1,114,606
Wyoming	586,106	0	146,614	0
National Total	**92,708,992**	**18,114,957**	**155,747,485**	**45,863,588**
Source: FNS-778 Federal Financial Report				

FY 2016: Federal E&T Outlays				
State Agency	E&T Grant	E&T ABAWD Grant	Federal 50% Administrative Reimbursement	Federal 50% Reimbursement for Participant Expenses
Alabama	596,757	0	0	12,734
Alaska	119,267		7,137	0
Arizona	3,308,673	0	246,234	191,886
Arkansas	774,808	0	0	79,858
California	8,078,566		28,302,615	4,793,635
Colorado	2,399,216	1,826,146	1,600,963	217,492
Connecticut	767,314	0	1,490,790	2,582
Delaware	229,362	1,069,879	52,718	29,159
District of Columbia	225,827		2,815,746	41,232
Florida	11,292,279			379,819
Georgia	1,302,272			33,038
Guam	84,262		9,573	38,963
Hawaii	254,741		588,556	56,094
Idaho	300,997	0	160,424	118,176
Illinois	4,829,000	0	7,777,165	468,798
Indiana	1,855,784		3,102,160	87,728
Iowa	270,123	0	60,777	69,572
Kansas	380,877			11,634
Kentucky	1,663,100			12,751
Louisiana	1,206,784		109,324	38,709
Maine	309,297			7,646
Maryland	1,175,301	0	173,341	5,821
Massachusetts	795,028		588,201	2,836
Michigan	2,591,434	0	0	36,277
Minnesota	2,479,149		2,904,853	2,156,813
Mississippi	1,314,459			490,973
Missouri	2,257,540			63,879
Montana	280,137	0	149,984	28,926
Nebraska	103,985		0	2,759
Nevada	501,964			29,673
New Hampshire	133,561	0	0	587
New Jersey	626,463		10,490,277	1,957,808
New Mexico	466,029		58,066	22,497
New York	10,813,586	0	64,147,344	17,958,067
North Carolina	996,554		50,018	10,673
North Dakota	138,508			1,517
Ohio	3,440,674		1,251,570	5,897,764
Oklahoma	333,286			2,002
Oregon	2,229,311	0	716,766	264,619
Pennsylvania	3,026,006		1,118,814	899,594
Rhode Island	307,386		712,566	45,382
South Carolina	1,581,670		3,483,221	45,199
South Dakota	338,015	196,955		5,043
Tennessee	2,835,032			36,484
Texas	4,719,779	8,992,806	3,620,561	768,098
Utah	476,377		151,959	80,136
Vermont	168,202	0	1,879,075	291,580
Virginia	1,522,700		782,192	131,518
Virgin Islands	338,250			0
Washington	6,105,022	0	13,068,344	1,567,203
West Virginia	531,311		0	9,161
Wisconsin	1,531,700	7,050,360	14,483,752	2,107,383
Wyoming	610,611	0	184,473	7,753
National Total	**95,018,336**	**19,136,146**	**166,339,559**	**41,619,531**
Source: FNS-778 Federal Financial Report				

FY 2017: Federal E&T Outlays				
State Agency	E&T Grant	E&T ABAWD Grant	Federal 50% Administrative Reimbursement	Federal 50% Reimbursement for Participant Expenses
Alabama	906,292	0	49,030	24,791
Alaska	129,523	0	1,628	0
Arizona	3,155,347		550,151	257,991
Arkansas	831,184	0	299,490	28,310
California	11,018,428		30,261,221	5,057,579
Colorado	1,101,128	849,598	2,583,568	226,312
Connecticut	1,050,851	0	1,672,804	2,930
Delaware	216,412	344,339	0	24,057
District of Columbia	998,522		1,983,651	38,181
Florida	9,724,639			304,784
Georgia	1,404,337		21,163	8,307
Guam	78,579		25,838	41,011
Hawaii	237,043		440,157	48,998
Idaho	264,248	0	66,844	117,664
Illinois	5,705,445		7,975,088	387,134
Indiana	1,863,286		2,831,118	80,012
Iowa	424,660	0	146,653	90,942
Kansas	521,792			23,809
Kentucky	1,724,942			53,651
Louisiana	1,177,462		360,758	42,660
Maine	280,573		25,435	8,173
Maryland	1,042,619		645,971	14,011
Massachusetts	2,102,110		1,187,874	3,073
Michigan	2,850,932	0	77,536	49,029
Minnesota	2,584,672		2,573,146	1,986,057
Mississippi	1,131,037		92	400,811
Missouri	1,564,436	222,537	698,057	68,028
Montana	241,749	0	174,855	28,696
Nebraska	80,006	0	0	7,546
Nevada	721,955	0	0	43,035
New Hampshire	163,888	0	17,948	3,471
New Jersey	693,011		9,884,958	1,546,714
New Mexico	855,070		6,611	188
New York	5,369,716	5,235,362	75,751,325	7,837,366
North Carolina	1,895,759		119,058	307,039
North Dakota	70,310			2,199
Ohio	2,938,610		2,239,594	4,331,927
Oklahoma	1,123,812		10,881	21,200
Oregon	2,023,561	2,009,275	1,162,530	222,706
Pennsylvania	3,189,204		2,348,442	922,129
Rhode Island	321,534		920,978	35,450
South Carolina	1,343,728		2,567,985	8,624
South Dakota	185,217	160,735	105,333	6,716
Tennessee	1,922,182		27,438	2,521
Texas	5,920,835	2,892,886	3,955,164	558,810
Utah	463,163		27,347	41,797
Vermont	175,850	0	362,887	0
Virginia	1,853,134		957,716	137,292
Virgin Islands	50,000			0
Washington	3,854,074	908,967	14,089,681	3,774,656
West Virginia	649,125	0	0	7,317
Wisconsin	1,448,289	2,204,363	18,124,266	2,882,565
Wyoming	571,647	0	245,431	8,031
National Total	**92,215,928**	**14,828,062**	**187,577,701**	**32,126,300**
Source: FNS-778 Federal Financial Report				

FY 2018: Federal E&T Outlays				
State Agency	E&T Grant	E&T ABAWD Grant	Federal 50% Administrative Reimbursement	Federal 50% Reimbursement for Participant Expenses
Alabama	1,636,624	0	631,211	137,958
Alaska	171,718		107,848	65,272
Arizona	1,834,930		621,277	255,622
Arkansas	460,635	0	759,466	14,385
California	11,364,448	0	38,455,846	5,244,665
Colorado	1,531,827	964,912	2,423,528	167,723
Connecticut	1,063,232	0	1,840,936	13,904
Delaware	188,993		60,720	102,769
District of Columbia	293,296		4,172,721	46,038
Florida	9,779,132			234,855
Georgia	1,939,302		146,298	18,538
Guam	83,639		16,684	37,565
Hawaii	313,344		444,239	83,181
Idaho	746,095	0	269,677	109,276
Illinois	5,015,884		9,671,916	317,582
Indiana	1,518,039		1,505,260	68,674
Iowa	474,474		26,309	151,280
Kansas	623,570		0	52,013
Kentucky	3,647,831		12,431	88,242
Louisiana	1,141,597		595,632	29,488
Maine	360,308		117,658	27,496
Maryland	899,657		1,766,696	105,371
Massachusetts	2,511,603		1,515,514	5,055
Michigan	3,041,755		0	67,793
Minnesota	2,589,865	0	1,944,292	572,717
Mississippi	1,433,788		776,622	143,097
Missouri	1,533,491		1,075,011	39,277
Montana	245,172	0	124,601	15,844
Nebraska	88,910	0	0	13,355
Nevada	748,728	0	15,365	35,736
New Hampshire	147,262		10,000	5,680
New Jersey	660,411		12,656,659	1,183,127
New Mexico	115,668		3,456	1,143
New York	5,306,072	5,847,953	65,508,692	8,043,967
North Carolina	1,516,257		1,076,503	234,878
North Dakota	70,545		18,439	2,289
Ohio	2,733,529		2,009,003	2,269,280
Oklahoma	448,157			20,500
Oregon	1,882,746	3,362,573	7,243,320	389,981
Pennsylvania	3,517,919		2,872,435	1,341,100
Rhode Island	446,859		874,709	61,848
South Carolina	1,675,101		1,521,129	9,648
South Dakota	150,390	112,665	0	8,758
Tennessee	2,076,933		152,625	21,398
Texas	5,109,507	2,919,146	2,750,942	489,517
Utah	270,981		0	44,391
Vermont	174,898		381,504	0
Virginia	1,559,831		866,759	179,671
Virgin Islands	50,000			0
Washington	3,317,362	873,830	15,188,240	1,681,859
West Virginia	507,374		117,234	6,346
Wisconsin	1,556,081	1,900,585	14,695,615	2,316,626
Wyoming	670,405	0	277,470	10,000
National Total	**91,246,175**	**15,981,664**	**197,322,492**	**26,586,978**

Source: FNS-778 Federal Financial Report

FY 2019: Federal E&T Outlays - Estimates as of November 7, 2019				
State Agency	E&T Grant	E&T ABAWD Grant	Federal 50% Administrative Reimbursement	Federal 50% Reimbursement for Participant Expenses
Alabama	1,521,896	0	2,783,000	292,187
Alaska	68,493		241,815	38,527
Arizona	874,462		592,069	117,427
Arkansas	53,705		110,147	7,250
California	9,693,904		27,670,267	3,206,639
Colorado	1,179,477	815,457	1,781,368	90,598
Connecticut	705,181	0	817,073	8,471
Delaware	16,207	141,171		18,472
District of Columbia	240,740		2,243,256	56,470
Florida	6,671,645			98,977
Georgia	1,297,501		1,619,624	148,502
Guam	28,919		27,360	20,534
Hawaii	139,585		308,781	73,987
Idaho	438,763		277,843	169,103
Illinois	1,624,822		9,312,988	195,937
Indiana	824,090		752,293	85,480
Iowa	185,528		12,554	66,189
Kansas	313,599			13,105
Kentucky	1,584,835		1,271	87,541
Louisiana	605,943		1,132,892	22,907
Maine	241,878		212,716	114,137
Maryland	533,844		836,222	31,468
Massachusetts	1,126,324		1,195,543	9,981
Michigan	0	0	0	13
Minnesota	724,892		1,364,327	226,676
Mississippi	1,908,435		434,052	79,825
Missouri	887,992		874,791	0
Montana	258,868	0	6,997	9,800
Nebraska	60,834			16,983
Nevada	638,699			9,796
New Hampshire	159,389		6,826	1,373
New Jersey	466,107	0	8,782,468	975,610
New Mexico				15,000
New York	6,477,945		40,652,183	5,305,270
North Carolina	1,142,022		50,721	1,004,079
North Dakota	100,000		206,402	53,857
Ohio	2,804,968		2,052,685	1,566,429
Oklahoma	708,786		1,188,000	92,887
Oregon	99,890	1,337,420	5,936,141	175,428
Pennsylvania	2,604,270		3,605,304	1,496,684
Rhode Island	258,059		615,670	52,603
South Carolina	1,183,641		880,662	5,862
South Dakota	155,283	98,755		6,992
Tennessee	1,444,030	0	404,464	23,153
Texas	5,386,431	4,000,000	4,363,928	668,049
Utah	148,688			33,802
Vermont	365,014	112,393	254,208	22,410
Virginia	1,043,852		567,674	120,025
Virgin Islands	18,118	0		0
Washington	3,113,280	732,772	19,920,483	2,844,093
West Virginia	609,518		57,588	3,658
Wisconsin	465,158	0	9,518,031	1,358,062
Wyoming	183,001	0	103,747	2,535
National Total	**63,388,511**	**7,237,968**	**153,776,434**	**21,144,843**
Source: FNS-778 Federal Financial Report				

FY 2020: Federal Allocations				
State Agency	E&T Grant	E&T ABAWD Grant	Federal 50% Administrative Reimbursement *	Federal 50% Reimbursement for Participant Expenses *
Alabama	2,215,754			
Alaska	301,752			
Arizona	2,249,667			
Arkansas	1,043,614	337,662		
California	12,568,700			
Colorado	1,204,896	753,247		
Connecticut	989,928			
Delaware	256,026	259,740		
District of Columbia	313,189			
Florida	7,414,821			
Georgia	5,426,886			
Guam	113,671			
Hawaii	315,798			
Idaho	239,220			
Illinois	6,736,785			
Indiana	1,537,444			
Iowa	721,652			
Kansas	669,453			
Kentucky	2,642,546			
Louisiana	2,104,528			
Maine	413,734			
Maryland	1,200,419			
Massachusetts	1,688,106	1,610,390		
Michigan	2,266,115			
Minnesota	1,204,536			
Mississippi	1,339,837			
Missouri	1,530,996			
Montana	356,721			
Nebraska	347,812			
Nevada	1,437,422			
New Hampshire	193,186			
New Jersey	480,610			
New Mexico	1,292,355			
New York	6,488,162	5,636,364		
North Carolina	3,182,573			
North Dakota	100,000			
Ohio	3,189,184			
Oklahoma	992,094			
Oregon	2,545,773	2,363,636		
Pennsylvania	4,830,644			
Rhode Island	467,639			
South Carolina	1,671,089			
South Dakota	234,188	155,844		
Tennessee	2,728,272			
Texas	6,701,856	3,402,597		
Utah	322,174			
Vermont	171,346	129,870		
Virginia	1,700,824	1,142,857		
Virgin Islands	100,000			
Washington	2,839,619	2,961,039		
West Virginia	1,060,610			
Wisconsin	1,655,772	1,246,753		
Wyoming	100,000			
National Total	**103,900,000**	**20,000,000**		

Source: 100 percent and ABAWD Final Allocations
* Estimated State distribution is unavailable

Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide an update on FNS' work with State partners to establish State Law Enforcement Bureau (SLEB) agreements. How many agreements are in place and provide a brief summary of the number of open and closed cases?

Response: A total of 29 States currently have a SLEB Agreement with FNS. Of those 29, only 18 States actively worked cases in FY 2019. Kansas is the most recent addition to SLEB, added in FY 2020. SLEB investigative results often do not lead to sanctions. Since FY 2012, of the 2,200 SLEB investigations opened, close to 75 percent resulted in no further action, and approximately 10 percent resulted in disqualification.

Mr. Fortenberry: How much of your budget has been spent on fraud prevention and detection efforts for Fiscal Years 2015 through Fiscal Year 2019? How much funding is assumed in the FY 2020 request? Please provide a breakout for mandatory and discretionary funds.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

SNAP Administrative Funds Directed at Retailer Integrity and Fraud Prevention
(dollars in thousands)

	FY 2015 Actual	FY 2016 Actual	FY 2017 Actual	FY 2018 Actual	FY 2019 Estimated	FY 2020 Requested
Mandatory Other Program Costs:						
Benefit & Retailer Redemption and Monitoring	$46,233	$41,245	$43,057	$48,470	$47,783	$53,780
Payment Accuracy and Cooperative Services	19,623	19,185	25,416	23,691	23,647	34,148
Web-Based Automation of Systems	7,102	6,810	6,969	6,598	6,831	7,500
Retailer Integrity and Trafficking	12,186	16,333	19,067	16,416	16,309	21,667
Total, Funds for Retailer Integrity and Fraud Prevention	85,144	83,573	94,509	95,175	94,570	117,095

Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a list of the number of SNAP staff across all of FNCS that are working on retailer fraud as of fiscal year 2019 and actuals for fiscal year 2018 and provide the breakdown by headquarters and the locations across the nation.

Response: Responsibility for monitoring, identifying, and holding those accountable for retailer fraud lies with the FNS national office in two organizational units.

The Retailer Operations and Compliance Division manages the day-to-day authorization, reauthorization, and monitoring and sanctioning of retailers that participate in SNAP. In fiscal year 2019, 209 Retailer Operations and Compliance Division staff worked on retailer fraud in some capacity.

The SNAP Retailer Policy and Management Division manages all retailer and issuance related policy, systems, data, contracts, quality assurance, and final agency decisions on retailer sanctions through the administrative review

process. In fiscal year 2019, 45 Retailer Policy and Management Division staff worked on retailer fraud in some capacity.

In fiscal year 2019, a total of 254 FNS staff from both national office Divisions worked on this effort.

Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide any updates from last year on the activities across USDA to reduce fraud in the SNAP program.

Response: FNS awarded a contract to provide technical assistance to State agencies to improve prevention, detection, and investigation of fraud by SNAP recipients. This assistance is a continuation of FNS' efforts to promote the SNAP Fraud Framework, a collection of procedures, innovative ideas, and best practices that FNS issued to State agencies in May 2018. The Framework acknowledges State differences by providing a variety of techniques for States to consider as they improve recipient integrity.

FNS also awarded nine SNAP Fraud Framework Implementation Grants totaling more than $4.6 million to State agencies to fund new projects that improve recipient fraud efforts using principles from the SNAP Fraud Framework (Delaware, District of Columbia, Florida, Hawaii, Michigan, New Jersey, Oklahoma, Tennessee, and Texas).

FNS continues to take a multi-faceted approach to SNAP retailer compliance with policy updates, operational and systems enhancements. FNS has proactively reached out to educate retailers in order to promote voluntary compliance with program rules. FNS continues to focus on the highest risk retailers at authorization and reauthorization. Delivery routes, which have historically posed a particular fraud risk, have been subject to enhanced review. An agreement to streamline the case clearance process with the USDA Office of Inspector General has allowed FNS to expedite actions to remove violators. FNS continues to update and enhance the Agency's fraud monitoring system. In addition, FNS published a proposed rule to address use of the Freedom of Information Act process as a tool to delay actions against violating retailers.

FOOD DISTRIBUTION PROGRAM ON INDIAN RESERVATIONS

Mr. Fortenberry: Native Americans have some of the highest diabetes rates in the Nation. In fact, Native Americans are twice as likely to get diabetes than Caucasians. I have supported funding in the budget to allow Tribes to restore access to more traditional foods that can be healthier in their diet. As part of the Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations and related programs, what is USDA doing to partner with American Indian tribes to help improve Native American health?

Response: Since 2002, the USDA Food Distribution Division has collaborated with the FDPIR Food Package Review Work Group, a work group made up of Tribal representatives and USDA/CDC staff, to discuss the overall nutritional quality, variety and acceptability of foods offered in the FDPIR food package. The ongoing input and feedback USDA receives from the FDPIR Food Package Review Work Group, as well as from FDPIR programs and participants throughout the year, have resulted in many positive enhancements to the FDPIR food package. The program now offers over 100 nutritious products for participants to select from, including over 40 fresh fruit and fresh vegetable options, and a selection of traditional foods including bison, blue cornmeal, wild salmon, traditionally harvested wild rice, and catfish. In addition, the improvements made are reflected in the Healthy Eating Index, a measurement used by USDA to determine how well a set of foods align with key recommendations of the Dietary Guidelines for Americans. The FDPIR Food Package received a score of 73 out of 100 compared to 59 out of 100 for the average American diet.

Since 2009, USDA has awarded approximately $1 million per year through the Food Distribution Nutrition Education Grant Program to support nutrition education projects at the tribal level that help FDPIR participants make healthy choices and prepare nutritious foods. Many of these grants include local Tribal partnerships that aim to improve Native American health. Additionally, in FY 2020, USDA is awarding a cooperative agreement to the Oklahoma Tribal Engagement Partners who will plan, develop, implement, and evaluate a culturally relevant training project that will teach local agency FDPIR staff to be nutrition paraprofessionals.

LAG IN SNAP PARTICIPATION DECLINE

Mr. Fortenberry: Participation in SNAP dropped from a yearly average of 47.6 million people in 2013 to 36.3 in July of this this year – a nearly 24 percent reduction. This drop is the result of a strong economy and a low unemployment rate. The unemployment rate for abled bodied adults looking for work is down to 3.5 percent from a high of 10 percent in 2009. Please provide a table showing SNAP participation and unemployment rates to include fiscal years 2013 through 2018. Also, add a column that shows total benefit costs to include the ARRA component as well.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information is as follows:]

Year	SNAP Participation (millions)	Benefit Costs (billions)	ARRA Funds (billions)	Fiscal Year Unemployment Rate
FY 2013	47.7	76.1	6.7	7.4
FY 2014	46.5	70.0	5.6	6.2
FY 2015	45.9	69.6	0	5.3
FY 2016	44.2	66.6	0	4.9
FY 2017	42.2	63.6	0	4.4
FY 2018	40.3	60.6	0	3.9

Mr. Fortenberry: Why are we not seeing a steeper drop in SNAP participation when compared with the drop in unemployment?

Response: Historically, there has been as much as a two-year lag between changes in the unemployment rate and changes in SNAP participation. As unemployment remains at historical lows, SNAP participation continues to decline. In Fiscal Year 2016 an average of 44.2 million individuals received SNAP each month; in August 2019 6.5 million fewer people were receiving SNAP. We expect that this trend will continue due to sustained economic growth and job creation.

FARM BILL REQUIREMENT THAT GOVERNOR APPROVE ABAWD WAIVERS

Mr. Fortenberry: Last year, the Farm Bill was delayed over changes to the SNAP program. Specifically, the Ag Committees debated the policy related to ABAWDs - or "able-bodied adults without dependents". By definition, these are the people that serve as the basis of American's workforce. USDA issued a proposed rule in December 2018, the day the President signed the Farm Bill. To be clear, I'm not talking about seniors, I'm not talking about people with disabilities, and I'm most certainly not talking about kids. When can we expect to see that final rule issued?

Response: On December 5, 2019, the final rule entitled *Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Requirements for Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents* was published in the Federal Register:

https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2019/12/05/2019-26044/supplemental-nutrition-assistance-program-requirements-for-able-bodied-adults-without-dependents.

Mr. Fortenberry: As you may remember, there was a Farm Bill provision that governors must approve any and all ABAWD waiver requests that go from their state agency to the USDA for consideration. Well, to my knowledge, there has been no rule proposed or guidance issued that implements this piece of the Farm Bill to honor Congressional intent. Why hasn't the USDA proposed or promulgated rules to implement this piece of the Farm Bill?

Response: On December 5, 2019, the final rule entitled, "Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program: Requirements for Able-Bodied Adults Without Dependents" was published in the Federal Register. This rule requires that any State agency's waiver request must have the support of the chief executive officer of the State to ensure that such a critical request is supported at the highest levels of State government.

DEFINITIONS OF POVERTY

Mr. Fortenberry: Like so many things the federal government does, we seem to have very different measures of poverty. I thought poverty had a set definition and we could use that definition to determine who is eligible for certain programs. However, it appears that people are eligible for school lunch if their family has income at no more than 185 percent, not more than 200% for SNAP, and then it could be over 300% for WIC. Is this accurate and if so, does USDA see a need to standardize some of these definitions? Because it seems to be the source of much disagreement in Congress. Who qualifies as a vulnerable population and who does not?

Response: The laws that govern Federal nutrition assistance programs identify specific income requirements for eligibility. These are generally defined as multiples of the Federal poverty guidelines, which are updated annually by the Department of Health and Human Services. The 2019 poverty guideline is $25,750 for a family of four. Based on this, the core eligibility requirements for nutrition assistance are as follows:

INCOME ELIGIBILITY GUIDELINES (Fiscal Year/School Year 2020)		
% of Poverty	Income for a Family of 4	Makes You Eligible for:
130%	$33,475 per year; $2,790 per month	• SNAP/FDPIR • free school meals/CACFP • CSFP (elderly)
185%	$47,638 per year; $3,970 per month	• reduced price school meals/CACFP • SFSP (at least 50% of families at this income) • WIC

The figures that you cite appear to tie not to eligibility requirements specified in the statutes related to nutrition assistance programs, but to other provisions in law that allow States to use eligibility requirements of other assistance programs to determine eligibility for nutrition assistance programs.

In some instances, such as with the link between TANF and SNAP, current SNAP regulations allow States and USDA broad flexibility in this area, which can have the effect of allowing households to be certified for SNAP when their income exceeds the program's limit. The Department is currently using its discretion under the law to limit the use of these flexibilities to increase consistency of program requirements from State to State, and to promote program integrity. We have not proposed changes to the underlying eligibility requirements, but would be happy to work with Congress to consider changes in this area, if you wish to pursue them.

WIC EBT

Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide an update to the transition of WIC programs to Electronic Benefit Transfer systems.

Response: FNS expects most but not all WIC State agencies will meet the statutory mandate. As of November 2019, 53 State agencies have achieved statewide WIC electronic benefit transfer (EBT). Thirty-six (36) State agencies have not implemented EBT statewide. Twenty-five (25) of these 36 State agencies have the capability to meet the statutory deadline based on current project status.

There are two EBT technologies in use in WIC: (1) offline, smart card technology with an embedded microchip that stores the participant's food benefits information on the chip; and (2) online, magnetic stripe technology similar to a traditional debit card that accesses an online database where the participant's benefit account is maintained. Of the 53 State agencies with statewide EBT, 46 use online technology.

Currently, 13 WIC State agencies have statewide implementation dates in advance of the statutory deadline. Twelve (12) of the remaining WIC State agencies, including Indian Tribal Organizations (ITOs) planning to implement WIC EBT, are currently establishing or confirming EBT implementation timelines and are not yet considered at high risk of missing the statutory deadline.

At this time, based on current project status, FNS has identified 11 State agencies at high risk of not meeting the mandate: the District of Columbia; Georgia; Mississippi; New Jersey; Puerto Rico; and six ITOs in New Mexico including Acoma, Canoncito, and Laguna; Eight Northern Indian Pueblos; Five Sandoval Indian Pueblos; Pueblo of San Felipe; Pueblo of Zuni; and Santo Domingo Pueblo. This list is subject to change as the EBT statutory deadline approaches.

Statute allows States to request an exemption from the required statutory timeframe for EBT implementation (i.e., an extension request), not a wholesale exemption from EBT implementation. FNS will set forth a standard approach by which WIC State agencies may request an extension to the October 1, 2020 statutory deadline if needed.

Recent technical assistance activities to help support EBT advancement included training for WIC State agencies and EBT industry partners at two national stakeholder conferences. FNS will continue to provide technical assistance to all WIC State agencies working to implement EBT.

NAP PROGRAM IN PUERTO RICO

Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide statistics on the number of NAP participants who received additional benefits versus how many new participants were added to the program as a result of the 2017 NAP and the 2019 NAP supplemental appropriations. Please provide any relevant policy documents related to the supplemental funding.

Response: Based in the block grant structure of the Nutrition Assistance Program, Puerto Rico had significant flexibility in developing its Disaster Relief Comprehensive Plan to utilize the $1.27 billion and $600 million in supplemental appropriations provided by Congress in October 2017 and June 2019, respectively. With FNS support and approval, PR chose to modify their NAP income limits and increase maximum allotments to serve disaster-affected households throughout the island. Based on the approved disaster program structure, time constraints, and technological capabilities of the NAP system, PR's reporting for the disaster program show the total number of households and participants that were active on the program at the end of each month. PR's reporting does not allow for direct comparison of how many participants or households have been added as a result of the disaster.

Based on data reported by the NAP agency, in February 2018, the month prior to the first disaster issuance, there were 1,217,596 NAP participants in 655,747 households. At the peak of the twelve months (July 2018), there were 1,360,883 NAP participants in 733,460 households. In March 2019, based on available funding, the NAP agency reverted the maximum allotment levels to pre-hurricane Irma/Maria levels, but chose to continue the higher net income limits for the remainder of the fiscal year. These higher net income limits have been extended for fiscal year 2020 as well using the additional disaster supplemental appropriation amount of $600 passed by Congress in June 2019. As of October 2019, the latest available reported data, there are 1,288,811 NAP participants in 732,802 households. This program is due to end in June 2020.

Puerto Rico Nutrition Assistance Program (NAP) Participation Data

	February 2018	March 2018	July 2018 (*Peak)	March 2019	October 2019
Participants (Part)	**1,217,596**	**1,239,177**	**1,360,883***	**1,337,580**	**1,288,811**
Households (HH)	**655,747**	**667,852**	**733,460***	**727,214**	**732,802**

COMMODITY ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

Mr. Fortenberry: Of the total amount obligated for the Commodity Supplemental Food Program (CSFP), what portion or percentage goes towards administrative costs? Please provide a table that shows a breakout by state of CSFP administrative costs for fiscal years 2014 through 2019.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information is as follows:]

The percentage of the total obligated amount that goes towards administrative costs for the CSFP program is approximately 20 percent. The amount of administrative funding for the CSFP program is statutorily defined on a per-caseload basis by the Agriculture and Consumer Protection Act of 1973, as amended. The following table shows the administrative costs for fiscal years 2014 through 2019 broken out by States. The information is provided for the record.

CSFP Administrative Costs by State (thousands)

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Alaska	155	156	145	192	197	208

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Arizona	904	925	956	992	1,505	1,588
Arkansas	217	224	240	358	459	484
California	5,521	5,671	6,041	6,987	7,442	7,850
Colorado	1,316	1,329	1,226	1,193	1,213	1,280
Connecticut	0	133	179	204	196	206
Delaware	174	179	182	173	172	182
District of Columbia	462	435	401	394	409	432
Florida	0	133	189	599	576	607
Georgia	217	224	240	329	424	447
Hawaii	0	133	179	297	298	314
Idaho	0	111	149	161	167	177
Illinois	1,245	1,208	1,272	1,346	1,231	1,299
Indiana	265	265	272	301	351	370
Iowa	218	220	228	236	256	270
Kansas	359	362	377	410	453	477
Kentucky	1,696	1,749	1,876	2,068	2,369	2,499
Louisiana	4,778	4,719	4,549	4,703	4,358	4,597
Maine	214	221	236	578	703	741
Maryland	0	133	179	180	213	225
Massachusetts	0	133	179	182	186	197
Michigan	5,547	5,577	5,587	5,482	5,757	6,073
Minnesota	1,162	1,182	1,209	1,172	1,113	1,174
Mississippi	695	717	769	898	937	989
Missouri	1,140	1,172	1,257	1,713	1,853	1,954
Montana	595	610	630	625	544	574
Nebraska	808	764	710	713	656	692
Nevada	525	536	573	559	587	619
New Hampshire	435	403	357	330	307	324
New Jersey	215	222	235	312	455	480
New Mexico	1,206	1,224	1,224	1,243	1,199	1,265
New York	2,473	2,551	2,590	2,499	2,508	2,645
North Carolina	83	85	91	349	698	736
North Dakota	150	144	136	144	147	155
Ohio	1,487	1,527	1,635	1,788	1,987	2,096
Oklahoma	217	224	237	255	266	281
Oregon	119	122	130	189	189	199
Pennsylvania	2,513	2,554	2,580	2,679	2,756	2,907
Rhode Island	0	111	149	124	114	120
South Carolina	392	402	423	486	466	491
South Dakota	350	352	361	344	346	365
Tennessee	978	1,009	1,011	999	976	1,029
Texas	2,464	2,542	2,726	3,499	4,387	4,627
Utah	176	181	194	223	235	248
Vermont	231	229	219	227	205	217
Virginia	0	0	279	0	786	829
Washington	378	387	410	438	456	481
West Virginia	0	0	0	0	381	401
Wisconsin	758	778	835	909	864	912
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	4	4
US	**42,842**	**44,268**	**45,854**	**50,739**	**54,357**	**57,337**

*2019 Data is estimated
**Data is from latest available NDB figures

Mr. Fortenberry: Please provide a table that shows a breakout by state of CSFP and TEFAP funding, with a separate column for TEFAP administrative funds, to include fiscal years 2014 through 2019.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information is as follows:]

CSFP Funding by State, FY 2014 through FY 2019 (thousands)

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Alaska	597	586	561	687	845	929
Arizona	3,859	4,095	3,902	3,836	5,002	5,499
Arkansas	910	978	976	1,383	1,850	2,034
California	22,837	23,815	23,927	27,300	31,287	34,395
Colorado	5,313	5,044	4,584	4,538	4,791	5,267
Connecticut	0	208	582	707	777	854
Delaware	751	813	700	669	698	768
DC	1,813	1,667	1,574	1,532	1,653	1,817
Florida	0	259	745	1,292	2,265	2,490
Georgia	877	939	969	1,382	1,779	1,956
Hawaii	0	219	620	883	1,153	1,268
Idaho	0	242	570	589	678	745
Illinois	4,801	5,200	4,811	4,961	5,332	5,862
Indiana	1,044	771	1,080	1,195	1,472	1,618
Iowa	857	899	850	910	1,007	1,107
Kansas	1,446	1,532	1,486	1,586	1,852	2,036
Kentucky	7,325	7,562	7,440	8,293	8,989	9,882
Louisiana	19,884	19,472	18,163	16,957	17,397	19,125
Maine	896	917	955	2,021	2,732	3,003
Maryland	0	143	527	723	915	1,006
Massachusetts	0	143	476	727	779	856
Michigan	23,030	22,820	21,872	21,775	22,804	25,070
Minnesota	4,727	4,884	4,617	4,509	4,539	4,990
Mississippi	2,885	3,050	3,033	3,476	3,953	4,346
Missouri	4,661	4,800	4,968	6,248	7,453	8,194
Montana	2,361	2,520	2,387	1,960	1,980	2,176
Nebraska	2,976	2,899	2,622	2,525	2,411	2,651
Nevada	1,974	2,193	2,181	2,139	2,256	2,480
New Hampshire	1,637	1,473	1,295	1,216	1,147	1,261
New Jersey	843	890	914	1,273	1,769	1,944
New Mexico	4,955	5,108	4,463	4,661	4,823	5,302
New York	9,301	10,127	9,234	9,970	9,861	10,841
North Carolina	355	377	351	1,004	2,522	2,773
North Dakota	578	579	521	556	602	662
Ohio	6,218	6,545	6,691	7,124	7,968	8,760
Oklahoma	874	916	889	965	1,111	1,221
Oregon	503	509	503	612	743	817
Pennsylvania	10,794	10,758	10,299	10,787	11,387	12,518
Rhode Island	0	72	354	447	475	522

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
South Carolina	1,608	1,629	1,521	1,694	1,837	2,020
South Dakota	1,364	1,441	1,331	1,395	1,345	1,478
Tennessee	3,945	3,942	4,010	3,848	3,641	4,003
Texas	10,436	10,770	10,708	13,391	17,489	19,226
Utah	697	764	763	847	980	1,077
Vermont	971	945	871	819	804	884
Virginia	0	0	336	1,278	2,283	2,510
Washington	1,545	1,565	1,547	1,680	1,859	2,043
West Virginia	0	0	0	568	1,521	1,672
Wisconsin	3,196	3,240	3,292	3,489	3,779	4,154
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	7	8
US	**185,524**	**189,781**	**186,409**	**192,426**	**216,602**	**238,120**

*2019 data is estimated
**Data is from latest available NDB figures

TEFAP Food and Administrative Costs, FY 2014 through FY 2016 (thousands)

State/Territory	FY 2014 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2014 TEFAP ADM	FY 2015 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2015 TEFAP ADM	FY 2016 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2016 TEFAP ADM
Alabama	9,015,043	869,526	8,012,212	888,003	10,292,800	1,017,743
Alaska	936,912	124,725	1,074,068	140,426	1,642,858	177,731
Arizona	12,216,256	1,696,463	9,935,722	1,840,575	13,127,270	2,020,967
Arkansas	6,004,511	673,825	4,427,765	688,591	5,645,373	519,059
California	72,590,895	10,157,915	59,347,442	10,904,038	76,564,372	11,460,005
Colorado	8,227,222	1,138,657	6,502,107	1,182,166	8,600,527	1,128,325
Connecticut	5,518,827	467,763	4,781,348	467,318	5,136,867	529,960
Delaware	2,035,838	115,862	1,379,371	117,629	2,127,769	129,824
District of Columbia	1,627,289	178,953	1,134,257	201,527	1,895,565	227,699
Florida	35,518,676	4,421,212	25,462,023	4,069,058	34,896,623	4,162,123
Georgia	20,618,501	1,758,473	14,799,159	1,756,572	21,262,066	1,865,322
Guam	486,561	9,239	274,815	2,311	490,164	34,826
Hawaii	2,015,013	146,103	1,295,681	162,591	1,715,845	170,319
Idaho	2,717,013	227,082	1,971,069	223,202	3,318,390	262,231
Illinois	22,142,669	2,865,402	21,346,153	2,532,681	24,746,208	2,536,508
Indiana	10,412,313	988,898	11,150,459	972,943	12,285,711	915,467
Iowa	3,873,564	545,527	2,769,927	484,440	4,967,951	496,129
Kansas	4,157,214	550,978	3,325,446	571,776	4,582,903	648,908
Kentucky	8,916,461	1,177,714	6,049,046	1,290,062	8,811,129	1,468,281
Louisiana	8,442,051	1,143,544	6,042,255	1,202,397	9,964,124	1,513,097
Maine	2,333,051	224,235	1,563,441	309,865	2,876,184	316,778
Maryland	7,364,412	1,068,943	4,877,249	1,017,603	8,390,714	1,271,923
Massachusetts	8,262,589	847,308	8,593,364	867,445	9,774,993	1,015,697
Michigan	18,464,929	2,568,837	15,144,427	2,788,580	20,055,417	2,612,538
Minnesota	6,561,870	951,635	5,431,795	1,026,127	7,365,939	1,077,676
Mississippi	6,352,448	746,982	6,114,722	833,528	6,629,468	885,247
Missouri	9,968,869	1,374,125	8,502,694	1,340,378	11,547,394	1,623,987
Montana	1,598,006	210,300	1,159,218	242,744	1,851,395	246,245
Nebraska	2,301,663	313,871	1,851,753	350,863	2,549,645	347,437

State/Territory	FY 2014 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2014 TEFAP ADM	FY 2015 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2015 TEFAP ADM	FY 2016 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2016 TEFAP ADM
Nevada	6,784,402	483,726	4,447,898	474,935	5,613,848	526,083
New Hampshire	1,632,537	183,598	1,464,512	198,097	1,506,517	208,544
New Jersey	17,594,485	1,918,779	11,866,008	1,982,240	14,994,893	2,133,889
New Mexico	4,630,152	548,323	3,505,755	628,469	5,054,738	676,124
New York	38,063,023	3,874,938	29,789,524	4,933,304	33,809,224	5,182,113
North Carolina	23,132,227	2,659,777	13,614,798	2,106,038	18,832,211	2,041,233
North Dakota	880,906	101,234	765,190	114,907	903,279	133,839
Ohio	20,192,566	1,736,364	16,962,745	2,340,539	22,058,090	2,366,439
Oklahoma	6,154,294	528,223	5,201,250	550,101	6,643,878	594,982
Oregon	7,419,659	1,001,320	5,935,374	1,055,852	7,115,063	1,125,555
Pennsylvania	19,472,082	1,840,721	20,067,138	2,918,392	22,112,016	3,054,360
Puerto Rico	9,230,770	1,868,352	6,553,862	2,068,938	8,877,502	1,917,245
Rhode Island	1,972,416	182,800	1,176,281	177,583	1,859,297	182,626
South Carolina	9,046,044	1,192,501	6,355,691	1,042,145	9,547,344	1,036,410
South Dakota	1,062,065	145,593	703,955	165,602	817,145	183,505
Tennessee	11,689,359	1,648,351	8,977,218	1,781,630	12,467,248	1,953,646
Texas	40,908,663	6,191,823	36,494,697	6,585,208	47,347,990	6,879,176
Utah	3,892,649	502,615	3,282,446	530,691	3,999,840	552,379
Vermont	748,222	87,806	715,725	109,007	1,407,139	128,600
Virginia	9,446,117	1,440,217	8,390,772	1,616,758	10,548,676	1,787,979
Virgin Islands	261,364	21,651	170,405	37,690	307,676	42,255
Washington	11,327,191	1,473,723	8,900,543	1,638,156	12,639,740	1,763,895
West Virginia	3,849,708	346,825	3,516,629	480,077	4,666,125	540,529
Wisconsin	9,353,564	1,207,370	7,472,346	1,330,123	9,264,447	1,353,830
Wyoming	662,492	66,189	760,356	101,871	816,517	116,058
US	**560,087,625**	**68,816,916**	**451,410,106**	**73,443,792**	**586,326,105**	**77,163,346**

TEFAP Food and Administrative Costs, FY 2017 through FY 2019 (thousands)

State/Territory	FY 2017 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2017 TEFAP ADM	FY 2018 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2018 TEFAP ADM	FY 2019 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2019 TEFAP ADM
Alabama	11,026,597	1,162,243	10,380,831	664,296	8,219,669	901,756
Alaska	1,539,957	169,888	958,191	97,102	1,372,762	131,812
Arizona	15,500,727	2,131,325	12,600,426	1,218,187	10,699,352	1,653,643
Arkansas	7,283,432	670,691	6,889,543	383,342	5,184,960	520,373
California	70,059,644	11,442,518	65,288,028	6,540,124	50,045,068	8,877,973
Colorado	6,524,178	1,126,047	6,856,927	643,607	4,429,100	873,673
Connecticut	6,748,531	593,401	5,209,765	339,166	3,159,040	460,405
Delaware	1,908,132	151,628	2,157,129	86,665	1,725,426	117,644
District of Columbia	1,652,067	237,684	1,406,559	135,851	576,297	184,413
Florida	36,110,847	5,254,686	33,621,427	3,003,386	24,740,527	4,076,984
Georgia	20,278,680	1,913,932	16,985,115	1,093,933	21,646,398	1,484,973
Guam	937,109	44,420	336,677	25,389	242,281	34,464

State/Territory	FY 2017 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2017 TEFAP ADM	FY 2018 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2018 TEFAP ADM	FY 2019 TEFAP FOOD	FY 2019 TEFAP ADM
Hawaii	1,852,910	155,796	1,314,081	89,047	586,816	120,878
Idaho	2,609,752	289,624	2,630,136	165,538	850,037	224,712
Illinois	23,276,321	2,765,151	23,883,138	1,580,459	15,700,227	2,145,414
Indiana	12,676,958	919,281	11,294,905	525,427	10,528,491	713,248
Iowa	4,697,303	496,823	4,459,058	283,966	4,532,207	385,473
Kansas	4,319,915	683,651	4,047,964	390,750	1,877,981	530,428
Kentucky	8,094,132	1,989,593	8,039,958	1,137,178	7,705,454	1,543,677
Louisiana	10,514,008	1,591,059	10,469,598	909,391	9,131,675	1,234,464
Maine	2,799,776	203,931	2,302,991	116,559	1,939,860	158,225
Maryland	5,093,898	1,313,798	6,770,899	750,919	3,341,441	1,019,344
Massachusetts	8,620,026	1,079,766	9,073,342	617,155	4,777,928	837,764
Michigan	17,629,003	2,775,853	17,222,821	1,586,576	16,584,045	2,153,717
Minnesota	7,604,746	1,129,928	6,455,478	645,825	5,848,539	876,684
Mississippi	6,521,293	1,087,285	6,337,739	621,452	5,992,715	843,598
Missouri	10,787,619	1,608,156	10,287,342	919,163	6,849,959	1,247,729
Montana	1,425,113	265,145	1,525,495	151,547	171,781	205,720
Nebraska	2,487,684	400,060	2,341,796	228,660	1,775,715	310,397
Nevada	5,464,655	561,504	5,770,931	320,935	4,694,327	435,657
New Hampshire	1,716,674	209,827	1,530,208	119,929	1,248,511	162,800
New Jersey	15,347,416	2,055,390	15,104,223	1,174,786	5,927,402	1,594,727
New Mexico	5,080,986	688,493	4,731,052	393,517	4,084,835	534,185
New York	35,810,683	5,340,954	33,888,142	3,052,694	25,496,947	4,143,917
North Carolina	16,709,670	2,978,823	17,473,968	1,702,586	10,437,475	2,311,197
North Dakota	1,156,711	146,356	1,029,021	83,652	476,677	113,554
Ohio	19,917,536	2,647,707	19,518,955	1,513,332	18,853,357	2,054,292
Oklahoma	7,335,987	704,058	6,601,220	402,414	8,885,000	546,262
Oregon	8,123,723	1,142,167	7,454,671	652,821	4,086,929	886,180
Pennsylvania	26,494,375	3,309,689	20,371,611	1,891,697	9,842,898	2,567,908
Puerto Rico	10,526,711	2,167,365	9,410,147	1,238,786	4,469,719	1,681,606
Rhode Island	1,411,352	197,571	1,600,473	112,924	1,051,103	153,291
South Carolina	10,280,759	1,066,379	8,632,061	609,503	5,232,702	827,378
South Dakota	906,209	185,074	987,508	105,782	1,133,369	143,594
Tennessee	13,474,668	1,894,635	10,514,994	1,082,904	12,797,954	1,470,001
Texas	45,071,032	7,483,244	44,054,584	4,277,148	39,459,979	5,806,068
Utah	3,576,895	614,636	3,178,212	351,303	2,810,083	476,881
Vermont	1,349,709	121,358	1,112,714	69,364	1,164,264	94,159
Virginia	10,888,604	1,785,555	10,753,121	1,020,558	6,878,385	1,385,369
Virgin Islands	187,658	36,944	335,309	21,116	0	28,664
Washington	12,823,563	1,906,075	12,111,558	1,089,443	5,701,232	1,478,877
West Virginia	3,903,554	574,808	4,102,318	328,539	2,280,270	445,980
Wisconsin	8,916,283	1,392,273	7,739,954	795,772	6,170,857	1,080,231
Wyoming	862,758	140,018	1,073,114	80,029	967,990	108,637
US	**577,918,531**	**83,004,266**	**540,227,425**	**47,442,198**	**414,388,015**	**64,401,000**

*2019 Data is estimated
**Data is from latest available NDB figures

Mr. Fortenberry: For both CSFP and TEFAP, provide a table showing the amount of commodities purchased with appropriated funds, the amount of commodities donated to the program and a total to include fiscal years 2014 through 2019.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information is as follows:]

CSFP Food Costs, FY 2014 through FY 2019 (thousands)

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019*
Alabama	0	0	0	0	0	0
Alaska	495	437	415	494	639	705
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	3,168	3,239	2,945	2,843	3,590	5,255
Arkansas	740	765	736	1,025	1,391	1,638
California	18,868	18,558	17,885	20,313	23,845	24,242
Colorado	4,320	3,806	3,358	3,346	3,578	3,859
Connecticut	0	78	406	506	585	623
Delaware	619	643	518	497	526	581
District of Columbia	1,478	1,258	1,175	1,142	1,248	1,414
Florida	0	171	556	692	1,689	1,825
Georgia	742	735	729	1,053	1,325	1,578
Hawaii	0	148	466	623	855	973
Idaho	0	131	421	428	510	546
Illinois	3,948	4,045	3,595	3,737	4,100	4,273
Indiana	862	785	818	897	1,174	1,129
Iowa	700	687	621	674	751	912
Kansas	1,206	1,194	1,109	1,199	1,399	1,655
Kentucky	6,131	5,877	5,565	6,228	6,620	7,594
Louisiana	16,482	14,940	13,615	12,254	13,040	14,020
Maine	742	732	728	1,443	2,049	2,342
Maryland	0	10	370	544	680	899
Massachusetts	0	10	297	546	592	622
Michigan	19,029	17,733	16,286	16,293	17,047	19,350
Minnesota	3,871	3,797	3,412	3,337	3,396	3,581
Mississippi	2,433	2,423	2,265	2,633	3,015	3,263
Missouri	3,862	3,752	3,712	4,591	5,688	6,191
Montana	1,951	1,949	1,757	1,436	1,436	1,578
Nebraska	2,389	2,182	1,912	1,813	1,755	1,872
Nevada	1,622	1,684	1,607	1,580	1,668	1,971
New Hampshire	1,327	1,103	945	885	840	838
New Jersey	682	682	679	961	1,312	1,725
New Mexico	4,142	4,011	3,618	3,549	3,699	3,955
New York	7,684	7,755	6,644	7,471	7,353	8,220
North Carolina	301	297	260	655	1,824	2,700
North Dakota	478	443	385	411	455	494
Ohio	5,138	5,130	5,101	5,442	5,981	6,875
Oklahoma	733	712	660	718	833	877
Oregon	415	396	373	423	554	621
Pennsylvania	9,008	8,384	7,719	8,108	8,631	9,508

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019*
Rhode Island	0	12	205	323	361	411
South Carolina	1,351	1,291	1,183	1,272	1,371	1,387
South Dakota	1,137	1,115	1,008	1,053	1,018	1,098
Tennessee	3,369	3,114	3,011	2,878	2,674	2,709
Texas	8,615	8,413	7,982	9,892	13,102	17,356
Utah	577	597	569	633	745	763
Vermont	812	735	652	593	598	560
Virginia	0	0	57	904	1,497	2,812
Washington	1,274	1,200	1,137	1,243	1,403	1,487
West Virginia	0	0	0	290	1,140	1,350
Wisconsin	2,640	2,528	2,475	2,601	2,823	3,189
Wyoming	0	0	0	0	3	35
US	**145,339**	**139,687**	**131,943**	**142,467**	**162,412**	**183,460**

*2019 data is estimated
**Data is from latest available NDB figures

TEFAP Food Costs, FY 2014 through FY 2019 (thousands)

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019*
Alabama	4,107	4,503	5,058	5,557	5,743	3,499
Alaska	403	534	400	747	429	278
Arizona	5,234	5,472	6,193	7,559	6,233	7,171
Arkansas	2,605	2,793	2,455	3,107	3,403	1,865
California	31,186	34,763	38,012	35,652	36,381	33,421
Colorado	3,688	4,130	3,697	3,009	3,922	2,282
Connecticut	2,204	2,875	2,480	3,756	2,946	4,620
Delaware	626	753	658	548	956	1,252
District of Columbia	542	617	661	878	731	745
Florida	17,531	15,764	18,207	18,560	17,832	26,720
Georgia	10,835	9,106	11,165	10,275	9,294	22,627
Guam	152	128	58	369	230	0
Hawaii	917	652	901	969	888	839
Idaho	1,280	1,074	1,429	1,586	1,487	384
Illinois	9,782	13,091	12,769	11,312	13,181	10,289
Indiana	4,283	7,234	6,629	6,601	6,123	7,196
Iowa	1,824	1,663	2,322	2,471	2,557	2,605
Kansas	1,786	1,795	2,332	2,000	2,110	438
Kentucky	4,338	4,009	4,305	3,864	4,156	5,143
Louisiana	3,385	3,684	4,801	5,246	5,213	7,031
Maine	1,053	918	1,248	1,033	1,020	2,094
Maryland	4,269	3,204	4,643	4,002	4,478	3,407
Massachusetts	3,369	5,425	5,500	5,319	5,931	3,314
Michigan	7,857	8,596	9,562	7,765	9,675	7,199
Minnesota	3,017	3,009	3,826	4,007	3,407	3,871
Mississippi	2,569	3,855	3,257	3,353	3,182	5,607
Missouri	4,352	4,894	5,821	4,864	5,607	3,998
Montana	648	639	1,015	666	932	298
Nebraska	1,133	1,106	1,079	1,401	1,283	781
Nevada	3,395	2,927	2,903	2,714	3,051	3,443
New Hampshire	714	815	751	643	729	591
New Jersey	6,493	6,746	6,008	6,431	7,312	6,783

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019*
New Mexico	1,664	1,857	2,540	2,283	2,126	3,097
New York	15,650	18,680	16,470	17,267	20,029	17,601
North Carolina	12,705	7,622	10,043	7,272	9,581	7,475
North Dakota	439	365	303	547	488	238
Ohio	8,937	9,886	11,340	9,567	10,257	15,229
Oklahoma	2,592	3,065	3,103	3,616	3,211	10,063
Oregon	3,394	3,425	3,470	3,877	4,062	1,155
Pennsylvania	8,447	12,497	8,601	11,934	10,209	0
Puerto Rico	7,271	5,938	8,086	7,694	6,433	2,691
Rhode Island	1,032	668	1,466	911	1,031	1,246
South Carolina	3,820	3,999	4,171	5,572	4,909	3,703
South Dakota	675	525	639	511	539	948
Tennessee	4,909	5,503	5,976	6,893	5,519	10,851
Texas	17,431	21,091	23,533	23,497	24,472	30,657
Utah	1,622	1,815	1,957	1,868	1,467	2,927
Vermont	303	431	339	517	296	219
Virginia	4,483	5,143	5,657	5,626	5,900	5,395
Virgin Islands	102	90	178	148	132	0
Washington	5,255	4,533	6,258	5,688	6,270	5,396
West Virginia	1,228	1,369	2,047	1,687	2,018	2,093
Wisconsin	4,265	4,528	4,600	3,950	4,225	4,178
Wyoming	291	385	416	290	588	1,131
US	**252,090**	**270,188**	**291,335**	**261,739**	**294,183**	**306,083**

*2019 data is estimated
**Data is from latest available NDB figures

CSFP Bonus Commodities, FY 2014 through FY 2019 (thousands)

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019*
Alaska	48	6	0	0	0	0
American Samoa	0	0	0	0	0	0
Arizona	214	69	0	0	0	0
Arkansas	47	12	0	0	0	0
California	1,552	414	0	0	0	0
Colorado	323	91	0	0	0	0
Delaware	42	10	0	0	0	0
Dist. Columbia	128	25	0	0	0	0
Georgia	82	19	0	0	0	0
Illinois	389	53	0	0	0	0
Indiana	82	14	0	0	0	0
Iowa	60	8	0	0	0	0
Kansas	120	25	0	0	0	0
Kentucky	502	64	0	0	0	0
Louisiana	1,373	179	0	0	0	0
Maine	59	10	0	0	0	0
Michigan	1,547	491	0	0	0	0
Minnesota	306	96	0	0	0	0
Mississippi	241	86	105	22	0	0
Missouri	324	104	0	0	0	0
Montana	176	40	0	0	0	0

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019*
Nebraska	221	47	0	0	0	0
Nevada	174	28	0	0	0	0
New Hampshire	102	29	0	0	0	0
New Jersey	54	13	0	0	0	0
New Mexico	353	74	0	0	0	0
New York	855	180	0	0	0	0
North Carolina	28	6	4	6	0	0
North Dakota	51	9	0	0	0	0
Ohio	407	112	0	0	0	0
Oklahoma	76	18	0	0	0	0
Oregon	31	10	5	11	0	0
Pennsylvania	728	180	0	0	0	0
South Carolina	101	22	0	14	0	0
South Dakota	116	26	0	0	0	0
Tennessee	348	125	0	0	0	0
Texas	643	185	0	0	0	0
Utah	56	15	2	0	0	0
Vermont	72	18	0	0	0	0
Washington	108	22	0	0	0	0
Wisconsin	199	59	0	0	0	0
US	**12,337**	**2,989**	**116**	**53**	**0**	**0**

*2019 data is estimated
**Data is from latest available NDB figures

TEFAP Bonus Commodities, FY 2014 through FY 2019 (thousands)

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Alabama	4,908	3,509	5,235	5,469	4,637	6,783
Alaska	534	541	1,243	793	529	1,259
Arizona	6,982	4,464	6,934	7,941	6,368	7,755
Arkansas	3,399	1,635	3,190	4,176	3,486	4,419
California	41,405	24,584	38,553	34,408	28,907	36,323
Colorado	4,539	2,372	4,903	3,516	2,935	3,492
Connecticut	3,315	1,906	2,657	2,992	2,264	1,262
Delaware	1,410	627	1,470	1,360	1,201	1,211
District of Columbia	1,086	517	1,234	775	675	270
Florida	17,987	9,698	16,690	17,551	15,790	13,770
Georgia	9,784	5,693	10,097	10,004	7,691	12,356
Guam	335	147	432	568	107	242
Hawaii	1,098	644	815	884	426	242
Idaho	1,437	897	1,890	1,024	1,143	693
Illinois	12,360	8,255	11,977	11,964	10,702	11,476
Indiana	6,130	3,916	5,656	6,076	5,172	7,574
Iowa	2,049	1,107	2,646	2,227	1,902	3,463
Kansas	2,371	1,530	2,251	2,320	1,938	1,698
Kentucky	4,579	2,040	4,506	4,230	3,884	5,594
Louisiana	5,057	2,358	5,163	5,268	5,257	6,245
Maine	1,280	646	1,629	1,766	1,283	1,080
Maryland	3,095	1,673	3,748	1,092	2,293	1,942
Massachusetts	4,894	3,168	4,275	3,301	3,142	3,417

State/Territory	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Michigan	10,608	6,549	10,493	9,864	7,548	13,628
Minnesota	3,544	2,423	3,540	3,598	3,048	4,259
Mississippi	3,784	2,260	3,373	3,168	3,156	3,690
Missouri	5,617	3,609	5,726	5,924	4,680	5,208
Montana	950	520	837	759	593	49
Nebraska	1,169	746	1,471	1,087	1,059	1,455
Nevada	3,389	1,521	2,726	2,751	2,720	3,281
New Hampshire	919	649	755	1,074	801	1,006
New Jersey	11,101	5,120	8,987	8,916	7,792	3,142
New Mexico	2,966	1,649	2,515	2,798	2,605	2,813
New York	22,413	11,109	17,339	18,544	13,859	18,270
North Carolina	10,427	5,993	8,789	9,438	7,893	7,368
North Dakota	442	401	600	610	541	379
Ohio	11,256	7,077	10,718	10,350	9,262	12,601
Oklahoma	3,563	2,136	3,541	3,720	3,390	4,753
Oregon	4,026	2,510	3,646	4,247	3,392	3,613
Pennsylvania	11,025	7,570	13,511	14,561	10,162	9,843
Puerto Rico	1,960	616	791	2,832	2,978	3,365
Rhode Island	940	508	393	500	569	539
South Carolina	5,226	2,356	5,377	4,709	3,723	3,712
South Dakota	387	179	178	395	448	744
Tennessee	6,781	3,474	6,492	6,582	4,996	8,342
Texas	23,478	15,403	23,815	21,574	19,582	26,873
Utah	2,271	1,467	2,043	1,709	1,711	1,608
Vermont	445	285	1,068	832	817	1,074
Virginia	4,963	3,248	4,892	5,262	4,853	4,663
Virgin Islands	160	81	130	40	203	0
Washington	6,072	4,367	6,381	7,136	5,841	3,486
West Virginia	2,622	2,148	2,620	2,216	2,085	1,421
Wisconsin	5,089	2,945	4,665	4,967	3,515	4,455
Wyoming	372	375	401	573	485	504
US	**307,997**	**181,222**	**295,006**	**282,174**	**246,044**	**288,713**

*2019 data is estimated
**Data is from latest available NDB figures

Mr. Fortenberry: Please explain how many people, not caseload, USDA will serve in the CSFP for Fiscal Years 2018 and 2019 and estimated fiscal year 2020.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information is as follows:]

Fiscal Year	CSFP Participation
2018	675,998
2019*	701,565
2020*	736,110

*2019 and 2020 information is estimated

Mr. Fortenberry: Provide a table for the record, by state, which includes grants for the Senior Farmers Market Nutrition Program for fiscal years 2014 through 2019.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP) Grant Amounts FY 2014 - FY 2019

State Agency	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Alabama	$1,574,001	$1,576,302	$1,550,549	$1,554,776	$1,574,072	$1,562,717
Alaska	86,542	86,542	85,129	85,129	85,129	84,515
Arizona	146,358	146,358	143,967	143,967	143,967	142,928
Arkansas	112,486	112,650	110,809	115,036	115,036	114,206
California	761,250	762,363	749,908	754,135	773,431	767,851
Chickasaw Nation of Oklahoma	161,686	161,686	159,044	159,044	159,044	157,897
Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma	*	7,953	7,953	12,180	31,476	31,476
Connecticut	82,427	82,427	81,080	81,080	81,080	80,495
Delaware	*	*	*	*	30,000	30,000
District of Columbia	145,631	145,631	143,252	143,252	143,252	142,219
Five Sandoval Indian Pueblos, Inc.	19,240	19,240	19,240	19,240	19,240	19,240
Florida	98,608	98,752	97,139	101,366	120,662	119,792
Georgia	234,999	235,342	231,497	235,724	255,020	253,180
Grand Traverse Band of Ottawa & Chippewa Indians	9,925	9,925	9,925	9,925	9,925	9,925

Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP) Grant Amounts
FY 2014 - FY 2019

State Agency	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Hawaii	502,732	502,732	494,519	498,746	498,746	495,148
Illinois	801,535	802,706	789,592	793,819	813,115	807,249
Indiana	61,676	61,676	61,676	65,903	85,199	84,584
Iowa	538,703	539,490	530,676	530,676	530,676	526,848
Kansas	171,311	171,561	168,758	172,985	192,281	190,894
Kentucky	297,388	297,823	292,957	297,184	316,480	314,197
Louisiana	380,604	381,160	374,933	379,160	379,160	376,425
Maine	933,820	935,185	919,906	924,133	943,429	936,623
Maryland	211,145	211,454	208,000	208,000	208,000	206,499
Massachusetts	522,562	523,326	514,776	519,003	538,299	534,416
Michigan	227,200	227,532	223,815	228,042	247,338	245,554
Minnesota	111,425	111,588	109,765	109,765	129,061	128,130
Mississippi	93,012	93,148	91,626	95,853	115,149	114,318
Mississippi Choctaw	29,440	29,440	29,440	29,440	29,440	29,440
Missouri	*	*	*	*	*	229,012
Montana	92,586	92,721	91,206	95,433	95,433	94,745
Nebraska	231,970	231,970	228,180	232,407	232,407	230,730
Nevada	154,278	154,278	151,758	151,758	151,758	150,663
New Hampshire	92,142	92,142	90,636	90,636	90,636	89,982
New Jersey	1,101,001	1,101,001	1,083,013	1,083,013	1,083,013	1,075,200
New Mexico	306,142	306,142	301,140	305,367	324,663	322,321
New York	1,792,164	1,794,782	1,765,462	1,769,689	1,788,983	1,776,076
North Carolina	80,919	81,037	79,713	83,940	83,940	83,334
Ohio	1,616,656	1,619,019	1,592,569	1,596,796	1,616,092	1,604,434
Oklahoma	75,000	75,110	73,883	78,110	78,110	77,547
Oregon	852,470	853,716	839,768	839,768	859,064	852,867
Osage Nation	38,140	38,140	38,140	38,140	38,140	38,140
Pennsylvania	1,793,037	1,795,658	1,766,323	1,770,555	1,770,555	1,757,782

Senior Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (SFMNP) Grant Amounts FY 2014 - FY 2019						
State Agency	**FY 2014**	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Pueblo of San Felipe	17,474	17,474	17,474	17,474	36,770	36,770
Puerto Rico	940,003	940,003	924,646	924,646	924,646	917,976
Rhode Island	260,136	260,516	256,260	260,487	279,783	277,765
Standing Rock	22,200	22,200	22,200	22,200	22,200	22,200
South Carolina	600,414	601,292	591,468	595,695	614,991	610,554
Tennessee	513,136	513,886	505,491	509,718	509,718	506,041
Texas	112,905	112,905	111,061	115,288	115,288	114,456
Vermont	85,991	86,117	84,710	88,937	88,937	88,295
Virginia	445,878	446,530	439,235	443,462	462,758	459,420
Washington	227,083	227,415	223,700	227,927	247,223	245,440
West Virginia	494,755	495,478	487,383	487,383	487,383	483,867
Wisconsin	323,308	323,781	318,492	322,719	342,015	339,548
U.S.	**20,585,494**	**20,617,305**	**20,283,842**	**20,419,111**	**20,912,213**	**20,991,931**

* Did not participate in the program.

Mr. Fortenberry: Provide a table for the record, by state, which includes grants for the WIC Farmers Market Nutrition Program for fiscal years 2014 through 2019.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows:]

WIC Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) Grant Amounts FYs 2014-2019						
State Agency	**FY 2014**	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Alabama	$113,343	$113,343	$113,343	$113,343	$113,343	$110,090
Alaska	185,379	185,379	185,379	185,379	185,379	180,059
Arizona	193,885	193,885	193,885	193,885	193,885	188,320
Arkansas	156,599	156,599	156,599	156,599	156,599	152,105
California	2,063,983	2,063,983	2,063,983	2,063,983	2,063,983	2,004,746
Chickasaw Nation, OK	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000

WIC Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) Grant Amounts FYs 2014-2019						
State Agency	**FY 2014**	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Choctaw Nation, OK	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Connecticut	298,107	299,230	299,230	299,230	299,230	290,642
Delaware	262,093	262,093	262,093	262,093	262,093	254,571
District of Columbia	283,121	283,121	283,121	283,121	283,121	274,995
Five Sandoval Indian Pueblos, NM	6,337	6,337	6,337	6,337	6,337	6,337
Florida	255,755	256,718	285,964	285,964	285,964	277,757
Georgia	952,217	952,217	1,060,695	1,242,658	1,424,577	1,383,691
Guam	78,911	78,911	78,911	78,911	78,911	76,646
Illinois	363,653	363,653	363,653	363,653	363,653	353,216
Indiana	238,853	238,853	238,853	238,853	238,853	231,998
Iowa	466,435	468,191	468,191	468,191	468,191	454,754
Kentucky	185,361	185,361	185,361	185,361	185,361	180,041
Louisiana	9,167	9,202	10,250	10,250	10,250	10,250
Maine	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Maryland	320,742	321,950	358,628	358,628	358,628	348,335
Massachusetts	404,569	406,092	452,355	520,995	589,635	572,712
Michigan	371,145	372,543	409,797	450,777	450,777	437,839
Minnesota	288,497	289,583	320,000	320,000	355,000	344,811
Mississippi	94,287	94,642	94,642	94,642	94,642	91,926
Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians	19,494	19,494	21,715	21,715	21,715	21,715
Montana	59,782	59,782	59,782	59,782	59,782	59,782
Nebraska	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000	75,000
Nevada	*	*	344,117	344,117	344,117	334,241
New Jersey	1,056,954	1,056,954	1,056,954	1,056,954	1,056,954	1,026,619
New Mexico	251,127	251,127	251,127	251,127	251,127	243,920
New York	3,238,995	3,251,192	3,621,574	3,803,537	3,985,456	3,871,070
North Carolina	233,600	233,600	233,600	233,600	233,600	226,896
Ohio	447,916	447,916	447,916	447,916	447,916	435,061
Oregon	343,651	344,945	384,242	566,205	748,124	726,652
Osage Tribe, OK	31,325	31,325	31,325	41,325	51,325	51,325
Pennsylvania	1,681,813	1,688,146	1,880,464	2,062,427	2,062,427	2,003,234

WIC Farmers' Market Nutrition Program (FMNP) Grant Amounts FYs 2014-2019						
State Agency	**FY 2014**	**FY 2015**	**FY 2016**	**FY 2017**	**FY 2018**	**FY 2019**
Pueblo of San Felipe, NM	8,666	8,666	8,666	8,666	8,666	8,666
Puerto Rico	1,554,783	1,554,783	1,554,783	1,554,783	1,554,783	1,510,160
Rhode Island	125,787	125,787	125,787	125,787	125,787	122,177
South Carolina	126,899	126,899	126,899	126,899	126,899	123,257
Tennessee	79,276	79,575	88,641	125,000	125,000	121,412
Texas	1,054,646	1,054,646	1,054,646	1,054,646	1,054,646	1,024,377
Vermont	75,000	75,282	75,282	75,282	75,282	73,121
Virgin Islands	81,316	77,791	77,791	77,791	77,791	75,558
Virginia	60,241	63,766	63,766	63,766	63,766	63,766
Washington	552,751	554,832	618,040	800,003	800,003	777,042
West Virginia	74,965	74,965	74,965	74,965	74,965	74,965
Wisconsin	581,340	583,529	650,006	831,969	831,969	808,091
U.S.	**19,632,766**	**19,666,888**	**21,043,358**	**22,291,115**	**22,950,512**	**22,308,948**

* Did not participate in the program.

NUTRITION STUDIES AND INFORMATION

Mr. Fortenberry: How much is being spent in the SNAP, CNP, and WIC for studies and evaluations in fiscal year 2018 and 2019? How much will be assumed in the fiscal year 2020 budget request?

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows]:

FNS Studies and Evaluation Funding
(Dollars in thousands)

Regular Appropriations	FY 2018	FY 2019	FY 2020
SNAP Program Evaluation and Modernization	$14,912	$15,313	$18,679
WIC Studies	5,000	5,000	5,000
Child Nutrition	21,277	21,639	14,999
Total Research Funding	41,189	41,590	38,678

Mr. Fortenberry: How much of your total agency budget is spent on nutrition education in FY 2018 and 2020? Please provide a breakout of nutrition education spending by each program area.

Response: The information is provided for the record.

[The information follows]:

Food and Nutrition Service
Nutrition Education and Promotion
(Dollars in Thousands)

Program	2018 Actual Obligations	2019 Estimated Obligations	2020 Estimated Obligations
Child Nutrition Programs	$30,204	$63,841	$46,057
Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC)	659,979	695,405	717,670
Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP)	436,817	450,685	451,564
Food Distribution Program on Indian Reservations	1,223	1,248	250
Center for Nutrition Policy and Promotion (CNPP)	9,020	10,940	10,940
Nutrition Program Administration (NPA)	5,300	5,300	5,300
Total, Food and Nutrition Service	1,142,543	1,227,419	1,231,781

Source: FY 2020 President's Budget

Mr. Fortenberry: How many other USDA agencies conduct nutrition education programs?

Response: In addition to FNS, the National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA) conducts nutrition

education programs. FNS' nutrition education efforts focus on the specific participant populations in each FNS programs, such as WIC or School Lunch and Breakfast. NIFA, through their Expanded Food and Nutrition Education Program (EFNEP) focuses on the low-income population overall. EFNEP is community outreach program that operates through grants to Land-Grant universities in every State. FNS' nutrition education programs are delivered to program participants through program operators in States, territories and Indian Tribal Organizations.

Mr. Fortenberry: How do you coordinate with other agencies to ensure that you are not duplicating efforts?

Response: The U.S. Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) conducts a variety of studies, evaluations, and related activities that respond to the needs of policymakers and managers and help ensure that nutrition assistance programs achieve their goals effectively. FNS chooses which studies to pursue in consultation with policy officials, program staff, and other stakeholders. FNS publishes the list of new studies each fiscal year on their website via a Research and Evaluation Plan. This plan provides short descriptions of projects that are expected to be launched in a given fiscal year. It reflects decisions by FNS' program and research staff and leadership on the best use of available research funding to meet current information needs that are aligned with agency priorities to improve program efficiency, integrity, and nutrition. It is developed in consultation with the agencies of the Research, Education, and Economics (REE) mission area.

In addition to consulting on the development of the annual Research and Evaluation Plan, REE staff members regularly participate as valued experts in the development of study design specifications and data collection plans, and they also serve on advisory and technical panels for the studies.

Mr. Fortenberry: What is the total Department spending in nutrition education? Of this total Department-wide spending, what amount is directed towards obesity?

Response: Total estimated USDA spending in FY 2019 on nutrition research, education and information is $1.6 billion. Of that, $1.3 billion was directed toward obesity and healthy weight. In FY 2020, $1.4 billion is estimated for nutrition research, education and information with $1.2 billion directed toward obesity and healthy weight.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE INSPECTOR GENERAL (OIG)
QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
HOUSE AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING
MARCH 12, 2019

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CHAIRMAN SANFORD BISHOP

Staffing Levels at OIG

1. Please update last year's table showing staffing levels (both actual on-board employees and FTEs) for every year since 1978 to present.

Response: The information requested follows on Page 2.

Fiscal Year (FY)	FTE Level	Staffing Level[1]
2019 EST	482	441[2]
2018	482	438
2017	480	454
2016	531	500
2015	525	503
2014	525	494
2013	560	514
2012	577	558
2011	600	608
2010	623	593
2009	586	550
2008	600	576
2007	615	588
2006	639	595
2005	721	579
2004	721	597
2003	721	621
2002	723	642
2001	723	650
2000	753	670
1999	753	701
1998	750	737
1997	754	742
1996	811	754
1995	831	777
1994	850	821
1993	850	862
1992	850	876
1991	870	817
1990	860	834
1989	850	860
1988	818	835
1987	850	818
1986	880	820
1985	891	851
1984	902	879
1983	902	897
1982	901	872
1981	950	900
1980	1001	936
1979	955	988
1978	N/A[3]	894

2. Please update last year's table showing funding level for each year going back to 1978 to present for personnel compensation and benefits as defined by OMB object class.

Response: The information requested follows:

FY	Labor Costs (thousands)	FY	Labor Costs (thousands)
2019 EST	$ 70,879	1998	$ 54,000
2018	$ 71,820	1997	$ 52,000
2017	$ 73,094	1996	$ 52,000
2016	$ 74,587	1995	$ 52,000
2015	$ 74,405	1994	$ 51,651
2014	$ 72,632	1993	$ 50,938
2013	$ 70,619	1992	$ 49,751
2012	$ 75,292	1991	$ 43,353
2011	$ 76,000	1990	$ 40,193
2010	$ 78,000	1989	$ 38,644
2009	$ 83,000	1988	$ 36,090
2008	$ 72,000	1987	$ 33,586
2007	$ 66,000	1986	$ 31,893
2006	$ 67,000	1985	$ 32,272
2005	$ 64,000	1984	$ 31,919
2004	$ 60,000	1983	$ 31,241
2003	$ 59,000	1982	$ 28,672
2002	$ 60,000	1981	$ 27,017
2001	$ 63,000	1980	$ 25,100
2000	$ 56,000	1979	$ 23,159
1999	$ 54,000	1978	$ 20,531

[1] All staffing level data includes full-time, part-time, permanent, and temporary staff.
[2] Staffing level as of June 22, 2019.
[3] Historic staff ceiling level is unknown for FY 1978.

3. Please update last year's table showing OIG's rate of staff attrition each fiscal year from 2014 to 2018 and projected for fiscal year 2019.

Response: The information requested follows:

	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	*FY 2019 (Projected)*[4]
Agency Transfer - Out	7	6	10	12	10	7
Separation from Federal Civil Service	28	30	23	38	33	30
Separation - All	35	36	33	50	43	37
Annual OnBoard (Actuals)	494	503	500	454	438	438
Annual Attrition Rate	7.09	7.16	6.60	11.01	9.81	8.45

4. What USDA programs, functions, or agencies are of most concern to you? Please explain why the OIG holds such concerns.

Response: Because OIG's mission is to identify and eliminate fraud, waste, and abuse, any USDA program with identified weaknesses and vulnerabilities is of significant concern to us. However, as referenced in OIG's past semiannual reports to Congress and annual reports on management challenges facing USDA, the programs and functions of most concern are those relating to food safety and security, information technology security, and improper payments in agency programs. Our work has also shown that these programs would benefit from the implementation of strong, integrated internal control systems. USDA managers need to make use of available tools to ensure high program performance and integrity.

Below are some examples of programs, functions, or agencies that are of most concern:

Food Safety and Security: We view food safety inspection as a continuing concern because food-borne pathogens and food contamination can put consumer health in jeopardy. Since our last testimony on March 15, 2018, we issued two audits related to food safety and security.

Our audit of the New Poultry Inspection System (NPIS) found that FSIS is following its policies and procedures to implement NPIS as established in its Modernization of Poultry Slaughter Inspection Final Rule. However, when the Agency promulgated the final rule, it did not clarify when NPIS would be "fully implemented on a wide scale" so that the Agency could properly evaluate the effectiveness of this new program. Without a proper evaluation of NPIS' impact, FSIS cannot provide stakeholders with information

4. Data as of April 27, 2019.

regarding: (1) the program's effectiveness; or (2) obstacles impeding NPIS' acceptance within the industry. FSIS concurred with our finding and re commendations.

In other safety and security work, our audit of USDA agency activities for agroterrorism prevention, detection, and response found that the three agencies did not have information readily available to respond to USDA's Office of Homeland Security's (OHS) requests related to the Homeland Security Presidential Directive-9 tracking document, the Sector Critical Infrastructure Protection Annual Report, and the Food and Agriculture Sector-Specific Plan. Also, the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) and the Agricultural Research Service (ARS) did not report vulnerability assessment actions or results to OHS. FSIS did report vulnerability assessments, but did not have sufficient information to indicate the status of corrective actions to address vulnerabilities. Finally, all three agencies need to make improvements to track and implement corrective actions from exercises or actual incidents. The agencies generally agreed with our recommendations, and OHS stated these recommendations should bolster its efforts to oversee USDA's agroterrorism preparedness.

Information Technology (IT) Management and Security: IT management and security has been a longstanding concern for USDA, and, in FY 2018, we issued four reports related to these topics. We have consistently recommended that the Office of the Chief Information Officer (OCIO) work in collaboration with USDA agencies to achieve an improved security posture. USDA senior management needs to continue its efforts in making sure each agency and office understands that how well it implements IT security directly influences USDA's overall security posture and the Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) score. The degree to which USDA, as a whole, complies with FISMA and other security guidance has a direct correlation to the security posture of each agency and office. For USDA to attain a secure and sustainable security posture, all 36 agencies and offices must consistently implement Departmental policy based on a standard methodology. When every agency and office complies with USDA's policies, USDA, as a whole, will be FISMA compliant and, more importantly, will have a sustainable security posture. The Department generally agreed with our findings and stated it has developed corrective actions and project plans to address prior year recommendations in addition to the eight new recommendations for FY 2018.
Improper Payments: For FY 2018, USDA reported that, collectively, its 9 high-risk programs made approximately $6.10 billion in improper payments, a 6.25 percent improper payment rate. USDA also reported 59 high-dollar overpayments totaling over $6 million. This count represents an increase from the 56 overpayments reported for FY 2017.

Our FY 2018 Improper Payment Requirements review, found that the Department continued to report noncompliance with improper payment requirements.. Specifically, 4 of USDA's 9 high-risk programs – 2 FSA and 2 FNS – did not comply with one or more of the following requirements: (a) meeting annual reduction targets, or (b) publishing gross improper payment rates of less than 10 percent. This occurred because the programs' corrective actions have not yielded the desired results. Our FY 2018 review of high dollar overpayments found that USDA maintained the quality of its high-dollar overpayments reports, with no overall declines in the accuracy, completeness, and timeliness of the Department's reporting.

Reporting Hotline

5. Does USDA receive reports regarding farm program payment or related fraud/abuse? If so, what types of reports come into USDA? How many reports does OIG receive on average per month on this issue?

Response: The OIG Hotline receives complaints (reports) regarding farm program payment and related fraud/abuse. The complaints typically involve allegations of entities falsifying information in order to receive farm program payments, the forging of signatures on contracts and other documents, and misuse of farm program funds. The number of such complaints is too low to provide a monthly average. For example, in FY 2018, the OIG Hotline received six complaints related to farm program payment or related fraud/abuse; in FY 2017 we received seven. For FY 2019 we have only received two related complaints to date.

6. Has OIG seen an increase in the number of hotline calls over the years? Please update last year's graph to include fiscal years 2014 through 2018 and fiscal year 2019 to date.

Response: As reflected in the chart below, OIG has seen an increase in the number of complaints received.



For FY 2019, the chart reflects the number of complaints received in the First Half of FY 2019, from October 1, 2018, through June 30, 2019.

OIG Audits, Investigations and General Information Requests

7. Please update last year's table showing the financial statement audits OIG contracts for and those conducted in-house, as well as the cost of each audit for fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

Response: See table below:

Audited Agency	Method of Performance	FY 2014 Actual Cost	FY 2015 Actual Cost	FY 2016 Actual Cost	FY 2017 Actual Cost	FY 2018 Actual Cost[56]
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation*	**In-House**	$433,856	$1,521,728	$1,204,335	$1,386,576	$1,574,995
Commodity Credit Corporation	Contract	$1,859,293	$2,018,971	$1,577,921	$1,454,350	$1,478,136
Food Nutrition Service	**In-House**	$952,203	$1,732,214	$1,109,403	$1,251,169	$1,573,410
Rural Development **	**In-House**	$1,325,696	$1,612,851	$1,790,182	$1,799,601	$2,074,527
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Contract	$1,424,991	$1,410,364	$1,463,320	$1,446,031	$1,456,449
USDA Consolidated and Closing Package***	**In-House**	$2,170,507	$3,307,354	$3,226,852	$3,242,935	$3,941,771

*Starting in FY 2015, FCIC's financial statement audit was performed in-house and the estimation insurance claims methodology section of the audit was performed under contract.
** The audit was performed by OIG; however, the credit reform review was performed under contract.
***We issue two reports from our audit work on USDA's consolidated financial statements: (1) USDA's Consolidated Financial Statements; and (2) USDA's Closing Package Financial Statements.

8. Please update last year's table showing the amount of funds expended for public accountants hired under contract for fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

   Response: See table below:

Audited Agency	Method of Performance	FY 2014 Actual Cost	FY 2015 Actual Cost	FY 2016 Actual Cost	FY 2017 Actual Cost	FY 2018 Actual Cost[7]
Type of work the independent public accounting firm performs: • FCIC: Starting with FY 2015, FCIC's financial statement audit was performed in-house and the estimation insurance claims methodology section of the audit was performed under contract. • CCC: The entire financial statement audit was performed under contract. • RD: The financial statement audit was performed by OIG; however, the credit reform review was performed under contract. • NRCS: The entire financial statement audit was performed under contract. • USDA Consolidated: In FY 2018, the IT audit work related to general and application controls was performed under contract. • OCIO: In FY 2018, the Federal Information Security Modernization Act (FISMA) audit was performed under contract.						
Federal Crop Insurance Corporation	**In-House**	$397,148	$229,716	$191,458	$195,319	$206,744
Commodity Credit Corporation	Contract	$1,810,993	$1,892,481	$1,474,264	$1,360,078	$1,384,074
Rural Development	**In-House**	$245,830	$237,218	$243,917	$225,640	$233,013
Natural Resources Conservation Service	Contract	$1,389,249	$1,362,955	$1,394,735	$1,396,064	$1,379,349
USDA Consolidated	**In-House**	NA	NA	NA	NA	$393,675
OCIO	Contract	NA	NA	NA	NA	$693,613

[6] The FY 2018 costs increased from FY 2017 due to an increase in travel and labor costs.

[7] This figure was updated from the prior year's QFRs to represent actual travel costs charged to the contract.

Type of work the independent public accounting firm performs: OIG contracted with a public accounting firm to perform attestation engagements in accordance with government auditing standards.						
Food and Nutrition Service	Contract	NA	NA	$691,098	$1,160,369[8]	$320,253[9]
Office of the Chief Financial Officer	Contract	NA	$253,287[10]	$283,090	$291,482	$288,791[11]
Type of work the IT consultant performs: OIG contracted with an IT consultant firm to perform oversight reviews on USDA's implementation of the Continuous Diagnostics and Mitigation (CDM) project.						
Office of the Chief Information Officer	Contract	NA	NA	$451,794	$403,139	$247,264[12]

9. Please provide an update for all current findings of material weakness for fiscal year 2018. Specifically, list the finding, OIG's recommendation and the current status.

Response: See table on Pages 10 and 11, data as of June 27, 2019.

FY 2018 Material Weaknesses Findings and Recommendations	Status (Reached Management Decision)
FY 2018 USDA Consolidated Financial Statements, Assignment No. 50401-0016-11	
Finding 1: Improvements are needed in overall financial management. **Recommendation:** Since USDA has actions planned and in progress, we are making no further recommendations herein.	N/A
Finding 2: Improvements are needed in overall Information Technology Security Program. **Recommendation:** Eight new recommendations were issued based on security weaknesses identified in the FY 2018 FISMA report. The Department concurred with our findings and recommendations. As a result, we are making no further recommendations in this report.	N/A
FY 2018 CCC Financial Statements, Assignment No. 06403-0001-11	
Finding 1: Improvements are needed in internal control over financial reporting. **Recommendation 1:** Implement effective undelivered order (UDO) monitoring controls at the program level, whereby the responsibility for assessing the accuracy and validity of open obligations resides at the program level, and the accounting execution, if necessary, as a result of the programmatic monitoring resides with the CCC accountants.	Yes
Recommendation 2: Provide necessary training to the County field offices' personnel over the requirements of OMB A-11 for recording obligations, and, where necessary, ensure program handbooks are up to date regarding execution and related accounting, to ensure consistent understanding and recording of obligations in accordance with OMB A-11 across all field offices.	Yes
Recommendation 3: Implement effective automated and/or manual controls to evaluate the relationship between a Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) annual rental contract and CRP cost share contract; and develop and implement data analytic routines and management review controls related to program UDO populations to identify and correct for abnormalities in the data.	Yes
Recommendation 4: Strengthen management controls related to the annual Agriculture Risk Coverage/Price Loss Coverage (ARC/PLC) UDO calculation to ensure that it is performed at a level of precision to include relevant and accurate data elements, such as enrollments and crop prices that reflect the documentation submitted by the producer and approved by management.	Yes
Recommendation 5: Implement processes, procedures, and controls to ensure accurate recognition of adjustments to delivered orders are input into the accounting systems and perform periodic reviews of the accounting events to validate the results of recorded transactions. **Recommendation 6:** Implement effective automated budgetary funds controls within its accounting systems to ensure that a funds control violation does not occur.	Yes

FY 2018 Material Weaknesses Findings and Recommendations	Status (Reached Management Decision)
Recommendation 7: Implement effective internal controls to review and reconcile the general ledger account inter-relationships, between borrowing authority and other budgetary accounts. In addition, we recommend CCC record borrowing authority at the appropriate program level to prevent abnormal balances, which assist in meaningful account review and reconciliation.	Yes Yes
FY 2018 NRCS Balance Sheet Audit, Assignment No. 10403-0001-11	
Finding 1: Improved Accounting and Controls are Needed Over Obligations and Undelivered Orders (Repeat Condition). **Recommendations:** (1) Develop and implement a process that tracks agreement progress to ensure all signed agreements have been recorded in the financial system; (2) Monitor open obligations to ensure that they are recorded in the appropriate period of and liquidated timely; and (3) Provide adequate training to personnel related to the documentation requirements for support.	Yes
Finding 2: Improved Accounting and Controls are Needed Over Expenses (Repeat Condition). **Recommendations:** (1) Design, implement, and document policies and procedures that include documented internal controls which provide support that NRCS has reviewed the transactional data and assumptions used in its entity-wide expenses accrual process; (2) Design, implement, and document policies and procedures that include documented internal controls which provide support that NRCS has reviewed all expenses excluded from its entity-wide accrual policy and evaluate the need for any additional accruals; and (3) Provide additional guidance and/or training to employees over the recording of transactions with future economic benefits.	Yes
FY 2018 FCIC/RMA Financial Statements Audit, Assignment No. 05401-0010-11	
Finding 1: Improvements are Needed in the Review of the Estimated Loss Calculations. **Recommendation 1:** We recommend that management develop change controls over the program production model used to calculate actuarial projections to avoid inadvertent modifications to the model.	Yes

10. Please update last year's table showing the amount spent for confidential operational activities for fiscal years 2014 through 2018.

Response: The information requested follows:

FY	Available	Spent
2014	$125,000	$76,408
2015	$125,000	$78,089
2016	$125,000	$64,145
2017	$125,000	$83,443
2018	$125,000	$38,535

11. Please update last year's summary of complaints from the OIG Hotline for Fiscal Year 2018.

Response: The below chart summarizes OIG Hotline complaints received during FY 2018.

Hotline Complaints Summary	
FY 2018 Hotline Complaints Received	
Total No. of Complaints Received	**12,306**
Employee Misconduct	489
Participant Fraud*	11,372
Waste Mismanagement	293
Health/Safety Problem	41
Opinion/Information	107
Bribery	2
Reprisal	2

*This category encompasses various forms of fraud. In FY 2018, of the total 12,306 complaints, there were 10,830 complaints involving SNAP fraud that were directly referred to FNS for action.

12. Please update last year's table showing the number of audit reports, investigative reports, indictments, convictions, and lawsuits filed for fiscal year 2018.

Response: The requested information for FY 2018 follows:

Audit Reports—Final	42
Audit Reports--Interim	5
Final Action Verification Reports	2
Investigative Reports	254
Indictments	510
Convictions	541
Lawsuits Filed	12

13. How were the indictments resolved, and what percent led to convictions? Please report for the latest data available.

Response: In FY 2018, the conviction rate was 99%. For the first half of FY 2019, the conviction rate is 98%. The period of time to obtain court action on an indictment varies widely; therefore, indictments claimed in a time period do not necessarily correspond to the convictions claimed in that same time period.

14. Please update last year's description of the work the IG is doing in regard to federal, state or industry employee whistleblowers. What is the total number of whistleblower complaints between fiscal years 2014 and 2018? How many open investigations and reviews are related to these whistleblower complaints?

Response: OIG receives complaints from many sources including, but not limited to, Federal and State employees and the general public. Any individual who contacts OIG to report an allegation of fraud, waste, or abuse is considered a potential whistleblower. Each Hotline complaint received is reviewed and a determination made whether the matter should be addressed by OIG; referred to the appropriate USDA agency for review, response, and appropriate action; or referred to the appropriate Federal government agency for any action if deemed appropriate. The total number of all categories of complaints received through the Hotline between FYs 2014 and 2018 is reflected in the table below, as are the per FY-specific breakdown numbers.

The OIG Hotline also tracks complaints from Federal and State employees and the general public that are investigated under the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), 41 USC 4712, which provides protections for employees of contractors and grantees. The total number of NDAA complaints received between FY 2014 and FY 2018 is reflected in the table below by FY, and these complaints are included in the investigations totals below.,

Additionally, the table reflects the per FY number of whistleblower and NDAA complaints converted into audits and investigations; and summarizes the per FY numbers of all categories of complaints received.

	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018
Audits	13	3	1	3	2
Investigations	43	29	34	78	62
Total Hotline Complaints Received	4,300	4,159	5,644	10,494	12,306

15. Please update the number of complaints OIG received from outside groups that are not whistleblower complaints in fiscal years 2014 through 2018? How many open investigations and reviews are related to these complaints?

Response: We consider all complaints received to be potential whistleblower complaints. However, we do track complaints received from public sources through the OIG Hotline as audits or Investigations.[13]





16. Please update for the record amounts transferred to OIG through the granting of a Petition for Remission or Mitigation for fiscal years 2014 through 2018. Provide an explanation of the use of these funds by OIG and specific expenses funded in fiscal year 2018 by each fund.

[13] The data figures represented on both charts are too small statistically to be depicted visually via the bar graphic. However, the numerical numbers of investigations and investigations per FY are noted on the graph.

Response: The amounts below represent the total asset forfeiture funds received on granted petitions for remission or mitigation:

Receipt of Petition Funds			
FY	**Treasury**	**DOJ**	**Totals**
2014	$1,124,225	$818,495	$1,942,720
2015	$576,090	$72,570	$648,660
2016	$184,547	$128,970	$313,517
2017	$1,530,094	$2,299,556	$3,829,650
2018	$469,418	$1,823,141	$2,292,559

Pursuant to 7 U.S.C. Section 2270a , OIG is authorized to utilize petition funds for law enforcement activities authorized under the IG Act. In FY 2018, the funds were used to fund law enforcement specific equipment, travel, mandatory law enforcement training, as well as software and equipment to support OIG's Technical Crimes Division, which conducts electronic forensic analysis for OIG's investigative work.

During FY 2018, the following expenditures were paid with Petition Funds:

FY 2018 Petition Fund Expenditures	
Protective Vest Replacements (Treasury Fund)	$42,000
Vehicle Based Law Enforcement Emergency Equip. (Treasury Fund)	$60,000
Wildland Fire Investigation Team Training (Treasury Fund)	$14,000
Investigative Mission Critical Travel (Treasury Fund)	$500,000
Animal Fighting Investigations Training and Travel (Treasury Fund)	$17,718
Social Media Training to Assist in Investigative Activities (Treasury Fund)	$9,804
Employee Misconduct Training (Treasury Fund)	$57,158
TOTAL	**$700,680**

17. How many OIG employees are entitled to Law Enforcement Officer Pay? How many receive Law Enforcement Availability Pay?

Response: OIG employees are on either the GS or ES pay scale. However, pursuant to law and OPM regulations, 116 of OIG's criminal investigators (GS 1811) are entitled to an additional 25% in Law Enforcement Availability Pay (LEAP), a premium pay that is paid to Federal law enforcement officers. Due to the nature of their work, criminal investigators are required to work, or be available to work, substantial

amounts of "unscheduled duty." Availability pay is generally an entitlement that an agency must provide if the required conditions are met. OIG uses the Federal locality pay scale authorized by OPM for all other employees within the Federal Government.

18. Please update last year's table showing OIG-owned firearms, including the size and general purpose of the firearms.

Response: The requested information is as follows:

OIG Owned Firearms *(Inventory as of 04/08/19)*		
Type of Firearms	**Number**	**General Purpose**
.40 cal. semiautomatic pistols (includes Glock models 23 and 27)	266	Assigned to each Special Agent and carried while carrying out their law enforcement authorities.
MP-5s	83	Carried during the execution of high-risk arrest and search warrant operations.
UMP-40s	85	Procured to replace the MP-5s. Currently under evaluation, these have not been placed into a duty carry status.
.357 cal. Revolvers	4	Used in undercover operations.
.38 cal. Revolvers	2	Used in undercover operations.
12-gauge shotguns	91*	Carried during the execution of high-risk arrest and search warrant operations.
Miscellaneous weapons maintained for training purposes	117**	These are semi-automatic pistols, MP-5s, and shotguns, which are the firearms OIG agents carry as described above. However, they are unable to fire live rounds. The weapons are used only for training.
Total	**648**	

** This number for "12-gauge shotguns" has changed from 89, as reflected in our FY 2018 response, due to two weapons being transferred in FY 2019 from the "Miscellaneous weapons" category into the "12-gauge shotgun" inventory.*

*** This number for "Miscellaneous weapons" has changed from 120, as reflected in our FY 2018 response, due to the two weapons being transferred from the "Miscellaneous weapons" category (as noted above); in addition, one training weapon was previously inadvertently counted twice. As a result the final total shows a net decrease of 1 weapon from 649 in FY 2018, to 648 in FY 2019.*

19. Please update last year's table showing the allocation of OIG's resources and the percent of each that went towards investigations and audits of each USDA agency for fiscal year 2018 and estimates for fiscal year 2019.

Response: The information requested follows:

FY 2018 Investigations						
Agency	*Total OIG Dollars in Thousands*	*OIG Staff Years*	*Investigation Dollars in Thousands*	*Percentage of OIG Dollars per Agency*	*Investigation Staff Years*	*Percentage of OIG Staff Years per Agency*
RMA	$5,197	24	$2,015	2%	9	2%
FSA	7,972	36	6,267	6%	28	6%
FAS	1,091	5	342	0%	2	0%
FNS-SNAP	21,853	94	20,839	22%	90	21%
FNCS-OTHER	16,050	74	6,935	8%	31	7%
AMS	3,460	16	1,915	2%	8	2%
APHIS	4,938	22	4,196	4%	18	4%
GIPSA	1,197	6	312	0%	1	0%
FSIS	4,647	21	1,548	2%	7	2%
ARS	979	4	975	1%	4	1%
NIFA	1,440	7	191	0%	1	0%
RD	1,844	9	0	0%	0	0%
RBS	489	2	482	0%	2	0%
RHS	2,332	11	849	1%	4	1%
RUS	455	2	256	0%	1	0%
FS	4,975	23	1,201	1%	5	1%
NRCS	3,414	16	498	1%	2	1%
OO	724	3	0	0%	0	0%
OCFO	938	4	25	0%	0	0%
OCIO	72	0	10	0%	0	0%
OIG (internal)	974	5	15	0%	0	0%
OHSEC	15	0	15	0%	0	0%
Multi-Agency	11,470	54	161	0%	0	0%
OTHER	578	3	578	1%	3	1%
Disaster Mgmt.	171	1	171	0%	1	0%
OCRE	20	0	20	0%	0	0%
SEC	15	0	15	0%	0	0%
Total	**$97,310**	**442**	**$49,831**	**51%**	**217**	**49%**

FY 2018 Audit						
Agency	*Total OIG Dollars in Thousands*	*OIG Staff Years*	*Audit Dollars in Thousands*	*Percentage of OIG Dollars per Agency*	*Audit Staff Years*	*Percentage of OIG Staff Years per Agency*

RMA	$5,197	24	$3,182	3%	15	3%
FSA	7,972	36	1,705	2%	8	2%
FAS	1,091	5	749	1%	3	1%
FNS-SNAP	21,853	94	1,014	1%	4	1%
FNCS-OTHER	16,050	74	9,115	9%	43	10%
AMS	3,460	16	1,545	2%	8	2%
APHIS	4,938	22	742	1%	4	1%
GIPSA	1,197	6	885	1%	5	1%
FSIS	4,647	21	3,099	3%	14	3%
ARS	979	4	4	0%	0	0%
NIFA	1,440	7	1,249	1%	6	1%
RD	1,844	9	1,844	2%	9	2%
RBS	489	2	7	0%	0	0%
RHS	2,332	11	1,483	2%	7	2%
RUS	455	2	199	0%	1	0%
FS	4,975	23	3,774	4%	18	4%
NRCS	3,414	16	2,916	3%	14	3%
OO	724	3	724	1%	3	1%
OCFO	938	4	913	1%	4	1%
OCIO	72	0	62	0%	0	0%
OIG (internal)	974	5	959	1%	5	1%
OHSEC	15	0	0	0%	0	0%
Multi-Agency	11,470	54	11,309	12%	54	12%
OTHER	578	3	0	0%	0	0%
Disaster Mgmt.	171	1	0	0%	0	0%
OCRE	20	0	0	0%	0	0%
SEC	15	0	0	0%	0	0%
Total	**$97,310**	**442**	**$47,479**	**49%**	**225**	**51%**

FY 2019 Investigations-Estimated[14]						
Agency	*Total OIG Dollars in Thousands*	*OIG Staff Years*	*Investigation Dollars in Thousands*	*Percentage of OIG Dollars per Agency*	*Investigation Staff Years*	*Percentage of OIG Staff Years per Agency*
RMA	$5,197	24	$2,015	2%	9	2%
FSA	7,972	36	6,267	6%	28	6%
FAS	1,091	5	342	0%	2	0%
FNS-SNAP	21,853	94	20,839	22%	90	21%

[14] FY 2019 estimates are based on FY 2018 actuals because FY 2019 data will not be available until after the end of the current FY.

FNCS-OTHER	16,050	74	6,935	8%	31	7%
AMS	3,460	16	1,915	2%	8	2%
APHIS	4,938	22	4,196	4%	18	4%
GIPSA	1,197	6	312	0%	1	0%
FSIS	4,647	21	1,548	2%	7	2%
ARS	979	4	975	1%	4	1%
NIFA	1,440	7	191	0%	1	0%
RD	1,844	9	0	0%	0	0%
RBS	489	2	482	0%	2	0%
RHS	2,332	11	849	1%	4	1%
RUS	455	2	256	0%	1	0%
FS	4,975	23	1,201	1%	5	1%
NRCS	3,414	16	498	1%	2	1%
OO	724	3	0	0%	0	0%
OCFO	938	4	25	0%	0	0%
OCIO	72	0	10	0%	0	0%
OIG (internal)	974	5	15	0%	0	0%
OHSEC	15	0	15	0%	0	0%
Multi-Agency	11,470	54	161	0%	0	0%
OTHER	578	3	578	1%	3	1%
Disaster Mgmt.	171	1	171	0%	1	0%
OCRE	20	0	20	0%	0	0%
SEC	15	0	15	0%	0	0%
Total	**$97,310**	**442**	**$49,831**	**51%**	**217**	**49%**

FY 2019 Audit-Estimated[15]						
Agency	*Total OIG Dollars in Thousands*	*OIG Staff Years*	*Audit Dollars in Thousands*	*Percentage of OIG Dollars per Agency*	*Audit Staff Years*	*Percentage of OIG Staff Years per Agency*
RMA	$5,197	24	$3,182	3%	15	3%
FSA	7,972	36	1,705	2%	8	2%
FAS	1,091	5	749	1%	3	1%
FNS-SNAP	21,853	94	1,014	1%	4	1%
FNCS-OTHER	16,050	74	9,115	9%	43	10%
AMS	3,460	16	1,545	2%	8	2%
APHIS	4,938	22	742	1%	4	1%
GIPSA	1,197	6	885	1%	5	1%
FSIS	4,647	21	3,099	3%	14	3%

[15] FY 2019 estimates are based on FY 2018 actuals because FY 2019 data will not be available until after the end of the current FY.

ARS	979	4	4	0%	0	0%
NIFA	1,440	7	1,249	1%	6	1%
RD	1,844	9	1,844	2%	9	2%
RBS	489	2	7	0%	0	0%
RHS	2,332	11	1,483	2%	7	2%
RUS	455	2	199	0%	1	0%
FS	4,975	23	3,774	4%	18	4%
NRCS	3,414	16	2,916	3%	14	3%
OO	724	3	724	1%	3	1%
OCFO	938	4	913	1%	4	1%
OCIO	72	0	62	0%	0	0%
OIG (internal)	974	5	959	1%	5	1%
OHSEC	15	0	0	0%	0	0%
Multi-Agency	11,470	54	11,309	12%	54	12%
OTHER	578	3	0	0%	0	0%
Disaster Mgmt.	171	1	0	0%	0	0%
OCRE	20	0	0	0%	0	0%
SEC	15	0	0	0%	0	0%
Total	**$97,310**	**442**	**$47,479**	**49%**	**225**	**51%**

Top Three Priorities and Budget Request

20. Please provide the Subcommittee with the IG's plans for the upcoming fiscal year.

Response: We plan our work by prioritizing work that is critical to accomplishing our Strategic Goals:

Strategic Goal	
Goal 1:	Strengthen USDA's ability to implement and improve safety and security measures to protect the public health, as well as agricultural and Departmental resources.
Goal 2:	Detect and reduce USDA program vulnerabilities and deficiencies to strengthen the integrity of the Department's programs.
Goal 3:	Provide USDA with oversight to help it achieve results-oriented performance.

Our Annual Plan highlights these strategic goals as well as other areas that we have identified as challenges within the Department.[16] In 2018, we reported seven Management Challenges that identified and consolidated broad issues that challenge the Department as a whole, as well as the unique challenges specific to certain programs.[17] Additional details regarding these challenges are presented in response to question 4 above.

The Office of Investigations addresses incoming allegations and complaints, taking into consideration our strategic goals, management challenges, dollar amount of potential fraud, level of risk to USDA programs, prosecutive potential, and several other factors during the course of planning out all our investigative work. During FY 2019, we will focus on bringing on-going investigations to completion. As noted in several places within this document we have investigative work in numerous USDA programs.

During FY 19, the Office of Data Sciences (ODS) is focusing on the development of business intelligence product prototypes. These product prototypes will help to analyze USDA program data in order identify potential relationships, patterns, anomalies, and trends that can then be addressed through audits or investigations as appropriate.

[16] Our FY 2019 Annual Plan is available on our internet site: at: https://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/2019_Annual_Plan.pdf. We will plan for FY 2020 audit work during the fourth quarter of FY 2019, focusing on our strategic goals, management challenges, mandatory audit work, and other priorities.
[17] *USDA Management Challenges*, Office of the Inspector General, USDA, August 2018.

With significant funding allocated by USDA for disaster assistance, each component within OIG, Audit, Investigations, and ODS will focus on conducting oversight in this area. OIG has developed a strategic plan to oversee disaster assistance to outline generally the work each area has planned.[18]

21. Please provide the IG's "top three" priorities for investigations and audits for the upcoming fiscal year.

Response: OIG prepares an Annual Plan each FY that details our top priorities for the upcoming FY, detailing the audits planned for each strategic goal. OIG's top priority is to strengthen USDA's ability to implement and improve safety and security measures to protect the public health, as well as agricultural and Departmental resources. OIG works to provide audits and investigations to help USDA and the American people meet critical challenges in safety, security, and public health. Our work focuses on issues such as the ongoing challenges of agricultural inspection activities, the safety of the food supply, homeland security, and IT security and management.

OIG's second major priority is detecting and reducing USDA program vulnerabilities and deficiencies to strengthen the integrity of the Department's programs. OIG conducts audits and investigations to help ensure or restore integrity in various USDA benefit and entitlement programs, including a variety of programs that provide payments directly and indirectly to individuals or entities. Some of the programs are among the largest in the Federal Government and support nutrition, farm production, and rural development. OIG attempts to provide coverage to the major assistance programs while also assessing risks associated with and providing oversight of the disaster assistance programs.

OIG's third major priority is providing USDA with oversight to help USDA achieve results-oriented performance. OIG conducts audits and investigations that focus on areas such as improved financial management and accountability, research, real property management, employee integrity, and performance management. Considerable resources are devoted to the annual mandatory financial statement audits, which includes IT work related to financial reporting. Tied to that is the mandatory work on the Department's compliance with improper payment reporting requirements.

Oversight of Disaster Funding for Hurricane Relief

22. Congress provided OIG with $2.5 million for oversight of USDA's disaster response to Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria. Please provide an update on how much has been spent to date and what has been accomplished, and describe plans for the remaining funds.

Response: Congress provided $2.5 million for OIG's oversight and audit of the more than $5.7 billion provided to USDA to fund necessary expenses related to agricultural losses, nutrition and rural assistance, and wildfires from Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, Maria, wildfires, and other declared major disasters and emergencies occurring in calendar year 2017. OIG appreciates the additional funds provided by the Subcommittee for oversight of USDA's disaster assistance activities. As of June 27, 2019, we have spent approximately $610,000 of the $2.5 million provided. To ensure that we use these funds as effectively as possible, we updated our Oversight Plan of USDA Disaster Funding[19] based on risk and other factors. We engaged with the Department to obtain relevant information about the program agencies' current plans and timetable for using this funding.

[18] This Disaster Oversight Plan is available on our Internet site. https://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/Oversight-of-Disaster-Funding180914.pdf
[19] Available at: https://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/Oversight-of-Disaster-Funding180914.pdf.

In September 2018, we started audit work to look at Forest Service's controls over its 2018 supplemental disaster appropriations. We also gained an understanding of how the $2.36 billion appropriated to the Office of the Secretary for disaster relief was to be used and distributed under the new Wildfires and Hurricanes Indemnity Program (WHIP), and started our audit work of WHIP in December 2018. Audits of these programs are appropriate at this time due to the amount of funds already distributed. We have initiated audit fieldwork into the administration and oversight of WHIP, which issues disaster payments to agricultural producers to offset losses from hurricanes and wildfires during 2017. This engagement includes all WHIP activity other than that associated with citrus losses in Florida. We plan to begin a separate audit later this year evaluating USDA's response to those citrus losses.

Additionally, OIG is utilizing prior disaster appropriations to provide oversight of USDA's response to disasters. In FY 2018, we started audit work to review FNS' disaster relief efforts to provide nutrition assistance to Puerto Rico due to Hurricanes Irma and Maria. We also have ongoing audit work to review hurricane relief emergency assistance for honeybee claims. We have two more audits utilizing this funding planned to begin this FY. We will be evaluating: (1) NRCS' controls over the Emergency Watershed Protection program relating to hurricane disaster assistance provided for Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria; and (2) the effectiveness of FSA's program delivery of the Emergency Conservation Program (ECP) for hurricane related disasters.

In FY18, OIG began outreach to Federal, State, and local partners to provide assistance in investigative efforts involving the multiple disasters. During FY19, we have continued these outreach efforts. In an effort to provide direct support, Investigations is reviewing the practicality of hiring additional law enforcement personnel to a two-year temporary position to supplement investigative efforts where no investigative personnel are available. The implementation of our disaster work relies on the distribution of assistance. Based upon previous disaster work, there may be a period of time between when the disaster occurred and when the fraud schemes emerge. Additionally, we will leverage assistance from ODS to take a more proactive approach to identifying potential fraud.

The Office of Data Sciences (ODS) created interactive geographic information system (GIS) maps to help OIG understand and visualize disaster funding distribution. One map focuses on USDA contracts associated with Hurricanes Maria, Harvey, and Irma, and the other visualizes the Farm Service Agency's (FSA) Emergency Conservation Program (ECP) funds distribution. The maps were built using publically available data from Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), the USAspending.gov site operated by the U.S. Treasury Department, the Federal Procurement Data System, and the U.S. Census Bureau. These are self-service business intelligence tools that provide a means to observe trends and anomalies and access source data. In addition, ODS provides data analysis and statistical support to disaster response audits and investigations.

OCFO Controls Over Final OIG Actions

23. Please provide the number of all open audit recommendations by year.

Response: The data in the table below is as of March 31, 2019:

Calendar Year of Audit Release[20]	Number of Recommendations Open/Unresolved (No Mgmt. Decision) (OIG)	Number of Recommendations Unimplemented/Pending Final Action (OCFO)	Total Number of Recommendations Open/Unresolved & Unimplemented/Pending Final Action
1996	0	4	4
2004	0	7	7
2005	0	3	3
2007	0	4	4
2008	0	2	2
2009	0	3	3
2010	0	2	2
2011	0	1	1
2012	0	7	7
2013	0	8	8
2014	0	22	22
2015	0	6	6
2016	0	36	36
2017	0	95	95
2018	22	163	185
2019	0	46	46
Total	**22**	**409**	**431**

24. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer (OCFO) is responsible for ensuring that recommendations made by OIG audits are implemented by the respective agencies. What is the best way to ensure OCFO has followed the IG's recommendations?

Response: USDA's OCFO is responsible for closing audit recommendations. This includes reviewing and approving agency requests for closure (final action) and tracking the closure status of audit recommendations. In September 2017, we issued our audit on *Departmental Oversight of Final Action on OIG Audit Recommendations* (Audit Report 1601-0001-41) and found that OCFO needed to strengthen its controls over the final action process. In response to this audit, we developed a new tool (i.e., final action verification (FAV)) to ensure OCFO has followed OIG's recommendations.

[20] For unlisted years, there were no recommendations open/unresolved or unimplemented/pending final action.

During FY 2018 we started using FAVs as a pilot program to review documentation accepted by OCFO as evidence of final action. We performed two FAVs during FY 2018. We will be using FAVs going forward to ensure that OCFO has obtained sufficient documentation to close OIG recommendations. We plan to perform additional FAVs in FY 2019, and are focusing our work on those high priority audits where OCFO agreed that agencies had implemented final action on all report recommendations.

25. Did OIG pilot a final action verification review in FY 2018? Please describe the findings from the pilot. Will it be continued or made permanent?

Response: Yes, as noted in our response to Question 24, we did pilot FAV reviews in FY 2018. During the FY 2018 pilot, we completed two FAVs and issued two associated reports: *AMS—Final Action Verification—Procurement and Inspection of Fruits and Vegetables*, 01026-0001-41 and *APHIS-Final Action Verification-Wildlife Services-Wildlife Damage Management*, 33026-0001-41. Both FAVs found that the final action documentation provided by the agencies to OCFO was sufficient to close the recommendations we made in the initial audit reports: *AMS Procurement and Inspection of Fruits and Vegetables* (01601-0001-41, February 2016), and *APHIS Wildlife Services - Wildlife Damage Management* (33601-0002-41, September 2015), respectively. Based on the success of the pilot, we will continue performing FAVs.

26. The Subcommittee has repeatedly called upon the Department, and some agencies more than others, to implement suspension and debarment tools. Which agencies have not implemented suspension and debarment tools? What would it take to encourage these agencies to get these tools into place?

Response: Of the 12 agencies that did not fully comply with one or more of the requirements for suspension and debarment, we found that 3 agencies did not consider suspension and debarment action for known program violators. Those agencies were AMS, FNS, and FSIS. The remaining 9 agencies did not comply with specific suspension and debarment requirements such as no agency specific guidance, no training plan, or training was not completed (see table below).

In September 2017, we completed an audit of USDA's suspension and debarment tools,[21] and OCFO took immediate corrective action by issuing a memo to all USDA agencies to address the lack of enforcement power by OCFO. The memo stated that OCFO would elevate any agencies that do not fully comply with suspension and debarment guidelines to the applicable offices of the Mission Area Under Secretaries. Additionally, OCFO directed each Under Secretary to designate a representative to join the USDA Suspension and Debarment Council to ensure each agency is fully compliant with suspension and debarment regulations. Furthermore, OCFO directed agencies to develop action plans detailing specific suspension and debarment internal control components to achieve USDA's suspension and debarment program objectives. We expect that the additional measures put into place by OCFO should enhance the ability of agencies to become compliant with suspension and debarment requirements and meet USDA's suspension and debarment program objectives.

Agencies Reviewed	No Agency-Specific Guidance[22]	Did Not Take Action on Known Program Violators	Did Not Provide All Activity Reports to OCFO	No Training Plan	Responsible Officials Did Not Complete Training
AMS		X		X	X
APHIS					X
FNS	X	X	X	X	X
FS				X	
FSA				X	
FSIS		X	X		X
RD				X	X
FAS	X				
GIPSA	X*				
NRCS	X				
OAO	X*				
OCE	X*				

* In response to our audit, OCFO allowed three agencies (OCE, OAO, & GIPSA) to use the Departmental Regulation as their agency guidance. This was due to the limited staff and activity of those agencies.

Since we issued our report in September 2017, all but one agency (FNS) have issued agency-specific policy describing their suspension and debarment tools for their programs. FNS has not developed any suspension and debarment tools for FNS programs other than SNAP and WIC. According to FNS, this is because for SNAP and WIC, FNS delivers federal funds through private retailers that FNS authorizes to participate in the program. FNS has the ability to terminate a retailer's participation for appropriate reasons. However,

[21] Audit Report 50016-0001-23, *Implementation of Suspension and Debarment Tools in the U.S. Department of Agriculture*, Sept. 2017.
[22] We also found an additional five USDA agencies that did not provide their suspension and debarment guidance to OCFO. These five agencies included Foreign Agricultural Service, Grain Inspection, Packers and Stockyards Administration (now part of the Agricultural Marketing Service), Natural Resources Conservation Service, Office of Advocacy and Outreach, and Office of the Chief Economist.

for the other FNS programs FNS' grantees are State agencies. FNS has determined that it would not be appropriate to initiate suspension and debarment actions against their State partners.

In order to assist USDA agencies in pursuing suspension and debarment as a result of fraudulent activities, OIG's Office of Investigations provides key investigative results directly to the suspension and debarment officials within USDA.

SNAP Fraud Detection

27. Please update last year's table that shows how much of OIG's budget is spent on monitoring SNAP to reflect fiscal years 2014 through 2018 and estimated for fiscal years 2019 and 2020.

Response: The following table reflects the cost of direct investigation staff time spent on SNAP investigations during FYs 2014 through 2019 (1st half). The chart also includes an estimate for FY 2020.

FY	Percent of Direct Investigations Time Spent on SNAP Investigations	Cost *(in millions)*
FY 2014 (actual)	58.32%	$25.1
FY 2015 (actual)	58.60%	$28.4
FY 2016 (actual)	55.80%	$27.0
FY 2017 (actual)	50.37%	$24.6
FY 2018 (actual)	42.07%	$20.8
FY 2019 (1st half)	42.37%	$21.2
FY 2020 (estimate)	41.05%	$20.6

28. Please update last year's table showing the number of SNAP-related cases that were investigated, the number referred to the Department of Justice, and the number accepted by the Department of Justice, for fiscal years 2014 through 2018 and fiscal year 2019 to date.

Response: The information requested follows:

	Opened	Referred to DOJ	Referred to State or Local Prosecutors	Accepted by State or Local Prosecutors	Accepted by DOJ
FY 2014	207	138	58	36	64
FY 2015	181	114	52	28	47
FY 2016	208	112	60	44	72
FY 2017	157	109	61	32	69
FY 2018	94	80	52	48	55
FY 2019 (1st half)	42	14	8	4	11
Total	889	567	291	192	318*

*The period of time to obtain court action varies widely, therefore the number of cases accepted by DOJ, as well as State and local prosecutors, does not necessarily correlate to the total number of cases resulting in convictions during these FYs.

29. Please update last year's table showing the number of SNAP-related cases that were successfully prosecuted for fiscal years 2014 through 2018 and fiscal year 2019 to date. Please note any monetary penalties associated with these cases.

Response: The information requested follows:

	Number of SNAP Cases Resulting in Convictions from DOJ, State, and Local Prosecutions	Monetary Results of SNAP cases
FY 2014	174	**$77,691,816**
FY 2015	190	**$122,716,634**
FY 2016	176	**$95,638,737**
FY 2017	173	**$99,671,338**
FY 2018	161	**$80,326,660**
FY 2019 (1st half)	57	**$24,977,057**
Total	931	**$501,022,242**

SNAP Fraud

30. How much of the IG's investigative resources is being used for SNAP-related investigations in FY 2019 compared to FY 2018, and is that anticipated to continue in FY 2020?

Response: In all of FY 2018 and the 1st half of FY 2019, approximately 42% of our direct investigations time was spent on SNAP-related investigations. We expect that a range of 40 – 43% of our direct investigative time will be spent annually on SNAP-related investigations in FY 19 and FY 20.

31. Does the IG have the tools needed to be successful in these investigations or is there anything specific that could be more helpful to its work – not just related to SNAP investigations but any investigation it might be undertaking?

Response: OIG has a number of ongoing investigations involving SNAP, and other USDA-related programs. Given the limited number of agents available to conduct investigations, USDA OIG could benefit from additional tools. For example, USDA OIG could benefit from the authority to subpoena testimony as an additional investigative tool. As noted by the Council of the Inspectors General on Integrity and Efficiency (CIGIE) in its latest CIGIE Legislation Committee Legislative Priorities for the 116th Congress,[23]OIG oversight can be substantially hampered by the inability to compel the testimony of witnesses who have information that cannot be obtained by other means. An example of where this authority is especially important is in cases where a Federal employee resigns. Without testimonial subpoena authority, that employee's resignation can substantially hamper an IG investigation, audit, or other review into matters pertaining to that individual's former responsibilities. Testimonial subpoena authority would enable OIG to obtain critical information from former USDA officials regarding actions taken while they were Federal employees. Once an employee leaves USDA, OIG cannot require him or her to cooperate in an investigation. Currently Inspectors General cannot compel such testimony from former employees.

Our agency would also benefit from increased use of data analytics. The use of data analytic risk models is a known tool that can have significant impacts on the success of investigations. Not only do the tools help identify the highest risk for potential individual fraud to maximize resource allocation, but they can also assist in identifying potential fraud rings which, once identified, can significantly impact the overall success of investigations. In addition, risk models can assist in uncovering additional anomalies that may give insight into other forms of potential fraud that were not previously known. Developing these models takes time and resources to not only identify and acquire data but to engage data science expertise to model and ensure that data representations/visualizations are developed in order to best aid the investigators. Such expertise and tools must be procured and can represent a sizable investment, but successes within the IG community have proven to have a significant return on investment. OIG's ODS has the fundamental expertise and tools to support the initial risk model development and maintenance efforts and, if augmented by additional data science expertise and proven visualization tools, the incorporation of this type of data analysis could provide long term impact to the success of investigations.

[23] https://www.ignet.gov/sites/default/files/files/CIGIE%20Legislative%20Priorities%20116th%20Congress.pdf

School Meals

32. Please provide an update regarding the National School Lunch and School Breakfast Program error rates. Last year there was some progress in lowering the error rates. Has that progress continued?

Response: FNS' progress has continued with respect to lowering error rates for these programs. The improper payment error rates for the National School Lunch (NSLP) and School Breakfast Programs (SBP) went down from 15.30% and 22.75%, respectively, in FY 2017 to 9.43% and 11.04%, respectively, in FY 2018. FNS conferred with OMB and removed meal claiming errors from its definition of an improper payment for NSLP and SBP, which may have had a role in lowering the annual estimates of improper payments made in those two programs.

Animal Fighting

33. How many federal animal fighting cases did OIG handle in FY 2018 as part of its work related to the Animal Welfare Act? What percentage of all OIG cases in FY 2018 does that account for? Please provide a breakdown of all cases by type and by geographic region/OIG office.

Response: In FY18, 7.12% of our direct investigations time was spent on animal fighting cases. This was spent on a total of 45 cases that had time worked in FY18, regardless of the year the case was opened.

Region	Total number	Dog Fighting	Cock Fighting
Southeast	9	9	0
Midwest	11	9	2
Northeast	5	3	2
Southwest	7	3	4
Western	13	0	13
Total	45	24	21

34. Of the animal fighting cases that OIG handled in FY 2018, how many of these cases did OIG initiate, as opposed to coming in at a later stage to work a case that was initiated through some other agency's investigation, like a drug case?

Response: Of these 45 cases, OIG initiated 7 from information we developed directly (i.e., 6 from information developed at the field level and 1 referral from information received through the OIG Hotline). The remaining 38 cases were investigations where OIG joined ongoing investigations initiated by local, State, and Federal law enforcement partners (including United States Attorney's Offices).

35. For each animal fighting case that OIG handled, how many OIG resources were used? Please compare that to the average cost spent on all OIG cases.

Response: There is not a set standard for the amount of OIG resources used for each investigation. It is situation dependent. There is a primary agent assigned to conduct the investigation and he or she may request additional staff resources as needed. The OIG identified several animal fighting enterprises

organized on a national scale resulting in the simultaneous execution of several search warrants requiring a significant number of OIG personnel to assist. To explain this in monetary terms, for these 45 cases above, using a figure of 7.12% (11,033 hours) of our direct investigations time spent on animal fighting cases in FY18 resulted in approximately $3.52 million spent on these cases. Additionally, the OIG expended funds associated with investigative travel, contracted storage space for evidence, equipment, specific training, digital forensic examinations, etc.

36. Does OIG have dedicated investigative protocols for animal fighting cases? Do you have dedicated staff who work on these cases?

Response: OIG has directives which are not specific to animal fighting but provide policies and procedures applicable in all our criminal and administrative investigations to ensure compliance with all applicable laws and regulations. OIG criminal investigators are not specifically assigned to investigate one particular type of violation or USDA program. Due to the many programs within USDA, the expectation is a criminal investigator will learn the program and its requirements during an investigation. Over the course of working multiple investigations in a specific program, our investigators often become subject matter experts. We leverage that expertise to provide program specific training to ensure our criminal investigators fully understand the program and its requirements. For example, OIG investigators have attended animal fighting training. Several of our investigators served as instructors in these training courses and have provide training to other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies as well as our prosecutorial partners.

37. Were there any leads related to reported animal fighting that were not pursued? What prevented OIG from pursuing these cases?

Response: Although OIG has been involved in investigating animal fighting for several years following the enactment of the Animal Fighting Prohibition Enforcement Act of 2007, we carefully assess the overall potential impact of each allegation we receive to ascertain if a criminal investigation should be opened. There are several factors that we consider when assessing allegations of possible criminal activity to make a determination about whether to open an investigation. Those factors include but are not limited to: 1) availability of OIG resources; 2) likelihood of prosecution; 3) amount of fraud; 4) extenuating circumstances, such as the connection to other investigations; 5) the ability of an agency to pursue an administrative remedy in lieu of prosecution; and 6) assistance requested by other Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies on cases showing a nexus to USDA. In FY18, only one animal fighting allegation (concerning the smuggling of fighting roosters) did not result in an OIG investigation.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN MARK POCAN

Animal Welfare Act Enforcement

38. Thank you for the consideration of my request, with Rep. Brian Fitzpatrick, for a renewed look at the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's (APHIS) enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act and for including that request in the OIG's FY19 Annual Plan. I look forward to seeing the results of that audit.

    Response: We plan to start an audit of "Animal Care Program Oversight of Breeders" in August 2019. We will evaluate the adequacy of APHIS' controls to ensure breeder compliance with Animal Welfare Act (AWA) and follow up on agency actions taken in response to a prior OIG audit, *Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Animal Care Program Inspections of Problematic Dealers* (33002-0004-SF, May 2010).

39. In February 2019 the Washington Post reported that documentation of Animal Welfare Act violations by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) was down 60% in 2018[1]. As you plan your APHIS audit, would the Office of the Inspector General also consider expanding the scope to include issues related to the decline in enforcement overall, including the impact of any changes made to the Animal Welfare Inspection Guide?

    Response: Our audit of "Animal Care Program Oversight of Dog Breeders" will be evaluating the adequacy of APHIS' controls to ensure breeder compliance with the Animal Welfare Act. The audit will provide an overall assessment of APHIS' enforcement actions which will include an assessment of enforcement rates as it relates to dog breeders. We will incorporate procedures to evaluate any significant changes made to sections of the Animal Welfare Inspection Guide related to dog breeders. We do not plan to expand the scope of our review beyond the review of dog breeders at this time. We will evaluate APHIS' actions taken in response to our prior audit which recommended several actions be taken by APHIS. These include requiring enforcement action for direct and serious violations and providing additional training to inspectors/supervisors on direct and repeat violations, enforcement procedures, and evidentiary requirements.

    We also plan to begin an audit by the end of FY 2019 to follow-up on APHIS' controls over licensing of animal exhibitors. The objective of this audit will be to evaluate APHIS' controls over the licensing of exhibitors of exotic animals, and to evaluate the agency's efforts to safeguard both the animals and members of the public who visit exhibitor facilities. As part of this audit we will follow up on the recommendations of our previous audit, *Controls Over Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service Licensing of Animal Exhibitors* (33601-0010-Ch, June 2010), emphasizing those recommendations related to public safety.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSWOMAN BARBARA LEE

Nutrition assistance (SNAP) audits

Ms. Fong, you mentioned in your testimony that the Office of Inspector General (OIG) spends a significant amount of investigative resources identifying and prosecuting fraud in nutrition assistance programs. As a former food stamp recipient myself, I know how important this program is for all struggling families. It was a bridge over troubled waters when I was raising my two boys as a single mother and I hope it will be there for all families. Sadly, our nutrition assistance program provides very little to keep families healthy – it's only about $1.40/per day. That's about $126/month or about $1,500 a year. Let me be clear – that's not enough money to eat for any person.

One of the things that I know the public talks about is SNAP fraud. It is my understanding that SNAP fraud is relatively low at about 3%. And that it's not so much fraud we are talking about but error – as opposed to fraud – where there are simple mistakes by a computer, an eligibility worker, or improper payments made through human error.

40. Ms. Fong, could you please tell us how many USDA personnel actually investigate these fraud allegations? About, on average, how much time and taxpayer money is spent investigating these alleged fraud cases and why? How much of these cases are error and how much of these cases are fraud?

    Response: Currently we have 116 special agents including supervisors who conduct and supervise OIG's investigative portfolio, including SNAP cases. The majority of our SNAP related investigations involve retailers who are authorized to participate in the SNAP program. If Investigations has initiated an investigation, in most instances there are indications of criminal activity and not simply an administrative or other error. The below chart, also referenced in Question 27, identifies the amount of time spent and cost of SNAP investigations from FY 2014 through the first half of FY 2019. The FY 2020 figures represent estimates.

FY	**Percent of Direct Investigations Time Spent on SNAP Investigations**	**Cost *(in millions)***
FY 2014 (actual)	58.32%	$25.1
FY 2015 (actual)	58.60%	$28.4
FY 2016 (actual)	55.80%	$27.0
FY 2017 (actual)	50.37%	$24.6
FY 2018 (actual)	42.07%	$20.8
FY 2019 (1st half)	42.37%	$21.2
FY 2020 (estimate)	41.05%	$20.6

Ms. Fong, you mentioned in your testimony that your office performed multiple reviews of the Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) controls over its Summer Food Service Program and that one review focused on

integrity of benefits in only 4 states – one of them being in California. You also mentioned that some sponsors of the Summer Food Service Program did not comply with and were improperly counting meals for reimbursement on the day of your site visits in places like California. The Summer Food Service Program is very important to me and I know that many children would go hungry without this assistance.

41. Ms. Fong, could you discuss some of the findings from that report? How much of the report was careless and human errors, systemic mistakes, or just a misunderstanding of the program's integrity? Are there any unintended consequences of the report in relation to closing some of the Summer Food Service Sites in California?

    Response: We have issued four audit reports regarding State level operations of the SFSP. As part of these audits, we reviewed 23 sponsors and we identified noncompliance issues for each of the 23 sponsors. For the most part, these sponsor noncompliance issues were the result of human errors or a misunderstanding of program requirements.

    We are not aware of any unintended consequences concerning the status of the sponsors' sites in California. However, for two sponsors we reviewed in California, we recommended that FNS direct the State agency to determine whether these sponsors were seriously deficient and take any appropriate action based on this determination. Seriously deficient sponsors have significant program violations and are not allowed to participate in SFSP. A seriously deficient finding by the State agency would indicate the sponsors were not delivering program meals effectively to eligible children in accordance with program requirements (e.g., sponsors improperly claimed meals for reimbursement, did not properly support program costs, violated food safety standards, etc.). We also identified noncompliance issues for the other three sponsors reviewed. These noncompliance issues, however, were the result of sponsors misunderstanding program requirements, so we recommended the State agency ensure these sponsors corrected the identified deficiencies.

Forest service sexual harassment

I want to talk about this culture of harassment, and abuse at the U.S. Forest Service. I am aware that the U.S. Forest Service is struggling to manage its ongoing sexual harassment cases. In your report on February 19, you mentioned that there were numerous failures by the U.S. Forest Service to adequately and properly handle these serious cases. I believe that there are reports from current and former staff of the U.S. Forest Service where they describe an ongoing culture of I am deeply concerned about how these valuable public employees are being treated. We ask staff of the U.S. Forest Service to care for our public lands and to serve people. There is absolutely no way these employees can serve to the best of their ability when they have managers who still work at the Service even after a complaint is filed.

42. Ms. Fong, do you think a full review and investigation of the entire agency's (USDA's) process for addressing sexual harassment and misconduct is warranted? Why or why not?

    Response: The Office of Investigations is tasked with investigating reported allegations and complaints involving USDA, including sexual harassment and misconduct. Investigations recognizes the importance of such allegations, and we make reviewing the allegations and initiating investigations, when warranted, a top priority. At the conclusion of these investigations, a report of the investigation will address the facts, as well as establish criminal and administrative factors leading to conviction, penalty or administrative

decisions. A review of adherence to established policy and procedures on the part of the agency involved is typically noted. We have received these types of allegations from employees in multiple USDA agencies. This may indicate a more systemic issue.

Currently, we do not have Audit work planned to evaluate sexual harassment and misconduct in other USDA agencies or offices. However, as we plan our work for future years, we will coordinate with the Office of Investigations and keep this area of concern in mind and determine whether to propose work to address areas of critical risks or weaknesses in program delivery, as appropriate.

43. Are you aware of the immediate steps the U.S. Forest Service is taking to correct these wrongs? In your testimony you mentioned they "agreed with your recommendations" but I'm wondering if you could be more specific.

Response: In the interim report issued in March 2018, we reached agreement with the Forest Service (FS) on the corrective actions it planned to take on the report's recommendations.[24] In summary, beginning in March 2018, FS agreed, for a trial period of at least 1 year, to only use contract investigators or investigators from other Federal agencies to investigate complaints of sexual harassment and sexual misconduct in its Pacific Southwest Region. At the end of the trial period, FS would assess the overall effectiveness of using only contract investigators or investigators from other Federal agencies to investigate sexual harassment and sexual misconduct cases and decide whether the practice should be made permanent.

We also reached agreement on the planned corrective actions on our eight of the recommendations in the final audit report issued in February 2019.[25] In summary, we recommended that FS provide training and guidance for reference checks and the 24-hour reporting requirement, ask specific questions regarding applicants' prior histories, establish disciplinary guidelines for allegations not reported within 24 hours, and establish internal guidelines for documenting the justification when deviating from the recommended penalty.

In addition, on November 15, 2018, the USDA Inspector General testified before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on OIG's work related to sexual harassment and misconduct at the FS. During the hearing, key members of the Committee asked how OIG could assist FS in establishing methods to measure its progress to address workplace concerns regarding sexual harassment and misconduct and to improve this aspect of its work environment. OIG agreed to canvass the oversight community, including the IG community and the U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO), and to conduct research to identify the universe of work done in the last 5 years (2013–2018) related to sexual harassment and misconduct. OIG issued the "Assessment of the State of Oversight Work in the Area of Sexual Harassment and Misconduct in the Federal Government" in July 2019.[26]

Office of Civil Rights within the Department of USDA

Finally, I want to talk about the Office of Civil Rights and the history of looking at these issues within the USDA. I know that this is something our Chairman cares very deeply about and I want to also associate myself with his remarks.

[24] 08601-0008-41(1), FS Initiatives to Address Workplace Misconduct Interim Report, March 5, 2018.
[25] 08601-0008-41, FS Initiatives to Address Workplace Misconduct, February 11, 2019.
[26] https://www.usda.gov/oig/webdocs/shmreport.pdf

In 2008 and 2009, the GAO and OIG released two reports that the USDA's civil rights office did not process complaints in a timely manner and then released incomplete records on the number and type of complaints.

Then again, in 2015, the federal investigators found that the office of civil rights had been "seriously mismanaged" and had "compromised the civil rights of USDA employees." In 2017, they declared that the Civil Rights Office continued to fail to process complaints in a timely manner or hold senior staff accountable.

I'm also aware that in the budget there is also a request to cut the Office of Civil Rights by $3 billion – or 12% from FY19 ($24 billion from FY19 enacted; budget request is $21 billion).

44. Ms. Fong, what is the OIG currently doing, if anything, to investigate this culture of abuse and complaints? Do you think these cuts will impact our ability to aggressively monitor these issues, including any backlog of cases?

    Response: We have an audit in our FY 2019 plan to look at the Office of Civil Rights. This audit will evaluate USDA's oversight of the civil rights complaint process for program complaints. We will also evaluate the effectiveness of corrective actions implemented in response to previous audit recommendations, as applicable. If we find weaknesses with the complaint process, we will work to identify the causes for any issues which could include consideration of the culture of the office and/or budgetary concerns.

    Additionally, the Office of Investigations has conducted investigations of specific complaints at the request of the Office of Special Counsel. We were asked to address allegations regarding the processing of internal Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) complaints filed against senior leaders within the Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, as well as the overall timeliness in the processing of all EEO complaints. Investigations found that in some instances where OASCR had failed to meet its deadline to investigate formal EEO complaints within 180 days, the timeliness issue occurred due to a delay in USDA agencies providing funding to OASCR because of an on-going continuing resolution. Although OIG cannot say definitively how any proposed budget reduction would impact OASCR, there may be an impact on timely delivery of services.

45. Have you all updated your report from 10 years ago? If not, could you commit to updating this report?

    Response: As noted in response to question 44, we will be conducting an audit in this area and will be following up on the applicable recommendations from the prior audit.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSWOMAN BETTY MCCOLLUM

Forest Service Workplace Sexual Misconduct

The report your office recently released entitled "Forest Service Initiatives to Address Workplace Misconduct" highlighted a blatant and obvious mishandling of complaints of workplace sexual harassment, gender discrimination, and retaliation against whistleblowers at the Forest Service.
During your testimony before the Oversight and Government Reform Committee a few months ago, you stated that the safety of USDA employees is one of your top priorities. That Committee also heard from a former Forest Service employee who spoke in great detail about the physical and verbal abuse she endured while at the agency, and how she believed she had been fired from her position for reporting that harassment.

I'm pleased your office is taking these claims seriously and released the report, but the culture of harassment seems to be persistent.

The report found that the Forest Service failed to:

- Identify applicants with a history of sexual harassment or misconduct;
- Act on allegations of sexual harassment or misconduct in a timely manner; and
- Document decisions to impose penalties on employees who engaged in sexual harassment or misconduct that were less severe than those called for in agency guidance.

46. Can you outline what your office doing to ensure the recommendations made in the report are actually being implemented by the Forest Service? Specifically, Finding 1 of the report states that employees with undisclosed histories of sexual harassment or misconduct were promoted. The Forest Service responded to several of the recommendations in Finding 1, saying they needed additional legal clarity to implement those recommendations.

    Response: We issue recommendations for corrective action to agencies for issues identified during the course of our audit work. Agency management then informs us of the actions they will take to resolve our recommendations, and we assess their responses for sufficiency. Once agreement is reached between OIG and the agency, we issue a memorandum that details the documentation that the agency should provide to OCFO[27] to demonstrate that corrective action to address the recommendation has been implemented (final action). The Forest Service (FS) is currently implementing the actions it agreed to in order to address the recommendations in the report.

    Once recommendations are implemented, we may perform a follow-up audit to examine FS' implementation of the recommendations. Depending on the sensitivity of the matter reported, the timing of this follow-up audit generally varies between 12 and 18 months after an agency has implemented the corrective actions. As discussed in response to Question 24, OIG may also perform a FAV to review the documentation accepted by OCFO to close the recommendations.

47. Is the Forest Service on track to complete the recommendations within the timeline they have estimated? Is your office working with them to ensure they meet the timeline?

[27] OCFO is the USDA agency responsible for determining that agreed-upon recommendations made by OIG audits are implemented by the agencies.

Response: According to OCFO, the office responsible for determining whether final action has been completed, the Forest Service (FS) implemented three of the four recommendations issued in the March 2018 interim report.[28] FS has stated the fourth interim report recommendation should be implemented by October 2019. The final audit report contained 8 recommendations, and OIG and FS agreed on the proposed corrective actions at report issuance in February 2019.[29] FS has implemented 3 of the 8 recommendations in the final report, and has stated that the all of these recommendations should be implemented by December 2019. We will continue to monitor FS' progress towards implementing the six open recommendations.

Crop Insurance Fraud

Last year, your office was involved in a few investigations involving crop insurance fraud.

In one case, the party in question was found guilty of defrauding taxpayers out of more than $5.6 million in false insurance claims, was sentenced to 25 months in prison and is prohibited from participating in the crop insurance program for 5 years.

In another, the party was sentenced to just 13 months in prison for illegally obtaining crop insurance and claiming crop losses for land he did not farm, and to pay almost $500,000 in restitution.

Crop insurance is a vital tool for farmers in Minnesota and across the country, but reports of fraud at this level are troubling.

In the budget that was released yesterday, the administration calls for some crop insurance reforms, including a new means test that would limit the program to producers with an Adjusted Gross Income of $500,000 or less.

48. Do you think reforms like the one proposed in the President's budget would help address some of the fraud we see in the crop insurance program?

    Response: We are not aware of any correlation between an adjusted gross income level in excess of $500,000 and a producer's willingness to commit crop insurance fraud. Only about 2.0 percent of producers have adjusted gross incomes in excess of $500,000.[30] Fraud is a crime of opportunity and is committed by individuals at all income levels. Our experience has shown that when income limitations are placed on programs, those who are intent on committing fraud will adjust their methods (e.g., create additional entities) so that they can still appear to qualify under the new income limitations.

49. Can you talk more broadly about any other work your office is doing to address fraud within the crop insurance or other subsidy programs?

    Response: In the audits we perform, we assess if the risk of fraud and/or abuse occurring is significant within the context of the engagement objective(s). We then use that fraud risk assessment to determine if the engagement's objective(s), scope, methodology, or audit procedures/tests need to be revised or if

[28] 08601-0008-41(1), FS Initiatives to Address Workplace Misconduct Interim Report, March 5, 2018.
[29] 08601-0008-41, FS Initiatives to Address Workplace Misconduct, February 11, 2019.
[30] *Farm Bill Income Cap for Program Payment Eligibility Affects Few Farms*, Ron Durst and Robert Williams, USDA, Economic Research Service, August 2016.

additional consideration of potential fraud and/or abuse is needed. We have audit work ongoing or planned in FY 2019 in the following FSA and RMA program areas:

Program	Program Area
FSA	Livestock Indemnity Program
FSA	2017 Hurricane Relief Emergency Assistance for Honeybees
FSA	Emergency Conservation Program
FSA	Market Facilitation Program
FSA	FSA Controls Over Its Contract Closeout Process
FSA	Wildfires and Hurricanes Indemnity Program
RMA	Controls Over Crop Insurance 508(h)[31] Products
RMA	Annual Forage Program and Follow Up on Pasture, Rangeland, Forage Program
RMA	RMA's Controls Over Multiple Peril Crop Insurance Policies with Additional Coverage for Hail
RMA	Whole Farm Revenue Protection Pilot Program Underwriting

In FY18, OIG allocated its investigative resources to investigating program fraud to include crop insurance and other USDA programs in which fraud is occurring. Investigations works with the USDA program agencies to share the results of its investigative work to assist them in identifying potential fraud schemes, which allows them to implement changes to their program requirements as necessary to address fraud.

[31] Section 508(h) of the Federal Crop Insurance Act allows private parties to develop insurance products that: (1) are in the best interests of producers; (2) follow sound insurance principles; and (3) are actuarially appropriate.

Questions Submitted by Chairman Jeff Fortenberry

Top Successes and Top Challenges at USDA

50. Can you tell the Subcommittee what agencies or programs at USDA need the most improvement in terms of performance? In other words, which parts of USDA do you think this Subcommittee should apply greater pressure to in order to get better results? Please be specific.

Response: In 2018, we reported seven Management Challenges that identified and consolidated broad issues that challenge the Department as a whole, as well as the unique challenges specific to certain programs.[32] This is consistent with challenges reported since 2015.

1) USDA Needs to Improve Oversight and Accountability for its Programs - USDA, much like other agencies and departments throughout the Government, faces challenges in overseeing its many programs. USDA employs nearly 100,000 employees in 16 agencies and 19 staff offices; in total, these employees operate programs responsible for delivering about $143 billion in public services annually. Overseeing these programs so every dollar spent accomplishes the intended results poses significant challenges to USDA program managers.

2) Information Technology (IT) Security Needs Continuous Improvement - As technology advances, so do the threats to IT security. While USDA has taken actions to improve its IT security, the Department continues to display weaknesses in planning, managing, and overseeing its cybersecurity initiatives. This, in turn, affects USDA's compliance with standards for safeguarding IT systems, as directed in the Federal Information Security Modernization Act of 2014 (FISMA). USDA senior management needs to ensure that agencies and offices understand that their individual IT security posture directly affects the degree to which USDA complies with FISMA and other security guidance. For USDA to attain a sustainable and secure IT posture, all 35 of its agencies and offices must consistently implement Departmental policy based on a standard methodology. When every agency and office complies with USDA's policies, USDA as a whole will be compliant with FISMA and, more importantly, have a sustainable security posture.

3) USDA Needs to Strengthen Program Performance and Performance Measures - Designing, developing, and implementing programs that reliably achieve their intended results has been a recurring challenge for the Department. OIG has found that agencies do not have adequate reviews or controls in place to supply the metrics necessary to evaluate program performance. In some programs, the strategy for measuring performance is missing altogether. As a result, some agencies are using inaccurate or unreliable data in program performance reports.

4) USDA Needs to Strengthen Controls over Improper Payments and Financial Management - USDA continues to be noncompliant with Federal requirements for improper payments. Also, USDA needs to address internal control deficiencies to resolve ongoing problems with financial management and reporting.

[32] *USDA Management Challenges*, Office of the Inspector General, USDA, August 2018.

5) USDA Needs to Improve Outreach Efforts – USDA has emphasized its efforts to improve outreach to new and beginning farmers and ranchers, local and regional food producers, minorities, women, and veterans. As part of those efforts, the Department has stressed the importance of civil rights, highlighting that significant progress needs to be made in working with communities when addressing past civil rights issues. Due to the public's perception of how USDA has historically treated members of socially disadvantaged groups, the Department is continually challenged to find effective ways to encourage and support all citizens in their agribusiness endeavors, especially those within underrepresented groups.

6) Food Safety Inspections Need Improved Controls – The Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS) has taken action to improve food safety and the humane handling of animals at the plants FSIS inspects. However, we have found that FSIS continues to face challenges gathering reliable data to ensure safety verification tasks are completed, effective, and consistent. FSIS also continues to face challenges in training, documenting and tracking, overseeing, testing, and verifying that the Nation's commercial supply of meat, poultry, and egg products complies with regulatory requirements.

7) The Food and Nutrition Service (FNS) Needs to Strengthen the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Management Controls - Although FNS has endeavored to improve management controls for SNAP, weaknesses continue to exist in controls over administrative tasks, benefit distribution, and quality control (QC) processes. The potential exists for billions of dollars of taxpayer-funded assistance not to be delivered or used as intended.

Finally, Departmental officials have expressed agreement with the management and programmatic challenges we have identified. We believe that USDA views them as priorities based on the tracking performed by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer to gauge agencies' actions and progress to address the challenges.

51. From a fiscal standpoint, what programs at USDA need greater or better financial controls to reduce fraud, waste, and abuse? And what are a few steps Congress can take to save limited taxpayer dollars being spent on these programs?

Response: OIG has identified USDA's need to strengthen controls over improper payments and financial management as a management challenge.[33] While USDA has made progress addressing this management challenge, OIG continues to identify the need for improvements. For example, in FYs 2017 and 2018, OIG recommended FNS should submit to Congress proposed statutory changes to bring the National School Lunch Program (NSLP), School Breakfast Program (SBP), Special Supplemental Nutrition Program for Women, Infants, and Children (WIC), Child and Adult Care Food Program (CACFP), and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) into compliance with improper payment reporting requirements.[34] Congress' assistance with ensuring that proposed statutory changes are implemented, as applicable, is one step to improve the programs mentioned above.

[33] *USDA Management Challenges*, Office of the Inspector General, USDA, August 2018.

[34] Audit Report 50024-0011-11, *USDA's Fiscal Year 2016 Compliance with Improper Payment Requirements*, May 2017, and Audit Report 50024-0013-11, *USDA's Fiscal Year 2017 Compliance with Improper Payment Requirements*, May 2018.

52. On a positive note, what agencies or programs can serve as a model for other parts of USDA-- that is, the agency work is resulting in positive outcomes AND the program manages their funds wisely?

Response: USDA efforts in managing payment integrity risk resulted in the Farm Service Agency's (FSA) Loan Deficiency Payment (LDP) program improving its statistically validated estimates of payment integrity levels above reporting thresholds. In addition, the LDP program is no longer considered susceptible to significant improper payments (high-risk) by the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). As a result, FSA's LDP program was removed from the OMB list of high-risk programs during FY 2018. Additionally, the improper payment error rates went down for the following four programs out of USDA's remaining nine high-risk programs.

- Food and Nutrition Service's (FNS) National School Lunch Program (NSLP) went down from 15.30% in FY 2017 to 9.43% in FY 2018.
- FNS' School Breakfast Program (SBP) went down from 22.75% in FY 2017 to 11.04% in FY 2018.
- Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Farm Security and Rural Investment Act Program (FSRIP) went down from 1.12% in FY 2017 to 0.83% in FY 2018.
- Risk Management Agency's (RMA) Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) Program Fund went down from 1.96% in FY 2017 to 1.81% in FY 2018.

Nebraska's Highly Erodible Land & OIG Report

In June of 2016, OIG released a report about highly erodible lands and wetland conservation in the Midwest with attention to ephemeral gully erosion. The report determined that the rules were not being applied or enforced evenly across the surveyed states, including Nebraska. NRCS subsequently decided to change their enforcement of gully erosion in Nebraska and other neighboring states by not allowing farmers to mechanically manipulate the soil in those areas in order to control erosion. This change placed 100s of farmers at risk of being out of compliance, without knowing it, and which threatened their eligibility for crop insurance and other farm programs.

53. In your report, did you account for the flexibility in the States' ability to meet the conservation compliance requirements in various States like Nebraska? I support the conservation compliance requirements but I want to make sure that farmers have time to comply with new requirements AND not get disqualified for crop insurance or farm programs.

    Response: We did consider that States may need flexibility in the treatment of all types of erosion. NRCS national office staff contended that, because each State is different, the States are better equipped to develop conservation plans that address their unique issues. Our recommendation, which NRCS agreed to implement, was to ensure the adequacy of State, issued guidance regarding required levels of treatment.

    NRCS has several variances available to allow producers additional time to comply with the conservation provisions if they are selected for a compliance review. The changes made to the required treatment of gully erosion in certain States would qualify a producer for one of those variances in the event that they were selected for a compliance review.

54. Is it fair to say that NRCS should have to go through a notice and comment on the conservation compliance changes or some other deliberative process so that all farmers know what they need to do to comply?

    Response: NRCS informed us that certain States had State-specific policies that were inconsistent with national policy. Therefore, NRCS said that they conducted an active outreach program in those States to notify producers of the change in State requirements. NRCS will also use tools such as variances to ensure producers have the needed time to make changes to their operations while remaining eligible for USDA benefits.

55. Is it reasonable to think that states in a region with wide ranging climate environments may have varied conservation practice methods that work in their specific state or region or county?

    Response: NRCS develops national conservation practice standards that are then tailored to both State and local conditions, as necessary. State offices may also develop special conservation practice standards called "interim standards" which, after a three-year evaluation period, may be adopted on a national level.

Improper Payments in the SNAP Program & Elsewhere

Eight years ago, I was the Chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee on Department Operations, Oversight, and Credit. Ms. Fong, you testified before the Ag Subcommittee as you are doing today. We spent a fair amount of time during that hearing on improper payments. As I noted at the time, I will reiterate that I don't want this to appear to be an inordinate focus on the poor among us or those with reduced capacities who are receiving SNAP benefits because this is an important social safety net program. Fraud is fraud, improper payments are improper payments whether that is the SNAP program or to a grain farmer with thousands of acres.
Just this past July, the Food and Nutrition Service revised its estimates of payment error rate. What was reported as an error rate of 3.7 percent is now actually 6.3 percent for Fiscal Year 2017.
If my math is correct, 6.3 percent of SNAP in FY 2017 equates to nearly $5 billion. With that same level of improper payments, you could have funded all of FDA, APHIS, and the Agricultural Research Service.

56. Have we made any progress in SNAP improper payments over these past eight years?

Response: From FY 2011 to FY 2014, it appeared that actions implemented by FNS and its State partners were working as USDA reported SNAP improper payments were on a downward trend with error rates under 4 percent. However, in FY 2015, we issued a report describing several weaknesses in the control structure related to identifying, calculating, and reporting improper payments for SNAP.[35] For example, we reported that: (1) Federal oversight of the State quality control (QC) process was inadequate; (2) States weakened the QC process by using third-party consultants and error review committees to mitigate individual QC-identified errors, rather than improving eligibility determinations; and (3) FNS' two-tier QC process is vulnerable to State abuse due to conflicting interests between accurately reporting true error rates and incurring penalties, or mitigating errors and receiving a bonus for exceeding standards. Thus, we concluded that FNS' QC process understated SNAP's error rate.

Since our FY 2015 audit report, Congress addressed the inherent risk related to bonuses and penalties tied to the States' SNAP error rates by repealing performance bonuses. In addition, FNS implemented several actions to address our report's recommendations, including clarifying guidance related to the use of consultants and revising the QC review process. According to USDA OCFO, the office responsible for determining final action, FNS implemented 17 of the 19 recommendations issued. We will continue to monitor FNS' progress towards implementing the remaining two recommendations.

Since FNS has modernized its approach to accurately identify and report SNAP improper payments based on OIG's previous audit findings, we cannot determine whether progress in SNAP improper payments were made over the last eight years. Although FNS did not report SNAP error rates for FY 2015 and FY 2016, FNS released an FY 2017 error rate based on its "modernized" QC review process. SNAP's reported error rate was 6.30 percent. This was a significant increase from the 3.20 percent reported for FY 2014. We may consider a follow-up engagement to assess FNS' progress in the future, once relevant final actions have been implemented for a sufficient time to test their effectiveness—usually 18-24 months after implementation.

[35] Audit Report 27601-0002-41, *FNS Quality Control Process for SNAP Error Rate*, September 23, 2015.

57. How can we make more progress in improper payments across the board – crop insurance, nutrition programs, or wherever taxpayer dollars are going to the wrong people or at the incorrect levels?

Response: USDA has been making improvements in its compliance with improper payments reporting requirements. Our annual audits in this area have noted that USDA has gone from 16 programs identified as susceptible to significant improper payments (high-risk) in FY 2011, to 20 in FY 2014, to 10 high-risk programs in FY 2017. This means the programs dropping off the high-risk list have documented, for a minimum of two consecutive years, improper payments below the statutory thresholds or otherwise demonstrated that the programs were no longer susceptible to significant improper payments.

Additionally, the improper payment error rates went down for the following four high-risk programs.
•Food and Nutrition Service's (FNS) National School Lunch Program (NSLP) went down from 15.30% in FY 2017 to 9.43% in FY 2018.
•FNS' School Breakfast Program (SBP) went down from 22.75% in FY 2017 to 11.04% in FY 2018.
•Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) Farm Security and Rural Investment Act Program (FSRIP) went down from 1.12% in FY 2017 to 0.83% in FY 2018.
•Risk Management Agency's (RMA)/Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) Program Fund went down from 1.96% in FY 2017 to 1.81% in FY 2018.

However, in reviewing USDA's FY 2018 Agency Financial Report and supporting documentation, we found that 4 of the 9 high risk-programs – 2 for FSA and 2 for FNS – did not comply with one or more of the improper payment requirements. Specifically: (1) USDA did not meet annual reduction targets for each program assessed to be at risk and measured for improper payments; and (2) USDA did not report a gross improper payment rate of less than 10 percent for each program and activity for which an improper payment estimate was obtained and published in the Agency Financial Report (AFR).[36]

Overall, by timely and consistently implementing corrective actions to our recommendations in our improper payment and other audit work, agencies can work to reduce the flow of taxpayer dollars to the wrong people and/or at incorrect levels.

OIG performs statutorily required work intended to ensure that USDA is reducing its improper payments as set forth by the Improper Payments Information Act of 2002. OIG notes that many USDA programs have highly decentralized structures that often rely on State and local organizations and self-reporting. Some of these organizations do not have sufficient accountability processes and management controls. We have issued audit recommendations to RMA, FSA, ERS, and FNS to propose statutory changes to their programs. To reduce improper payments without making changes to the programs and regulations, OIG notes the following actions need to be taken:

- Correct State errors and program methodologies to estimate improper payments.
- Seek ways to increase accountability within the limits of legislation to balance the mandated goal of simplifying access to benefits with the goal of reducing improper and erroneous payments.
- Continue to seek opportunities to expand data mining resources available to check eligibility.

[36] Audit Report 50024-0014-11, *USDA's Fiscal Year 2018 Compliance with Improper Payment Requirements*, May 2019.

58. Please provide a table that shows how much of OIG's budget is spent on monitoring SNAP to reflect fiscal years 2013 through 2018 and estimated for fiscal years 2019 and 2020.

Response: The following table includes the cost of direct investigation staff time spent on SNAP investigations during FYs 2013 through the first half of 2019. The chart also includes an estimate for FY 2020.

FY	Percent of Direct Investigations Time Spent on SNAP Investigations	Cost *(in millions)*
FY 2013 (actual)	54.52%	$22.8
FY 2014 (actual)	58.32%	$25.1
FY 2015 (actual)	58.60%	$28.4
FY 2016 (actual)	55.80%	$27.0
FY 2017 (actual)	50.37%	$24.6
FY 2018 (actual)	42.07%	$20.8
FY 2019 (estimate)	42.37%	$21.2
FY 2020 (estimate)	41.05%	$20.6

59. Please provide a table showing the number of SNAP-related cases that were investigated, the number referred to the Department of Justice, and the number accepted by the Department of Justice, for fiscal years 2013 through 2018 and fiscal year 2019 to date.

Response: The requested information follows:

	Opened	Referred to DOJ	Accepted by DOJ
FY 2013	195	137	109
FY 2014	207	138	64
FY 2015	181	114	47
FY 2016	208	112	72
FY 2017	157	109	69
FY 2018	94	80	55
FY 2019 (1st half)	42	14	11
Total	1,084	704	427*

*The period of time to obtain court action varies widely, therefore the number of cases accepted by DOJ, as well as State and local prosecutors, does not necessarily correlate to the total number of cases resulting in convictions during these FYs.

60. Please provide a table showing the number of SNAP-related cases that were successfully prosecuted for fiscal years 2013 through 2018 and fiscal year 2019 to date. Please note any monetary penalties associated with these cases.

Response: The requested information follows:

	Number of SNAP Cases Resulting in Convictions from DOJ, State, and Local Prosecutions	Monetary Results of SNAP cases
FY 2013	149	$49,855,920
FY 2014	174	$77,691,816
FY 2015	190	$122,716,634
FY 2016	176	$95,638,737
FY 2017	173	$99,671,338
FY 2018	161	$80,326,660
FY 2019 (1st half)	57	$24,977,057
Total	**1,080**	**$550,878,162**

Recouping Taxpayer Dollars

61. Whether we are talking about fraud or improper payments, the US government should recapture funds. You mention in your testimony several different examples of monetary restitution. These included $2.3 million under the WIC program, $3.2 million in a fraudulent contract for community food banks and lunch programs, and $209.3 million related to a fraudulent business and industry loan scheme. Can you tell me how much or the percentage of monetary restitutions will the Federal government actually recoup and return it back to the U.S. Treasury?

    Response: OIG's Office of Investigations devotes a considerable amount of resources to identifying and prosecuting fraud related to nutrition assistance programs, contracts, and USDA farm programs. This has resulted in several examples of monies recaptured from monetary restitution, including those cited in your question. OIG cannot, however, provide the percentage of monetary restitutions the Federal government will receive to be returned to the U.S. Treasury. This is because calculation and/or ordering of such restitution actions is outside of the purview of our agency. In this regard, OIG Investigations: 1) provides information to DOJ regarding fraud loss; 2) assists with DOJ calculation of any penalties and damages; and 3) provides evidence of the fraud and its impact on the program(s). DOJ and its counterparts are responsible for establishing and collecting restitution claims and submitting those to the US Treasury. OIG can only report on the final restitution amounts as set forth by DOJ.

62. Your testimony points out that USDA did not comply with improper payment requirements for a seventh year in a row. When the Federal Government makes overpayments to program participants, how successful is USDA in recouping these funds?

    Response: To clarify, for our eighth consecutive year reviewing information in USDA's agency financial reports and supporting documentation, OIG found again that USDA did not comply with one or more of the six reporting requirements under the Improper Payments Elimination and Recovery Act (IPERA) of 2010. This OIG review tested only reporting compliance; for example, whether the USDA is publishing improper payment estimates, publishing and meeting annual reduction targets in improper payment rates, and publishing gross improper payment rates of less than 10 percent for its programs identified as susceptible to significant improper payments (high-risk), as required under IPERA.

In USDA's FY 2018 Agency Financial Report[37], the Department reported it recaptured approximately $0.25 million in overpayments from its supplier credit recovery audits, $204.81 million from its internal payment recapture audits, and $371.59 million through methods outside of its payment recapture audits. Of this, USDA reported $187.89 million was returned to the Treasury and $13.71 million was returned to agencies for the original program purpose.

[37] According to the Department, "[t]he purpose of the USDA FY 2018 Agency Financial Report (AFR) is to inform Congress, the President, and the American people how USDA has used Federal Resources entrusted to the Department in FY 2018." See: https://www.ocfo.usda.gov/docs/2018AFR-FINAL-508.pdf.

USDA reported in its agency financial report the following information on its activities completed in identifying and recapturing overpayments in FYs 2017 and 2018, as detailed in the table below:

Payment Recapture Activity	FY 2017 Amount Recaptured (millions)	FY 2017 Percent of Overpayments Identified	FY 2018 Amount Recaptured (millions)	FY 2018 Percent of Overpayments Identified
Supplier Credit Recovery Audits by Contractor	$0.28	0.03	$0.25	0.04
Internal Payment Recapture Audits by USDA Programs	$245.25 *	28.26	$204.81 *	34.00
Methods Outside of Payment Recapture Audits	$614.55	70.81	$371.59	60.92
* Of this, USDA reported in FY 2017 $233.45 million was returned to the Treasury and $10.52 million was returned to agencies for the original program purpose and, in FY 2018, $187.89 million was returned to the Treasury and $13.71 million was returned to agencies for the original program purpose.				

Agroterrorism

63. The testimony mentions that your office recently completed an audit of USDA's readiness in responding to an agroterrorism event. The audit involved the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, the Agricultural Research Service, and the Food Safety and Inspection Service. You noted that "they did not have information readily available to respond to the USDA Office of Homeland Security's request for information. In your assessment, is USDA prepared to deal with an act of agroterrorism? I realize that some information may be sensitive, so share what you can.

Response: In September 2018, we issued our audit report 50701-0001-21, titled *USDA Agency Activities for Agroterrorism Prevention, Detection, and Response*. The objective of that audit was to determine if APHIS, ARS, and FSIS had developed plans and initiated actions to prevent, detect, and respond to agroterrorism threats or attacks.

We concluded that the agencies have developed plans and initiated actions to prevent, detect, and respond to agroterrorism threats or attacks. However, we identified improvements the agencies can make to better track and report these actions. In an earlier audit (Audit Report 61701-001-21, March 2017), *Agroterrorism Prevention, Detection, and Response*, we found that USDA's Office of Homeland Security (OHS) had not routinely requested agroterrorism preparedness information from agencies. In our 2018 audit, we found that the agencies did not have a process to proactively compile complete information to respond to OHS' requests related to the HSPD-9 tracking document, the Sector Critical Infrastructure Protection Annual Report (SAR), and the Food and Agriculture Sector-Specific Plan (SSP).

This audit also identified that APHIS' Veterinary Services and Plant Protection and Quarantine Programs has developed response plans for specific animal and plant diseases, conducted exercises that test response and emergency management capabilities, and created reports that contain corrective actions for addressing areas of weakness. Food defense is a priority for FSIS, which works with Federal, State, and local government agencies, industry, and other organizations to prevent, protect against, mitigate, respond to, and recover from intentional contamination of the food supply. ARS research efforts support USDA agencies, including APHIS and FSIS, by seeking new methods and strategies to improve food safety, food defense, or to prevent, detect, and respond to plant and animal diseases.

OIG has a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in place with the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)

and APHIS to address response to a potential agroterrorism event. The MOU defines the relationship between the FBI's Weapons of Mass Destruction Directorate, OIG, and APHIS and formalizes the protocol for notification, information sharing, and joint epidemiological and law enforcement investigations of suspected or confirmed acts of agroterrorism.

64. What can this Subcommittee do to ensure that livestock producers, producers of crops, and others in the U.S. food supply chain are better prepared to respond to an intentional contamination?

Response: We conducted our *USDA Agency Activities for Agroterrorism Prevention, Detection, and Response* audit (50701-0001-21, September 2018) to determine if APHIS, ARS, and FSIS had developed plans and initiated actions to prevent, detect, and respond to agroterrorism threats or attacks. Our audit focused on the work at three agencies, and we did not evaluate the producers of livestock or crops or other entities in the food supply chain. Therefore, we cannot offer any recommendation at this time.

Currently, we do not have work planned to evaluate the producers of livestock or crops or other entities in the food supply chain. However, as we plan our work for future years, we will keep this area of concern in mind and consider work to address areas of critical risks or weaknesses in the food supply chain, as appropriate.

To ensure that livestock producers, producers of crops and others in the U.S. food supply chain are better prepared to address these challenges, the Subcommittee could consider appropriate action to ensure continued education and outreach by USDA to better identify or prevent/detect program abuses; identify threats to the general health and safety of the public; and facilitate instruction on how to report potential acts of agroterrorism.

65. In responses to Questions for the Record last year, you noted that the Office of Homeland Security is in the process of developing improved procedures to more effectively oversee USDA's agroterrorism preparedness, including HSPD-9 compliance. Can you please provide the Committee with an update and tell us if the Office of Homeland Security has made any additional progress? What else must the Office of Homeland Security do to ensure that the U.S. agriculture community is prepared for an act of terrorism?

Response: According to information reported by OCFO, the Office of Homeland Security (OHS) has not yet completed the final action necessary to close this recommendation. Generally, if agencies timely and effectively address audit recommendations they should be better prepared.

Additionally, we completed an audit in September 2018 that focused on three USDA agencies with mission areas related to agroterrorism and emergency preparedness: the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS); the Agricultural Research Service (ARS); and the Food Safety and Inspection Service (FSIS).[38]

We found the agencies developed plans and initiated actions to prevent, detect, and respond to agroterrorism threats or attacks. However, we identified improvements the agencies can make to better track and report these actions. First, OIG found that the three agencies did not have information readily available to respond to OHS requests related to the Homeland Security Presidential Directive-9 tracking document, the Sector

[38] Audit Report 50701-0001-21, USDA Agency Activities for Agroterrorism Prevention, Detection, and Response, September 2018.

Critical Infrastructure Protection Annual Report, and the Food and Agriculture Sector-Specific Plan. Also, APHIS and ARS did not report vulnerability assessment actions or results to OHS. FSIS did report vulnerability assessments, but did not have sufficient information to indicate the status of corrective actions to address vulnerabilities.

Finally, all three agencies need to make improvements to track and implement corrective actions from exercises or actual incidents. The agencies generally agreed with our recommendations. OHS said these recommendations should bolster its efforts to oversee USDA's agroterrorism preparedness. We accepted management decision on all 12 recommendations in the audit report.

Vehicle Fleet Management

66. Your semi-annual report to Congress in May 2018 highlighted a shocking number of vehicles under USDA's management. The audit revealed that USDA oversaw 41,000 vehicles owned or leased by the Department at a cost of $260 million. The Department's Office of Property and Fleet Management is not taking effective actions to manage the continued use of more than 23,000 underutilized vehicles. Secretary Perdue strikes me as someone who tries to save taxpayer dollars by finding greater efficiencies wherever possible. Now I understand that the Department has some hard working folks in the field – whether that includes FSA, NRCS or FSIS – but what could USDA possibly be doing with 41,000 vehicles? How can we reduce waste in this area?

Response: Each USDA agency uses vehicles to help carry out its unique mission. For example, the FS uses its vehicles to manage and protect 154 national forests and 20 grasslands in 43 States and Puerto Rico. APHIS employees drive their vehicles to import and export locations all across the country and drive to sites to conduct crop or animal inspections. FSIS uses its vehicles to perform inspections at over 6,400 plants that produce meat, poultry, and egg products throughout the United States.

In our report to USDA's Departmental Management, we developed recommendations to help reduce waste in this area. Specifically, we recommended that USDA agencies annually conduct utilization reviews of their fleets and justify or dispose, share, or re-assign underutilized vehicles. Before we published our report in September 2018, the Department's Office of Property and Fleet Management informed us that they had immediately taken action and reduced USDA's fleet by over 4,200 vehicles, an immediate annual savings of more than $26 million to the Department.

Currently, we do not have work planned to further evaluate USDA's vehicle fleet management. However, as we plan our work for future years, we will keep this area of concern in mind and consider work to address areas of critical risks or weaknesses in vehicle fleet management, as appropriate.

Information Technology Vulnerabilities – Programs & Practices

67. Your testimony points to a significant deficiency in USDA's IT security programs and practices. You note that the Department still has 20 of 67 open recommendations you made between FY 2009 and FY 2017. Weaknesses still exist in six of the close recommendations and last fiscal year you discovered eight new weaknesses. All of this translates into a serious material weakness for the Department. How serious are these IT security vulnerabilities and what might be the impact of these IT security issues?

    Response: Given the sensitivity of some of our IT security findings, we would be happy to brief you or your staff on the specific issues. As an overview, USDA is a large, complex organization that includes 36 separate agencies and offices, most with their own IT infrastructure. Each of USDA's agencies and offices, including OCIO, needs to be held accountable for implementing the Department's policies and procedures.

    The Department's senior management needs to continue its efforts to make sure that each agency and office understands how its implementation of IT security directly influences the Department's overall security posture and FISMA score. For USDA to attain a secure and sustainable security posture, all agencies and offices must consistently implement Departmental policies based on a standard methodology. When every agency and office complies with USDA's policies, USDA, as a whole, will be FISMA compliant and, more importantly, will have a sustainable security posture.

68. Is the personal information of citizens who participate in USDA programs vulnerable?

    Response: During the FY 2018 FISMA audit we found that the Department did not establish a data protection and privacy program. Certain policies were established; however, there were several policies that were out-of-date and did not incorporate updated National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and OMB A-130 requirements. Additionally, there was no finalized, overarching data protection and privacy policy. The lack of updated policies and procedures led to a decentralized governance of Personally Identifiable Information (PII) throughout the Department. The sampled agencies that are reviewed had clear practices in place; however, the practices were inconsistently implemented and there was no evidence that the Departmental policies were communicated and understood by agency stakeholders. The Department maintained an inventory of the collection and use of PII through the utilization of reports, such as Privacy Score Cards, Privacy Threshold Analysis, and System Privacy Summary Reports. However, the Department records did not consistently match records kept at the agency. We recommended that the Department should develop privacy policies and procedures in accordance with NIST and OMB A-130 requirements. In addition, OCIO and the Chief Privacy Officer should conduct a thorough gap analysis of existing USDA policy, procedures, and guidance, and publish an updated Privacy Act Compliance Departmental Directive to include current NIST and OMB Privacy Act-related guidance and requirements.[39]

69. What role does your office play in determining and reporting these violations and what else can be done?

    Response: OIG is an independent and objective agency that conducts audits, investigations, and reviews regarding USDA programs and operations. OIG is mandated to: perform activities to assess compliance; prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse; make recommendations; and take follow-up actions concerning the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness of USDA programs and operations. USDA agencies are

[39] Audit Report 50501-0018-12, *U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Chief Information Officer, Fiscal Year 2018 Federal Information Security Modernization Act*, October 2018.

responsible for reporting PII incidents to the USDA OCIO, at which point Departmental PII incident policies/procedures are to be followed. If OIG were to find a PII incident in the course of an audit or investigation, we would follow Departmental procedures unless it appeared to be criminal in nature. At that point the case would be referred to OIG Investigations, which would work with the necessary law enforcement organizations, including the United States Computer Emergency Readiness Team (US-CERT).

Investigations' role would be to investigate allegations of criminal activity by individual or organization conducting or attempting to conduct a cyberattack on USDA's system(s). In the event of such findings, Investigations would work with the Federal Bureau of Investigation to fully investigate and prosecute violators and provide a report of investigation of its findings at the conclusion of the investigation to the appropriate USDA personnel.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT B. ADERHOLT

Improper Payments and Error Rates

In the past we have discussed the Office of Inspector General's (OIG) report on the SNAP quality control process used for determining error rates. The report raised some serious concerns that call into question some of the methods that states have used to achieve low error rate in the program. I know FNS has taken the report seriously, and I am pleased the agency is working to implement much needed change to ensure accountability and integrity in SNAP. For some programs like SNAP, the error rate threshold increases each year based on inflation, and I am aware this happens in other Federal programs as well.

70. Do you think that having the error rate indexed each year still provides an accurate assessment for improper payments or are we sweeping more errors under the rug?

Response: Our office has not specifically reviewed how the SNAP error rate threshold is indexed. Our reviews have focused on whether FNS uses an approved methodology and whether FNS enforces policies to ensure error rates are accurate and determined in compliance with regulatory requirements. OIG does note, however, that errors below the error tolerance threshold are not considered as part of the SNAP error rate.

In your testimony you mentioned that USDA did not comply with improper payment requirements set forth by the Improper Payments Information Act for a seventh consecutive year. I even asked about this at last year's hearing.

71. Can you explain why this has happened yet again, for a 7th consecutive year?

Response: In FY 2017, USDA delivered its public services through more than 149 programs. Overall, the number of programs identified as susceptible to significant improper payments (high-risk) has declined from 16 in FY 2011 to 10 high-risk programs in FY 2017. This means the programs dropping off the high-risk list have documented, for a minimum of two consecutive years, improper payments below the statutory thresholds or otherwise demonstrated that the programs were no longer susceptible to significant improper payments. "Significant improper payments" are defined as gross annual improper payments – i.e., the total amount of overpayments and underpayments – in the program exceeding: (1) both 1.5 percent of program outlays and $10 million of all program or activity payments made during the FY reported; or (2) $100 million regardless of the improper payment percentage of total program outlays.

To achieve overall compliance with the improper payment requirements, agencies must meet all of the six specific requirements set by IPIA, as amended by IPERA, including, for example: publishing improper payment estimates for all applicable high-risk programs; publishing a gross improper payment rate of less than 10 percent for each program; and publishing and meeting annual reduction targets. USDA did not fully meet these requirements.

A USDA high-risk program is found overall to be non-compliant if one or more of the six specific requirements are not met. In reviewing USDA's FY 2017 Agency Financial Report and supporting documentation, we found that USDA reported improper payments information for its 10 high-risk programs and complied with 3 of the 6 requirements. However, 6 of the 10 programs – 1 for FSA and 5 for FNS – did not comply with one or more of the requirements; specifically 4 programs – FSA's NAP and FNS' SNAP, CACFP, WIC – were non-compliant with one requirement and the other 2 programs – FNS' NSLP and SBP

– were non-compliant with two requirements. FSA targeted FY 2019 for mitigating the deficiencies for its NAP program and FNS targeted FY 2019 for SNAP and WIC and FY 2021 for CACFP, NSLP, and SBP.

72. Is the Department making progress in correcting improper payments or are you finding the same problems year after year?

Response: We reviewed USDA's FY 2018 compliance with improper payment reporting requirements. OIG noted the following progress made by the Department.[40]

- The number of USDA high-risk programs has gone from a high of 20 in FY 2014 to 9 in FY 2018 because OMB granted relief for programs under the reporting threshold.
- USDA efforts in managing payment integrity risk resulted in FSA's Loan Deficiency Payments program improving its statistically validated estimates of payment integrity levels above reporting thresholds and resulted in its removal in FY 2018 from the OMB list of high-risk programs.
- The improper payment error rates went down for the following four programs out of USDA's nine programs identified as high-risk for FY 2018.
    - Food and Nutrition Service's (FNS) National School Lunch Program (NSLP) went down from 15.30% in FY 2017 to 9.43% in FY 2018.
    - FNS' School Breakfast Program (SBP) went down from 22.75% in FY 2017 to 11.04% in FY 2018.
    - Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) Farm Security and Rural Investment Act Program (FSRIP) went down 1.12% in FY 2017 to 0.83% in FY 2018.
    - Risk Management Agency (RMA)/Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) Program Fund went down from 1.96% in FY 2017 to 1.81% in FY 2018.
- USDA continued to expand its use of the Do Not Pay (DNP) portal by increasing user activity, integration review, and adjudication within the portal for eligibility verification as well as post payment review.

73. To reduce improper payments, what changes do you think need to be made or implemented?

[40] FY 2014 through FY 2018 Agency Financial Reports as published publicly by USDA on its www.ocfo.usda.gov website, as well as OIG audit reports 50024-0013-11 and 50024-0014-11 on USDA's FY 2017 and FY 2018 Compliance with Improper Payment Requirements issued May 10, 2018 and May 31, 2019, respectively.

Response: OIG notes that many USDA programs have highly decentralized structures that often rely on State and local organizations and self-reporting. Some of these organizations do not have sufficient accountability processes and management controls. In addition, legislation limits USDA's ability to act due to concerns about potential barriers to participation in NSLP and SBP. We have issued audit recommendations to FNS to propose statutory changes to its programs. For example, in FYs 2017 and 2018, we recommended to FNS that it should submit to Congress proposed statutory changes to bring NSLP, SBP, WIC, CACFP, and SNAP into compliance. FNS has yet to obtain statutory changes to bring these programs into compliance, and has chosen other methods to improve its programs. In reviewing USDA's FY 2018 Agency Financial Report and supporting documentation, OIG noted that FNS' SNAP, NSLP, and CACFP were compliant with IPERA. [41] FNS has targeted FY 2019 for mitigating the deficiencies for WIC and FY 2021 for SBP. For NSLP and SBP, FNS changed its sampling process and now uses an OMB-approved alternative where meal claiming – e.g., a child's failure to select a required fruit or vegetable – is excluded from estimates of erroneous payments.

To reduce improper payments without making changes to the programs and regulations, OIG notes USDA needs to continue to:

- Correct State errors and program methodologies to estimate improper payments.
- Seek ways to increase accountability within the limits of legislation to balance the mandated goal of simplifying access to benefits with the goal of reducing improper and erroneous payments.
- Seek opportunities to expand data mining resources available to check eligibility.

Additionally, USDA statistically samples its high-risk programs every year to ensure that the corrective actions are effective at reducing improper payments while still allowing program participants the access they need. USDA initiated Enterprise Risk Management (ERM), which provides a strategically aligned portfolio view of organizational challenges and insight on how to most effectively prioritize resource allocations, ensuring successful mission delivery. In the context of improper payments, the ERM framework can be used to assist in the management of payment integrity risk. Leadership manages the payment integrity risk of an agency to allow it to achieve its strategic, operations, reporting, or compliance objectives. Following are a few examples of how payment integrity risk cuts across an agency's strategic, operations, reporting and compliance objectives:

- Strategic—Achieving payment integrity in core programs and mission;
- Operations—Ensuring payments to eligible recipients and managing fraud risk;
- Reporting—Managing data integrity risk related to the Agency Financial Report and www.paymentaccuracy.gov reporting; and
- Compliance—improper payments legislation, the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) guidance, and privacy laws.

Collectively, USDA efforts in sampling and ERM resulted in statistically validating FSA's LDP program, which improved its payment integrity levels above reporting thresholds and is no longer considered susceptible to significant improper payments by OMB. As a result, FSA's LDP program was removed from the OMB list of high-risk programs in FY 2018.

[41] Audit Report 50024-0011-11, *USDA's Fiscal Year 2016 Compliance with Improper Payment Requirements*, May 2017, Audit Report 50024-0013-11, *USDA's Fiscal Year 2017 Compliance with Improper Payment Requirements*, May 2018, and Audit Report 50024-0014-11, *USDA's Fiscal Year 2018 Compliance with Improper Payment Requirements*, May 2019.

In your testimony, you mention a successful instance where OIG partnered with FBI to investigate a Detroit store owner who committed SNAP and WIC fraud and was sentenced to 41 months in prison, followed by 36 months of supervised release, and ordered to pay a $100 fine and approximately $2.3 million in restitution. You also mention that future work includes the development of predictive risk model prototypes.

74. Will you elaborate on what you expect your future work to look like in this space?

Response: The Office of Investigations identifies new cases through a variety of means. New investigations are often developed from information obtained from ongoing investigations. OIG also utilizes advanced data analytics to support and enhance our audits and investigations through the work of our Office of Data Sciences (ODS). The integration of ODS' services helps the Office of Investigations discover fraud patterns and identify anomalies in USDA programs.

Predictive risk model prototypes are data driven decision-making tools that can be built to assist OIG in promoting efficiency and effectiveness in USDA programs. Risk models will help OIG investigators, and auditors, look for specific behaviors and patterns that are strong indicators of fraud, waste, or abuse. These risk model prototypes will ultimately create an environment in which OIG employees can conduct in-depth analysis that should: provide additional perspectives into agency programs; help us identify potential areas of highest risk; and provide insight to assist with prioritizing and allocating resources effectively to prevent fraud, waste, and abuse.

75. What will these prototypes that will help detect fraud look like?

Response: The prototypes will incorporate data visualizations tools and techniques that will allow for OIG investigators and auditors to see and explore USDA program data in various ways. The prototype models will utilize known risk factors for various types of fraud, waste, and abuse and assign numerical scoring to provide a means to identify high-priority/high risk areas (e.g., high-risk SNAP retailers). The data visualization techniques will also support the identification of potential relationships, patterns, anomalies, and trends that may need further investigation.

76. What role will Congress play as these prototypes are continued to be developed?

Response: As OIG moves forward on these prototypes we would request continued support of our efforts from the Committee to utilize the resources that make such prototypes possible. We will keep Congress appropriately informed, through reports or other means, of our work in this area.

The use of data analytics as a tool for evidence based decision-making continues to be a high priority in the Federal government. The adoption of data standards and a culture of data sharing across agencies and programs, while protecting individual privacy, will continue to be an opportunity and challenge as data analytics matures in the Federal Government.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
U.S. FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION
FY 2020 BUDGET HEARING
APRIL 3, 2019

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CHAIRMAN SANFORD BISHOP JR.

Nutrition Innovation Strategy

Mr. Bishop:

1. In 2018, the Commissioner announced an exciting, bold, and comprehensive Nutrition Innovation Strategy (NIS) that would address labeling claims; standards of identity; ingredient information; voluntary sodium reduction; and an educational campaign about menu labeling and the updated Nutrition Facts Label.

   - Given your retirement, what are your plans to continue the progress on the Nutrition Innovation Strategy? Specifically, labeling claims, standards of identity, ingredient information, voluntary sodium reduction, and an educational campaign about menu labeling and the updated Nutrition Facts Label?

   Response: FDA's Nutrition Innovation Strategy is an Agency priority, and FDA is continuing this important work. For example, regarding labeling claims, FDA intends to publish a proposed rule to update the regulatory definition of "healthy" in the near future. FDA is also continuing its work on standards of identity and held a public meeting on September 27, 2019, to give interested stakeholders an opportunity to discuss FDA's effort to modernize standards of identity. The docket remained open for comment until Nov 12, 2019. Regarding ingredient information, FDA published a draft guidance in May 2019 titled "The Use of an Alternate Name for Potassium Chloride in Food Labeling: Guidance for Industry." If the guidance is finalized, FDA would exercise enforcement discretion for use of the name "potassium chloride salt" in the ingredient statement on food labels as an alternative to the common or usual name "potassium chloride." The comment period closed on September 17, 2019, and FDA is analyzing the comments the Agency received. FDA is also continuing to advance our efforts around sodium reduction and anticipates finalizing the short-term voluntary sodium reduction targets outlined in the draft guidance titled "Voluntary Sodium Reduction Goals: Target Mean and Upper Bound Concentrations for Sodium in Commercially Processed, Packaged, and Prepared Foods." FDA has also published fact sheets and introduced a variety of new consumer education materials to raise awareness and encourage consumers to use calorie and nutrition information to help make more informed and healthy choices when dining out. Additionally, FDA is working diligently on an educational campaign for consumers surrounding the new nutrition information on the Nutrition Facts label that we anticipate launching in 2020.

Mr. Bishop:

2. We applaud the agency's support for consumer-awareness education campaigns for menu labeling and the updated Nutrition Facts panel as part of its Nutrition Innovation Strategy, however the agency will require dedicated adequate funding for the campaigns which will help Americans make informed choices about what they eat and will encourage companies to provide healthier food options.

   For menu labeling, FDA has conducted focus groups to help it develop consumer education materials. For instance, the FDA found that simple swaps—"Getting your sandwich with grilled chicken instead of fried helps cut the calories," for example—are effective messages. Additional materials could highlight the succinct statement on menus and menu boards that provides context about calories in a daily diet: that the ballpark target is 2,000 calories per day. The FDA should also highlight that additional nutrition information is available upon request.

   For its Nutrition Facts panel public education efforts, we support the focus on calories, serving sizes, and added sugars, and encourage the agency to include sodium. As the Commissioner stated in his March 29, 2018, speech at the National Food Policy Conference: "[t]here remains no single more effective public health action related to nutrition than the reduction of sodium in the diet." Education to enable consumers to evaluate whether a product is considered high in sodium is therefore critical.

   - Enforcement of menu labeling commences in May 2019. What issues does the Agency anticipate will be top priority and would additional resources be useful?

   Response: To date, FDA has focused resources on engagement with industry and other key stakeholders to educate and foster compliance with the requirements. FDA is committed to working flexibly with establishments to help them achieve compliance with the menu labeling regulations. The Agency is planning to assess overall industry implementation of the primary components of the menu labeling requirements: (1) posting calorie information on menus and menu boards for all standard menu items; (2) disclosing calorie information on signs adjacent to foods on display and self-service foods that are standard menu items; (3) including the succinct statement concerning suggested daily caloric intake and statement of availability for written nutrition information on menus and menu boards; and (4) having required written nutrition information available on premises of the chain restaurant or similar retail food establishment upon request. FDA will also provide continued support for industry stakeholders and engage with state, local, tribal, and territorial (SLTT) regulatory partners to ensure consistent implementation. In August 2019, the Agency published a fact sheet titled "FDA's Implementation of Menu Labeling Moving Forward" for stakeholders (e.g., chain restaurants or similar retail food establishments, trade

associations, state/local regulatory authorities, and consumers) outlining these priorities and activities.

Specific to enforcement activities, FDA is currently able to dedicate less than 1 full-time equivalent due to competing priorities in our nutrition and food labeling program.

FDA anticipates that its top priorities related to menu labeling in FY 2020 will be providing continued support for industry stakeholders and engaging with SLTT regulatory partners to ensure consistent implementation.

Mr. Bishop:

- What are the Agency's specific plans for a consumer education and awareness campaign for menu labeling and Nutrition Facts?

Response: FDA has issued a variety of consumer education materials to raise awareness and encourage consumers to use calorie and nutrition information to help make more informed and healthy choices when dining out. Specifically, in March 2019, FDA released new consumer education materials on the Agency's menu labeling webpage (www.fda.gov/caloriesonthemenu) and promoted social media messages to raise awareness and encourage consumers to use calorie and nutrition information to help make more informed and healthier choices when dining out.

Regarding the Nutrition Facts label, in 2020, FDA will launch an educational campaign for consumers surrounding the new nutrition information that consumers will be seeing in the marketplace. FDA's educational campaign will allow us to reach consumers directly through educational videos, social media outreach, media outreach, paid advertisements, printed materials, and user-friendly websites to help them understand the impact the dietary choices they make every day have on their own and their family's health. The campaign will focus on the areas where the Agency recognizes gaps in consumer understanding and use of nutrition information. The campaign will also highlight new elements of the Nutrition Facts label, such as added sugars, and how to use this information in the context of the entire label, including nutrients like sodium, for which excess intake remains a public health concern.

Mr. Bishop:

- How much funding does the agency plan to dedicate toward these campaigns?

Response: In FY 2020, FDA will continue these campaigns at a planned spending amount of approximately $700,000.

Voluntary Sodium Reduction Targets for Industry

Mr. Bishop:

3. Americans consume sodium mostly through processed foods that they purchase from a grocery store or at a restaurant. Researchers estimate that reducing current sodium intakes by 1,200 milligrams a day would prevent 60,000 to 120,000 cases of coronary heart disease, 32,000 to 60,000 cases of stroke, and 54,000 to 99,000 heart attacks annually. This reduction would also save an estimated $10 billion to $24 billion in health-care costs and 44,000 to 92,000 lives annually. FDA proposed draft voluntary targets to industry to reduce sodium in processed and restaurant foods.
   - What is the timetable for issuance of the final two-year sodium voluntary targets?

   Response: FDA plans to finalize the short-term voluntary sodium reduction targets outlined in the draft guidance titled, "Voluntary Sodium Reduction Goals: Target Mean and Upper Bound Concentrations for Sodium in Commercially Processed, Packaged, and Prepared Foods" in 2020.

Added Sugars Labeling for Single-Ingredient Sweeteners

Mr. Bishop:

4. The updated Nutrition Facts label now has an "Added Sugars" line, along with a corresponding Daily Value, to help consumers meet key recommendations from the Dietary Guidelines for Americans to reduce intake of calories from added sugars and to consume no more than 10 percent of calories from added sugars. Declaration of added sugars on the Nutrition Facts label is of great public health importance, especially given that two out of three adults and one out of three children are overweight or have obesity, and one out of three adults has prediabetes.
   From the urging of maple syrup and honey manufacturers, Congress inserted a rider in the FY2019 Agriculture Appropriation spending bill that allows omission of the "Added Sugars" line. However, the use of the percent "Daily Value" of added sugars in the Nutrition Facts label is preserved. The FDA has stated it will issue guidance for these and other single-ingredient sweeteners to ensure the percent "Daily Value" of sugars is listed for these products, which allows consumers to make informed decisions by knowing how much these products do contribute to their daily "budget" for added sugar intake. Consumers must be able to know the amount and corresponding Daily Value of added sugars in these products in order to limit added sugar intake.
   Added sugars, including those in honey and maple syrup, are linked to a higher risk of weight gain, type 2 diabetes, and heart disease. Small amounts of these products can significantly contribute to one's daily added sugar intake. For example, a one-tablespoon serving of honey has about a third of a day's added sugar, and a two-tablespoon serving of maple syrup has half a day's added sugar. Without the percent "Daily Value," consumers would remain in the dark about how much of these products contribute to their day's worth of added sugars.

- When will final guidance be issued for single-ingredient sweeteners such as maple syrup and honey so that consumers will know the percent "Daily Value" of the added sugars in these products?

Response: FDA issued final guidance titled "The Declaration of Added Sugars on Honey, Maple Syrup, Other Single-Ingredient Sugars and Syrups, and Certain Cranberry Products: Guidance for Industry" on June 18, 2019. The guidance provides clarity on the labeling of added sugars for single-ingredient packages or containers of honey, maple syrup, and other single-ingredient sugars and syrups as a result of the requirement contained in the Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018, which exempts such products from declaring "Includes Xg of Added Sugars" on the Nutrition Facts label. The guidance clarifies that the Added Sugars percent Daily Value is still required on packages and containers of single-ingredient sugars and syrups, and it encourages manufacturers to use a "†" symbol next to the Added Sugars percent Daily Value declaration on such products that leads to a statement in a footnote that provides additional information on how the added sugars in the product contribute to the diet.

Food Safety

Mr. Bishop:

5. Lack of adequate recordkeeping by members of industry slowed and impeded traceback efforts by the FDA during two recent outbreaks linked to romaine lettuce. The Food Safety Modernization Act Section 204 provided the agency with authority to set enhanced recordkeeping requirements for high risk foods. What is the agency's timeline for implementing proposed and final regulations under Section 204? Does the agency plan to issue any guidance to industry recommending appropriate recordkeeping requirements in advance of implementing regulations under Section 204? What is the timeline for issuing that guidance?

Response: FDA is currently working to draft a proposed rule on Additional Traceability Recordkeeping that will address the FSMA Section 204 requirement. The Agency anticipates publishing the proposed rule by September 2020 which allows time for public comment. After FDA publishes the proposed rule, the Agency will hold public meetings to provide stakeholders additional opportunity to provide feedback before finalizing the rule.

The Agency does not plan on issuing guidance in advance of implementing regulations under Section 204. However, FDA is committed to engaging in further dialogue with stakeholders on the importance of traceability of foods, through a recently announced initiative called the New Era of Smarter Food Safety. This initiative is intended to create a more digital, traceable, and safe system to protect consumers from contaminated food. To inform this work, FDA will hold a series of internal brainstorming sessions and held a public meeting to hear from a broad cross-section of stakeholders on this modern approach to strengthen the safety of the food supply. FDA plans to use the feedback

received from these activities in developing a Blueprint for a New Era of Smarter Food Safety, which FDA plans to release in early 2020.

Mr. Bishop:

The Food Safety Modernization Act Section 211 directs the FDA to create one-page notices with consumer-oriented information, to be posted in grocery stores so consumers can identify the recalled food in their possession. What is the agency's timeline for implementing this requirement of FSMA?

Response: Although FDA has not yet implemented Section 211 of the FDA Food Safety Modernization Act (FSMA), the Agency recognizes that Americans depend on FDA to help ensure that the food products they buy are safe, and FDA has taken several actions in the recent past to ensure that information about recalls is communicated and made available earlier. In September 2018, the Agency issued a draft guidance entitled "Public Availability of Lists of Retail Consignees to Effectuate Certain Human and Animal Food Recalls," which provides information on how and when FDA intends to publicize the identities of retail consignees (e.g., grocery stores) that may have received recalled human or animal foods. In addition, in November 2018, the Agency finalized a guidance on its authority under FSMA to mandate food recalls in certain circumstances ("Questions and Answers Regarding Mandatory Food Recalls"). On February 7, 2019, FDA issued the final guidance entitled "Public Warning and Notification of Recalls Under 21 CFR Part 7, Subpart C," which outlines the circumstances, content, and procedures for companies or FDA to issue public warnings to help alert the public to urgent situations where a product being recalled presents a serious hazard to health. These guidances will help make important product recall information available to grocery stores and consumers more promptly. In addition, these policy steps are part of FDA's broader action plan to further improve the product recall process. The Agency understands that consumers should have actionable information to avoid, or protect themselves from, recalled FDA-regulated products. The Agency intends to use all of its tools to carry through on this commitment, and FDA will keep the House Appropriations Committee updated on its progress.

Mr. Bishop:

In late 2018, the FDA solicited comments to inform agency action to require food manufacturers to label for sesame as a priority allergen. Sesame is ranked 9th in prevalence among food allergens in the United States and causes frequent severe reactions among allergic individuals. What is the agency's specific timeline for issuing a proposed and final rule or other final agency action on sesame allergen labeling?

Response: In October 2018, FDA issued a request for information on the prevalence and severity of sesame allergies in the United States and the prevalence of sesame-containing foods sold in the United States that are not required to disclose sesame as an ingredient, to inform possible regulatory action on sesame to protect and promote the public health. The comment period closed on December 31, 2018, and more than 4,800 comments were submitted. Some commenters submitted data, analyses and other information, including published studies. FDA has completed its review of the comments received and is using this information to inform next steps. Determining the next steps is an FDA priority.

Mr. Bishop:

The FDA has now received multiple reports of dependence, overdose, and death related to the sale of unwashed poppy seeds as a food or dietary supplement. These poppy seeds are unsafe because they have not been adequately processed to remove the sap and plant matter from the opium poppy, which contain high levels of opiates. Do you believe the agency has the authority to remove these dangerous products from the market? Why has the agency not acted on this authority to address this serious risk to consumers?

Response: Provisions of the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (FD&C Act) give FDA the authority to take action on poppy seed products that contain levels of morphine, codeine, or other alkaloid compounds that may pose a risk to human or animal health. For example, under section 402(a)(1) of the FD&C Act, a food is adulterated if it bears or contains any added poisonous or deleterious substance which may render it injurious to health; or, in the case that the substance is not added, if the substance in the food would ordinarily render the food injurious to health. In order to help identify products that are adulterated, FDA will continue to conduct sampling activities, including potential import sampling. If potentially harmful substances are found in a product that has been distributed or is on the market, FDA will consider any applicable regulatory and enforcement options, which may include encouraging a voluntary recall, ordering a mandatory recall, ordering administrative detention to prevent the product from being distributed, or issuing public warnings to alert consumers to the potential danger. If potentially harmful substances are found in samples taken from imported products, the shipment(s) may be detained and refused entry, and future shipments may be subject to an Import Alert (detention without physical examination) as warranted.

Mr. Bishop:

The FDA has delayed enforcement of the water testing requirements that make up an important component of the produce water safety rule under the Food Safety Modernization Act. Recent outbreaks in romaine lettuce and leafy greens have highlighted the need for the agency to swiftly finalize these rules to protect our produce supply. Do you commit to implementing the current produce water safety testing requirements without any further delays? Do you plan to re-open the rule to reconsider these requirements? Would the purpose of such reconsideration be "reducing regulatory burden" for industry, or enhancing food safety?

Response: FDA remains committed to agricultural water standards that are science-based and support food safety and public health, and the Agency is addressing questions about the practical implementation of these standards, for covered produce other than sprouts, across a variety of operations, water sources, and uses. The Agency has conducted extensive outreach to an array of stakeholders and subject matter experts to discern how best to achieve public health protections with workable solutions that address implementation challenges. For example, a team of FDA produce safety experts joined with hundreds of participants in Covington, Kentucky, and nearly 30 satellite locations across the country in a two-day Agricultural Water Summit hosted by the Produce Safety

Alliance. FDA produce safety experts also have conducted farm tours throughout the country specifically to observe operations as they relate to the use of agricultural water, and to discuss implementation issues that these farms face. Recent outbreaks potentially linked to agricultural water have further highlighted the diversity of agricultural production. FDA is incorporating lessons learned from these recent outbreaks into the solutions that the Agency is pursuing to achieve the shared goal of improved produce safety. The Agency believes that in order to enhance public health and produce safety, it is important to address the complexities of how these standards can be implemented by farmers.

Mr. Bishop:

In 2016, FDA approved the addition of folic acid to corn masa flour, an ingredient in foods including tortillas, tacos, tortilla chips and tamales, to prevent neural tube birth defects, which have a high prevalence in the children of Latina women. Yet whereas addition of folic acid to enriched wheat flour is mandatory, it remains voluntary for masa flour. Has the FDA taken any steps to assess the effectiveness of the voluntary fortification policy by determining how many manufacturers have made use of masa flour fortified with folic acid?

Response: Based on FDA's analyses of food supply and sales databases to date, only a limited number of corn masa products are fortified with folic acid. Additional food supply and sales data will be analyzed as data become available. Further, FDA continues to determine the folate status of U.S. populations and subpopulations (e.g., Hispanic women of childbearing age) by using folate intake and serum and red blood cell data from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC's) National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) database. FDA relies heavily on the biomarker and intake data (including intake from natural and fortified foods and supplements) from NHANES for monitoring purposes. Since the 2016 amendment of the food additive regulation to allow the addition of folic acid to corn masa flour, FDA has been awaiting available data for folate intake and biomarkers to determine how this fortification policy has impacted the U.S. population.

According to the NHANES analytical guidelines, two survey cycles (4 survey years, about 20,000 samples) are recommended for subpopulation analyses to provide reliable and robust results. These survey data (2017-2018 and 2019-2020) will be publicly available in 2022.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSWOMAN CHELLIE PINGREE

Diabetes Drugs

Ms. Pingree:

1. In October 2018, the FDA convened an Advisory Committee (ADCOM) to examine guidance that required that diabetes drugs undergo cardiovascular outcomes trials (CVOTs). What is the status of the FDA's review of this requirement? Will stakeholders, including patients, have an opportunity to provide feedback when revised guidance is issued?

   Response: FDA convened a two-day public meeting of the Endocrinologic and Metabolic Drugs Advisory Committee on October 24 and 25, 2018 to discuss and reassess the 2008 guidance for industry, entitled *Diabetes Mellitus — Evaluating Cardiovascular Risk in New Antidiabetic Therapies to Treat Type 2 Diabetes*,[1] which provides recommendations for cardiovascular safety assessments in diabetes drug development. The meeting was convened based on scientific knowledge and clinical trial experience accumulated over the past 10 years. The Agency is in the process of internally reviewing the discussions from the October 2018 meeting and re-examining the cardiovascular guidance.

[1] https://www.fda.gov/media/71297/download

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN MARK POCAN

Over-the-Counter (OTC) Hearing Aids

Mr. Pocan:

1. Congress passed the Over-the-Counter (OTC) Hearing Aid Act in 2017, which directed the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) to create a new category for OTC hearing aids by August 2020. The FDA has publicly announced that OTC hearing aids may not be marketed until FDA promulgates final rules. While the FDA has yet to finalize OTC hearing aid regulations, there appears to be a number of companies aggressively marketing OTC hearing aids to the public through online, print, and TV advertising.

   Given that hearing loss is a complex health issue, and there are significant health risks involved in the marketing of unregulated hearing aids, what enforcement action is the FDA taking against companies that are currently marketing and selling unregulated OTC hearing aids directly to consumers? Additionally, if the FDA is not taking any enforcement action, how does the FDA intend to protect the hearing health of consumers from manufacturers taking advantage of the current regulatory uncertainty?

   Response: FDA clarified the regulatory status of hearing aids in its July 24, 2018, letter to Hearing Aid Manufacturers, a copy of which is posted online. As the letter states, until the effective date of a published final regulation, no products that are intended to address hearing loss are, or can claim to be, OTC hearing aids within the meaning of section 520(q)(1) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Currently, hearing aids continue to be restricted devices that are subject to applicable federal and state requirements governing promotion, marketing and distribution.

   FDA monitors promotional activity and investigates complaints the Agency receives from patients, caregivers, health care providers and industry raising concerns about promotion of medical devices. When the Agency sees violative practices or unacceptable risks, FDA contacts companies to request that they voluntarily and promptly take corrective action to address our concerns, comply with FDA requirements, and ensure patients are protected. If the Agency's concerns are not addressed, FDA will consider additional actions, including potential enforcement actions.

   FDA is committed to timely implementation of FDARA section 709, which includes a notice-and-comment rulemaking process. FDA will continue to monitor promotional activities with respect to hearing aid devices and take appropriate action to assure compliance with applicable federal law.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT ADERHOLT

Sale of Illegal Mail-Order Abortion Drugs

Mr. Aderholt:

1. I appreciate the agency taking action to address the sale of illegal mail-order abortion drugs to the United States (U.S.). The actions of Aidaccess.org and Rablon are of great concern, and I am encouraged to see that the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has sent warning letters to these two online entities. I strongly encourage the FDA to continue to conduct oversight of these entities to ensure that they comply with the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act.

As you know, on October 18, 2018, an article published in The Atlantic revealed that Aid Access, a foreign company, has been established to distribute mail-order chemical abortion drugs to U.S. customers in violation of the FDA's safety protocols. Aid Access allows chemical abortion pills to be prescribed by an abortionist in the Netherlands, filled by a pharmacy in India, and shipped to stateside customers.

As noted in the warning letters, Mifeprex, also known as RU-486 or mifepristone, is the only chemical abortion drug approved in the U.S., and is used in combination with another FDA-approved drug, misoprostol. The FDA has approved chemical abortion for use up to 10 weeks gestation, but due to the risks, the FDA requires that only a certified prescriber dispense the drugs. The involvement of a physician or other certified prescriber who knows the state of a woman's pregnancy and health is critical, as patient safety is of utmost importance. Before the drugs are administered, it is crucial that a trained and certified healthcare provider screen for ectopic pregnancy, determine the gestational age of the baby, and monitor the patient for possible adverse events like severe hemorrhaging.

- What steps has the FDA taken to prevent these abortion drugs from being imported by mail-order?

Response: As you are aware, FDA recently warned two online entities, AidAccess.org and Rablon, for causing the introduction of unapproved new drugs (including mifepristone for medical termination of early pregnancy) into U.S. commerce in violation of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. FDA was recently sued in U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho in connection with the AidAccess Warning Letter. FDA does not comment on matters related to pending litigation.

FDA has been active in combating the illegal online sales of unapproved medicines to further the agency's mission to protect U.S. consumers. For example, in February 2019, the FDA warned a company called CanaRx for facilitating the distribution of unapproved new drugs and misbranded drugs to U.S. consumers. Last year, as part of the global effort known as Operation Pangea XI, the FDA, in partnership with international regulatory and law enforcement agencies, targeted 465 websites that illegally sell potentially dangerous, unapproved versions of opioid, oncology and antiviral prescription medicines to U.S. consumers. Last June, the agency announced a series of warning letters directed at 53 websites marketing unapproved opioids, and in August, warned an additional 21 websites engaged in similar conduct. Consumers are encouraged to report any unlawful sale of medical products online to the FDA.

Mr. Aderholt:

- Are there plans to take additional steps to prevent these illegal actions in the future?

Response: As noted above, FDA was recently sued in U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho in connection with the AidAccess Warning Letter. FDA does not comment on matters related to pending litigation. However, FDA remains very concerned about the sale of unapproved drugs on the Internet or via other channels for illegal importation, because this bypasses important safeguards designed to protect consumers' health. Unapproved drugs purchased from foreign sources are not the FDA-approved versions of the drugs, and therefore, they are not subject to FDA-regulated manufacturing controls or FDA inspection of manufacturing facilities. Drugs that have circumvented regulatory safeguards may be contaminated, counterfeit, contain varying amounts of active ingredients, or contain different ingredients altogether.

Mr. Aderholt:

- Aid Access has claimed that their activities are permissible under FDA exceptions. It's my understanding, however, that FDA's exceptions, are limited to very narrow circumstances that Aid Access cannot meet.

Response: As noted above, FDA was recently sued in U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho in connection with the AidAccess Warning Letter. FDA does not comment on matters related to pending litigation.

Mr. Aderholt:

- Can you elaborate on these exceptions and why they do not apply to Aid Access in these specific situations?

Response: As noted above, FDA was recently sued in U.S. District Court for the District of Idaho in connection with the AidAccess Warning Letter. FDA does not comment on matters related to pending litigation.

Compounding

Mr. Aderholt:

2. As the FDA moves forward with the implementation of the Drug Quality and Security Act, I appreciate the agency issuing a new draft Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the States regarding interstate distribution of compounded medications. While important changes are still needed, the newly reissued draft MOU released in September 2018 is a meaningful step in the right direction.

   However, there is concern that many states will not sign the draft MOU as written, especially if it continues to define distribution to include patient specific dispensing, resulting in patients no longer being able to receive their medication from the pharmacy of their choice or need.

- What is the FDA doing to work with stakeholders, including state boards of pharmacy, on the definition of distribution in the reissued MOU so that it does not include patient specific dispensing?

Response: FDA has consistently worked with stakeholders to draft the standard MOU and will continue to do so when finalizing the MOU. In the Federal Register of January 21, 1999 (64 FR 3301), FDA announced the availability for public comment of a draft standard MOU, developed in consultation with the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy (NABP). Over 6,000 commenters submitted comments on the 1999 draft standard MOU. In the Federal Register of February 19, 2015 (80 FR 8874), FDA withdrew the 1999 draft standard MOU and issued the 2015 draft standard MOU for public comment. FDA received more than 3,000 comments on the 2015 draft standard MOU. The Agency again sought public comment when it issued a revised draft standard MOU in the Federal Register of September 10, 2018 (83 FR 45631).

In developing the 2018 revised draft standard MOU, FDA consulted with NABP and considered the comments submitted on the 2015 draft standard MOU, among other comments. The Agency considered a number of comments in response to the 2015 draft standard MOU stating that distributing and dispensing are mutually exclusive activities, such that if a drug product is distributed, it is not also dispensed, and vice versa. After considering those comments and the public health objectives of section 503A(b)(3)(B) of the FD&C Act, the Agency proposed to revise the definition of distribution in the 2018 revised draft standard MOU to exclude dispensing that occurs at the facility in which the drug was compounded. Drugs that are picked up in this way would be considered dispensed, but not distributed, for purposes of calculating "inordinate amounts" under the MOU or applying the 5 percent limit in section 503A(b)(3)(B)(ii) of the FD&C Act.

In response to the 2018 revised draft standard MOU, the Agency received 38 comments during the comment period. As the Agency works on the MOU, it is considering the concerns and recommendations conveyed in the 38 comments, including those regarding the definition of "distribution." The Agency also continues to work in consultation with NABP on the MOU.

Mr. Aderholt:

- What is the current timeline for moving forward with the MOU?
  I have heard concerns that some states may not have the legal authority to enter into an MOU with the FDA without consulting with numerous state agencies, potentially requiring changes in state law.

Response: In the Federal Register Notice of availability regarding the 2018 revised draft standard MOU, consistent with the 2015 draft standard MOU, the Agency proposed a 180-day period after the final standard MOU is made available for States to consider and sign the MOU before FDA intends to enforce the 5% limit in States that have not signed the MOU. FDA invited public comment on whether this was an appropriate timeframe.

Some comments on the 2018 revised draft standard MOU stated that more time may be necessary because some States may need to enact new laws and promulgate new regulations before signing the MOU. FDA is considering the information in these comments as the Agency decides what timeframe to set for States to consider and sign the MOU after the final standard MOU is made available and before FDA intends to enforce the 5% limit.

Mr. Aderholt:

- Given the potential for protracted legislative or regulatory consideration, is the FDA concerned that some states might not be able to accomplish these changes within the 180 days after the final MOU is released, as currently proposed in the draft MOU? Additionally, some states have indicated that they do not have the resources to conduct the safety inspections required by state law and also meet the unfunded mandates currently proposed in the MOU.

Response: In response to comments expressing concerns about States not having sufficient resources to meet the information reporting obligations under the MOU, FDA announced a grant opportunity in June 2019, and awarded a cooperative agreement grant to NABP in September 2019 to establish an information-sharing system that will facilitate State information reporting to FDA by State Boards of Pharmacy or other appropriate State agencies that enter into the MOU with FDA. FDA expects that the system developed through this grant will help enable States to enter into MOU agreements with FDA by reducing the potential resource burden associated with the collection and sharing of information on compounded drugs.

In addition, as stated above, in the 2018 revised draft standard MOU, consistent with the 2015 draft standard MOU, the Agency proposed a 180-day period after the final standard MOU is made available for States to consider and sign the MOU before FDA intends to enforce the 5% limit. FDA invited public comment on whether this was an appropriate timeframe and some comments stated that more time may be necessary. FDA is considering the information in these comments as the Agency decides what timeframe to set for States to consider and sign the MOU after the final standard MOU is made available and before FDA intends to enforce the 5% limit.

Mr. Aderholt:

- What would be the impact if states are unable to comply with the MOU once it is finalized?

Response: Section 503A of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the FD&C Act) (21 U.S.C. 353a) describes the conditions that must be satisfied for drug products compounded by a licensed pharmacist or licensed physician to be exempt from certain sections of the FD&C Act. One of the conditions to qualify for the exemptions listed in section 503A of the FD&C Act is that: (1) the drug product is compounded in a State that has entered into an MOU with FDA that addresses the distribution of inordinate amounts of compounded drug products interstate and provides for appropriate investigation by a

State agency of complaints relating to drug products distributed outside such State, or (2) if the drug product is compounded in a State that has not entered into such an MOU, the licensed pharmacist, pharmacy, or physician does not distribute, or cause to be distributed, compounded drug products out of the State in which they are compounded in quantities that exceed 5 percent of the total prescription orders dispensed or distributed by such pharmacy or physician ("5 percent limit") (see section 503A(b)(3)(B)(i) and (ii) of the FD&C Act).

FDA intends to provide States with a period of time to consider whether to sign the final standard MOU after it is made available before enforcing the 5% limit in States that have not signed the MOU.

Pathogen Inactivation for the Nation's Blood Supply

Mr. Aderholt:

3. Safety and sustainability of the nation's blood supply is adversely affected by both existing and emerging pathogens. Potential contamination of blood components remains a significant concern. FDA's fiscal year 2020 budget requests $20 million for improved pathogen inactivation research. The Committee understands that robust pathogen reduction technology applies to whole blood collection that is than separated into various components (e.g. red blood cells, platelets, plasma) would "change the landscape".
   - What are FDA plans to expand its internal applied scientific research programs on pathogen reduction in fiscal year 2020?

   Response: FDA currently has a modest internal applied scientific research program on pathogen reduction. In FY2020, with additional funding and staffing, these intramural research efforts by FDA will be bolstered by organizing into a consortium of investigators who will work in a coordinated fashion to evaluate a variety of methods to determine their feasibility in pathogen reduction of whole blood. Two major aspects need to be studied: 1) the ability of a technology to inactivate a range of pathogens; and 2) the functionality of the blood components after exposure to the pathogen reduction technology. To enable these studies, there needs to be coordination between experts in a variety of infectious agents, as well as coordination with hematology experts to assess the function of blood components. The consortium will provide the structure and increased resources to support this more coordinated approach to enable screening of a variety of methodologies.

Mr. Aderholt:

- What are FDA plans to initiate collaborations with external academic and industrial partners to advance development of novel agents for pathogen reduction and optimize existing pathogen-reduction technologies?

Response: FDA currently has Cooperative Research and Development Agreements (CRADAs) with academia and industry to enable studies of pathogen reduction technologies through collaborations. Increased funding would enable expansion of the intramural work initiated under CRADAs as well as additional collaborative efforts with other academic and industrial partners through contracts and/or grants.

Mr. Aderholt:

- Roughly how much of the $20 million does FDA plan to spend "in-house", how much with academia, and how much with industry?

Response: FDA plans to spend approximately $2-$3 million to fund intramural research within the Agency. FDA plans to spend the remainder on contracts and/or grants externally, which could go to a mix of academic institutions, non-profit organizations, and industry.

Mr. Aderholt:

- What steps will FDA take to ensure that the government does not duplicate the capabilities in the private sector or cause the government to compete against industry?

Response: The FDA is actively monitoring private sector efforts in this area. A lack of significant progress in the private sector in development of whole blood pathogen reduction led FDA to request funds to stimulate the development of needed technologies in whole blood pathogen inactivation. We believe that the private sector is not likely to invest in this research, or to adopt such technology, unless there are efforts to make it less expensive, and that FDA is uniquely positioned to move such research forward. Thus, FDA does not view its efforts in pathogen reduction as competing with industry, but rather as developing data and methods that would enable industry to advance the development of pathogen reduction to further protect the safety of the blood supply.

Mr. Aderholt:

- Is it FDA's plan that all the funds in fiscal year 2020 for contracts or grants to industry go only to companies that are headquartered in the United States – that is, all to U.S. companies?

Response: FDA will follow all regulations that apply to the funding mechanisms ultimately chosen for the initiative.

Mr. Aderholt:

- What efforts would FDA make to capitalize on previous work with U.S. blood technology companies that have had successful FDA approval of pathogen reduction technologies for blood components?

Response: FDA already is capitalizing on previous work with US blood technology companies to evaluate licensed technologies for pathogen reduction of blood components (plasma and platelets) and determine if there are ways to optimize their technologies to

enable pathogen reduction of whole blood. For example, in 2018 CBER sought advice from its Blood Products Advisory Committee on the advantages and disadvantages of various strategies to control the risk of bacterial contamination in platelets, including the scientific evidence and the operational considerations involved.

Premium Cigars

Mr. Aderholt:

4. Companies comprising the vast majority of the cigar industry previously agreed with the Federal Trade Commission to include reasonably sized warning labels on packaging.

   Has FDA considered applying that standard rather than the standard spelled out in the deeming rule?

   Response: FDA carefully considered the existing Federal Trade Commission (FTC) warnings before deciding to require the warnings set out in the final deeming rule. For example, we note that FDA allowed companies to comply with the deeming rule's requirements in part by continuing to use the reproductive health warning previously required as part of the FTC agreement (81 Fed. Reg. 28974, 29071 (2016)). Nevertheless, FDA found that the new warning requirements were important to improving the public understanding of the health consequences of cigar use and were appropriate for the protection of public health (81 Fed. Reg. at 29064-66).

   Please note that the warning label requirement for cigars took effect in August 2018, however, FDA has issued a guidance document labeled "Compliance Policy for Certain Labeling and Warning Statement Requirements for Cigars and Pipe Tobacco." The guidance describes the July 5, 2018, order whereby the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia enjoined FDA from enforcing the warning requirements for cigars and pipe tobacco until 60 days after the final disposition of the plaintiffs' appeal in the case: *Cigar Ass'n of America v. FDA*, No. 1:16-cv-01460 (D.D.C.) (order granting injunction pending appeal); *see also Cigar Ass'n of America v. FDA*, No. 18-5195 (D.C. Cir.).

   FDA intends to comply with the court's order in *Cigar Ass'n of America v. FDA* and will not enforce the warning statement requirements for cigars and pipe tobacco until 60 days after the final disposition of Plaintiffs' appeal. In addition, the Agency does not intend to enforce the labeling requirements under sections 903(a)(2) and 920(a) of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act for cigars and pipe tobacco while the injunction remains in effect.

   As part of the Agency's comprehensive plan for regulation of nicotine and tobacco, in March 2018, FDA issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking (ANPRM) to provide an opportunity for the public to provide new information for the Agency to consider in the regulation of "premium" cigars. In particular, the Agency sought comments and scientific data related to how to define a "premium" cigar and the patterns of use and resulting public health impacts from these products. The Agency is currently

considering over 32,000 comments received in response to the ANPRM. In the meantime, all cigars remain subject to regulation based on FDA's previous determination that there was no appropriate public health justification to exempt "premium" cigars.

Vaping

Mr. Aderholt:

5. How quickly does FDA plan to implement its recently announced draft vapor guidance so that there are broad policy restrictions that apply uniformly to the vapor industry?

Response: The Administration continues to work diligently on the policy. The Agency remains committed to tackling the troubling epidemic of e-cigarette use among kids. Preventing youth access to and use of tobacco products, including electronic nicotine delivery systems, remains one of FDA's top priorities.

Mr. Aderholt:

6. Is the FDA conducting a public education campaign focused on the social sourcing issue that addresses the problem of 18 year olds providing vapor products to younger students?

Response: FDA expanded its successful "The Real Cost" public education campaign to address Youth E-Cigarette Prevention, aimed at educating teens about the dangers of e-cigarettes. The campaign targets nearly 10.7 million youth, aged 12-17, who have used e-cigarettes or are open to trying them, and features hard-hitting advertising on TV, digital and social media sites popular among teens. While most messaging focuses directly on the dangers of using e-cigarettes, specific ads highlight how e-cigarette use is being spread from friend to friend and therefore touch on access through social sources. In addition to a robust paid media plan to ensure teens see the messaging, FDA is extending our reach by placing posters with e-cigarette prevention messages in high schools across the nation for the second year in a row. FDA has again joined forces with Scholastic to provide educational resources to 450,000 high school educators and 900,000 middle school educators in the Fall of 2019 and the Spring of 2020. Resources include the National Youth Tobacco Survey (NYTS) infographic, an e-cigarette "mythbusters" infographic, lesson plans and activity sheets that all focus on the dangers of using e-cigarettes. All materials are available online at: www.scholastic.com/youthvapingrisks.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN ANDY HARRIS, M.D.

Processed Claims

Mr. Harris:

1. While I am happy that the U.S. and the E.U agreed last year to reopen portions of the molluscan shellfish trade, I am concerned that the proposal omits processed U.S. shellfish. Specifically, I am concerned about the quahog and surf clams (and other bi-valve shellfish) from Maryland that are losing the opportunity to compete in the European market, for no reason. Despite safe and well-recognized food safety practices at all points of the supply chain, U.S. processed clams are prevented from entering EU markets.
   My concern is that the FDA will resolve the underlying dispute regarding EU food safety controls for unprocessed molluscan shellfish without securing a commitment from the European Commission to lift its ban on processed molluscan shellfish products from U.S. exporters. Processed molluscan shellfish products, including clams processed in Maryland, are processed using a thermal process for shucking and an evisceration process that removes the digestive tract of these bi-valves. These products pose a low food safety risk.

- Why were the processed products denied entry into the EU despite being processed and safe--while we continue to accept EU's canned clams?

  Response: FDA agrees that it is essential to secure access to the European Union (EU) market for U.S. processed shellfish while the Agency is in the process of finalizing the equivalence determination for raw shellfish. From a technical standpoint, the Agency believes there is no justification for the EU ban on processed shellfish. FDA has made this point repeatedly to our counterparts at the European Commission (EC), explaining that the EU ban is not justified by principles of science and risk.

  FDA has communicated to the EC that the continued ban of U.S. processed shellfish products is unacceptable, and the Agency is pursuing a path forward under which the EU would grant access to U.S. processed shellfish from all states.

- Will the final agreement reached with the European Commission on this issue include lifting the EU ban on processed molluscan shellfish exports from the U.S?

  Response: FDA understands the importance of the EU market to U.S. exporters of processed shellfish. FDA currently is engaged in discussions with the EC to reach agreement on a mechanism that would provide access to the EU market for U.S. processed shellfish from all states, provided that the exported U.S. shellfish meet FDA requirements.

QUESTIONS FOR THE RECORD
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
FY 2020 BUDGET HEARING
APRIL 9, 2019

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CHAIRMAN SANFORD BISHOP JR.

ARS: Extramural Research Projects

1.

Mr. Bishop: The biosafety level-3Ag and level-4 biocontainment facility at the new National Bio and Agro-Defense Facility (NBAF) will increase federal laboratory capacity to study foreign animal diseases and emerging or zoonotic diseases with high potential consequence to animal and public health. However, until NBAF is online and fully operational in December 2022, USDA does not have the capability or facilities to conduct this research intramurally. Unfortunately, the Department's FY 2020 budget request proposes to eliminate the Agricultural Research Service's extramural research projects. I am concerned that the proposed elimination of extramural research in this area would pose an unreasonable threat to U.S. animal agriculture and public health.

Moreover, the FY19 Consolidated Appropriations Act included "an additional $5,000,000 for ARS to increase research efforts on foreign animal diseases and emerging diseases with high consequence to animal and public health." Present USDA facilities do not have the dedicated specialized space needed to support the study of emerging vector-borne and zoonotic foreign animal diseases. Where will USDA conduct this research until NBAF is operational?

Response: The President's Budget proposes to terminate some of the agency's extramural projects. Regarding foreign animal and emerging zoonotic disease research, the impact of the budget proposal to eliminate extramural funds would be limited to the work that is partially funded by ARS to leverage partnerships with foreign collaborators ($199,000). The fiscal year 2019 increase of $5,000,000 is being used to strengthen ongoing ARS research on foot and mouth disease, particularly vaccine development ($1,000,000); and to considerably strengthen on African Swine Fever, given the current spread of this disease throughout Eastern Europe and Asia ($2,000,000). The remaining funds ($2,000,000) are being used to develop a training program with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and University of California at Davis for work in BSL-4 facilities. ARS is focused on building the expertise to work on the BSL-4 viral disease agents Crimean Congo Hemorrhagic Fever (CCHF) and Henipah viruses, these are both vector-borne zoonotic diseases. The intent is to have scientists trained in BSL-4 facilities, with an independent research program ready to move into NBAF as soon as possible once NBAF reaches full operating capability.

FS/APHIS: Shutdown Delays

2.

Mr. Bishop: Secretary Perdue, I am interested to know how the most recent government shutdown impacted the review of permit applications within your Department. Has the shutdown caused a delay in the approval of certain types of permits within USDA and, if yes, how can Congress help the USDA expedite the approval of its pending applications? In addition, what can Congress do to help prevent these delays from occurring again in the near future.

Response: The recent government shutdown did have some impacts on the timing of our review and processing of permits due to employees being furloughed. We are working to simplify the permitting process and implementing online permitting for interested parties. For example, developed in FY 2018, and piloted in FY 2019, Forest Services' online permitting will enhance customer service from the Forest Service and increase economic benefits to communities.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN ROBERT ADERHOLT

RD: Infrastructure

3a.

Mr. Aderholt: Secretary Perdue, it is great to have you back before the subcommittee. I want to thank you for the work you have done to streamline program administration at USDA, particularly in school meal flexibility.

Also, I had dinner with some Alabama cattle farmers last week, and they had a few questions about what would happen with cell-cultured meat, and I reassured them that you and the team at USDA would look out for them, so thank you for your leadership on that issue.

Infrastructure is critical to every community. As you saw when you visited my home district in the 4th District of Alabama last spring, we are extremely lacking in the broadband space. As you are very aware, in the 2018 Omnibus, Congress created the ReConnect rural broadband pilot program. I understand the deadlines for the loan and the grant applications are due between May and July.

Do you feel like the process is on track for these applications to be awarded and implemented by the end of the year?

Response: USDA announced the first awards in the ReConnect program in October, and plans to obligate the full $600M in budget authority from the 2018 funding by the end of December.

3b.

Mr. Aderholt: USDA is a unique agency because you work with rural areas every day, and that is why I believe you are equipped and capable to efficiently deliver this program to the most vulnerable communities.

What is your vision for this pilot program for the future?

Response: USDA recognizes the important role of broadband connectivity to the economic prosperity of rural America. With that in focus, we have designed the ReConnect Program to make the greatest and most widespread impact as possible in rural communities across the nation. We are working diligently to prepare for our 2nd round of ReConnect funding and expect to announce the program rules this winter. To support that initiative, we continue to update our electronic Intake System and Mapping Platform to increase transparency and improve the overall customer experience.

As we move forward, we will continue to look for ways we can better partner with community leaders across the country and we will continue to work at the direction of President Trump to ensure that no community is left behind and that all Americans gain access to broadband connectivity.

3c.

Mr. Aderholt: Can you discuss how you and FCC Chairman Pai are coordinating between your agencies to ensure that taxpayer dollars are used most efficiently and that unserved areas have e-connectivity?

Response: The USDA works closely with its partners at the FCC through formal agreements, regular task force meetings, discussions, and data sharing to verify eligibility of those participating in USDA's broadband funding programs. The USDA plays a unique role in closing the digital divide due to our focus on rural economic development and our role as the only federal loan program that supports broadband investments.

The FCC is responsible for administering the Universal Service Fund (USF). FCC funding generally supports a percentage of a company's operating and capital expenses and is provided over time, while USDA loans and grants offer up-front capital needed to finance costly broadband construction. These costs, which many small companies and co-ops can't finance themselves, help deliver infrastructure investment. RUS funding requirements can also leverage and expand the footprint of the carrier receiving FCC support to ensure that broadband extends to the most rural households and sets construction standards designed to build robust systems.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSWOMAN CHELLIE PINGREE

OCE: Food Loss and Waste Liaison

4.

Ms. Pingree: The 2018 Farm Bill directed USDA to create a Food Loss and Waste Liaison. What is USDA's timeline for creating this new position?

Response: The Agriculture Improvement Act of 2018 (2018 Farm Bill) instructed USDA to establish a Food Loss and Waste Reduction Liaison to coordinate Federal, State, local, and nongovernmental programs, and other efforts, to measure and reduce the incidence of food loss and waste. The Farm Bill did not, however, provide funding for a liaison position. The Department has not created a new Food Loss and Waste Reduction Liaison position, but has delegated the responsibilities of the liaison to the Director of Sustainable Development in the Office of the Chief Economist. The Department will continue to evaluate the liaison position based on agency efforts and priorities as well as appropriated resources.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSWOMAN BETTY MCCOLLUM

FS: Rainy River Watershed, Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness

5a.

Ms. McCollum: Secretary Perdue, two years ago you testified before the Interior and Environment subcommittee, and at that hearing I asked you whether the mineral withdrawal study in the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness would continue.

Your response to me and the rest of the subcommittee was, and I quote:

"I think your statement regarding the two-year study over the sound science— none of us know what to do without the facts based and the sound science, and we are absolutely allowing that to proceed. You also know that your State has a shot at that after that recommendation as well. So, we are determined to proceed in that effort and let it run its course. No decision will be made prior to the conclusion of that."

Those were very reassuring words, but you failed to live up to them when you announced in September the abrupt cancellation of the mineral withdrawal study—20 months into a 24-month review—with a one-page press release, and we still have not seen any of the science behind this science-based decision.

I sent letters in November 2018 and again on March 1st 2019, along with Chairs from the Natural Resources Committee, asking for your agency to release the relevant documentation from the 20-month review.

Your own press release said the review included "a mineral resources report, a biological and economic impact assessment, and potential impacts to water resources, wilderness areas, and cultural resources."

- If you did have all these completed scientific reports as part of the environmental assessment before making your decision to cancel the withdrawal, why have they not been released to Congress and the public?
- If you didn't have these completed scientific reports to review before making your decision to cancel the withdrawal, what did you base your decision on?

Response: The documents being prepared for the withdrawal application were never finalized. The incomplete application package had not been reviewed by agency officials.

5b.

Ms. McCollum: The same month that you abandoned the mineral withdrawal proposal in Minnesota, the Forest Service recommended withdrawal of mineral leases on National Forest lands in Montana and Washington. All three of these withdrawals were proposed in response to the serious threat of acid drainage from gold and copper sulfide ore mines and were supported by the Governors of their respective states. Can you explain why the environmental assessment of Minnesota's withdrawal proposal was not completed and released like the other two?

Response: There are two methods for withdrawing Federal lands from mineral entry. The first is a legislative withdrawal where Congress legislates the permanent withdrawal of an area. The second method is an administrative withdrawal by the U.S. Department of the Interior. Administrative withdrawals from mineral entry can last up to 20 years. Once initiated, the administrative process need not reach completion; an application for withdrawal can be cancelled at any time. Each administrative withdrawal process independently moves through the withdrawal process steps; a decision on one withdrawal proposal is not related to the consideration of other withdrawal proposals.

APHIS: Chronic Wasting Disease

6a.

Ms. McCollum: Chronic Wasting Disease, or CWD, is a highly transmittable degenerative brain disease of cervids—including deer, elk, and moose—and has been found in both wild and farmed herds of deer.

In the same family as mad cow disease, CWD causes cervids to literally waste away—animals become very thin, have trouble standing up and walking, drink and urinate excessively, and have extreme trouble swallowing.

Currently, there is no vaccine or treatment for CWD, which is always fatal, but infected cervids can transmit to the disease during the silent incubation period, which can last years.

The USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) runs a voluntary Herd Certification Program to help control CWD in farmed cervids, but there aren't any mandatory eradication programs like those for mad cow disease or scrapie in sheep and goats.

The FY20 budget request for Equine, Cervid, and Small Ruminant Health within APHIS—the primary funding mechanism for CWD—is $16.5 million, a decrease from the $20.8 million that was appropriated in FY19.

Can you explain the decrease in spending for this program as we're seeing an increase in CWD across the country?

Response: At this time, there is a lack of tools to reduce the spread and eradicate CWD. While this fact remains, the limited resources available to address animal health diseases are best devoted to efforts for which we have seen progress in reducing or eliminating the spread of disease.

6b.

Ms. McCollum: Do you think USDA's current voluntary herd certification programs for farmed cervids is adequate to control the disease as we're dealing with it on the ground today?

Response: The current voluntary herd certification program was developed in consultation with industry and State partners. While we cannot say it is adequate to control CWD, the certification program does take into consideration the dynamics of captive cervid movement across multiple States.

6c.

Ms. McCollum: What additional resources would APHIS need to establish a program similar to scrapie or mad cow?

Response: The current understanding of how CWD is spread is not on par with the universal understanding of how bovine spongiform encephalopathy, also known as mad cow disease, and scrapie are spread. Given this fact, it is impossible to compare how the resource level for one compares to the resource level for the other.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY CONGRESSMAN MARK POCAN

APHIS: Animal Welfare Act Enforcement

7.

Mr. Pocan: I want to thank you for including an audit of dog breeders' compliance with the Animal Welfare Act in the Inspector General's FY2019 annual plan. I continue to be concerned about the precipitous decline in reported violations and enforcement of the Animal Welfare Act – two Washington Post articles covered this issue in the past 6 months and reported, respectively, that violations cited in inspection reports are down by 60 percent since last year and the number of enforcement actions have plummeted. I hope that the IG's audit will help explain this sharp drop in citations and enforcement actions and reveal where there are deficiencies with APHIS's inspection and enforcement program. What is the timeline for completion of the audit? Will you support the IG's recommendations on how the agency can ensure better compliance with the law?

Response: I share your interest in the welfare of animals. It is for this reason that we will be issued on March 22nd a proposed rule (Docket No. APHIS-2017-0062) that would, among other things, promote compliance and strengthen the standards of care for dogs under the Animal Welfare Act. We are anticipating a robust response from the public and will need some time to consider this input. Our expected publication date will be reflecting in our Fall 2019 Unified Agenda of Regulatory and Deregulatory Actions.

ARS: ARS Hiring

8.

Mr. Pocan: The Agricultural Research Service is a critical program for the continued growth and stability of the agricultural economy of the US. Presently, ARS has the capacity to staff about 7,900 employees. Unfortunately, ARS has only 5,600-5,700 positions filled, resulting in about a 28% vacancy rate. For example, the Wisconsin cranberry research facility's plant physiologist position has been authorized but never filled. This vacancy and the missed opportunity for fundamental cranberry growing research has been of great concern for the cranberry industry—we are hopeful that it will be filled soon. Why has there been a delay in hiring? Is there a prioritization system for which positions are filled? If so, what is the process for prioritizing one research area over another? Are all positions expected to be filled? If so, what is the timeline?

Response: The number of permanent ARS employees onboard as of August 2019 was approximately 5,100. ARS plans to recruit for 1,400 permanent positions in fiscal year 2020 to deal with attrition and achieve a level of approximately 6,00 permanent employees. The agency has experienced severe attrition among the Human Resources staff. To address this issue, ARS has prioritized the hiring of Human Resources professionals and leveraged contractor support to facilitate the completion of hiring actions. The ability to outsource routine HR actions and use contractors to train new hires will allow ARS Human Resources Specialists to focus more on recruitment.

Several key factors play a role in prioritizing positions for recruitment such as research impact and productivity of the management unit; importance of the position to the function of the entire management unit; number of vacancies in a management unit; and length of time the position has been vacant.

FSIS: Swine Slaughter Inspection Rule

9a.

Mr. Pocan: The agency proposed a new rule last February, "Modernization of Swine Slaughter Inspection." In the proposed rule, FSIS stated that "it recognizes that evaluation of the effects of line speed on food safety should include the effects of line speed on establishment employee safety." Do you agree with this statement?

Response: While FSIS agrees that safe working conditions in swine slaughter establishments are important, the Agency has neither the authority nor the expertise to regulate issues related to establishment worker safety. FSIS has been delegated the authority to exercise the functions of the Secretary of Agriculture under the Federal Meat Inspection Act (FMIA), the Poultry Products Inspection Act (PPIA; 21 U.S.C. 451 et seq.), and the Egg Products Inspection Act (EPIA; 21 U.S.C 1301 et seq.) (the Acts). Under these Acts, FSIS protects the public by verifying that meat, poultry, and egg products are safe, wholesome, not adulterated, and properly marked, labeled, and packaged. The Acts authorize FSIS to administer and enforce laws and regulations solely to protect the health and welfare of consumers.

The Department of Labor's Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) was created by the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 651 et seq.) to assure safe and healthful working conditions for men and women by setting and enforcing standards and by providing training, outreach, education, and assistance. OSHA is the Federal agency with statutory and regulatory authority to promote workplace safety and health. FSIS' authority with respect to working conditions in slaughter establishments extends only to FSIS inspection personnel.

FSIS worked with OSHA to develop a poster that establishments must display providing information on the signs and symptoms of occupational injuries and illnesses experienced by market hog slaughter workers, and about workers' rights to report these conditions without fear of retaliation (see 9 CFR 310.27). The final rule will also require establishments operating under NSIS to submit on an annual basis an attestation to the management member of the local FSIS circuit safety committee stating that the establishment maintains a program to monitor and document any work-related conditions of establishment workers (9 CFR 310.27). Because OSHA is the Federal agency with statutory and regulatory authority to promote workplace safety and health, FSIS will forward these annual attestations to OSHA for use in its own enforcement program. FSIS employees, however, will not be responsible for determining the merit of the content of the attestation or for enforcement of non-compliance with the attestation provision. OSHA and FSIS will continue to partner through a Memorandum of Understanding, to strengthen collaboration between FSIS inspectors and OSHA enforcement staff and ensure identification and reporting of safety hazards impacting working conditions of FSIS inspectors and those of establishment employees.

9b.

Mr. Pocan: In this proposed rule, the agency stated that it conducted a preliminary evaluation. However, the agency failed to provide the analysis, data and full methodology used to in the analysis in the docket, meaning the public was unable to provide comments on the agency's analysis and conclusions. There have been repeated requests to the agency to re-open the comment period, place the analysis in the docket and allow the public to comment. Will you place the data and analysis in the docket and allow the public to comment, and review any comments, before moving forward with final review and publication of this rule?

Response: All the data used for the analysis was publicly available on the OSHA's and FSIS' websites during the public comment period of the proposed rule. After the publication of the final rule, FSIS will also post the data in the FSIS Freedom of Information Act Electronic Reading Room. FSIS did not use the analysis to draw conclusions on worker safety in HIMP or non-HIMP establishments. FSIS' worker safety analysis was developed to solicit comment for use by OSHA and National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH).

9c.

Mr. Pocan: The evaluation completed by FSIS mentioned above, released following a records request after the comment period was closed, has been reviewed by experts who determined that the data analysis methods FSIS used were flawed. Among other flaws, the agency compared varying years and amounts of data of plants that were not randomly selected. Will you work with the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) to develop a new evaluation and conduct that prior to issuing any final rule?

Response: USDA used the best available data in the proposed rule. FSIS will continue to work with other Federal agencies to ensure the identification and reporting of safety hazards impacting working conditions of FSIS inspectors and those of establishment employees.

9d.

Mr. Pocan: According to the FSIS statement issued on April 8, 2019, "While FSIS recognizes that worker safety in swine slaughter establishments is a critical issue, the agency does not have the authority to regulate issues related to establishment worker safety." Does this mean that USDA can allow plants to increase line speeds and increase worker injuries? Does this mean once you allow a plant to increase line speeds and increase the pace at which workers are doing their job, then you will request that OSHA inspect that plant?

Response: USDA will require each establishment that operates under the New Swine Slaughter Inspection System to provide an annual attestation to the management member of the local FSIS circuit safety committee stating that the establishment maintains a program to monitor and document any work-related conditions that arise among establishment workers. FSIS will forward the annual attestations to OSHA for further review. OSHA, in turn, may use the information in the attestations in its own enforcement program.

WITNESSES

	Page
Hicks, Trey	1
Isley, Ken	1
Lipps, Brandon	207