



Risk Management Guide

PROBLEM STATEMENT

FFP operates in emergency, unstable, and otherwise non-traditional environments that USDA has not historically administered. Risk assessment, third-party monitoring, program evaluation, and implementing-partner personnel safety all require methodologies adapted to environments where standard pre-engagement diligence is unavailable.

WHY IT MATTERS

The Risk Management Guide is the operational core of the FFP transition. Without it, USDA assumes the risk surface of emergency programming without the tools to manage it.

HSG'S APPROACH

1. Build the risk-assessment framework for FFP-eligible countries where standard diligence is unavailable — drawing on Maurice House's execution of the first U.S. wheat export to Taliban-led Afghanistan, the canonical case.
2. Inherit USAID FFP Office Monitoring, Evaluation & Reporting Policy & Guidance V2.0 M&E baseline for DFSA-equivalent activities. Evaluate for adoption-as-is, modification, or USDA-grade replacement.
3. Treat GAO-17-224 (International Food Assistance: USAID Has Controls for Implementation) audit-readiness baseline USDA inherits and improves upon. The Risk Management Guide explicitly closes any GAO-17-224 finding USDA carries forward.
4. Design third-party monitoring decision criteria — when third-party monitoring is appropriate, contract architecture, cost-benefit framework.
5. Develop evaluation methodologies adapted to insecure environments.
6. Build the USDA international field-office relationship architecture for cases where field office and activities are in different countries.

EXPECTED DELIVERABLES

- Risk Management Guide (PWS Deliverable 5) — month 7
- Risk-assessment framework with limited-information scenarios
- USAID FFP M&E V2.0 inheritance and adoption assessment
- GAO-17-224 audit-readiness baseline carry-forward plan
- Third-party monitoring decision tree
- Insecure-environment evaluation methodology
- USDA field-office-to-third-country relationship architecture

EXPECTED OUTCOME

USDA can scope, monitor, and evaluate FFP operations in non-traditional environments with documented methodology that survives OIG scrutiny.

ENGAGEMENT TEAM

PRIMARY LEAD

Maurice W. House

Senior FAS Advisor · Title II Subject-Matter Expert

CONTRIBUTORS

Kevin Latner

Senior FAS Advisor · Food for Progress Monetization SME · Cross-Cutting Programs Lead
