

*Patrick Fine:* Welcome to all of our new and returning listeners. I'm Patrick Fine, CEO of FHI 360, and you're listening to *A Deeper Look* podcast. Before we get started, I'd like to invite you to subscribe to this podcast on Soundcloud, iTunes, or wherever you get your podcast, and please leave a review or comment. We'd love to hear from you.

This year, we're focusing on humanitarian crisis and emergency response, and today, we're going to discuss food security in crisis situations.

I'm fortunate to have Matt Nims, one of the U.S. government's senior experts on issues of food security and food aid, with me today. Matt is the acting director of USAID's Office of Food for Peace, which is the U.S. government's lead in addressing food insecurity worldwide in both emergency and development situations. Matt, welcome to the podcast.

*Matt Nims:* Thanks, Patrick. I'm glad to be here and excited to get into our discussion today.

*Patrick Fine:* I am too. I have so many questions to ask. First, let me just say a bit about Matt. Matt has worked on food issues at USAID for over 17 years. He started in Indonesia, where he oversaw development and emergency food assistance programs. In 2005, you were working on the response to the tsunami in Asia. Since then, you've been involved in responses to other natural disasters. Matt's also worked on health and HIV prevention programs and managed energy and water infrastructure programs in conflict settings such as Afghanistan.

So, he's one of those people who brings experience from both the development side and the humanitarian side, which is a great combination, and provides a really interesting perspective on the kinds of questions that we'll be discussing today. Since January 2017, Matt has held the position of acting director in the Food for Peace office at USAID.

So, let me jump in with a question to start the conversation. Can you give us a sense of your perspective on how the world is doing in addressing food insecurity in crisis situations?

*Matt Nims:* I do think it's important to talk about where we are right now in the world. How's the world doing, you know, food security wise? And unfortunately, the answer is we're not doing so good. The world is

actually trending in a negative direction. So, to put it in another way, since the Millennium Challenge Goals and all of these things the U.N. was pushing on food security and the number of hungry people in the world, we, the global community, were actually doing very, very well. Every year, the number of hungry people was reducing. I think there were a lot of reasons for this – increase of incomes and increase of trade.

But the recent U.N. report that came out, *The State of Food Security [and Nutrition] in the World*, looking at 2016 and forward, after more than 10 years of a downward trend – a reduction of people who were food insecure – has now seen that go the other way.

In fact, in '16, we saw an increase in the number of food insecurity. The U.N. [and] the food organizations were reporting reversal of this more than a decade trend of people being food insecure.

*Patrick Fine:* And is that primarily because of manmade complex emergencies, or is it more natural disasters driven by things like climate change?

*Matt Nims:* Climate change is a factor in this, but the major reason in this is primarily totally conflict, manmade conflict, you know, underline of “man” in this case.

And in '17, what we saw was an unprecedented level of food insecurity in the world. So, we have South Sudan, Nigeria, Somalia, and Yemen, where we were in famine in South Sudan or on the brink of famine in those three places.

*Patrick Fine:* So, we've heard a lot in the last year about the four famines. Now what you're saying is there was one declared famine in South Sudan –

*Matt Nims:* Correct.

*Patrick Fine:* And then the other three countries, which are Somalia –

*Matt Nims:* Nigeria and Yemen.

*Patrick Fine:* Nigeria and Yemen – are on the brink of famine.

*Matt Nims:* Exactly. So, 2017 was unprecedented levels since World War II as far as the number of highly food insecure people. As we turn the corner in 2018, we're not seeing very much of a decline on any of

this. The good news is, parts of southern Africa are seeing some more rain, and so the levels attributed to El Niño and other factors are looking better.

When we talk about food insecurity in the world, we have the international phase classification. You look at a situation on many given factors, and you're able to say on a scale of one to five, one meaning no food insecurity to five, the bad word, "famine," the "f" word in what we do. And if we look at the world, we're seeing more groups of people from three go to four or from two go to three.

So, especially in these four areas, we're seeing an intensification of the need. So, if we were to look at what's happening in '18 in these situations, the conflict is increasing, and the populations under siege – their ability to actually survive is being reduced. So, in those places – South Sudan especially, where we did have famine – the real possibility exists that we could be going into famine again in some of those areas.

*Patrick Fine:* What is the difference between the international community declaring that a country is experiencing famine versus being on the brink of famine or being highly food insecure? Is there a real difference?

*Matt Nims:* There is. It's unfortunate, but over time, even back since 1984, I think probably our listeners will remember that the '84 famine in Ethiopia led the community around food security to really develop hard and fast definitions on what constitutes a famine. So, when we use or start using the word famine or brink of famine, it's based on a very intense scientific measuring on what this constitutes. And what that is is basically three categories: 20 percent of a given defined population are having difficulty in accessing sufficient food for their daily caloric need.

*Patrick Fine:* So, they're under a certain calorie level per day.

*Matt Nims:* Correct. The 20 percent, let's say, of a community.

*Patrick Fine:* Is that 2,000 calories per day?

*Matt Nims:* It's 2,100 kilocalories per day is the standard. So, if 20 percent of a population in a given village cannot actually access that amount of calories, that is one factor towards a famine. The other one is that 30 percent of the children, of the population under 5, are acutely malnourished. So, the wasting measure, most commonly measured

through the middle upper arm circumference measure that maybe you've seen, maybe our audience is familiar with, the UNICEF and other, red, yellow, green.

*Patrick Fine:* Right. The body mass index measure.

*Matt Nims:* Correct. So, 30 percent of the children are in a severe or acutely malnourished situation. And two deaths per day per 10,000 people in the given population attributed to lack of food. All three of these have to exist in a given population for there to be a famine declaration. And it has to be data that is attributed through credible and accepted practices of data collection. So, in some certain cases where we don't have hard and fast data, the community then will not do a famine declaration. What this leads the community to believe is that sometimes, it's a very conservative definition. Unless we have all three of these indicators, we will not do "famine," which means that there could be other famine conditions existing, but we do not have access to those areas.

*Patrick Fine:* Right.

*Matt Nims:* This is exactly the case that we've been seeing for the last two plus years in Nigeria, in northern Nigeria. Our teams, the community –

*Patrick Fine:* The international community –

*Matt Nims:* Our food security, the international community, has not had access to large areas of Boko Haram-controlled territory. When we have over time been able to enter these areas, we're seeing horrific levels of food insecurity. You know, upwards of 60 percent of the children are acutely malnourished, if there are children left. So that is one of the major reasons Nigeria's on the list. There are still large areas that are not accessible, and it is mostly thought that the risk of famine is very, very high in northern Nigeria, especially as the lean season comes on board.

The situation in Yemen bears a little bit of discussion as well –

*Patrick Fine:* – Because that's now cited as the country that is facing the worst food insecurity in the world.

*Matt Nims:* The number of people in need of emergency food assistance is 17 million people –

*Patrick Fine:* 17 million –.

*Matt Nims:* In Yemen right now.

*Patrick Fine:* And when you say emergency food assistance, is that special high-nutrient products?

*Matt Nims:* What it really means is that without the delivery of some sort of assistance – food or some sort of voucher, you know, to allow them to purchase food – they would not be able to meet their daily requirements necessary for a family to survive.

*Patrick Fine:* So, that's 17 million people in Yemen, which has a population of about 27 million. So, more than half the population.

*Matt Nims:* At present, we are reaching through the World Food Programme and our NGO partners as a global community about 8 million people. So, there are still a large group of people that are not being met.

Another reason why Yemen deserves [a] further look is, Yemen is a country that imports 90 percent of its food. So, traditional food security approaches of trying to build agriculturally based sustainable operations is not what we can do in Yemen.

*Patrick Fine:* Because they don't have any water in Yemen.

*Matt Nims:* Exactly. Correct. And so, what we have is a very large, vulnerable group completely dependent upon the commercial sector to function, and I think that Yemen has one of the best examples of when you have conflict raging over time, you see a breakdown of these agricultural as well as these commercial markets, which leads to the destruction and degradation of the given population. And your more vulnerable elements of any population are going to be the first to feel that, and in Yemen, now, the vulnerable elements of population make up the majority of the whole population in Yemen. And so, our approach in Yemen, right now, is to ensure access to both the commercial markets as well as the humanitarian.

*Patrick Fine:* So, let me ask about that. In a case like Yemen – where food security is not dependent on people being able to grow their own food, it's dependent on the ability of commercial markets to import food, and then you have conflict, which disrupts those markets, which destroys the infrastructure like cranes and ports, the infrastructure to unload food at ports or through land corridors as well – in addition to just trying to meet the immediate need for

food so people don't starve, is there a strategy around reestablishing those commercial supply chains?

*Matt Nims:* Most assuredly so. And I think you hit it on the head. Each crisis is going to have its individual approach on how USAID Food for Peace as well as the international community comes together. In Yemen, the commercial sector is most definitely dominating how we try to address that situation. USAID with the World Food Programme just brought in four additional cranes to the port of Yemen to ensure the throughput of the port of Hodeidah continues. And to increase that throughput so that not just the humanitarian food that's coming in but the ever-needed and very, very crucial commercial sector continues to advance through that port. That is incredibly crucial because, as any of the operators in Yemen right now will say, the humanitarian engine cannot feed Yemen. There is no way that, from a humanitarian basis, we can do this. We need the muscle and the strength of the commercial sector to make this happen.

*Patrick Fine:* Right. Matt, we've framed the issue of food insecurity. I know that it's more than just hunger. What additional risks do you see and do you address through your programs that are not specific to hunger but that are part of a response to food insecurity?

*Matt Nims:* There are very close to 20 million people on the verge of famine. But there's also 800 million people in the world who are food insecure. And we need to look at those too. The adage is, you know, a hungry person is an angry person is a susceptible person. So, the idea of trying to address that to build a more stable situation so that we aren't having these people susceptible to extremist elements. This is good for the United States. This is good for the world.

*Patrick Fine:* So, that's a security perspective.

*Matt Nims:* Most definitely a security perspective. But then chronic malnutrition is really one of the leading causes of poor health, which impacts productivity, which impacts learning, which impacts the idea that you're going to have a productive citizen.

*Patrick Fine:* It actually robs a country and the citizens of the country of opportunity.

*Matt Nims:* And advancement. Food security, and the idea of healthy, food-secure people is a fundamental aspect of having a stable country that is economically viable and increasing over time. And that is a

lot of what we do beyond just saving those that are impacted by famine or the threat of famine.

*Patrick Fine:* Now, I've heard that the U.S. is the largest contributor to meeting humanitarian needs in the world, that the U.S. provides more assistance, not just food assistance, but overall assistance, to meet humanitarian needs generated by what you've described as a growing number of crises. How do you assess the overall architecture and effectiveness of the food security coordination amongst the world food program, the FAO, the international NGOs, the private sector businesses that are food providers? How has that evolved, and what does it look like today?

*Matt Nims:* That is a great question. I first of all very much appreciate that you're recognizing that the U.S. government, through offices like USAID Food for Peace, is the world leader on the food security front. We dominate through the volume and through dollar levels the international number of reaching those in need.

*Patrick Fine:* What's the proportion?

*Matt Nims:* The basic proportion is that the U.S. government provides about a third of the food security needs in the world, in the emergency section and the humanitarian sector. That is not a third in every situation, but global, if we were look at it, the U.S. has led. And that is very much above the rest of the world.

*Patrick Fine:* Right, any other individual country.

*Matt Nims:* As we go forward, I think it is important that the rest of the world, including nontraditional donors that maybe have not given to these types of international responses before, understand the value of why this happens and start actually putting money into these responses.

*Patrick Fine:* So, in terms of what you referred to as nontraditional donors, I assume you're talking about new, emerging donor countries, like China. China's now the third largest bilateral donor in the world behind the U.S. and Japan, and I've heard it's going to overtake Japan, maybe this year. Are they very active in the humanitarian sphere?

*Matt Nims:* Given those levels, they are not very active in the humanitarian sphere as of yet.

*Patrick Fine:* And are there efforts ongoing to try to bring them into food security coordination?

*Matt Nims:* There are. There are efforts, both, I think from our offices in USAID, as well as some through the U.N. itself. The World Food Programme, for example, has recently opened up an office in China to be able to help explain to the Chinese government the importance of what they do and how a more stable situation globally actually promotes trade for all countries. It is hoped that through these efforts, we can explain and further educate Chinese, as well as other governments, [on] the importance of this.

*Patrick Fine:* Right.

*Matt Nims:* Another big avenue would be how, in some of the Middle Eastern countries, you're seeing a more intensive effort to get them involved, again, away from just bilateral but also to understand the importance of an NGO and U.N.-led combined approach. So, there is a lot of bilateral assistance that is not captured or even known about as we mount these crises. And I think bringing in greater coordination on that level and a deeper understanding, let's just say, Saudi Arabia or Qatar, that they have a role to play, and being able to take credit for what they do and the resources that they give, and that those resources are given in a more coordinated manner, will lead to, I think, a more coordinated approach.

Your other question on how do we organize or how do we coordinate some of these responses. Efforts like the global food security cluster – which is housed in different offices within the U.N. but is funded by different donors – have proven how important having an on-the-ground, field-led coordination structure [is], where the different donors as well as the operators can come together to strategize on how to approach a given situation. The most effective clusters are ones that include a host government element that are able to bring the issues that are affecting the government at that time and to actually some element of leadership to those clusters as well. These have proven to be very, very effective as we go forward for these large crises.

When conflict is present, those normal systems break down, and it impedes the work of humanitarians as well as the commercial sector.

*Patrick Fine:* Right. What is the role that the private sector plays? And I'm not thinking so much of local operators, I'm thinking more of the large food companies. You know, you hear a lot on the development

side about private sector engagement, and you hear a lot of statements from private sector leaders about the importance of contributing to social good. It's a huge trend right now. I've seen less with respect to private sector engagement around humanitarian crisis, but you've pointed out the important role of commercial systems in addressing food security. What are you seeing with respect to private sector engagement and humanitarian crises?

*Matt Nims:*

I totally agree, Patrick, on your estimation that in the humanitarian assistance realm, there's not a lot of talk, or hasn't been traditionally, from the private sector. We've seen some different examples of that. Elements of the U.N. and even NGOs have partnered with, for example, certain delivery contract companies like Federal Express or even UPS or even global TNT type organizations to improve their own supply chain or to even piggy back on some of their logistic capacity in certain emergency situations. And those are the quick examples a lot of people in my community will throw forward. But by and large, as these disasters become prolonged, we haven't seen, I think, a real good engagement or relationship between the private sector and what we are doing.

It's not enough just to say, "Oh, a private sector involvement." It's where are the synergies that both entities can utilize so that the good actually helps on both sides.

*Patrick Fine:*

Right. Right.

*Matt Nims:*

So, it's a different way of approaching it internally for USAID. So, towards that goal, USAID is planning, in the upcoming months, a humanitarian grand challenge focused to bring in the private sector to help us develop those innovative solutions in the humanitarian assistance realm.

*Patrick Fine:*

That's really interesting, and it makes me think about what's new in addressing food security needs and crisis conditions. So, that would be one example of new approaches to engaging the private sector in addressing crisis.

So, you've been at this for almost 20 years. Over that period of time, is technology impacting the way we address food security issues in crisis? Are there new approaches that we're using in terms of data analytics or how we use information?

*Matt Nims:* I think most definitely, and especially on behalf of Food for Peace as an office.

What we've seen over the last eight years is the transformation of an office with only one major tool, that being in-kind food assistance – basically buying food from U.S. farmers and putting them primarily on U.S. ships to address an emergency situation and in the development setting. What we have seen over the past eight years is the inclusion of cash resources or more a market-based approach.

We've had new tools through Congress and through different changes of some of our legislation, as well as additional resources from other elements of Congress that have enabled Food for Peace, especially, to be able to buy food locally, or enable our partners to buy food locally, or even to develop voucher systems for those affected by conflict or in a food insecurity situation to access local markets. And in even certain cases, also just a cash distribution.

*Patrick Fine:* So, those are major developments, and I know there was a huge policy debate in the U.S. around allowing purchases in local countries, or even in the region, versus using surplus U.S. food.

*Matt Nims:* Congress has given USAID Food for Peace a different funding stream similar to regular disaster assistance money, which is what we use, and that is all primarily for local purchase or for a voucher type program.

*Patrick Fine:* Okay. So that's a huge reform with respect to how the U.S. operates.

*Matt Nims:* Very much.

But the innovative side of this, I think, has been a global understanding that we need to have a much deeper understanding of the existing market conditions that exist in these conflict situations.

*Patrick Fine:* And that ties into using private sector channels. So, if you're giving vouchers to access local markets, you're reinforcing the private sector solution.

*Matt Nims:* Exactly. And being able to understand that in many of these settings, a one type approach is probably not sufficient to address the problem you're trying to fix. But, we have learned how to use mobile phones and be able to rapidly set up cash distribution type

programs, or to enable mobile vouchers so that an affected community that has a functional market still existing can very quickly access resources to be able to protect their food security.

*Patrick Fine:* So, you're using mobile money?

*Matt Nims:* We're using mobile money. We are using global financial institutions to open up banking accounts to places that don't even have a banking infrastructure. In many ways, the humanitarian situation is creating more utilization of these modern tools in places that normally would not have access to that.

*Patrick Fine:* So, one of my memories from working in refugee camps was distributing food and trying to have a system in place where we could identify who had received food. They had wristbands at one point. They would dip their fingers in ink in another time. And now, I've read about the use of biometrics, but I've also read about controversy. What's your thinking about that?

*Matt Nims:* I think first that it's incredibly impressive to acknowledge that in some of the most dynamic conflict and displacement situations, our international partners, NGOs and the U.N., can set up a system that can read the retina of an intended beneficiary to ensure all the effort to identify those in need are actually getting the resources that they need, that those that we have targeted are the ones that are receiving that aid. When you go out and find the people who are in need who fit your criteria, they are going to utilize those resources that are transferred in the way that it is intended, and we're going to have less leakage and all of that. So, it's incredibly important that we do have these measures.

The debate that you talk about is now, we've got these institutions that have traditionally not had such levels of data on very vulnerable groups of people.

*Patrick Fine:* Right.

*Matt Nims:* And we have been talking about that very openly in forums, and I think that elements of the U.N. and the NGOs have been very good at putting in protocols and protections of these databases.

I think when it first started, let's say, you know, it's five or six years ago, the emphasis was just getting the tools in place to be able to ensure the person who we're targeting is the person that they are, and there was a lot of buzz on just utilizing this technology quickly. I think in the last couple of years, you've seen

a real understanding on behalf of our implementing partners of the importance of this data and how to protect it.

I definitely think that the community has risen to the challenge to adopt and even further develop some of these tools. I also think that there's still a lot of work left to do. There are other tools out there that the humanitarian community needs to adopt to ensure that we are on the cutting edge.

The famine early warning system, FEWS Net, which has been a cutting-edge example of being able to look at all the data that's out there in the world through satellite imagery, through market-based interviews of teams on the ground to nutritional data, bringing that all together to be able to forecast events. This is a tool that we have honed over 30 years here at the USAID. Food for Peace is the funder of this, and what it has allowed us to do is to harness different U.S. government agencies take cutting-edge science and data, turn that into a formula to be able to, with growing levels of confidence, say, "In six months, we are going to have a severe food security situation in a given country."

And I think that's a lot of what we saw in the El Niño situation in – 2016. We saw it coming, and the FEWS Net data analysis and the informational products that USAID Food for Peace pushed out really changed the dynamic. What Food for Peace did with that information is, we put over 600,000 tons of commodity on ships to southern Africa, primarily to Ethiopia, because we knew that this was coming. And the impact of the El Niño drought on Ethiopia in 2016 was greatly reduced. We were able to get in front of it.

The other major reason why this drought did not have as much impact as, let's say, in 1984, when actually the drought was not as severe, another major reason besides our fast action was the capacity of the Ethiopian government, was the fact that we as the international community led by USAID and Food for Peace, over the last 20 years, had been building the capacity of the government and these communities to withstand this shock. So, when it did come, even though the scale was larger than in '84, the amount of those impacted and the amount of those that suffered was less than in '84 because we had this resilient system built up and quite frankly, basically the Ethiopian government themselves came in with over 700 million of their own resources to, in a sense, combine together to have that collaboration from the international community and Ethiopia to address the situation.

*Patrick Fine:* So that's a great example of resilience. We talk a lot about resilience. They're putting their own resources, and they're matching that with partnership with the international community, and the result is that the impact of a potentially devastating humanitarian crisis is much, much less. It's actually mitigated.

*Matt Nims:* Which brings us to why we are so concerned about what we see in the world right now. For resilience to be achieved at that scale, you need government, and you need the longer-term investments that are in place there. And what we see right now is due, again, primarily to conflict, is that all of those systems are breaking down, and to be able to address that, humanitarian assistance can only do so much. We need more stability brought in through bringing the political and diplomatic forces to bear in these situations.

It used to be that the humanitarian assistance machine architecture was built on responding to climactic or natural disasters, and we prided ourselves, you know, within 24, 48 hours, we're going to have a team on the ground. We're going to be working with people there, and we're going to save lives immediately. After six months, you know, we had, in a sense, done what we were going to do. We were going to pass this off hopefully, and we can start the rebuilding process. And that marked, I would say, a good decade and a half of development of this tool.

That was I would say, 80 percent of what humanitarian assistance was, was just geared towards the humanitarian, you know, natural disaster response. Now, what we're seeing – and literally, in a four- to five-year period – is a complete reversal. What we're seeing is 80 percent of what the community does are these longer-term engagements due to conflict. So, we're going in, and instead of having this ramp down, the whole community has been having to operate for three, four, even five years in these situations. So, you're burning out your humanitarian engine, your humanitarian framework, because it's really not designed to do that for that long.

*Patrick Fine:* It's a chronic situation.

*Matt Nims:* And it's become a chronic situation, but we're still, in many instances, trying to treat it as a humanitarian Band-Aid.

*Patrick Fine:* Right.

*Matt Nims:* And what we've realized and figured out, and I echo the voices of people I have heard in the field, in Somalia, in elements of Yemen,

in the Syria conflict is, we can't do this anymore. We've reached our point. We need the higher-level diplomatic engagement to come in here and fix this problem. We are not going to "humanitarian assistance" our way out of this situation. And I think that's one of the bigger messages that we want to see going forward from this is, we are seeing global trends going downward. We're seeing us adopting on the humanitarian side, new approaches, new strategies to try and alleviate and address some of these concerns, but that's only going to get us so far.

*Patrick Fine:* But there are limits.

*Matt Nims:* There are limits to that.

*Patrick Fine:* There are limits to what can be accomplished with humanitarian assistance and that in the long term, the real solutions lie in diplomacy, and in reconciliation, and in approaches that support stabilization, so communities themselves can reconstitute themselves.

*Matt Nims:* Exactly correct.

*Patrick Fine:* So, looking at the current year, 2018, what do you see as the big challenges that you'll be facing?

*Matt Nims:* As I look at the unprecedented level of need that we had in 2017, as we transition to '18, I am not confident that we're trending in the in a right direction. The conflicts are definitely continuing to rage, and there [are] still high levels of food insecurity on top of that.

In addition to all of this, what we're seeing in now, almost every country I think in Africa, is the onset of fall armyworm.

*Patrick Fine:* What is fall armyworm?

*Matt Nims:* So this is a pestilence. This is pest that actually is prevalent in other countries of the world which has now established a foothold in Africa.

*Patrick Fine:* It's not indigenous to Africa?

*Matt Nims:* It is not indigenous to Africa, and it is highly, highly destructive to the maize and grain crops of countries around the region.

*Patrick Fine:* To the staple crops.

*Matt Nims:* To the staple crops, around the region. The international community is beginning to mobilize. USAID has set up a task force to be able to look at this. We're already seeing certain countries, Malawi, for instance, just issued a disaster declaration in the whole of Malawi because of the impacts on the crop season.

As we as a community look at this, this is one of those where we're going to need high levels of coordination and cooperation between implementers as well as host governments. Again, one silver bullet is not going to be enough. We're going to need cooperation on utilization of pesticides and bio crops to be able to resist.

This could lead to drastic reduction of available food in the region that needs it most.

*Patrick Fine:* And is it centered in southern Africa?

*Matt Nims:* It has been in western Africa, in eastern Africa and southern Africa, in some of the breadbasket areas of Uganda.

What's incredibly scary to the experts, to people at the food and agriculture organization as well as some of our team in USAID, is how fast this has spread across Africa.

*Patrick Fine:* Wow.

*Matt Nims:* And because it is not indigenous or it is not something Africa is used to, the impact of this could be incredibly severe.

*Patrick Fine:* Matt, thanks so much for being here. Thanks for sharing your perspective, and giving this view of both the challenges of food insecurity in crisis situations and the way the U.S. government and the broader international community are responding to those challenges.

*Matt Nims:* Patrick, I really want to say thank you for allowing me the opportunity to sit down and talk with you about these things. What we do is important, and being able to express that passion, you know, makes me happy. So, thank you for that opportunity.

*Patrick Fine:* Yeah. Well, it's heartening to me. It's heartening to me to hear people who are on the front line like you who bring passion to the

work because that makes the difference.

And thank you, again, to our listeners, both new listeners and returning listeners. I hope you enjoy this discussion today. Send us your comments on Soundcloud or iTunes and leave us a review. You can listen to previous episodes of *A Deeper Look* – both from this season and from last season, where we were dealing with the Sustainable Development Goals. And stay tuned. Throughout this year, we'll continue to explore pressing issues related to crisis response. Join us next month for another conversation.