

# Global Food Security by the Numbers

By Charles Hanrahan

September 2015



## Executive summary

- ▶ Research suggests that investments in global food security alleviate poverty, spur economic growth, promote social stability, and enhance the resilience of communities and countries in low-income regions of the world.
  - ▶ US investments in global food security have been largely successful in supporting development while fostering strategic relationships and positioning American businesses to take advantage of markets of growth.
  - ▶ In spite of these efforts—and strong evidence of their impacts—it is challenging to evaluate how global food security funds are being invested because of outdated definitions and opaque budgeting practices. This will become increasingly problematic as policymakers evaluate the effectiveness of investments and the need to sustain them over the long term.
  - ▶ This paper lays out what is known about current US investments in global food security and makes recommendations for how to clarify and track investments across a range of agencies, with the goal of strengthening America's commitment to alleviating hunger and spurring agriculture and food system growth over the long term.
- ▶ Currently, four challenges are making it difficult to evaluate US investments:
    - There is no unanimous view on which US investments and activities contribute to global food security. For example, some stakeholders focus exclusively on Feed the Future, while others devote attention primarily to food aid. Investments in agricultural research and international postconflict reconstruction are almost never discussed. An updated definition that takes into account the range and interconnected nature of investments related to global food security is needed.
    - Although Feed the Future attempts to utilize a “whole-of-government” approach by coordinating the entirety of US government agencies engaged in food security, the role of different agencies and mechanisms for collaboration are opaque, making it difficult to leverage strengths across the government. Agencies are also defining “global food security” and “global agricultural development” differently, making it challenging to track investments.
    - Within Feed the Future it is difficult to identify which transformative investments should be scaled up because it is unclear how some global food security funds are being directed.

- Details on funding for improved nutrition, a necessary and increasingly recognized aspect of global food security, are unclear, making it difficult to craft effective, cross-sectoral interventions.
- ▶ To address these challenges, The Chicago Council recommends the following:
  - **Recommendation 1**—Global food security assistance should be consistently defined as funds directed towards agricultural development, nutrition interventions, food aid, and agriculture and food research.
  - **Recommendation 2**—The US government should provide a more detailed accounting of how Feed the Future and nutrition monies are being spent.
  - **Recommendation 3**—The US government should better leverage the strengths of federal agencies and assign clear agency roles and responsibilities. Members of Congress should consider legislatively strengthening coordination and consultation between the 11 agencies involved in global food security activities, especially between the US Agency for International Development (USAID) and the US Department of Agriculture (USDA) on the Feed the Future research strategy and food aid initiatives.
  - **Recommendation 4**—Congress should provide leadership by authorizing a long-term commitment to global food security.

## Introduction

Experts predict food production must increase 60 percent by 2050 to meet the demands of a growing global population.<sup>1</sup> This challenge becomes even more complex when considering the need to help curb rising rates of micronutrient deficiencies and diet-related chronic disease—and ensure the development of local markets that empower smallholder farmers, many of whom are women—by growing more nutrient-rich foods like fruits, vegetables, and pulses.

In response, after decades of declining investment in agricultural development, new research, new players, and additional resources have cropped up across the agricultural landscape.<sup>2</sup> US investments through Feed the Future, a US program to advance food security overseas, have largely been successful,

supporting important strategic relationships, yielding notable gains in alleviating poverty, combating malnutrition, and positioning US business to take advantage of growing markets. The US Department of Agriculture (USDA) began funding research with both US and international implications, examining the impacts of natural resource shortages, climate change, and nutrition challenges on food production.<sup>3</sup> The National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health have expanded research in agriculture and nutrition science. Country compacts made through the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC) are supporting rural infrastructure in low-income countries, helping to facilitate agricultural markets and attract business investment. And nutrient fortification efforts are getting increased attention from the Centers for Disease Control.

These efforts have yielded dramatic results:

- ▶ More than 12.5 million children have been reached with nutrition interventions,<sup>4</sup> and stunting has declined by 33 percent in Ghana and 9 percent in Ethiopia, in part due to US government interventions.<sup>5</sup>
- ▶ Nearly seven million farmers and food producers are improving their yields due to new technologies. For example, in Honduras average incomes of Feed the Future beneficiaries increased 55 percent between 2012 and 2014.<sup>6</sup>
- ▶ Sales of nutrient-rich crops are on the rise, amounting to \$66.5 million in 2013.<sup>7</sup>
- ▶ More than \$4 billion in private-sector monies have been committed to making food systems in low-income countries more productive.<sup>8</sup>

US investments have occurred alongside a global resurgence in funding for agriculture in developing countries. Because so many people in low-income

---

***Research has shown that investments in agricultural development are one of the best mechanisms to advance food security while also spurring economic growth, alleviating poverty, and promoting social stability.***

---

countries work in agriculture, investments in rural development have spurred growth in African economies and have reduced the number of people living in abject poverty worldwide by more than 200 million.<sup>9</sup>

With a burgeoning global population expected to surpass nine billion by 2050 and an increasingly volatile climate, ensuring that our food system is abundant, reliable, and nutritious has never been a more important task. Research has shown that investments in agricultural development are one of the best mechanisms to advance food security while also spurring economic growth, alleviating poverty, and promoting social stability.<sup>10</sup>

Given the significant return that investments in agriculture yield, it is no surprise that legislation to institutionalize these commitments over the long-term has been introduced in both chambers of the US Congress. To aid Congress in this effort, The Chicago Council has undertaken an effort to map the types of American investments that are driving success in agricultural development and explore the effectiveness of government agency collaboration. This report is the culmination of that research, which includes recommendations for decision makers.

## The road to a long-term commitment to food security

The global food price crisis of 2007–08 led to widespread political and economic instability. With most of the chronically hungry living in rural areas in developing countries, the crisis focused world leaders' attention on the role of agriculture in reducing hunger, extreme poverty, and malnutrition. Currently, 795 million people suffer from chronic hunger, much of which is rooted in poverty.<sup>11</sup>

Beginning in the Bush administration and continuing under President Obama, the United States has begun to increase its funding for agricultural development and food security programs. Previously, US agricultural development assistance had been on

---

***Between 2008 and 2012 the United States provided a total of \$11.5 billion to developing country agriculture, and between 2013 and 2015 Congress appropriated more than \$1 billion annually to agricultural development assistance.***

---

the decline for more than two decades. According to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's Development Assistance Committee, US support for agricultural development fell from

\$1.037 billion in 1985 to just under \$300 million in 1997. Beginning in the mid-2000s, however, US agricultural development assistance began to trend upward.<sup>12</sup> Oxfam calculated that between 2008 and 2012 the US provided a total of \$11.5 billion to developing country agriculture.<sup>13</sup> In fiscal years 2013 through 2015 Congress appropriated more than \$1 billion annually for agricultural development assistance.

Tracking and evaluating these initiatives is imperative to measuring success, expanding effective programs, and ensuring continued funding. Yet given how quickly investments in global food security have evolved, the Council's research has identified four challenges to evaluating US investments:

- ▶ There are inconsistent definitions of the investments and activities that support global food security.
- ▶ There is a lack of clarity about how the "whole-of-government" approach to global food security is being implemented and how agencies' strengths are being leveraged.
- ▶ It is difficult to identify which transformative investments should be scaled up because it is unclear how some global food security funds are being directed.
- ▶ Details on funding for improved nutrition, a necessary and increasingly recognized aspect of global food security, are unclear, making it difficult to craft effective, cross-sectoral interventions.

As the Obama administration wraps up, policymakers and advocates are thinking about how to institutionalize recent advancements in programming and coordination and ensure progress is not lost. In the 114th Congress, legislation has been introduced in both the House and Senate to effectively codify Feed the Future. Separate legislation that would significantly alter traditional food aid programs has also been introduced in the Senate. How Congress deals with these bills could largely determine the future of US food security assistance.

## Mapping of US food security investments

The US investments and activities that advance global food security fall roughly into three categories:

- ▶ **Part I**—US Feed the Future initiative, which includes bilateral agricultural development and nutrition assistance; multilateral programs such

as the World Bank's Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), the UN World Food Program, International Fund for Agricultural Development, and Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations; and companion investments through the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition

- ▶ **Part 2**—International food aid programs
- ▶ **Part 3**—Agricultural research programs

## Part I— Feed the Future

More than half of the world's poorest people live in rural parts of the developing world and rely on agriculture for their livelihoods.<sup>14</sup> Growing their incomes and yields is twice as effective at reducing poverty as investment in other sectors.<sup>15</sup> Furthermore, investing in agricultural growth overseas positions the United States to tap future markets. Africa and Asia are home to the world's fastest-growing economies, and the value of Africa's food and agriculture sector is expected to reach \$1 trillion by 2030.<sup>16</sup>

The United States has recognized these challenges and opportunities, and in June 2009 at the G8 Summit in L'Aquila, Italy, President Obama pledged \$3.5 billion over three years (FY2010 to FY2012) to a food security initiative to address hunger and poverty worldwide.<sup>17</sup> The US commitment was part of a pledge of more than \$22 billion by G8 and G20 countries and others to address global food security.<sup>18</sup> The L'Aquila declaration called for donors to increase their contributions to agricultural development assistance and to provide the assistance in a new way—a way that supports comprehensive investments through country-owned plans. The declaration also called upon donors to continue providing emergency assistance and to support national safety nets and nutrition schemes, noting that such assistance can meet the needs of people suffering from acute hunger.

In May 2010 the United States officially launched the global hunger and food security initiative called Feed the Future. The US Department of State was the lead agency in developing the Feed the Future strategy, while the United States Agency for International Development (USAID) became the primary agency responsible for coordinating its implementation. Nine other agencies contribute to Feed the Future, which is meant to be a “whole-of-government” effort.

### Box 1

#### Five Principles for Sustainable Food Security

The five principles for sustainable food security endorsed at the 2009 World Summit on Food Security in Rome are:

- ▶ supporting comprehensive strategies,
- ▶ investment through country-owned plans,
- ▶ improving stronger coordination among donors,
- ▶ leveraging effective multilateral institutions, and
- ▶ delivering sustained and accountable commitments.

Feed the Future builds on five principles for sustainable food security articulated in the L'Aquila declaration and subsequently endorsed at the 2009 World Summit on Food Security in Rome<sup>19</sup> (see box 1). The two primary objectives of Feed the Future are (1) to accelerate inclusive agricultural sector growth and (2) to improve the nutritional status in developing countries, particularly of women and children. Feed the Future is focusing activities in 19 developing countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, and Latin America and the Caribbean. It integrates three cross-cutting priorities—gender, environment, and climate change—into its investment activities in focus countries. To promote inclusive economic growth, Feed the Future investments target agricultural research and extension, agricultural production/productivity enhancement, and linkages between producers and value chains that incorporate sustainability, gender equality, and women's empowerment. Nutrition assistance in focus countries concentrates on nutrition interventions, especially during the 1,000-day period between pregnancy and a child's second birthday.

USAID's 2015 Feed the Future progress report is the first that has been able to report on more than baseline data for poverty reduction in three regions (Bangladesh, Honduras, and Uganda), and stunting reduction in five (Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Kenya). To measure progress in these two top goal areas, Feed the Future began a second round of indicator assessments and population-based surveys. The report focuses on the early impacts gleaned from the first round of data collection. Through 2015 and 2016 USAID has planned to roll out a series



## Role of Nutrition in Feed the Future

Stunting (reduced height for age) is a well-established child health indicator of chronic undernutrition. It is widely documented that nutrition interventions focused on the critical 1,000-day window from pregnancy to a child's second birthday can have a profound impact on the child's health and ability to grow and learn. Notably, agricultural growth is associated with greater reductions in stunting than nonagricultural growth. Yet the full potential of agriculture to improve the nutrition of vulnerable farming families as well as the general population has yet to be realized.

Feed the Future aims to realize the potential for agricultural development and enhanced food systems to improve nutrition through providing greater access to diverse, nutritious diets. Feed the Future's objective is to reduce stunting rates by 20 percent in the areas where it works. Nutrition activities include direct interventions, research, capacity building, and policy formulation at national and international levels. The initiative also contributes to the evidence base by demonstrating how agricultural interventions may positively affect diet, nutrition, and the health of rural families. For the rural households targeted, agriculture is the primary way people make a living. Feed the Future nutrition interventions aim to:

- ▶ increase access to nutrition services and behavior change messaging;
- ▶ improve hygiene and sanitation;
- ▶ support the cultivation, storage, postharvest processing and consumption of nutrient-dense crops; and
- ▶ empower women in agriculture.

In their 2015 progress report, USAID documented impressive results, especially in their efforts to reduce stunting. In five key focus countries—Bangladesh, Cambodia, Ethiopia, Ghana, and Kenya—stunting rates have fallen as low as 18.8 percent, or a reduction of 33 percent in regions where Feed the Future operates. In Kenya nutrition interventions through Feed the Future programs, among other US government efforts, have reached more than three million children under the age of five and provided nutrition training to more than 6,000 health-care providers, community health workers, and agriculture extension agents just in 2014 alone.

Often cited by USAID as crucial to their wider nutrition efforts, especially in places such as Cambodia, the USDA's McGovern-Dole School Feeding and Child Nutrition Program contributes to improving the nutrition and food security of school-aged children, pregnant or lactating mothers, and infants and provides training to community members on child health and nutrition.

of reports covering additional impact data as it becomes available.

Feed the Future is not a permanently authorized statutory program. It is funded through the framework provided by the Foreign Assistance Act. Since its launch five years ago, the initiative has evolved to leverage research, multilateral assistance, and public-private partnerships.

### A growing focus on international research

International agricultural research and capacity building are critical to accomplishing Feed the Future's objectives of reducing global hunger, poverty, and malnutrition. In May 2011 the US government released its Feed the Future research strategy to guide investments, the result of a year-long collaboration by USAID with USDA, US universities, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), and other international research organizations and the private sector.<sup>20</sup> The strategy calls for an approach

called *sustainable intensification*, defined broadly as producing more and better food without depleting natural resources, while helping farmers in developing countries to adapt to climate change. Investments under the strategy include a focus on longer-term research and capacity building as well as applied and adaptive research on near-term impacts.

Collaboration between USAID and USDA in implementing the research strategy is a major component of Feed the Future's whole-of-government approach. Other partners include innovation labs (formerly known as Collaborative Research Support Programs) at US universities, international research centers such as the CGIAR, and select private-sector firms that can assist in bringing innovations to scale. Where possible and appropriate, the National Science Foundation and National Institutes of Health can also assist with research efforts.

USDA has been uniquely positioned to provide research support and has focused on research invest-

## Food Security Innovation Center and Innovation Labs

A Feed the Future Food Security Innovation Center (FSIC), established within USAID's Bureau for Food Security, leads implementation of the Feed the Future's research strategy. The strategy calls for the FSIC to organize projects through seven "challenge" areas:

- ▶ Climate-Resilient Cereals
- ▶ Legume Productivity
- ▶ Advanced Approaches to Control Pests and Diseases
- ▶ Research on Nutritious and Safe Foods
- ▶ Markets and Policy Research
- ▶ Sustainable Intensification
- ▶ Human and Institutional Capacity

One important function of the FSIC is to intensify efforts to scale up promising agricultural technologies on a country or regionwide scale. The New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition and the Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA) will partner with USAID in the scaling up effort, according to the strategy document.

**Innovation labs.** Feed the Future has established 24 innovation labs that enable USAID to draw on the expertise of US universities and developing country research institutions. The labs are led by US universities. The predecessor of the labs is the Collaborative Research Support program, which was established in Title XII of the 1975 reauthorization of the Foreign Assistance Act.

ments that can yield both domestic and international gains through the Norman Borlaug Commemorative Research Initiative.<sup>21</sup> Partnership between USAID and USDA is based on the principle that agricultural research can provide results that will lead to increased agriculture productivity both in the United States and developing countries. Such "dual use" research includes adaptation of crops to climate change, production of livestock vaccines to recalcitrant infectious diseases, and efficiency in water and energy use in agriculture.

### Leveraging multilateral approaches

In addition to bilateral engagement, the United States also has committed to provide funding for multilateral efforts to address global food security. The most significant is to the World Bank's Global Agriculture and

Food Security Program (GAFSP), a trust fund launched in 2010 at the request of G20 leaders in 2009. The primary objective of GAFSP is to improve the food security and livelihoods of the poor in developing countries through more effective public- and private-sector investment in the agricultural and rural sectors.

The United States joined 10 donors to pledge a total of \$1.4 billion to GAFSP. Other donors include Australia, the Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, Canada, Ireland, Japan, Korea, Netherlands, Spain, and the United Kingdom. As of November 30, 2014, \$1.37 billion or 93 percent of the total pledge has been received.<sup>22</sup> GAFSP financing is available to World Bank member countries eligible for the International Development Association. As of the end of 2014, GAFSP had allocated \$912.5 million to public-sector projects in 245 countries and \$44 million to private-sector projects. Sixteen of the Feed the Future focus countries have received GASFP funding since 2010.<sup>23</sup> The United States also supports the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), an organization focused on rural poverty reduction, malnutrition alleviation, and improving livelihoods.

### Forging public-private partnerships

Launched in 2012, the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition is a public-private partnership that aims to promote and expand global investment in food security and nutrition, building on previous G8 efforts.<sup>24</sup> The New Alliance is a shared commitment among African governments, private-sector business, and high-income country donors like the United States to raise 50 million people out of poverty by 2022 through investments in agricultural development.

Feed the Future serves as the principal vehicle through which the United States contributes to the New Alliance. The New Alliance includes nine African countries—Benin, Burkina Faso, Cote d'Ivoire, Ethiopia, Ghana, Malawi, Mozambique, and Tanzania—and aligns policy reforms, private investment intentions, and donor commitments behind recipient country priorities.

The New Alliance reports that since 2012 around 180 African and international companies have signed letters of intent to invest \$7.8 billion in African agriculture, \$1.1 billion of which was realized in 2013. Private investments have reached three million smallholders and created more than 36,000 jobs.<sup>25</sup> The New

Alliance is not without critics.<sup>26</sup> Some have suggested that there has been a lack of transparency in the consultation process with civil society in the alliance member countries. Other complaints are that small farmers have been shut out of the planning process for new investments. Still others argue it is unclear where private monies are flowing and question the authenticity of public reforms. This criticism should be taken seriously. Yet the New Alliance remains one of the only vehicles to pool public and private monies for country-led catalytic investments. For example, one of the first investment priorities was the Southern Agricultural Growth Corridor of Tanzania, which connected Malawi, Zambia, and Tanzania with rail, road, and electricity to power the agricultural economy.

### Feed the Future and a whole-of-government approach

Feed the Future's whole-of-government approach was set up to leverage the strengths of 11 US government agencies to advance food security through agricultural development globally. A list of the agencies and what is known about their spending on global food security activities are shown in table 1.

The MCC and US Department of Treasury carry out programs that directly contribute funds and resources to food security activities complementary to Feed the Future investments. MCC reports that \$4.5 billion—almost half of its obligated investments since it was established—is related to improving food security.<sup>27</sup> MCC's food security efforts include building rural infrastructure such as roads, ports, and storage facilities and funding irrigation projects. The agency states that it carries out food security activities in 12 countries (11 of which are Feed the Future countries).<sup>28</sup> Treasury's role vis-à-vis Feed the Future has been to manage US participation in GAFSP and IFAD.

USDA's role in support of Feed the Future includes in-country capacity building, basic and applied research, and support for improved market information, statistics, and analysis. Some Feed the Future resources are devoted to these activities in Feed the Future countries. Yet USAID does not report on the extent to which USDA agencies are involved in providing research, technical assistance, or other capacity-building activities. USAID indicates that in terms of tapping USDA's research and capacity-building expertise, it counts the Cochran Fellowship<sup>29</sup> and the Borlaug Fellowship<sup>30</sup> programs as food security-related

spending. USAID's reporting on USDA contributions to food security do not include reimbursable research and technical assistance provided by various USDA research and other agencies.

Many of these agencies have long-term relationships with USAID that predate the Feed the Future initiative. These include the USDA, Peace Corps, the US Geological Survey (USGS), and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). USDA, NOAA, and USGS have done most of their work with USAID on a reimbursable basis. Because of these

---

***There is not clear information on how annual investments are being spent, making it difficult to scale up investments that have empirically yielded transformational results.***

---

pre-existing relationships and the reimbursable nature of the funding, there has been no data available on the amount specific agencies spend that contribute solely to Feed the Future programs and do not overlap with other food security, agricultural development, food assistance, and nutrition initiatives.

### Funding for Feed the Future and complementary programs

Funding for Feed the Future has averaged over \$900 million annually (FY2010–FY2015),<sup>31</sup> more than one-third of USAID's appropriated funds for Development Assistance. This investment includes reportedly \$135 to \$150 million annually for internationally focused research, spread across USDA, universities, and international agricultural research centers.<sup>32</sup> Separately, USAID has committed an annual average of \$80 million from its Global Health Initiative account for nutrition assistance in Feed the Future focus countries.<sup>33</sup>

Investments in multilateral frameworks—GAFSP and IFAD—are considered to be part of Feed the Future, but are managed out of the US Department of Treasury. As of the end of 2014, the United States had committed \$444 million to GAFSP. US funding for IFAD has amounted to \$30 million annually (FY2010–FY2015).<sup>34</sup>

In addition to IFAD, the US government supports global food security through investments in the UN World Food Program (WFP) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations. WFP, the largest distributor of food aid globally for development programs and humanitarian relief,

TABLE 1

## US Government Agencies Involved in Feed the Future Implementation

Agency	Participation in Feed the Future	Reporting on Feed the Future Funding
US Department of the Treasury	The US Department of Treasury coordinates US support to multilateral development banks for food security. It manages US participation in GAFSP and IFAD. Uses US influence to leverage multilateral institutions' support for global food security.	<b>Available</b> —Information on funding for GAFSP and IFAD is available through the federal budget. The GAFSP trust fund and IFAD report regularly on their funding and activities.
US Agency for International Development	USAID is the lead agency in implementing Feed the Future. Also administers Food for Peace Title II Emergency and Nonemergency food assistance.	<b>On a limited basis</b> —Topline information on Feed the Future funding is available through the Foreign Assistance Dashboard and Feed the Future Progress Reports.
Millennium Challenge Corporation	MCC compacts support investments in irrigation, rural roads, postharvest infrastructure, training, rural loans, land tenure policy, and nutrition. MCC reports \$1.2 billion in food security investments in compacts entering into force between 2010 and 2013.	<b>On a limited basis</b> —Topline information on Feed the Future-related funding is available through the Millennium Challenge Corporation website.
US Department of Agriculture	USDA supports global food security and Feed the Future through in-country capacity building; basic and applied research; and improved market information, statistics, and analysis. USDA research, economic/statistical analysis, and capacity building are done mainly on a reimbursable basis with USAID. USDA also manages a number of nonemergency food aid programs that promote food security: McGovern-Dole Food for Education, Food for Progress, and the Local and Regional Procurement Program.	<b>On a limited basis</b> —Feed the Future-related research capacity-building activities, including the Borlaug and Cochran Fellowships, are reported on a limited basis. Funding for research and capacity-building activities is not publically available. Funding for food aid programs is reported in annual budget presentations and congressional appropriations bills.
Peace Corps	Peace Corps partners with Feed the Future at the grassroots level. Peace Corps reports that 1,200 volunteers have served or serve as Feed the Future volunteers.	<b>On a limited basis</b> —Information about funding for Feed the Future-related Peace Corps activities for various years has been available through Feed the Future progress reports.
US African Development Foundation	The US African Development Foundation promotes community-based and empowering economic and political activities.	<b>On a limited basis</b> —Aggregated information on funding for Feed the Future-related activities for various years has been available through the Feed the Future progress reports.
US Department of State	The US Department of State uses diplomacy to influence other donor countries to pursue policies favorable to agricultural development and to invest in global food security.	<b>Unavailable</b> —Information on funding for Feed the Future-related activities has not been reported.
US Department of Commerce	The US Department of Commerce, through the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, provides climate forecasting and assistance with sustainable fisheries. It is a long-standing participant in USAID's Famine Early Warning System. US Department of Commerce participation is reimbursed by USAID.	<b>Unavailable</b> —Information on funding for Feed the Future-related activities has not been reported.
Overseas Private Investment Corporation	The Overseas Private Investment Corporation supports Feed the Future by working with host governments, private-sector partners and other stakeholders to spur investments in agriculture in emerging markets and in supporting sustainable agribusiness. To stimulate investment in these markets, OPIC offers financing, political risk insurance and support for private equity investment funds. ,	<b>Unavailable</b> —Information on funding for Feed the Future-related activities has not been reported.
US Geological Survey	The US Geological Survey monitors (and forecasts when possible) incidence of drought and flooding in Africa in order to identify problems in the food supply system that could potentially lead to famine or other food-insecure conditions. It participates in the USAID's Famine Early Warning System on a reimbursable basis.	<b>Unavailable</b> —Information on funding for Feed the Future-related activities has not been reported.
US Trade Representative	The US Trade Representative manages trade relations and policy, including negotiating trade and investment agreements with some Feed the Future focus countries.	<b>Unavailable</b> —Information on funding for Feed the Future-related activities has not been reported.

Sources: Government Accountability Office, *Global Food Security: USAID Is Improving Coordination But Needs to Require Systematic Assessments of Country-Level Risks*, GAO-13-809, September 2013; websites of individual agencies; and selected budget data.



advances nutrition and increasingly supports agricultural development through innovative approaches to local purchase of commodities for food aid. In 2014 the United States, WFP's largest donor, provided the organization \$2.2 billion.<sup>35</sup> The United States draws its contributions to WFP from funds appropriated for Food for Peace Title II and the McGovern-Dole Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program (Agriculture appropriations) and from funds appropriated for International Disaster Assistance (State and Foreign Operation appropriations). In FY2014 the United States provided FAO, which has agricultural development and food security at the heart of its efforts, with \$115.6 million.<sup>36</sup> US funds for FAO are drawn from annual State and Foreign Operations appropriations.

Although the results of Feed the Future have been notable, in some cases there is not clear information on how annual investments are being spent, making it difficult to scale up investments that have empirically

yielded transformational results. For example, it is unclear how much is being spent on research, student training, university partnerships for capacity building, trade capacity building, or extension—all activities that have been shown to have high returns on investments.<sup>37</sup> Furthermore, the majority of agencies involved in Feed the Future's whole-of-government approach do not make their spending on global food security activities publically available. This makes it challenging to analyze how agencies are involved and how collaboration can be improved.

## Part II—US International Food Aid

The United States is the world's largest donor of food aid to help hungry people, a matter of justifiable national pride. Hundreds of thousands of lives have been saved through this assistance over the years, and hundreds of millions of lives have been improved.<sup>38</sup> Food aid—both emergency and long-term or “development”

TABLE 2

### US Global Food Security Assistance—State and Foreign Operations by Fiscal Year, 2010-2016

#### Funding by Program and Appropriations Subcommittee (\$ thousand)

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
	Actual				Enacted	Requested	
Feed the Future	808,594	943,362	953,588	1,000,595	975,595	924,000	900,300
Community Development Fund	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	80,000	80,000
Nutrition/Health	71,100	89,820	95,000	90,000	95,000	101,000	101,000
MCC	739,000	242,000	11,000	205,000	NA	NA	NA
GAFFP	67,000	125,000	150,000	134,000	135,000	80,000	43,000
IFAD	30,000	29,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
EFSP*	244,000	232,000	374,000	578,000	NA	NA	NA
Peace Corps	NA	NA	23,000	23,850	26,510	NA	NA
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,959,694</b>	<b>1,661,182</b>	<b>1,636,588</b>	<b>2,061,445</b>	<b>1,262,105</b>	<b>1,215,000</b>	<b>1,154,300</b>

\*The Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP) is a cash-based food-aid program administered by USAID and funded through State and Foreign Operations Appropriations. It is detailed in Part II on international food aid programs.

Sources: USAID Congressional Budget Justification, various years; Feed the Future 2014, 2015 Progress Report.

aid—will continue to be a critical tool through which to advance global food security.

The United States predominantly provides food aid in the form of commodities for emergency food relief and to support development projects. More recently, the United States has begun using cash, vouchers, and local procurement to meet food needs in limited situations where US commodities cannot arrive on time or be effectively distributed. This is a welcome development, as research suggests that food aid is most effective in the form of cash, limiting the use of commodities to emergency situations where fortified food is needed or local sources are not available.<sup>39</sup> US inter-

national food aid has been distributed mainly through several congressionally authorized programs.

Unlike the Feed the Future initiative, all these food aid programs have been authorized in farm bills, the most recent being the Agricultural Act of 2014 (P.L. 113-79), which extends the programs through FY2018. Feed the Future, on the other hand, is not mentioned in statute, but is instead authorized using broad authorities to assist agricultural development in the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961. Food aid programs are primarily funded through the annual agriculture appropriations bills and are administered either by USAID or by USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service

#### Box 4

### Food for Peace Act (P.L. 480) Title II Emergency and Nonemergency Food Aid

Title II was first authorized as part of P.L. 480. Administered by USAID, Title II of the Food for Peace Act provides for the donation of US agricultural commodities to intergovernmental organizations and qualifying nongovernmental organizations to support specific emergency or nonemergency food needs for direct food distribution, and in limited cases, by monetization. Title II donations may be used for both emergency and nonemergency assistance.

Funding for Title II emergency and development food aid has averaged \$1.6 billion since FY2010.<sup>40</sup> USAID targets emergency food aid to vulnerable populations in response to malnutrition, famine, natural disaster, civil strife, and other extraordinary relief requirements. Emergency assistance is provided through recipient governments and public or private agencies, including intergovernmental organizations, particularly the World Food Program.

Nonemergency food assistance involves multiyear development programs (generally three to five years)—made through eligible private voluntary organizations, cooperatives, or intergovernmental organizations—that target chronically food insecure populations. These programs include monetization and/or direct distribution of food aid. Under monetization—and depending on the agreement with the recipient country—proceeds from the sale of donated US commodities are used by cooperating sponsors either to fund distribution expenses in the case of direct feeding programs or to implement various development projects that address chronic food shortages and food security.<sup>41</sup> In recent years, the US government has reduced monetization of food aid, except in limited circumstances, through funding provided by Feed the Future.<sup>42</sup>

Title II of the Food for Peace Act also authorizes the John Ogonowski and Doug Bereuter Farmer-to-Farmer Program.<sup>43</sup> Instead of commodity food aid, this program provides technical assistance from US volunteers to farmers, farm groups, agribusinesses, and other agriculture-sector institutions in developing and transitional countries with the goal of promoting sustainable improvements in food security and agricultural processing, production, and marketing. The program recruits volunteers from US farms, universities, cooperatives, private agribusinesses, and nonprofit farm organizations. Title II funds are made available to this program on a formula basis.

**Funding:** Average annual funding for the program has been around \$10 million in recent years.<sup>44</sup>

#### Food for Progress

The 1985 farm bill (P.L. 99-198; §1110) authorized the Food for Progress program. USDA's Foreign Agricultural Service (FAS) administers the program. USDA undertakes multiyear agreements with cooperating sponsors, including private voluntary organizations, cooperatives, intergovernmental organizations, and recipient-country governments. These agreements require monetization of donated US commodities in support of certain developing countries and emerging democracies. Qualifying countries must have made commitments to agricultural policy reforms that incorporate free enterprise elements through changes in commodity pricing, marketing, input availability, distribution, and private-sector involvement. Program activities focus on private-sector development of agricultural infrastructure such as improved production practices, marketing systems, farmer training, agroprocessing, and agribusiness development.

**Funding:** Food for Progress has averaged funding annually of \$142 million during FY2010-FY2015.<sup>45</sup>

### McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program

The 2002 farm bill (P.L. 107-171, §3107) first authorized the McGovern-Dole program, administered by FAS. Under the McGovern-Dole program, implementing partners use US commodities and financial and technical assistance to carry out school feeding programs and maternal, infant, and child nutrition programs in foreign countries identified as having critical food needs. The 2014 farm bill (§3204) reauthorized the program through FY2018 with discretionary funding of “such sums as are necessary” to be determined by annual appropriations.

**Funding** for McGovern-Dole has averaged \$188 million since FY2010.<sup>46</sup>

### Local and Regional Procurement

Under a local and regional purchase program, the administering agency (either USDA or USAID) awards cash grants to eligible organizations—a private voluntary organization or cooperative that is registered with USAID or an intergovernmental organization—to carry out field-based projects to purchase eligible commodities from markets close to the target population in response to food crises and disasters. Both USDA and USAID have funded local and regional procurement activity. The 2008 farm bill (P.L. 110-246, §3206) authorized USDA to develop a four-year (FY2009-FY2012) local and regional procurement pilot project with a mandatory authorization for \$60 million of Commodity Credit Corporation funds (i.e., not from Title II appropriations). In response to the success of the pilot projects, the 2014 farm bill (P.L. 113-79; §3207) converted the expired pilot project into a permanent local and regional procurement program to be administered by USDA/FAS.

**Funding.** Congress authorized funding levels for the local and regional procurement program at \$80 million annually for FY2014 through FY2018, but instead of mandatory Commodity Credit Corporation funding, the program is now subject to annual appropriations. In both FY2014 and FY2015 Congress made no appropriations for local and regional procurement. USDA has requested \$20 million for it in its FY2016 budget submission.<sup>47</sup>

### Emergency Food Security Program (EFSP)

EFSP is a cash-based food-aid program administered by USAID. It provides grants to eligible organizations for rapid response to the highest priority emergency food security needs. The Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (P.L. 897-195), as amended (FAA; P.L. 87-195) authorizes, among other things, the provision of disaster assistance such as EFSP. USAID initiated EFSP in FY2010 as a complement to Food for Peace Act Title II emergency, in-kind food aid donations. USAID uses funds from its International Disaster Assistance account, also authorized under the FAA, to finance EFSP activities.

**Funding.** According to the Government Accountability Office, from FY2010 through FY2014 USAID awarded EFSP grants totaling about \$991 million for cash-based food assistance, most of it to those displaced by the conflict in Syria.<sup>48</sup>

(FAS). The 2008 farm bill also reauthorizes the Bill Emerson Humanitarian Trust, a reserve of commodities and cash for use in the Food for Peace programs to meet unanticipated food aid needs. Average annual spending on all international food aid programs over the past decade has been approximately \$2.2 billion, with Food for Peace Title II activities comprising the largest portion of the total budget (about 50 to 90 percent of the total food aid budget annually over the past decade).<sup>49</sup>

Some have raised questions about how and to what extent Title II nonemergency or development food aid programs and USDA food aid programs are coordinated with Feed the Future project activities in focus countries. Such food aid programs are carried out in eight African Feed the Future focus countries, yet there is not enough information to determine what type of coordination is taking place.

### The administration’s food aid reform proposal

The FY2016 P.L. 480 Title II request of \$1.4 billion includes \$270 million to be used for development programs and an additional \$80 million requested in the Development Assistance account under USAID’s Community Development Fund, bringing the total funding for these types of programs to \$350 million.<sup>50</sup> Together, these resources would support development food assistance programs’ efforts to address chronic food insecurity in areas of recurrent crises to reduce poverty and build resilience. The balance of the Title II request, \$1.13 billion, would be used to provide emergency food assistance in response to natural disasters and complex emergencies. The request also includes new authority to use up to 25 percent (\$350 million) of the Title II appropriation in emergencies for such uses as local or regional procurement of agricultural commodities near crisis areas, food vouchers, or cash

TABLE 3

## US International Food Aid—Agriculture Appropriations by Fiscal Year, 2010-2016

Funding by Program and Appropriations Subcommittee (\$ thousand)

	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
	Actual				Enacted	Requested	
Food for Peace Title II	1,933,000	1,660,000	1,610,000	1,355,000	1,466,000	1,466,000	1,400,000
Food for Progress	146,000	162,000	246,000	150,000	137,000	135,000	135,000
McGovern-Dole	174,000	206,000	192	184,000	185,000	192,000	192,000
LRP	24,000	23,000	0	0	0	0	20,000
US African Development Foundation	7,861	10,745	6,883	5,140	6,599	NA	NA
Farmer-to-Farmer*	13,000	13,000	10,000	10,000	NA	NA	NA
Cochran Fellowship Program	283	200	825	3,004	2,587	NA	NA
Borlaug Fellowship Program	206	307	1,677	1,021	1,157	NA	NA
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>2,285,350</b>	<b>2,062,252</b>	<b>1,865,577</b>	<b>1,698,165</b>	<b>1,798,343</b>	<b>1,793,000</b>	<b>1,747,000</b>

\*Farmer-to-Farmer funding is calculated from Food for Peace Title II Appropriations.

Source: USDA Annual Budget Summaries, various years; USAID Congressional Budget Justification, various years; Feed the Future 2014, 2015 Progress Report.

transfers. The US administration maintains that the additional flexibility provided by these changes would make emergency food aid more timely and cost effective, improve program efficiencies and performance, and increase the number of people assisted by about two million annually with the same level of resources. Similar proposals in previous budget submissions were rejected by congressional appropriators. Congress has also put together several proposals related to food aid, which are detailed below.

### Funding for international food aid

There is detailed information on US funding for food assistance publically available both by agencies and Congress. Unlike aid to agriculture, which declined rapidly from the mid-1980s until the mid-2000s, fund-

ing for international food aid has remained robust. However, recent years have seen a growing emphasis on technical assistance and local and regional purchase, which studies suggest makes food aid more flexible and effective.<sup>51</sup>

## Part III—The Role of Research in Advancing Global Food Security

As mentioned above, a portion of Feed the Future monies are directed toward international research and capacity building, carried out through USDA, US universities, or international research centers. However, US investments in domestic research priorities are increasingly seen as an essential tool for advancing food security both at home and abroad. Previous Chi-



Chicago Council reports have found that the challenges of drought and flooding, deteriorating soils, pests and diseases, and food safety are faced by growers in America and Africa. And many of the solutions that work in the fields of Kansas will work in farms of India. In fact,

---

***Low-income countries can make gains in agricultural production, in some cases 600 times more quickly, if they adapt research carried out in other countries rather than conducting the same research at home.***

---

recent research suggests that low-income countries can make gains in agricultural production, in some cases 600 times more quickly, if they adapt research carried out in other countries rather than conducting the same research at home.<sup>52</sup> Given this, The Chicago Council has recommended since 2013 that US investments in agricultural research be bolstered and considered as a vital tool to advancing global food security.

### **USDA research and capacity-building capability**

Agricultural research is conducted primarily in the USDA's Research, Education, and Economics (REE) mission area. REE has federal leadership responsibility for advancing scientific knowledge related to agriculture through research, extension, and education. It works across USDA, other federal agencies, international organizations, and the private sector to protect, secure, and improve food, agricultural, and natural resources systems. REE programs are carried out by four agencies:

- ▶ The Agricultural Research Service conducts intramural research in natural and biological sciences.
- ▶ The National Institute of Food and Agriculture partners with land grant and non-land grant colleges and universities in carrying out extramural research, higher education, and extension activities.
- ▶ The Economic Research Service performs intramural economic and social science research.
- ▶ The National Agricultural Statistics Service conducts the Census of Agriculture and provides the official, current statistics on agricultural production and indicators of the economic and environmental welfare of the farm sector.

### **Direct support for USDA intramural research**

The Agricultural Research Service participates in Feed the Future research through its Office of International Programs, which facilitates participation of national programs and scientists.<sup>53</sup> The Agricultural Research Service has subscribed to the notion of working regionally with Feed the Future focus countries, building research capacity and applying new technologies for the United States and developing countries. Additionally, through universities and research labs, it carries out research on a range of US agriculture priorities.

### **Complementary research: Collaboration with the National Institute for Food and Agriculture**

The National Institute for Food and Agriculture distributes federal funds to land grant colleges of agriculture to provide partial support for state-level research, education, and extension.<sup>54</sup> The formulas for distributing these funds is set forth in various federal statutes. In addition, the National Institute for Food and Agriculture provides funds for research through a competitive grants program, the Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI). AFRI funds fundamental and applied research, education, and extension to address food and agriculture problems of national, regional, and multistate importance in sustaining all components of food and agriculture.

The National Institute for Food and Agriculture maintains that involvement in implementing the Feed the Future research strategy through its competitive grants program ensures that US-focused research, extension, education and international programs, networks of university experts, and science-based knowledge systems are open to mutually beneficial international engagement opportunities. Science partnerships that cross borders often benefit US agriculture by advancing the science needed here at home, while also promoting the science that's needed to strengthen food security overseas.

### **Other USDA agencies**

Two other USDA agencies with international capacity-building expertise are the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service and the Natural Resource Conservation Service.

**Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service.** The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service's mission is to protect and promote US agricultural health,

regulate genetically engineered organisms, administer the Animal Welfare Act, and carry out wildlife damage management activities. It carries out technical and regulatory capacity-building efforts with US and foreign government counterparts.<sup>55</sup> Programs supporting sanitary and phytosanitary issues related to safeguarding of US agriculture from foreign plant pests and animal diseases comprise a significant effort. Capacity-building activities supported by the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service occur both in the United States and abroad and are a useful tool in fostering safe agricultural trade and maintaining technical and regulatory relationships with other countries and international organizations.

**Natural Resource Conservation Service.** The Natural Resource Conservation Service provides both short- and long-term technical assistance in natural resource conservation projects.<sup>56</sup> It currently is actively involved in two Feed the Future focus countries, Kenya and Tanzania, and is working with USAID in a third, Haiti, to prepare a proposal for a pilot capacity-building activity with the Haitian Ministry of Agriculture. All of the Natural Resource Conservation Service's participation in international technical assistance activities is done on a reimbursable basis.

**USDA Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research.** In the 2014 farm bill, Congress created the Foundation for Food and Agricultural Research as a vehicle to pool public and private monies to enhance current food and agriculture research efforts. The foundation is governed by an independent board of directors, none of which are currently serving in government, and can focus on any research priorities deemed appropriate and necessary by that board. Congress appropriated \$200 million to the foundation, all of which must be matched dollar-for-dollar by private monies. The foundation's board was named in mid-2014, and its first executive director was announced in June 2015.

### Funding for agricultural research

Over the past half century, every dollar investment in agricultural research and development returned benefits valued at between \$20 to \$30.<sup>57</sup> In spite of this, growth in public agricultural research spending peaked in 1994 and has since declined by more than 20 percent. Research suggests that stagnating public investment in research is already making it more difficult for producers to adapt to droughts, floods, new pests, and

emerging diseases. Multifactor productivity in US agriculture has been in decline, dropping by nearly half, from 2.12 percent per year during 1949 to 1990 to 1.15 percent per year from 1990 to 2007.<sup>58</sup> In FY2016 USDA has requested \$3.36 billion to fund REE activities.<sup>59</sup> The Chicago Council as well as other organizations and experts have recommended a dramatic reinvestment in agricultural research to both grow America's agricultural sector and advance global food security.

### Congressional jurisdiction over food security legislation and appropriations

Global food security activities fall under the jurisdiction of several congressional committees and subcommittees. The House and Senate Agriculture committees have legislative jurisdiction over US international food aid programs. The Senate Agriculture Committee has had exclusive jurisdiction over food aid programs, while the House Foreign Affairs Committee has periodically exercised jurisdiction over Title II of Food for Peace. The House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations committees have jurisdiction over agricultural development assistance as authorized in the FAA (P.L. 87-195). The Agriculture Subcommittee of House Appropriations has had jurisdiction over food aid programs, while the Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs has enjoyed jurisdiction over agricultural development assistance.

Appropriations for food aid programs are made through the subcommittees on Agriculture, Rural Development, and Food and Drug Administration of the House and Senate Appropriations committees. Appropriations for agricultural development assistance fall under the jurisdiction of the House and Senate Appropriations subcommittees on State and Foreign Operations. Appropriations for EFSP (funded from International Disaster Assistance appropriations) are also in the purview of the same subcommittees.

Several hearings have been held and several important pieces of legislation have been introduced in the 114th Congress relating to global food security.

**Agricultural Development Assistance: Feed the Future: H.R. 1567 and S. 1252, the Global Food Security Act of 2015.** Similar but not identical, these bills call upon the president to develop a comprehensive global food security strategy and for the president or a designee to coordinate the efforts of relevant federal departments and agencies in implementing the

TABLE 4

Federal Spending on Agriculture Research by Fiscal Year, 2010-2015						
Funding by Agency (\$ thousand)						
	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015
	Actual			Estimated		
Agricultural Research Service (ARS)	1,178,000	1,133,000	1,090,000	1,014,000	1,132,000	1,104,000
Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS)	30,000	29,000	37,000	37,000	44,000	40,000
Economic Research Service (ERS)	86,000	81,000	77,000	71,000	78,000	83,000
National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS)	8,000	7,000	7,000	8,000	7,000	10,000
National Institute of Food and Agriculture (NIFA)	690,000	724,000	614,000	546,000	737,000	744,000
Agriculture and Food Research Initiative (AFRI)*	262,000	264,000	264,000	276,000	316,000	325,000
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>1,992,000</b>	<b>1,974,000</b>	<b>1,825,000</b>	<b>1,676,000</b>	<b>1,998,000</b>	<b>1,981,000</b>

\*AFRI funding is included in NIFA appropriations and reported in USDA's Congressional Budget Justification, various years.  
Source: National Science Foundation, "Federal Funds for R&D," <http://www.nsf.gov/statistics/fedfunds/>.

Feed the Future Strategy (Senate bill) or Global Food Security Strategy (House bill) through a whole-of-government approach. They also call upon the president to submit to Congress a report on the implementation of the strategy. Among other requirements, the legislation requires the president to provide a transparent, open, and detailed accounting of spending by relevant federal departments and agencies to implement the strategy, including listing the recipients of funding or partner organizations to the extent possible and describing their activities. The Senate bill calls for a disaggregated accounting of assistance provided through different procurement mechanisms. Both bills authorize around \$1 billion in funding for FY2016.

#### **Food Aid: S. 525, the Food Aid Reform Act of 2015.**

This proposes eliminating monetization, cargo preference requirements, and the US-only commodity purchase requirement for Title II program activity. S. 525 would allow Title II funds to be used for both in-kind

and cash-based assistance—which is deemed by USAID as the preferred option for the given situation. Further, the bill would transfer the Title II program authority away from farm legislation and USDA to the Foreign Assistance Act and USAID. Finally, S. 525 proposes lowering the authorized annual appropriations level for Title II programs by \$100,000 to \$2.4 billion per fiscal year to reflect the efficiencies that would be gained from the increased flexibility in use of Title II funds.

## **Conclusions and recommendations**

The reinvigoration of US investments in global food security through agricultural development has been critical. Agricultural development and other food security efforts make the food supply more reliable and affordable, which hedges against civil strife. These investments have also helped the United States forge stronger relationships with countries in Africa and

Asia, home to some of the world's fastest-growing economies, many of which will be among the most important economies of the future.

As US investments in global food security through Feed the Future move toward a seventh year of funding (FY2016) and Congress evaluates whether to make these programs a hallmark of US development assistance for the decade to come, The Chicago Council recommends the following to promote transparency and interagency collaboration:

**Recommendation 1—Global food security assistance should be consistently defined as funds directed towards agricultural development, nutrition interventions, food aid, and agriculture and food research.**

Those working to advance global food security understand that it involves a range of tools, from research and development to agricultural development to food aid. To clarify the dialogue and ensure that funding includes the range of investments necessary for nutritious food to be affordable and available globally, global food security should be defined as funds directed towards agricultural development, food aid, and research.

**Recommendation 2—The US government should provide a more detailed accounting of how Feed the Future and nutrition monies are being spent.**

USAID has developed a comprehensive monitoring and evaluation system, the positive results of which are evident in the four annual progress reports that USAID has published. USAID, however, does not report how it allocates the approximately \$1 billion annually that Congress appropriates for Feed the Future. The lack of funding information is obvious in the case of Feed the Future support for agricultural research and capacity building. Information about the funding is anecdotal. Knowing how much and how funds are allocated to this transformational component of Feed the Future is critical for Congress, the agency partners implementing the programs, and the public.

The two bills introduced in the 114th Congress—S. 1252 and H.R. 1567—are both specific in calling for the inclusion of a detailed accounting of spending by departments and agencies involved in implementing Feed the Future in an annual global food security report. Both bills call for “a transparent, open, and detailed accounting of spending under this Act by all relevant federal agencies, including a disaggregated accounting of assistance provided through different

procurement mechanisms.” This would give Congress the information it needs to make funding decisions and agency managers the information they need to develop effective programs.

**Recommendation 3—The US government should better leverage the strengths of federal agencies and assign clear agency roles and responsibilities.**

The broad definition of global food security assistance that includes the individual components of food security assistance included in this report—agricultural development, nutrition assistance, multilateral programs, and international food aid—provides a rationale for embarking on a whole-of-government approach to implementation of food security assistance. Yet not all of the roles of the federal departments and agencies involved in implementing Feed the Future have been fully articulated, nor have the ways in which agencies collaborate. Some agencies implement projects on a reimbursable basis, like USGS or NOAA. Others, USDA or MCC for example, have their own programs funded by congressional appropriations. In USDA's case, an effort is under way, as described in the Feed the Future research strategy, to get a clearer delineation of USDA research that is directly funded by USAID and research that is complementary.

USAID, together with the other listed agencies, should clearly articulate agency roles in the implementation of Feed the Future. Such information is important for decision makers—congressional committees and agencies—to clearly understand just how the 11 agencies identified as part of the whole-of-government approach do or could contribute to Feed the Future. For example, USAID and USDA should follow up on their intention to explore the contributions that the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health might make to implementing the Feed the Future research strategy. Also, as some have suggested, the Department of Defense has experience in providing food security assistance as a first responder and through reconstruction work in conflict zones throughout the world.<sup>60</sup> USAID could explore this possibility as well. Beyond these three agencies, there are other federal departments or agencies that could be useful in US global food security assistance. These include the Departments of Interior and Education, the Trade and Development Agency, the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Inter-American Foundation.



**Recommendation 4—Congress should provide leadership by authorizing a long-term commitment to global food security.**

Global food security is a long-term goal, requiring the energies and investments of a range of actors. For US investments to have an enduring impact, a commitment to global food security must be institutionalized through legislation. There is broad, bipartisan support for such a bill. InterAction, an organization

---

*For US investments to have an enduring impact, a commitment to global food security must be institutionalized through legislation.*

---

of 60 nongovernmental organization members, has pledged to continue working with Congress and the administration to ensure passage of such authorizing legislation. Former Senator Richard Lugar has indicated that enacting a US global food security strategy and program would provide “sustainability to a program

that requires sustainability to succeed.” Three Chicago Council task forces have recommended long-term authorizing legislation. Now is the time for Congress to cement a timely initiative that has had such high returns on investment.

Furthermore, given that global food security is likely to be a central priority for this millennium, Congress should establish a forum that can explore the issue holistically. An entity like the House Select Committee on Hunger (or a bicameral committee), which existed in the late 1980s and early 1990s, provided an influential forum for engaging Congress in discussions of food security strategy and implementation. The committee had bipartisan leadership and membership. Members came from both the authorizing and the appropriations committees and focused attention on global and domestic food security. To a certain extent, House and Senate caucuses on hunger have played a role once played by the Hunger Committee. Groups like these caucuses can engage the attention of congressional members and staff by calling attention to global food security issues.

## About the author

Charles E. Hanrahan completed his 30-year career with the Congressional Research Service (CRS) in 2014 as senior specialist in agricultural policy, a statutory position established by the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970. At CRS he conducted research and analysis of agricultural policy issues with a focus on international food aid, agricultural development, and international agricultural trade for members of Congress, congressional committees, and their staffs. He possesses extensive knowledge of legislation relating to international agricultural issues.

Prior to joining CRS, Dr. Hanrahan held a number of senior positions in USDA’s Economic Research Service, including assistant director for research in the International Economics division, and branch chief for Trade, Agricultural Development, and Africa-Middle East Branches. In addition, he was a member of USAID’s Sahel Development Task Force, participated in the National Academy of Sciences World

Food and Nutrition Study, and served as director of Abt Associates USAID-funded Agricultural Policy Analysis project.

Dr. Hanrahan served as a Peace Corps volunteer in the Republic of Guinea. He was an adjunct faculty member, teaching courses in economic development, agricultural development, and African economic development, at Georgetown University’s School of Foreign Service, the (USDA) Graduate School, and Johns Hopkins University’s School for Advanced International Studies. He is fluent in French

Dr. Hanrahan is currently an independent consultant focusing on international agricultural issues and a nonresident senior fellow at The Chicago Council on Global Affairs. He holds a PhD in agricultural economics from the University of Kentucky and a BSFS degree from Georgetown University’s Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service.

# Endnotes

1. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), *World Agriculture Towards 2030/2050: The 2012 revision*, ESA E Working Paper No. 12-3, <http://www.fao.org/economic/esa/esag/en/>.
2. Philip G. Pardey and Jason Beddow, *Agricultural Innovation: The United States in a Changing Global Reality* (Chicago, IL: The Chicago Council on Global Affairs, April 2013).
3. US Agency for International Development (USAID), *Feed the Future Research Strategy* (Washington, DC: USAID, 2011), [http://www.feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/FTF\\_research\\_strategy.pdf](http://www.feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/FTF_research_strategy.pdf).
4. US Agency for International Development (USAID), *2014 Feed the Future Progress Report* (Washington, DC: USAID, May 2014).
5. US Agency for International Development (USAID), *2015 Feed the Future Progress Report* (Washington, DC: USAID, August 2015).
6. Ibid.
7. World Bank, *Crop Production Index*, <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/AG.PRD.CROPXD/countries>.
8. USAID, *2014 Feed the Future Progress Report*.
9. World Bank, *Africa's Pulse: An Analysis of Issues Shaping Africa's Future*, vol. 8 (2013).
10. World Bank, *World Development Report 2008: Agriculture for Development* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2008).
11. Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), *The State of Food Insecurity in 2014*, Rome, 2014, <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i4030e.pdf>.
12. "QWIDS," *Organization for Economic Co-Operation and Development's Query Wizard for International Development Statistics*, accessed March, 2015, <http://stats.oecd.org/qwids/>.
13. Oxfam America, *Promise and Potential: Delivering Inclusive Sustainable Development for Small-Scale Food Producers through the Feed the Future Initiative* (Washington, DC: Oxfam America, 2015).
14. The World Bank, Agriculture & Rural Development, <http://data.worldbank.org/topic/agriculture-and-rural-development>.
15. World Bank, *World Development Report 2008*.
16. Charles Roxburgh et al., *Lions on the Move: The Progress and Potential of African Economies* (New York: McKinsey Global Institute, June 2010).
17. US Department of State, *L'Aquila Food Security Initiative (AFSI), Final Report 2012* (US Department of State, 2012), <http://www.state.gov/documents/organization/202922.pdf>.
18. G8, *L'Aquila Joint Statement on Global Food Security From La Maddalena to L'Aquila Summit 2009* (G8: July 10, 2009), [http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8\\_Allegato/LAquila\\_Joint\\_Statement\\_on\\_Global\\_Food\\_Security%5B1%5D,0.pdf](http://www.g8italia2009.it/static/G8_Allegato/LAquila_Joint_Statement_on_Global_Food_Security%5B1%5D,0.pdf).
19. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), *Declaration of the World Summit on Food Security*, World Summit on Food Security, November 16-18, 2009.
20. USAID, *Feed the Future Research Strategy*.
21. Ibid.
22. Global Agriculture & Food Security Program (GAFSP), *Funding*, accessed March 2015, <http://www.gafspfund.org/content/funding>.
23. Ibid.
24. New Alliance for Food and Nutrition, *Progress Report 2013-2014* (Washington, DC: New Alliance, August 2014), <http://new-alliance.org/resource/2013-2014-new-alliance-progress-report>.
25. Ibid.
26. Oxfam America, *Promise and Potential*.
27. Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), *MCC Helps Feed the Planet*, (Washington, DC: March 6, 2015), <https://www.mcc.gov/resources/doc/factsheet-2011002060505-food-security>.
28. Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), *Food Security*, accessed March 2015, <https://www.mcc.gov/initiatives/initiative/food-security>.
29. US Department of Agriculture (USDA), "Cochran Fellowship Program," <http://www.fas.usda.gov/programs/cochran-fellowship-program>.
30. US Department of Agriculture (USDA), "Borlaug Fellowship Program," <http://www.fas.usda.gov/programs/borlaug-fellowship-program>.
31. US Agency for International Development, *Congressional Budget Justification*, various years, <http://www.state.gov/s/d/rm/rls/statecbj/>.
32. USAID officials, informal estimates mentioned in discussion with The Chicago Council, March 2015.
33. InterAction, *InterAction Federal Budget Table*, accessed April 2015, <http://www.interaction.org/document/interaction-federal-budget-table>.
34. US Department of Treasury, *Congressional Budget Justification*, various years, <http://www.treasury.gov/about/budget-performance/Pages/index.aspx>.
35. World Food Program, *Contributions to WFP: Comparative Figures and Five-Year Aggregate Ranking*, [documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/research/wfp232961.pdf](http://documents.wfp.org/stellent/groups/public/documents/research/wfp232961.pdf).
36. Department of State, *FY 2016 Congressional Budget Justification*, <https://www.usaid.gov/sites/default/files/documents/9276/FY16CBIStateFORP.pdf>.

37. Economic Research Service of the US Department of Agriculture, "Economic Returns to Public Agricultural Research," Economic Brief No. (EB-10), p. 9, September 2007, <http://www.ers.usda.gov/publications/eb-economic-brief/eb10.aspx>.
38. Randy Schnepf, *U.S. International Food Aid Programs: Background and Issues* (Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service, April 1, 2015).
39. US Agency for International Development, *Food Aid Reform: Behind the Numbers*, <https://www.usaid.gov/foodaidreform/behind-the-numbers>.
40. Schnepf, *U.S. International Food Aid Programs*.
41. USAID, *Food Aid Reform*.
42. Ibid.
43. US Agency for International Development, "The John Ogonowski-Doug Bereuter Farmer-to-Farmer Program," <http://www.usaid.gov/what-we-do/agriculture-and-food-security/supporting-agricultural-capacity-development/john-ogonowski>.
44. Schnepf, *U.S. International Food Aid Programs*.
45. Ibid.
46. Ibid.
47. Office of Management and Budget, *President's Budget Request*, various years, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget>.
48. Government Accountability Office, *International Cash-Based Food Assistance: USAID Has Developed Processes for Initial Project Approval But Should Strengthen Financial Oversight*, GAO-15-328 (Washington, DC: GAO, March 2015).
49. Schnepf, *U.S. International Food Aid Programs*.
50. Office of Management and Budget, *President's Budget Request FY2016*, February 2, 2015, <https://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget>.
51. USAID, *Food Aid Reform*.
52. Pardey and Beddow, *Agricultural Innovation*.
53. Agriculture Research Service at the US Department of Agriculture, "OIRP Feed the Future Projects," <http://www.ars.usda.gov/Research/docs.htm?docid=22832>.
54. National Institute of Food and Agriculture, "NIFA Assists Feed the Future Global Security Initiative," <http://nifa.usda.gov/nifa-assists-feed-future-global-security-initiative>.
55. Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service of the US Department of Agriculture, <http://www.aphis.usda.gov/wps/portal/aphis/home/>.
56. National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) at US Department of Agriculture, "International Programs," <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/programs/alphabetical/international/>.
57. Pardey and Beddow, *Agricultural Innovation*.
58. Ibid.
59. US Department of Agriculture, *FY2016 Congressional Budget Justification*.
60. Connie Veillette, *Hunger and Whole of Government* (Washington, DC: The Lugar Center, 2015), [http://www.thelugarcenter.org/media/publication/11\\_2015-02%20Hunger%20and%20Whole%20of%20Government%20by%20Connie%20Veillette\\_.pdf](http://www.thelugarcenter.org/media/publication/11_2015-02%20Hunger%20and%20Whole%20of%20Government%20by%20Connie%20Veillette_.pdf).

**The Chicago Council  
on Global Affairs**, founded in 1922,  
is an independent, nonpartisan organization  
committed to educating the public—and influencing  
the public discourse—on global issues of the day.  
The Council provides a forum in Chicago for world  
leaders, policymakers, and other experts to speak  
to its members and the public on these issues. Long  
known for its public opinion surveys of American  
views on foreign policy, The Chicago Council also  
brings together stakeholders to examine issues  
and offer policy insight into areas such as global  
agriculture, the global economy, global energy,  
global cities, global security, and global immigration.  
Learn more at [thechicagocouncil.org](http://thechicagocouncil.org) and follow  
[@ChicagoCouncil](https://twitter.com/ChicagoCouncil).



**THE CHICAGO COUNCIL**  
**ON GLOBAL AFFAIRS**

332 South Michigan Avenue  
Suite 1100  
Chicago, Illinois 60604-4416  
[www.thechicagocouncil.org](http://www.thechicagocouncil.org)