Food System Financing Vulnerability Index

John M. Ulimwengu

1. Introduction

Food systems are integral to ensuring access to sustainable healthy diets for all, thereby supporting public health, livelihoods, and environmental sustainability. However, these systems are increasingly vulnerable to a range of shocks and stressors, from economic downturns and financial constraints to the impacts of climate change and pandemics. One of the most critical determinants of food system resilience is the ability to effectively manage financing vulnerabilities. Financing vulnerability refers to the susceptibility of food system components to performance degradation due to inadequate, inefficient, or uneven allocation of financial resources. Addressing this issue is paramount for enhancing the system's capacity to withstand and recover from disruptions while maintaining functionality.

Financial shocks, such as sudden economic crises or fluctuations in funding availability, can severely disrupt the operations of food systems. These shocks may manifest in the forms of reduced productivity in agricultural sectors, interruptions in food distribution networks, or diminished access to nutritious foods for vulnerable populations. Resource limitations, whether due to budget constraints or misallocation, exacerbate these risks by failing to provide critical support to the most vulnerable areas of these systems. Furthermore, uneven allocation of financial resources can deepen disparities, leaving critical components underfunded and disproportionately increasing their risk of failure. Such systemic weaknesses not only threaten food security but also undermine efforts to achieve global sustainability and public health goals, as highlighted in frameworks such as the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) (HLPE 2017).

To address these challenges, robust frameworks are needed to assess and manage financing vulnerability across the diverse and interdependent components of food systems. The Food System Financing Vulnerability Index (FSFVI) is proposed as a quantitative tool to measure and monitor financing vulnerability within food systems. This index integrates performance data, financial allocation, and sensitivity to financial resources to provide actionable insights for stakeholders. By identifying the most vulnerable components and prioritizing financial investments where they are most effective, the FSFVI can help optimize resource allocation, improve systemic resilience, and support evidence-based policymaking.

The FSFVI is designed with practical applications in mind, allowing policymakers and stakeholders to evaluate current vulnerabilities, simulate the effects of financial shocks, and track progress over time. In this technical note, the FSFVI is presented as a comprehensive framework to address financing vulnerability in food systems. Its development and application are informed by recent research on food system resilience and the

role of resource allocation in mitigating systemic risks (Fanzo et al. 2020; Tubiello et al. 2013). This tool aims to strengthen food systems' capacity to deliver sustainable and healthy diets even in the face of mounting global challenges.

2. Conceptual framework

The FSFVI conceptualizes a given food system as a complex and interconnected network of components (x_i), each representing a critical subsystem or activity essential for the system's overall functionality. These components may include key activities such as food production, distribution, processing, retail, and consumption. Each component operates within an ideal performance benchmark ($\bar{x}_i$), which reflects the level of output, efficiency, or effectiveness necessary for the food system to achieve its objectives, such as providing sustainable healthy diets and ensuring equitable access to food.

Deviations from these benchmarks indicate a performance gap (δ_i), which quantifies the extent to which a component underperforms relative to its target. The performance gap for a given component is calculated as

$$\delta_i = \frac{|x_i - \bar{x}_i|}{x_i}, \tag{1}$$

where x_i is the observed performance of the component. The numerator $|x_i - \bar{x}_i|$ represents the absolute deviation from the benchmark, while the denominator x_i normalizes this deviation relative to the observed performance. A higher value of δ_i indicates a more substantial underperformance, signaling greater vulnerability of the food system component.

Components with larger performance gaps (δ_i) are particularly susceptible to failure and thus require targeted financial interventions to improve their performance and reduce vulnerability. This focus aligns with frameworks such as the Food Systems Dashboard, which integrates performance and contextual indicators to assess and monitor the functionality of food systems (Fanzo et al. 2020). The inclusion of performance benchmarks and gap analysis ensures that the FSFVI captures both the current state of the system and its potential to improve with targeted support.

The FSFVI extends this performance-based analysis by explicitly incorporating the role of financial resources (f_i) in addressing performance gaps. Financial vulnerability is modeled as a function of both the intrinsic performance gap (δ_i) and the resources allocated to the component. This approach acknowledges that while financial inputs are critical for mitigating gaps, their impact is often subject to diminishing returns. In other words, additional financial investment provides progressively smaller improvements in performance as a component approaches its benchmark. This phenomenon is captured in the vulnerability function

$$v_i(f_i) = \delta_i \cdot \frac{1}{1 + \alpha_i f_i}, \tag{2}$$

where α_i is the sensitivity parameter for the component, reflecting how efficiently financial resources translate into performance improvements, and f_i is the financial allocation to component i.

The diminishing returns inherent in $v_i(f_i)$ highlight the need for strategic prioritization of financial resources, ensuring that investments are directed to components where they yield the greatest marginal benefit. This aligns with findings from studies on resource prioritization under constraints, which emphasize the importance of optimizing resource allocation to reduce overall systemic vulnerability (HLPE 2017).

By integrating performance gaps, financial allocations, and diminishing returns, the FSFVI provides a holistic framework for assessing and managing financing vulnerability in food systems. It enables stakeholders to identify components most in need of intervention, prioritize financial resources effectively, and track improvements over time. This framework supports evidence-based decision-making, ensuring that limited resources are deployed in ways that maximize the resilience and sustainability of food systems.

3. Complete mathematical representation

The FSFVI quantifies the financing vulnerability of a given food system by aggregating the vulnerabilities of its individual components. The mathematical representation of the FSFVI is detailed below.

Component vulnerability function

As explained above, the financing vulnerability of a component (i) is modeled as

$$v_i(f_i) = \delta_i \cdot \frac{1}{1+\alpha_i f_i}.$$

The term δ_i is the relative performance gap of component i, representing the extent to which it underperforms relative to its benchmark ($\bar{x}_i$):

$$\delta_i = \frac{|x_i - \bar{x}_i|}{x_i},$$

where x_i is the observed performance, and $\bar{x}_i$ is the ideal performance of the component.

The term f_i represents the financial resources allocated to component i, while α_i is a sensitivity parameter specific to the component, representing the efficiency with which financial resources reduce vulnerability. Larger α_i values indicate higher responsiveness to financial inputs.

This function captures the diminishing returns of financial investments, where the impact of additional funding decreases as the component's performance approaches its benchmark.

Aggregation of vulnerabilities

The FSFVI aggregates the vulnerabilities of all n components, weighted by their relative importance (ω_i):

$$FSFVI = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i \cdot v_i(f_i), \tag{3}$$

where ω_i represents the weight assigned to component i, reflecting its relative importance within a given food system. Components that play a critical role in food system outcomes, such as those linked to food security or sustainability, are typically assigned higher weights.

Key insights from the FSFVI

- Component-level vulnerability: The term $v_i(f_i)$ provides a granular view of the vulnerability of individual components that considers their performance gaps (δ_i) and the impact of financial investments (f_i).

- System-level vulnerability: The aggregated FSFVI quantifies the overall vulnerability of the food system, allowing for an assessment of its resilience to financial shocks and stressors.

- Weighting for importance: By incorporating weights (ω_i), the FSFVI ensures that critical components contribute proportionally to the overall vulnerability measure, reflecting their systemic significance.

4. Optimization

The FSFVI framework operates under specific constraints to ensure its practical applicability and alignment with real-world financial and systemic considerations. These constraints are essential for guiding the allocation of financial resources while maintaining a focus on reducing system-wide vulnerability.

Budget constraint

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} f_i \leq F, \tag{4}$$

where f_i represents the financial resources allocated to component i, and F is the total available financial budget for allocation.

The budget constraint ensures that the sum of allocated resources across all n components does not exceed the total financial resources available. This constraint reflects the real-world limitation of finite budgets and necessitates strategic prioritization of resource distribution to achieve the greatest impact on reducing system vulnerability.

Non-negativity constraint

$$f_i \geq 0, \forall i, \tag{5}$$

This constraint ensures that financial allocations are non-negative, meaning no component can receive a negative allocation of resources. This is a fundamental assumption in financial modeling and reflects the practical reality that resources cannot be "removed" from components as part of the allocation process.

Prioritization rule

$$f_i \geq f_j \text{ if } \delta_i \geq \delta_j, \tag{6}$$

where δ_i is the relative performance gap of component i, and δ_j is the relative performance gap of component j.

This prioritization rule ensures that components with larger performance gaps (δ_i) are allocated at least as much financial support as those with smaller gaps (δ_j). This aligns with the principle of targeting resources toward the most vulnerable components to maximize the impact of financial investments. The rule reflects the need to address disparities in vulnerability across components, ensuring that funding is directed where it is most urgently needed (FAO 2021).

Optimized financial allocation

Minimize: $\sum_{i=1}^{n} \omega_i \cdot v_i(f_i), \tag{7}$

subject to budget and non-negativity constraints.

This ensures that financial resources are distributed efficiently to minimize the overall system vulnerability while adhering to the total budget and ensuring that all allocations are non-negative.

5. Data requirements

Performance data (x_i) and benchmarks $(\bar{x}_i)$ collect observed performance data for each component in the food system, such as production output, distribution efficiency, or consumption levels. These also define the benchmark, representing the ideal performance level necessary to achieve systemic goals.

System priorities (ω_i) assign weights to each component based on its criticality within the given food system. Components integral to achieving key outcomes, such as food security or sustainability, should be given higher weights. This step aligns with approaches such as those proposed by Tubiello and colleagues (2013), which emphasize prioritization based on systemic importance.

Financial budget *(F)* and sensitivity parameters (α_i) determine the total financial budget available for allocation across components. These also set sensitivity parameters for each component, reflecting how effectively financial investments translate into performance improvements. These parameters can be based on historical data, expert input, or empirical studies.

6. Potential benchmarks for the FSFVI

Benchmarks are essential for interpreting the FSFVI. They provide reference points to evaluate the financing vulnerability of food systems and guide decisions on resource allocation, policy adjustments, and long-term planning. Without benchmarks, the FSFVI would lack the contextual framework necessary for its effective application, leaving policymakers without clear indicators of what constitutes an acceptable or unacceptable level of financing vulnerability. Several types of benchmarks can be applied, ranging from absolute thresholds to historical comparisons and policy-driven targets, each offering unique insights into food system resilience.

Absolute thresholds represent one approach to benchmarking the FSFVI. These thresholds classify FSFVI values into qualitative categories such as low, moderate, and high vulnerability. For instance, a low FSFVI value (such as ≤ 0.1) might indicate effective financial resource allocation and minimal residual performance gaps within the system. This suggests that food system components are adequately funded to address vulnerabilities and enhance resilience. On the other hand, moderate FSFVI values (0.1 < FSFVI ≤ 0.3) may highlight areas requiring further attention, where resource allocation has mitigated some gaps, but not all. High FSFVI values (> 0.3) would signify significant weaknesses in the system, potentially caused by underfunding or inefficient distribution of resources. These thresholds provide a clear framework for interpreting FSFVI values and can help prioritize interventions to reduce systemic vulnerability.

In addition to absolute thresholds, comparative benchmarks offer valuable insights by allowing policymakers to evaluate FSFVI values against those of other food systems, regions, or time periods. For example, regional comparisons can highlight disparities in financing vulnerability, helping to identify systems or regions that are particularly resilient or vulnerable. Temporal comparisons can track changes in FSFVI values over time, offering a measure of progress in addressing vulnerabilities. Global averages could also serve as benchmarks that enable countries or regions to evaluate their performance relative to global standards. These comparisons provide a broader context for understanding FSFVI values and identifying best practices from other systems.

Policy-driven benchmarks offer another approach by linking FSFVI values to specific goals or frameworks, such as the SDGs. For instance, FSFVI benchmarks can be aligned with SDG 2 (Zero Hunger) to ensure that financial investments contribute to equitable access to nutritious food. National food security strategies can

also serve as a reference, with FSFVI values indicating whether resource allocation supports targets for reducing hunger, improving agricultural productivity, or increasing food affordability. Benchmarks tied to crisis preparedness are another valuable application: policymakers could establish FSFVI thresholds to ensure that food systems remain resilient to financial shocks from natural disasters, pandemics, or economic downturns. By linking FSFVI values to broader policy objectives, these benchmarks provide actionable targets for improving systemic resilience.

Benchmarks can also be tailored to specific components of food systems. For example, FSFVI values for agricultural production might need to remain consistently low to ensure a reliable food supply. Benchmarks for distribution systems could focus on maintaining food availability and affordability, particularly in densely populated regions or areas reliant on imported food. Similarly, benchmarks for food consumption components might address disparities in access to affordable nutritious diets, reflecting the importance of equitable resource distribution. These sector-specific benchmarks allow for a more granular analysis of the FSFVI, ensuring that interventions target the most critical areas of food systems.

Another effective benchmarking strategy is the use of historical baselines. Comparing current FSFVI values to past values provides a measure of progress. For instance, policymakers can evaluate whether financial interventions have successfully reduced vulnerabilities by tracking FSFVI values over time. Historical baselines are also useful in understanding the impacts of crises or shocks, such as economic downturns or natural disasters. FSFVI values recorded during such events can serve as reference points, helping policymakers ensure that food systems maintain resilience during normal operations. These comparisons enable stakeholders to learn from past experiences and refine strategies for managing future vulnerabilities.

Finally, expert-driven benchmarks can provide a tailored approach to interpreting FSFVI values. Engaging stakeholders, researchers, and practitioners allows for the establishment of benchmarks that reflect the specific context and priorities of a given food system. Participatory goal-setting ensures that benchmarks are aligned with local realities, while expert consensus can provide insights into acceptable levels of vulnerability. Benchmarking FSFVI values against best-performing systems globally or within similar socioeconomic contexts can further highlight opportunities for improvement and adaptation of successful practices.

Establishing meaningful benchmarks for the FSFVI is essential to interpreting its results and guiding decision-making. Absolute thresholds, comparative benchmarks, policy-driven targets, sector-specific thresholds, historical baselines, and expert-driven approaches each provide unique advantages for evaluating food system vulnerability. By integrating these benchmarks, policymakers can identify critical gaps, prioritize interventions, and measure progress over time. Benchmarks not only enhance the utility of the FSFVI but also ensure that financial investments align with broader goals of food security, sustainability, and resilience.

7. Interpreting the FSFVI

The FSFVI's interpretive framework provides a comprehensive view of financing vulnerabilities within the food system, supporting strategic decision-making at both the component and system-wide levels.

Assessing overall system vulnerability

At the core of the FSFVI is its ability to quantify the aggregate financing vulnerability of a given food system. This measure reflects how effectively financial resources are allocated and whether these allocations adequately address systemic performance gaps.

A low FSFVI signals that resources are being allocated effectively, reducing residual vulnerabilities across the system. In such cases, performance gaps are adequately addressed, and the system is resilient to financial and operational disruptions. A low FSFVI highlights that the allocation of financial resources aligns well with systemic needs, ensuring the most vulnerable components are prioritized and supported. This outcome demonstrates an efficient and resilient food system capable of withstanding potential stressors.

Conversely, a high FSFVI indicates systemic weaknesses, often due to underfunding or inefficient resource allocation. Critical components may remain underperforming, leaving the system vulnerable to shocks and stressors such as economic fluctuations or climate events. Policymakers should investigate whether the budget (F) is inherently insufficient or if financial resources are being misallocated. Addressing a high FSFVI may require an increase in total funding, reallocation of existing resources, or adjustments to resource distribution priorities to ensure that the system's most critical gaps are closed (Fanzo et al. 2020).

Identifying priority components

The FSFVI is instrumental in pinpointing specific components within food systems that require targeted interventions. By analyzing individual vulnerabilities ($v_i(f_i)$) and performance gaps (δ_i), policymakers can identify which components are most in need of financial support.

Components with significant performance gaps (high δ_i) are inherently more vulnerable and must be prioritized for resource allocation. Persistent vulnerabilities, even after financial input, may indicate deeper structural or systemic issues. These issues might require non-financial interventions such as policy reforms, infrastructure investments, or capacity-building initiatives to complement financial allocations.

Components with disproportionately high vulnerabilities compared to others in the system should be flagged for further analysis. Identifying and addressing such disparities ensures equitable resource distribution. It also prevents overinvestment in components where the marginal benefits of additional funding are limited, enabling more impactful use of resources elsewhere.

Evaluating resource efficiency

The FSFVI incorporates sensitivity parameters (α_i), which quantify the responsiveness of components to financial inputs. By analyzing these parameters, policymakers can evaluate the efficiency of their resource allocation strategies.

Components with high sensitivity to financial resources (high α_i) exhibit substantial improvements in performance with additional funding. Targeting these components for increased financial input can significantly reduce vulnerabilities, ensuring that resources yield the greatest possible impact.

Components with low sensitivity to financial inputs (low α_i) are less responsive to funding and may require alternative interventions. For such components, strategies such as technical assistance, policy adjustments, or infrastructure development might be more effective. Allocating excessive financial resources to these components is inefficient and should be avoided.

Sensitivity analysis enables policymakers to perform cost-benefit evaluations, ensuring that funding decisions are evidence-based and aligned with strategic objectives. This approach allows for the identification of the most cost-effective interventions, optimizing the allocation of limited financial resources (IPCC 2023).

8. Assessing vulnerability through comparison of optimal and actual FSFVI

By comparing the optimal FSFVI, calculated under ideal resource allocation, with the actual FSFVI, which reflects real-world financial distributions, policymakers can gain a deeper understanding of systemic vulnerabilities and inefficiencies. This comparison highlights the alignment—or lack thereof—between resource allocation and the needs of the food system.

Optimal vs. actual FSFVI

The optimal FSFVI represents the minimum achievable financing vulnerability of the food system. It assumes that financial resources are allocated perfectly to minimize performance gaps and maximize the impact of investments. This value serves as a benchmark for how resilient the system could be under ideal conditions.

The actual FSFVI, on the other hand, is calculated using existing resource allocation. It reflects the current level of vulnerability in the food system, influenced by real-world constraints, policy decisions, and operational practices. Discrepancies between the two reveal the extent to which vulnerabilities remain unaddressed due to suboptimal financial distribution.

This comparison is particularly useful for identifying systemic weaknesses. A small gap between the actual and optimal FSFVI suggests that resource allocation is effective and closely aligned with the system's needs. Conversely, a large gap indicates significant residual vulnerabilities and inefficiencies that require attention.

Metrics for FSFVI comparison

Several metrics can be used to quantify the difference between optimal and actual FSFVI.

The absolute FSFVI gap measures unaddressed vulnerability:

$$Gap_{FSFVI} = FSFVI_{actual} - FSFVI_{optimal}. \tag{8}$$

A larger gap indicates greater inefficiency in addressing systemic vulnerabilities.

The normalized gap ratio expresses the FSFVI gap as a proportion of the optimal FSFVI:

$$Gap\ Ratio = \frac{FSFVI_{actual} - FSFVI_{optimal}}{FSFVI_{optimal}}. \tag{9}$$

It allows for easy comparison across systems, highlighting relative inefficiencies.

The efficiency index compares actual system performance to the theoretical ideal:

$$Efficiency\ Index = \frac{FSFVI_{optimal}}{FSFVI_{actual}}. \tag{10}$$

An index value closer to 1 indicates better alignment with optimal resource allocation.

9. Conclusion

The FSFVI serves as a transformative tool for addressing financing vulnerability within food systems. It provides a structured, quantitative framework that combines performance data, resource allocation efficiency, and systemic priorities to assess and mitigate vulnerabilities. The FSFVI not only enables stakeholders to

identify and prioritize the most vulnerable components of food systems but also guides optimal resource allocation to improve overall resilience. By ensuring that resources are allocated to areas where they can have the greatest impact, the FSFVI supports sustainable, efficient, and equitable food systems.

One of the FSFVI's greatest strengths lies in its ability to provide actionable insights. Policymakers can use the index to assess the system-wide effectiveness of financial interventions and make evidence-based decisions. For instance, by comparing the actual FSFVI to the optimal FSFVI, stakeholders can quantify residual vulnerabilities, identify inefficiencies in resource use, and recalibrate financial strategies. This ensures that resource allocation aligns with systemic needs, thereby reducing vulnerabilities and enhancing resilience. Additionally, the FSFVI provides a basis for monitoring progress over time, enabling stakeholders to evaluate the impact of interventions and refine their approaches as needed.

The FSFVI's adaptability makes it a valuable tool across different contexts. It can be tailored to evaluate financing vulnerability at various scales, from national to regional food systems, and adapted to sector-specific benchmarks for components such as production, distribution, and consumption. The flexibility of the FSFVI also allows it to integrate with broader policy frameworks, such as the SDGs, ensuring that food system resilience aligns with global sustainability objectives. By linking financing vulnerability to performance and policy goals, the FSFVI ensures that interventions are not only reactive but also proactive in addressing long-term systemic challenges.

In a world increasingly impacted by economic uncertainties, climate change, and global health crises, the FSFVI equips policymakers with the tools to understand financing vulnerabilities, make informed decisions, and foster food systems capable of withstanding and recovering from shocks. By strategically leveraging the insights provided by the FSFVI, stakeholders can contribute to food systems that are not only sustainable but also equitable, ensuring access to healthy, nutritious diets for all.

The FSFVI's relevance will only grow as global challenges intensify. By enabling a holistic understanding of financing vulnerability and promoting efficient resource allocation, the FSFVI plays a critical role in building robust, adaptable food systems that can meet the needs of present and future generations. Its application represents a significant step forward in the effort to secure global food security, sustainability, and resilience in an ever-changing world.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

John M. Ulimwengu is a senior research fellow at the International Food Policy Research Institute (https://www.ifpri.org/profile/john-ulimwengu). He holds a PhD in Agricultural Economics from Ohio State University (United States). His research interests include resilience, food systems, poverty dynamics, and network analysis. Since 2007, Dr. Ulimwengu has been involved in strategic research on the transformation of the agricultural sector in Africa under the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Program (CAADP) agenda. From 2017 to 2021, he was the Africa-wide coordinator of the Regional Strategic Analysis and Knowledge Support System (ReSAKSS). He is currently leading food system mapping projects in Ghana, Rwanda, Malawi, Ethiopia, and Niger.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Fanzo, J., L. Haddad, R. McLaren, et al.. 2020. "The Food Systems Dashboard Is a New Tool to Inform Better Food Policy." *Nature Food* 1: 243–246.

FAO (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations). 2021. *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World*. Rome.

HLPE (High Level Panel of Experts). 2017. *Nutrition and Food Systems*. The High Level Panel of Experts on Food Security and Nutrition of the Committee on World Food Security, Rome.

IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change). 2023. *Climate Change Impacts on Food Systems*. AR6 Synthesis Report.

Tubiello, F.N., M. Salvatore, S. Rossi, A. Ferrara, N. Fitton, and P. Smith. 2013. "The FAOSTAT Database of Greenhouse Gas Emissions from Agriculture." *Environmental Research Letters* 8 (1): 015009..