U.S. GOVERNMENT GLOBAL FOOD SECURITY STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION REPORT

FEED THE FUTURE

Table of Contents

Foreword from USAID Administrator Mark Green

Introduction

1.) Updates on Global Food Security Strategy Implementation

2.) Progress Implementing the Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Approach under the Global Food Security Strategy

3.) Coordination and Implementation Synergies under the Global Food Security Strategy

4.) Legal and Regulatory Impediments to Implementation

5.) Global Food Security Strategy Spending Report

Appendix 1: Global Food Security Strategy Executive Summary (2016)

Appendix 2: Global Food Security Strategy Agency Implementation Plan Updates

Appendix 3: Global Food Security Strategy MEL Indicators

Appendix 4: Feed the Future Results

MESSAGE FROM THE USAID ADMINISTRATOR

As the Global Coordinator of Feed the Future, I am proud to submit the first Global Food Security Strategy Implementation Report for Fiscal Year 2017 The Global Food Security Act sends a clear message that the United States is committed to addressing the root causes of poverty and hunger. Through the corresponding *U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy*, U.S. Government Agencies and Departments are building on the success of the first phase of Feed the Future as we work together to achieve the objectives set out in the legislation, while advancing both the development and national security interests of the Administration.

Since the submission of the *Strategy* last October, the interagency has taken a number of important steps. Most notably, the interagency has selected 12 Feed the Future target countries; launched the process to develop target-country plans; convened an interagency working group to develop a thoughtful approach to strategic transition (i.e., country graduation); developed a new interagency research strategy; and developed detailed technical guidance to support programmatic design and implementation in the field by using the best practices laid out in the *Strategy*.

While we have made progress, we recognize we have a great deal of work to do to realize the *Strategy*'s vision for sustainably reducing global hunger, poverty and malnutrition through increasing investment from the target countries and partnership with the private sector, civil society and other donors. We look forward to engaging closely with our partners in Congress, and our external stakeholder community, as we continue the important work of implementing this whole-of-government food-security *Strategy*.

Sincerely,
Mark Green

Introduction

The Global Food Security Act of 2016 (GFSA) called for the interagency to develop a new whole-of-government global food security strategy, which the Feed the Future U.S. Government (USG) partner Agencies and Departments worked together to create, along with Department- and Agency-specific implementation plans. Using past performance and evidence, including other relevant research findings, consultations with the private sector, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), leading experts, and other stakeholders, we produced the USG's *Global Food Security Strategy* (GFSS) that will guide Feed the Future moving forward. The *Strategy* maintains key tenets of the first phase of Feed the Future (2010 - 2017)[1], including a focus on small-scale food producers[2], especially women, and an overarching goal of sustainably reducing poverty, hunger, and malnutrition in support of America's development and national security interests. However, it includes a few important distinctions from the first phase of Feed the Future.

First, the interagency further elevated nutrition, building on its pioneering efforts to integrate agriculture and nutrition, with a focus on the first 1,000 days from pregnancy to a child's second birthday. Second, the GFSS is seeking to further integrate water, sanitation, and hygiene into our work to better nourish women and children, as improved access to clean and safe drinking water, food, and sanitation services, along with hygiene, is critical to improving nutritional status. Third, we increased our focus on strengthening resilience among people and systems to break the cycle of crisis that keeps people in poverty, including addressing the root causes of recurrent shocks. Fourth, the interagency further emphasized the need to work not just on agricultural production, but throughout the entire agriculture and food system – including processing, trade, marketing, and preparation to reduce food prices, increase incomes, and provide employment for the rural and urban poor. The strategy also emphasizes the role of the USG in facilitating systemic change in Feed the Future target countries, including in the policy-enabling environment and in market systems, to help markets function well while improving the availability of food. We are using our influence and technical expertise to help partner governments update policies and allocate their national resources in ways that will create long-term, country-led change. Together, these efforts will sustain momentum and growth beyond the U.S. Government's assistance.

This report responds to Section 8(a) of the GFSA, which requires the USG to submit a report to describe the interagency's progress toward implementing the GFSS. In the following sections, we cover Feed the Future progress through 2017 and progress toward GFSS implementation, specifically: selection of the target countries; defining strategic transition; country planning; technical implementation guidance; the development of our new whole-of-government research

[1] The "first phase" of Feed the Future refers to the time period of 2010 to 2017, in which the U.S. Government implemented Feed the Future based on multi-year country strategies. 2017 represents a transitional year from Phase 1 to Phase 2, guided by the GFSS.

[2] The GFSS defines small-scale producers as farmers, pastoralists, foresters, and fishers.

strategy; and incorporating gender analysis in our programming. We also review our interagency approach to monitoring, evaluation and learning (MEL); how the GFSS leverages and complements other USG strategies; private sector engagement and partnerships; and multilateral food security and nutrition efforts. As technical appendices, we have also included tables with our new and updated MEL indicators and mechanisms for reporting, the Feed the Future Global Results through Fiscal Year 2016, along with Agency- and Department-specific updates to the implementation plans submitted as part of the GFSS in 2016.

We look forward to continuing to make strong progress, in close consultation with our Congressional stakeholders, to sustainably reduce global hunger, poverty and malnutrition.

1. Updates on Global Food Security Strategy Implementation

Results from Feed the Future's First Phase and 2016-2017 Highlights

The first year of GFSS implementation has brought strong progress in food security across Feed the Future's initial focus countries, and the rapid interagency scale-up of mechanisms and processes to transition Feed the Future into the broader, even more ambitious approach of the *Strategy*. The first step to implement the new approach was for the interagency to select 12 target countries in which to concentrate its collective investment through Feed the Future. We are currently in the process of developing five-year country plans for the 12 Feed the Future target countries. Existing Feed the Future strategies in our initial focus countries[3], from Phase one of Feed the Future, run through FY 2017, and we will begin to analyze final results in 2018.

When Feed the Future first began, the interagency took on an ambitious and focused effort to combat the root causes of hunger and poverty in a select number of countries. The GFSA endorsed this approach and the GFSS builds on it to achieve long-lasting results, based on lessons we have learned from the first phase of Feed the Future implementation.

Today, nine million more people are living above the poverty line, 1.7 million more households are not suffering from hunger, and 1.8 million more children are living free from the devastating effects of stunting in the areas where the initiative works[4]. Since 2011, Feed the Future farmers have earned nearly **$2.6 billion** in new agricultural sales, and we have unlocked nearly **$2.7**

[3]At the beginning of the first phase of Feed the Future, the interagency selected 19 "focus" countries in which to concentrate its food security programming and measure high level results. Section 5(a)(2) of the GFSA required the interagency to select a set of "target" countries based on the targeting criteria outlined in the GFSS. 10 of the 19 former focus countries will continue as target countries. For the nine former focus countries that will not continue as target countries, the interagency will work with each country team at Post and the host country government to determine how best to continue supporting the government's leadership on food security moving forward.

[4] These results represent aggregate statistics observed in 17 of the original 19 Feed the Future focus countries over a two-to-six year period, depending on country data source. Figures are not yet available for Mali and Guatemala.

billion in agricultural and rural loans to help smallholder farmers and businesses grow. Feed the Future has partnered with hundreds of local small- and-medium-sized businesses, as well as U.S. and multinational companies, to leverage nearly **$830 million in direct private sector capital investment** since 2011--a conservative estimate of our total leverage.

In 2016 alone, we helped **nearly 11 million small-scale food producers gain access** to new tools and technologies such as high-yielding seeds, fertilizer application, soil conservation, and water management. In Africa, this helped the producers reached by Feed the Future increase their maize yields 23 percent above national averages. With modern know-how and technologies, these farmers have been able to move from a life of subsistence to one of higher incomes and stability.

In 2016, Feed the Future, in partnership with USAID Global Health and USAID Food for Peace, also trained **more than 3.7 million people**[5] in child health and nutrition and helped thousands of health facilities address malnutrition so they can help families help themselves, now and for years to come. These are part of the Feed the Future's efforts that helped reach **more than 27 million children** under the age of five in 2016 with interventions to improve their nutrition, with particular focus on the critical 1,000-day window of opportunity from pregnancy to a child's second birthday.

Results like these, achieved during the first phase of Feed the Future, have made a significant impact in the areas where we work. We are extremely encouraged by the changes observed in Feed the Future zones of influence at interim. Since the initiative began, based on average annual rates of reduction measured at that time, we project that poverty has dropped by an average of **19 percent** and childhood stunting by **26 percent** across areas in which the initiative has focused efforts.[6]

While continuing to implement ongoing food security programs that maintain Feed the Future's strong momentum in reducing poverty and improving nutrition, our country-level programs will integrate key principles of the GFSS in their implementation.

Already, our programs are strengthening resilience, investing in long-term solutions to food security today to reduce the need for costly food aid in the future by helping countries move beyond aid dependency. We have seen how such long-term investment works in Ethiopia. In 2016, Feed the Future's targeted resilience investments in Ethiopia helped the country mitigate

[5] People trained include health professionals, primary health care workers, community health workers, volunteers, mothers/caregivers, policy-makers, researchers, and other non-health personnel in child health care and child nutrition training provided through USG-supported programs during the reporting year.

[6] Projections of average total percentage change between 2010 and 2016 are based on population- and time-weighted average annual rates of change measured in the baseline and interim population-based surveys in Feed the Future target regions.

drought, even though the drought was more severe and lasted longer than the 1985 crisis that led to widespread famine. A recent study[7] conducted by the United Kingdom's Department for International Development in Kenya and Ethiopia estimated that every $1 invested in resilience will result in nearly $3 of savings by reducing humanitarian spending, avoiding losses and improving outcomes for poverty, hunger and nutrition.

In the long term, development assistance has the potential to be far more cost efficient than responding to repeat, large-scale emergencies, as seen in a comparison of two similar communities during the 2016 drought in Malawi. In the first community, which had not received development assistance, responding to urgent, life-saving needs cost an average of $390 per household over 10 months. All signs indicated the community would likely require similar assistance during future droughts, which occur every five to seven years. By contrast, a neighboring community in which we invested in long-term food-security programs between 2009 and 2014 did not require food assistance in 2016 and is thriving, producing three harvests per year. Our investments, which included improving small-scale irrigation, extension and access to better inputs, finance and markets cost only $376 per household over five years and eliminated the need for food assistance. Assuming at least three droughts over the next 20 years in Malawi, resilience building was 68 percent less expensive than providing humanitarian assistance[8].

Feed the Future investments in Nigeria are increasingly building resilience of vulnerable households who are suffering the effects of the Boko Haram insurgency, by focusing on the youth, who are among the most vulnerable. The objectives align with U.S. national security interests, and ultimately move people out of chronic vulnerability and away from dependence on humanitarian assistance by building their capacity to engage in agricultural production and diversified rural non-farm entrepreneurial activities aimed at growing their incomes toward long-term economic recovery, stability, and poverty reduction.

The private sector also participates in Feed the Future activities that strengthen resilience. The Alliance for Resilient Coffee harnesses the expertise of a consortium of organizations to develop tools that help major coffee roasters and traders identify and manage the risks posed by weather variability to their coffee supply chains. Managing weather variability risks will benefit smallholder farmers and their cooperatives, while helping to secure the future of the coffee sector in the face of changing growing conditions. The consortium consists of the Hanns R. Neumann Foundation, Conservation International, The International Center for Tropical Agriculture, The International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, Root Capital, Sustainable Food Lab, and World Coffee Research. Launched in late 2016, pilot activities are underway in Guatemala, Honduras, and Uganda.

[7] http://www.alnap.org/pool/files/econ-ear-rec-res-full-report-.pdf.
[8] Based on estimates provided by World Food Programme and USAID/FFP.

And in Sénégal, where previous Feed the Future investments helped drive agricultural transformation in the Sénégal River Valley, the initiative is pivoting to look beyond targeted agricultural value chains to address broader challenges in the agriculture labor market. The valley is now a major job creation hub in the country, where small businesses are increasingly connecting small-scale food producers to markets, while offering jobs and economic opportunities to youth and women. The Feed the Future program has refocused on accelerating this transformation, by addressing the skill gaps that impede women and youth's ability to take advantage of the new jobs, and strengthening local enterprises and entrepreneurship to generate more jobs and economic opportunities for the poor.

Country leadership, political will, and commitment to results and accountability are critical to the long-term sustainability and success of our investments and partnerships. From the beginning, Feed the Future has worked with countries to support country-led policy reform and implementation efforts, and to urge countries to set their own priorities for food security and nutrition. We have worked with African leaders through the Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme (CAADP), the Malabo Declaration for Agriculture, the African Leaders Summit, the Addis Ababa Agenda for Action, and other commitments to mobilize their domestic resources. We have created partnerships with other donors and through multilateral bodies like the G7 to coordinate and catalyze development assistance and private sector investment. Feed the Future rallied private and public partners to commit to specific policy reforms and investments that would accelerate the implementation of CAADP country strategies for improving food security and nutrition, and supported the partners' agreements to hold themselves accountable to these commitments.

In Africa, Feed the Future partner governments have outpaced their neighbors' domestic investments in agriculture and increased their investments by an average of 35 percent -- an additional $718 million per year.

Feed the Future's partner governments have regularly taken over and scaled programs that we helped pilot, such as a novel livestock insurance program for pastoralists in Kenya. It is now paying out millions of dollars to more than 12,000 pastoralist households, to enable them to better manage through the current drought and speed their recovery once drought conditions subside.

As outlined in A Food-Secure 2030, which set out a global vision and call to action consistent with the GFSS, we are continuing and adding to these efforts. A shared commitment to growth includes strong leadership and investment by developing countries and more catalytic development assistance, which will help mobilize significantly more capital from both the public and private sectors. Transparent policy agendas and mutual accountability will ensure resources

achieve maximum impact. Feed the Future will also continue to work with other development institutions, donors, technical agencies, and civil society to support country leadership, capacity building, and accountable institutions.

As we move forward with implementation, the interagency will build on Feed the Future's proven approach, which is to work closely with partners spanning sectors to help people create and find meaningful work and sustainably feed themselves and their families. We have learned the importance of building resilience, elevated to the objective level within the GFSS, and country ownership, already a key tenet of the first phase of Feed the Future, to sustainably reduce poverty, hunger and malnutrition. We have also learned the critical importance of promoting women's economic empowerment in agriculture to reach these objectives.

As we finalized individual plans in the Feed the Future target countries, we will build on the success of the initiative through a process of continuous learning, rigorous performance management, and a focus on accountability and results. Our renewed emphasis on interagency collaboration has set the stage for the initiative to produce long-term, sustainable results in the areas where we work.

Changes to the Global Food Security Strategy

The interagency is considering ways to update the *Strategy* to improve its alignment with the Administration's priorities, including U.S. national security. As the interagency determines the changes needed, we will consult with our Congressional and other stakeholders to solicit feedback and input on any proposed modifications and updates. As implementation moves forward, the interagency, led by the Administration's national security and foreign policy priorities, will undertake a process of continuous learning, evaluation, and adaptation to ensure our interventions achieve the best possible results in the areas where we work. Through this process we will reevaluate the GFSS to determine if any further changes are necessary.

Implementation Progress Review

Since the submission of the GFSS in October 2016, the interagency has taken a number of important steps to implement the *Strategy* through Feed the Future. The interagency has convened a set of working groups to advance key implementation workstreams, most notably: (1) the selection of 12 Feed the Future target countries; (2) construction of a thoughtful, long-term approach to strategic transition of target countries from GFSS assistance; (3) launching the development of five-year interagency country plans for the 12 target countries; (4) the development of detailed technical guidance to inform programmatic implementation in the field; (5) the development of a new interagency food security research strategy; and (6) the development of a new set of indicators and MEL approach (discussed in Section 2).

Selection of Feed the Future Target Countries

The first step to implement the GFSS was to identify target countries where U.S. Government investments have the greatest potential to achieve sustainable improvements in poverty, hunger and malnutrition. Using the targeting criteria in the GFSS, the interagency developed a highly transparent, data-driven, three-phase process for indicator selection, consultation with the field, resource alignment and host government engagement. During the country selection process, the interagency carefully analyzed a wide range of qualitative and quantitative data, including valid third-party indicators aligned to the targeting criteria; qualitative data drawn from surveys of interagency country teams in the field; and the contextual perspectives of the Feed the Future U.S. Government partner Agencies and Departments.

In addition to engaging U.S. Government Agencies and Departments, we held several consultations with Congressional stakeholders and also invited more than 150 public and private sector organizations to participate in consultations about the process and application of the GFSS selection criteria within the context of the FY 2018 budget request, including the level of need, potential for agriculture-led growth, opportunities for partnership, opportunities for regional economic integration, and host government commitment to investment and policy reform.

From this, the interagency identified 25 target country candidates through a comprehensive review of "level of need" and "opportunity for impact," in addition to country-specific factors. After reaching a technical consensus, the interagency further narrowed the list to reflect countries where the interagency could have the most impact. This process resulted in the selection of a total of 12 Feed the Future target countries for GFSS implementation. This list enables the interagency to focus and concentrate its collective resources to build on successful pre-existing focus-country programs, while expanding into countries not previously part of the initiative but with high levels of need and opportunity for impact.

The 12 selected Feed the Future target countries are listed below:

- Bangladesh;
- Ethiopia;
- Ghana;
- Guatemala;
- Honduras;
- Kenya;
- Mali;
- Nepal;
- Niger*;
- Nigeria*;
- Sénégal; and
- Uganda.

Ten of the 12 target countries were previously Feed the Future focus countries, and two were previously aligned Feed the Future countries, as indicated by (*).

Feed the Future target countries are where the interagency will concentrate its collective resources, in close partnership with host country governments, to meet ambitious reduction targets for poverty, hunger and malnutrition. USG posts in the target countries are expected to meet four requirements: (1) host a designated interagency Feed the Future coordinator in country; (2) produce an approved interagency country plan; (3) define zone(s) of influence to measure impact; and (4) establish goal-level targets for poverty, hunger and malnutrition.

The interagency views the selection of a target country as a dynamic, ongoing process it will revisit at appropriate time intervals as funding and country conditions change, in close consultation with Congress and the National Security Council. Building on the criteria, data and methodology for target country selection, the interagency will develop a process and timeline for reassessing the list in the coming years to determine whether to make changes. In addition, the interagency recognizes how vital agriculture is to ending poverty and hunger and, as noted in the GFSS, we will continue to invest in additional high-need, non-target countries to produce meaningful results, and work closely with regional programs to sustain development gains, target populations vulnerable to violence and insecurity, and capitalize on emerging opportunities. Feed the Future regional programs contribute to GFSS objectives by addressing significant cross-border issues, including trade, policy, and regional food markets. The interagency will support non-target countries, to the greatest extent possible, and is working to develop clear guidance and requirements for GFSS implementation in these countries.

Strategic Transition

Section 8(a)(5) of the GFSA requires that this report "describe[s] related strategies and benchmarks for graduating target countries and communities from assistance provided under the Global Food Security Strategy over time". For this purpose, we propose using the term "strategic transition," rather than "graduation," to achieve our overarching goal of ending the need for our foreign assistance, where appropriate. Ultimately, the goal of target country investments is to put in place the conditions for which intensive food security and humanitarian assistance is no longer needed.

The basic premise of *strategic transition* is to identify the point at which countries have clearly demonstrated they have the capacity to sustain development advancements and successes in inclusive agricultural growth, resilience, and nutrition and can "transition" to a new assistance relationship with the U.S.

More specifically, strategic transition does not imply food security programming will necessarily cease completely; instead it indicates a stage at which a country has realized sufficient improvements in food security whereby the interagency determines it has demonstrated the capacity and commitment to build on and sustain progress on reducing poverty, hunger and malnutrition with reduced or no investment of U.S. taxpayer dollars. Additionally, the USG's engagement and relationship with a country would not be expected to end following a strategic transition out of target country status; rather, the relationship would focus on continued activity around policy reform, opening markets, promoting trade and investment, scientific collaborations, and leveraging USG food security and multilateral donor funding to improve food security. Planning and decision-making for a strategic transition will take place in close consultation and partnership with USG stakeholders and host country governments, integrated into the target country planning process. The interagency will develop targets for reductions in poverty, stunting and malnutrition with the ultimate objective of successfully transitioning the country out of target country status.

The interagency will convene over the next several months to develop a strategic transition framework with fully defined indicators and benchmarks. Currently, the interagency is developing strategic transition indicators that build on the data and criteria used for the process used to select the target countries and will align its transition indicators with the GFSS results framework and MEL approach.

The strategic transition framework will measure a target country's readiness to transition away from USG assistance by analyzing the following:

- Level of need (i.e., trends in poverty, hunger and malnutrition);
- Effectiveness (i.e., host country institutional capacity, investment, domestic resource mobilization, success toward policy reform, and private sector investment and growth);
- Resilience to shocks and stresses; and
- Country-specific factors, policy considerations and other relevant qualitative data.

As the interagency develops the methodology and process for undertaking strategic transitions, we will consult with Congressional and other stakeholders to solicit input and feedback. Once the methodology is fully established, the interagency will develop a regular process of review to evaluate country progress toward transition.

Finally, the interagency will make use of the process of "strategic transition review" to assess and determine if a target country should no longer maintain its status and make recommendations, as appropriate, to shift food security resources.

Country Planning under the *Global Food Security Strategy*

In each of the target countries, the interagency is undertaking a highly collaborative and data-

driven process to develop country plans that outline an evidence-based, whole-of-government approach to achieve Feed the Future's goals and objectives, guided by the GFSS. In addition, the plans will describe how Feed the Future programs within each country will contribute to the broader national security and foreign policy goals of the Administration. These documents will serve as the foundation for measuring progress against the goals and objectives through annual reporting and performance reviews. Feed the Future interagency country plans will cover five years of implementation (FY 2018-FY 2022) and, where applicable, will replace the Feed the Future Multi-Year Strategies created in FY 2011 and extended through the end of FY 2017. The plans will include all relevant contributions from the U.S. Government Agencies and Departments named in the GFSA. All 12 country plans are currently under development, and the interagency anticipates completing them with stakeholder input from the end of calendar year 2017 through early calendar year 2018, on a rolling basis.

These plans build on and support each country's food security priorities and reflect lessons learned, evidence, and local context. The planning process reinforces the key principles of interagency collaboration, evidence-based programming, and a country-led approach based on the Rome Principles[9] and best practices of international aid effectiveness.

The guidance for the development of the country plans ensures they will meet the requirements of the GFSA and incorporate the approach defined in the GFSS. Plans will build on and enhance **whole-of-government coordination** by bringing together the diverse and complementary technical, programmatic, in-kind, and financial contributions of the relevant Federal Agencies and Departments involved in implementing the GFSS. Plans will ensure **country and local ownership** by engaging both local women and men as stakeholders in planning and aligning with country-owned food security policy and investment plans. They will emphasize **sustainability** by seeking to catalyze local investments and systemic change to create the conditions in which our assistance is no longer needed. They will leverage **partnerships** with key stakeholders and employ **science, technology, and innovation** to deliver cost-effective and results-oriented development solutions.

Beginning in the summer of 2017, interagency country teams began conducting an in-depth review of available relevant evidence, and will conduct additional analysis needed to fill any gaps, and either have held or will hold consultative workshops and engagements with key in-country government, civil society, the private sector, development partners, and other stakeholders to inform the country plans.

Technical Implementation Guidance under the Global Food Security Strategy

The interagency developed a series of technical guidance documents to provide field and

[9] https://feedthefuture.gov/about#Principles%20

headquarters staff with a shared understanding of key technical concepts for implementing Feed the Future under the GFSS. The documents will help Feed the Future programming achieve intermediary GFSS results and objectives and create consistency among the many different technical portfolios involved in GFSS implementation through the initiative.

The technical guidance is divided into Core and Supplemental topics. The five Core topics are considered essential reading. The Supplemental topics, selected based on knowledge gaps, or the need to present new information to the Feed the Future community, are intended to be used as applicable.

Fifteen of these documents are posted on feedthefuture.gov, with additional topics to follow, and will be updated and added to, as needed, to capture learning across the food security and nutrition community.

The portfolio of 18 technical guidance topics are the following:

- **Five core topics** - Inclusive and Sustainable Agricultural-Led Economic Growth (Objective 1); Strengthened Resilience among People and Systems (Objective 2); A Well-Nourished Population, Especially Women and Children (Objective 3); Advancing Gender Equality and Female Empowerment (Cross-Cutting Intermediate Result 3); and Policy Programming (Cross-Cutting Intermediate Result 5); and
- **Thirteen supplemental topics** – Market Systems and Value Chain Programming; Finance: Unlocking Capital Flows; Agricultural Trade; Increased Sustainable Agricultural Productivity; Investing in Livestock Production and Animal Source Food Market Systems; Employment and Entrepreneurship; Diversifying Livelihoods, Resilience, and Pathways Out of Poverty; Capacity Development; Youth; Land, Marine and Resource Tenure; Private Sector Engagement; Towards Digitally Enabled Global Agriculture and Food Systems; and Scaling for Widespread Adoption of Improved Technologies and Practices.

Research Strategy Alignment

The GFSA mandates the alignment and leveraging of broader U.S. strategies and investments in science, technology, and innovation, including agricultural research and extension, as an essential component of the USG's response to global food security challenges. To meet this mandate, the *Global Food Security Research Strategy*, developed over the past year, lays out a vision for coordinated USG investment in global food security research. It articulates high-level research priorities, identifies opportunities and mechanisms for partnership across USG Agencies and Departments and allied organizations, and provides a platform to support operational coordination, monitoring and evaluation of research programming. In doing so, the *Research Strategy* aims to increase the impact and cost-efficiency of both international and domestic food security research investments. The *Research Strategy* is designed to guide Feed the Future

research investments under the GFSS, including those of the Feed the Future Innovation Labs, other U.S. university-based programs, and USG funding priorities for the centers of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR). From inception, these research investments will be designed to ensure the greatest relevance and potential for impact at scale, through deeper understanding of market demand and the landscape of opportunity to address key food security issues.

The *Research Strategy* outlines three themes to guide future investment:

I. Technologies and practices that advance the productivity frontier to drive income growth, improve diets, and promote natural resource conservation;

II. Technologies and practices that reduce, manage, and mitigate risk to build resilient, prosperous, well-nourished individuals, households and communities; and

In addition to generating and refining scalable technologies and practices that advance productivity and nutrition and offset risk in Feed the Future partner countries, research also provides key insights about partner countries that maximize the impact and efficiency of U.S. Government investments.

III. Improved knowledge about how to achieve human food security outcomes: Generating evidence on how to sustainably and equitably improve economic opportunity, nutrition, and resilience.

The 2017 *Research Strategy* builds on the foundational 2011 Feed the Future Research Strategy, the design of which the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) and the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) co-led, informed by broad outreach to other USG science granting agencies[10] as well as public stakeholders through a global web-based e-consultation convened by the Presidentially appointed Board for International Food and Agricultural Development (BIFAD). Over 400 participants from more than 30 countries registered for the event from the private sector, U.S. university community, CGIAR centers, international organizations, and developing country research community members. The U.S. Government launched the 2017 *Research Strategy* on September 12, 2017 at a public meeting of the BIFAD.

Moving forward, USAID and USDA will consult and engage with USG science granting agencies, implementing partners and the private sector to identify and build on synergies in support of the GFSS objectives that can advance research. They will work through existing

[10] The U.S. Government science granting agencies are the National Institutes of Health, the National Science Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Energy.

structures and platforms, such as the National Science and Technology Council, and interagency working groups like the Interagency Working Group on Plant Genomics and the Interagency Committee on Human Nutrition Research. Global food security research activities will begin to align with the 2017 *Research Strategy* over the next 12 months as programs end and new programs are designed and initiated.

2. Progress Implementing the MEL Approach under the Global Food Security Strategy[11]

Accountability for results and transparency are central elements of the Feed the Future approach. We take the responsibility of effectively and efficiently using the dollars entrusted to us by the American people very seriously. Therefore, we are committed to rigorous MEL to track progress, facilitate performance-based and adaptive management, remain accountable on our commitments, and learn more about effective and evidence-based approaches to food security and nutrition.

Progress Implementing the MEL System of the GFSS

This section reviews the steps we have taken to align and update our interagency approach to MEL, consistent with requirements in the GFSA and commitments in the GFSS.

Update to overall MEL approach: Feed the Future's rigorous MEL system has tracked results at the activity, program, country, regional, and initiative levels. Since 2011, we have continually assessed, adjusted, and built capacity for Feed the Future's accountability and learning approach and systems through additional guidance, training, and workshops to support the accurate collection, analysis, and reporting of data.

As an example, user feedback gathered through the Feed the Future Global Performance Evaluation, completed in 2017, and other review processes found four key areas for improvement, including the links from activities to higher-level impacts, capturing systems-level work, the use of evidence generated by the system, and leveraging national data systems for impact results. Taking these recommendations and other lessons learned to date, we have further adjusted the MEL system to serve its transparency, accountability, and learning functions more effectively under the GFSS. In addition, we are also exploring the frontiers of how to leverage remotely sensed geospatial data and other innovative technologies to decrease costs and increase efficiency in our MEL system.

Development of standard indicators: Since the release of the GFSS, the interagency MEL

[11] For a review of the most recent results data from the first phase of Feed the Future please see the recently published Feed the Future Progress Snapshot, https://feedthefuture.gov/sites/default/files/resource/files/2017_Feed_the_Future_Progress_Snapshot.pdf

working group has updated the Feed the Future standard indicators to be used for monitoring performance against the GFSS results framework. These indicators will be used for both annual and periodic reporting to support accountability and learning on what programs have achieved and to assess progress against the Results Framework. The MEL Working Group developed this list through a consultative process that included input from over 100 public and private sector stakeholders and USG technical experts.

The interagency will collect these indicators, listed in Appendix 3, at a variety of levels, including at the national, global, or regional level; zone-of-influence level (measured at population level in our geographic areas of focus); and an activity level. Activity-level indicators are typically collected annually whereas national or zone-of-influence indicators are typically collected only every three or so years based on the expense and management burden of collecting these data.

Indicators will measure results at all levels of the results framework, moving from **outputs** - tangible and intended products or consequences of an activity; to **outcomes** - the results of these products and consequences; and, eventually, to **impacts** – medium- to long-term effects produced by a project or program that change the development situation of a country. Our new indicators track this progression of performance from the project level (predominantly outputs), to the broader program level (predominantly outcomes), and the overall goal level (representing impacts).

In addition to these **standard performance indicators** directly related to our results framework, we also monitor context indicators and promote custom indicators tailored to each country and program context. **Context indicators** are outside the control of the activity or program, but have the potential to affect the achievement of expected results. Unlike performance indicators (where we set targets and are responsible for achieving them), we do not set targets for context indicators, but rather observe and monitor their trends to better inform our programming. **Custom indicators** are performance indicators identified for an individual program, project, or activity vital for tracking progress or managing progress, but not as broadly applicable across the initiative to warrant making them required. The interagency MEL working group will continue to review the GFSS performance and context indicators as implementation moves forward.

Strengthening national data systems: To reduce monitoring and evaluation costs over the long term to the USG, we are focusing on strengthening each target country's national data system by increasing support to build host-country capacity and accountability. The need for more frequent, sex-disaggregated, higher-quality, and cost-effective data on poverty, food security, agriculture, nutrition and resilience is widely recognized. Countries need these data in order to measure and report on progress of development endeavors, including the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), and have the information needed for more effective policy-making. In the past year, we

have advanced the twin objectives of measuring our progress and help countries generate needed data by expanding our partnership with the World Bank Living Standards Measurement Study - Integrated Surveys in Agriculture project. Under this effort, we will help support the collection of national household surveys in several target countries, while recognizing this will be a long-term endeavor in some countries.

Learning agenda: As outlined in the GFSS, a key component of our MEL approach includes a learning agenda that prioritizes filling key evidence gaps vital to the effectiveness of our efforts to reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty sustainably. Over the coming months, the interagency MEL working group will finalize a small number of key questions and, over the coming years, use a variety of types of evidence to help answer those questions, including the analysis of monitoring data, results from performance and impact evaluations, and research. Findings from the Learning Agenda will bring to light new best practices or challenge commonly held assumptions, which should result in continuous improvement of our programming and broader GFSS engagement. In this way, Feed the Future will continue to learn and adapt based on results and findings from implementation and from the broader development community. This will ensure Feed the Future reflects best practices and current evidence to address food security and nutrition challenges.

Overview of Reporting Process

Building on Feed the Future reporting systems to date, under the GFSS we are prioritizing rigorous, transparent reporting through a holistic interagency approach. Under this system, each year, the interagency has collected data from implementing partners, Agency and Department staff, or other sources and entered it into the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS), part of an interagency effort to consolidate USG reporting on Feed the Future activities. FTFMS has collected and stored information at the activity, project, and country levels, and tailored it to the needs of each Agency/Department as appropriate. In addition to collecting indicator results, the system also collected program reporting narratives to enhance the understanding of the environment in which the results were achieved. Annually, after data go through a rigorous quality control process, the interagency aggregates and releases the results publicly. Under the GFSS, Feed the Future is continuing to use and refine this system, including by leveraging it to track our new and revised indicators.

For example, we are committed to taking steps to further the open and transparent reporting of FTFMS results as required in the GFSA. First, building on the release of several datasets from country surveys commissioned for Feed the Future focus countries, we will release more granular data publicly in support of the USG's commitment to open data. Second, through the regular review of our Learning Agenda, we will share not just results, but also lessons learned in a way that allows stakeholders to see how we are learning from our monitoring and evaluation findings. Third, we aim to further strengthen interagency reporting, through improved systems

and processes, so that it reflects a more comprehensive picture of the work the U.S. Government is doing in food security.

How Feed the Future MEL Informs Programming

Building on the strong culture of learning established under the first Feed the Future Learning Agenda, we continue to ensure strong use of monitoring and evaluation findings to continually improve programming. This culture of learning greatly influenced the GFSS itself. As an example, the Feed the Future Evaluation Synthesis Report, released in March 2016, contained an inventory of 196 performance and impact evaluations conducted from 2010 to 2015 and synthesized findings to draw out learning and increase global understanding of what works best for sustainably improving food security and nutrition. These findings were incorporated into the Feed the Future Global Performance Evaluation, a key learning input that shaped the GFSS.

Since the release of the GFSS, the availability of new impact-level data for our existing focus countries has allowed for a comprehensive analysis of information to inform new project designs, ongoing performance management, and the strategic direction reflected in new target country plans. Recent examples in which analysis of data and evidence has informed project and program design and adjustments include the following:

- As a result of trend analyses, **Kenya**, although on track to reach stunting targets, appeared unlikely to reach targets set for poverty reduction in western counties. Headquarters and field USG staff worked closely to understand better the reasons behind the poverty constraints and built an action plan to broaden the impact of the program.
- In **Honduras**, survey results highlighted challenges to reducing poverty, such as the impact of the recent *El Niño*. As a result, Feed the Future programming has adopted a stronger emphasis on irrigation to ensure stable yields and access to markets in the face of recurring drought.
- The midterm Population-Based Survey (PBS) for **Sénégal** showed a slight, but not statistically significant, increase in child stunting. The USAID Mission in Sénégal decided to further investigate the causes of acute and chronic malnutrition at the national level, followed by a deeper causal analysis in the zone of influence (currently underway), to better understand the persistently high levels of chronic and acute malnutrition among children and inform possible program adjustments.

How Feed the Future MEL Informs Budget Decisions

Each year, USG Agencies and Departments review the programmatic performance of their Feed the Future investments to ensure the efficient and effective allocation of U.S. taxpayer resources to achieve the initiative's goals. For example, as the lead Agency charged with coordinating implementation of Feed the Future, USAID has carefully considered the results of performance evaluations, annual performance reviews, and the results of interim population-based surveys (PBS) to support the development of its budget recommendations for Feed the Future country

programs. Based on the results of this ongoing analysis, USAID has recommended, and will continue to recommend, shifts during the development of the President's Budget Request, and assesses implementation during budget execution, to address funding shortfalls, maximize and scale impact in high performing programs, and remedy programming delays. USAID will also provide recommendations to shift resources away from low performing programs to maximize the effectiveness of taxpayer resources.

The USG and its partners are continuing to closely monitor program performance through the implementation of the GFSS to maximize impact in service of America's national security and foreign policy goals.

Gender Analysis under the Global Food Security Strategy

Advancing women's empowerment and gender equality remains critical to achieving inclusive and sustainable agriculture-led growth, a high-level objective in the GFSS. The GFSS places a greater focus on reducing the barriers women face throughout agriculture and food systems--in production, processing, marketing, financial and other services, employment, etc.--as well as gives increased attention to domains of women's empowerment in agriculture that are particularly complex, such as women's workload and time-allocation.

Feed the Future has championed the collection and use of sex-disaggregated data, and developed innovative tools to track progress toward achieving women's empowerment and gender equality. Developed under the first phase of Feed the Future, the Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) is the first comprehensive and standardized measure to directly capture women's empowerment and inclusion levels in the agricultural sector. In phase one of Feed the Future, all 19 Feed the Future focus countries collected WEAI data, in addition to sex-disaggregated data, to assess the state of empowerment and gender parity in agriculture, to identify key areas in which empowerment needs to be strengthened, and to track progress over time. The evidence generated from the WEAI and sex-disaggregated indicators has informed the strategic integration of gender into the next generation of Feed the Future-supported programs.

Analysis of sex-disaggregated and WEAI data continues to inform programming to reach our objectives and advance gender equality and female empowerment through Feed the Future under the GFSS. WEAI data, for example, showed that, across the majority of Feed the Future focus countries and regions, the greatest constraints to women's empowerment were lack of access to credit, excessive workloads, and low group membership.

Gender-disaggregated data will continue to shape how Feed the Future engages women, men, and communities to improve diets, hygiene, and use of nutrition services through the initiative. In Bangladesh, the Ministry of Agriculture used results from the WEAI to inform the design of agriculture and nutrition programs; those proven effective in improving household income,

nutrition and women's empowerment outcomes will be implemented at scale. Furthermore, analysis of baseline WEAI data from Nepal, Ghana, and Bangladesh consistently showed that women's empowerment has a positive and significant relationship to the dietary diversity of mothers and their children, which identifies levers for women's empowerment as part of nutrition-sensitive agricultural programming.

The GFSS continues to promote the strategic examination of programmatic needs and progress across key dimensions related to men's and women's roles in agriculture; to achieve this, Feed the Future target countries will leverage the Gender Integration Framework (GIF). Developed under Feed the Future, the GIF is an analytical tool that incorporates the WEAI and other sources of sex-disaggregated and gender data for missions and partners to prioritize relevant and actionable paths to advancing gender equality and women's empowerment.

3. Coordination and Implementation Synergies under the Global Food Security Strategy

Interagency Working Groups

To continue the close collaboration under the GFSS, the interagency established three new working groups to leverage the expertise of the Feed the Future USG Agencies and Departments in the implementation of the *Strategy*. These working groups are open to and comprised of diverse groups of interagency subject matter experts in the areas of monitoring and evaluation, nutrition and private sector partnership and engagement.

The Global Food Security Strategy MEL Working Group

The interagency MEL working group, formed in 2016, drafted the Monitoring and Evaluation section of the GFSS, revised interagency indicators to be used for performance monitoring, and is working to develop the new Learning Agenda. Partners include different Bureaus from USAID, the U.S. Department of State, USDA, the U.S. Department of Commerce, the U.S. Department of the Treasury, the Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC), the Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC), Peace Corps, and the U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF).

The Global Food Security Strategy Nutrition Technical Sub-Working Group

Under the USG Global Nutrition Coordination Plan (GNCP), the USG is accountable for coordinated actions that provide the backbone for collaborative USG nutrition programming, including the creation of a permanent, government-wide Global Nutrition Technical Working Group to serve as a leader and convener for action and information-sharing. As part of the Global Nutrition Technical Working Group, the GFSS Technical Sub-working Group builds upon the shared nutrition goals by the Agencies and Departments that are leading global nutrition efforts on behalf of the USG. Co-led by USAID and USDA, the GFSS Technical Sub-working

Group serves as a platform to collaborate at the headquarters and country levels, build consensus on priority actions to demonstrate results toward the GFSS nutrition objective through Feed the Future, and document USG progress and results.

The Global Food Security Strategy Private Sector Engagement Working Group

The private sector is a key stakeholder and partner for Feed the Future, as private resources are leveraged as the engine that propels agricultural development and transformation. The interagency is taking a market systems approach for facilitating private sector engagement and partnerships under the GFSS, including with U.S. companies and agri-businesses, to ensure the success and sustainability of these investments. OPIC and USAID co-chair an Interagency Private Sector Engagement working group, comprised of nine Federal Agencies and Departments, as a platform to share information and effectively coordinate various resources, tools, and authorities to engage and leverage private sector expertise and investment to achieve the objectives of the GFSS. In 2017, the working group held a series of consultations with small- and medium-sized U.S. businesses based in Georgia, Texas, and Colorado to engage in interactive discussions and learn how to better engage and catalyze investments in global food security.

How the Global Food Security Strategy Complements Other USG Strategies

Through Feed the Future, the USG pioneered a development approach that incorporates aid-effectiveness principles and effective coordination among the U.S. Departments and Agencies in the GFSA.

The GFSA builds upon this foundational effort, and provides a framework for Feed the Future to be even more effective and efficient by complementing other U.S. food security and development assistance programs on the continuum from emergency food aid through to sustainable, agriculture-led economic growth. With engagement from the National Security Council, the interagency is reviewing the alignment of the contributions of food security to broader national security goals outlined in the forthcoming *U.S. National Security Strategy*. In addition to regular coordination at the headquarters and field levels, interagency coordination on food security includes the following examples.

The GFSS directly supports the USG's multi-sectoral approach to decrease malnutrition as described in the GNCP and USAID's Multi-Sectoral Nutrition Strategy (MSNS). The MSNS Conceptual Framework highlights how both nutrition-specific and nutrition-sensitive interventions are critical to achieving optimal nutrition and guided the development of the GFSS Results Framework for Objective 3. The GNCP helps to deliver on the nutrition objective of the GFSS by strengthening the impact of the USG's diverse nutrition investments and accelerating progress toward shared nutrition goals.

The implementation of the GFSS includes Food for Peace (FFP) investments under the FFP *2016–2025 Food Assistance and Food Security Strategy*. There is clear alignment between the GFSS and the FFP *Strategy*, and USAID strategically coordinates complementary Feed the Future and Food for Peace activities to maximize impact. Food for Peace activities provide very poor households with skills and capacities – a "push" – and Feed the Future creates a "pull" through the demand for labor and smallholder production. The GFSS also leverages the USAID-supported Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET) to support evidence-based forecasting and analysis of the drivers of acute and chronic food insecurity. Finally, FFP implements the Emergency Food Security Program, codified in the GFSA, which is a key part of USAID's response to emergency needs, including the ongoing famines in Yemen, Somalia, South Sudan, and Nigeria that have put 20 million people at risk of severe hunger or starvation. While the emergency response to these crises alleviates immediate suffering, Feed the Future is taking preventive action to build the resilience that leads to lasting food security for future generations.

USDA is leading efforts to build government and private sector capacities in food safety, particularly in Central America, that are helping exporters of fruits and vegetables comply with the Food Safety Modernization Act, which will lead to safer, healthier produce in U.S. supermarkets with lower pesticide residue levels. In addition, USDA's Food for Progress programs have strengthened the technical capacity of the national rural extension system in Guatemala to expand agricultural production and trade.

To ensure strategic coordination at the country level, the interagency is ensuring the participation of all relevant USG Departments and Agencies in the process to create target country plans. Feed the Future target country plans must align with the USG interagency Integrated Country Strategy[12] that articulates overall U.S. priorities in each country. As GFSS implementation continues, the interagency will continually assess the success of its coordination efforts through frequent engagement and discussion.

USAID's Water and Development Plan (as a part of the *USG Global Water Strategy, 2017-2022*) complements the work undertaken as part of the GFSS. The plan focuses interventions in water, sanitation and hygiene, as well as in water resources management, to increase the availability and sustainable management of safe water and sanitation for the underserved and most vulnerable. The GFSS engages in the water and sanitation sector to improve nutritional outputs and in agricultural water resources management to promote the use, efficiency, conservation and enhanced productivity of water. Within the *Global Water Strategy*, examples of interagency

[12] The Integrated Country Strategy (ICS) is a multi-year plan that articulates the U.S. priorities in a given country. The ICS sets Mission Goals and Mission Objectives through a coordinated and collaborative planning effort among Department of State (State), USAID, and other U.S. Government (USG) Agencies and Departments that operate overseas under Chief of Mission authority.

action that contribute to the goal and objectives of the GFSS include the following: (1) work by the Department of State on international water resource issues and conflict resolution; (2) water infrastructure support through MCC and the Department of Defense; and (3) science and technology support within the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, especially on health, from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Multilateral Food Security Efforts under the Global Food Security Strategy

The USG continued to address food security on the global agenda through bilateral and multilateral processes. The U.S. commitment to food security and nutrition, as evidenced by the GFSA, enables the United States to exert considerable leadership on multilateral food security efforts. USAID, USDA, the Department of State and Department of Treasury all actively engage in high-level fora, including the G7 and G20, and work with other donors to invest their development dollars more strategically to support host governments to improve food security systems and nutrition. In 2017, the G20 Initiative for Rural Youth Employment focused attention on the importance of the agricultural sector to create job opportunities for the burgeoning youth population in rural areas. The G7 encouraged investment in agriculture and food security, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa, as a means to reduce the economic motivations for migration. Members of the G7 and G20, the Gates Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, and multilateral development agencies (such as the multilateral development banks and the Rome-based United Nations (UN) agencies) remain committed to enhancing food security and nutrition in order to make progress towards the Sustainable Development Goals.

The momentum for increasing investments in nutrition continues to grow thanks to the Scaling Up Nutrition (SUN) Movement and its leadership in raising global awareness for nutrition as a fundamental concern for development and economic growth. As of today, 59 countries and two Indian States, have signed on to the SUN Movement and agreed to its principles and to increase their own resources to address the malnutrition problems in their countries. The Italian Government in its role as G7 President in 2017 will host a *Nutrition for Growth* Summit in Milan, Italy on November 4, 2017, to highlight the continued need for greater investment among a diverse set of actors, and in particular the need to focus on improving nutrition for women and girls, on nutrition problems specific to urban settings, and on improving food systems globally.

The United States has collaborated with other donors in the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), a multilateral fund called for by the G20 in 2010 to improve incomes and food and nutrition security for smallholder farmers in the poorest countries. GAFSP finances investments to boost farm productivity; provide access to critical infrastructure, such as feeder roads and irrigation; increase farmers' access to financial products; strengthen household nutrition; and connect smallholders to local, regional, and global markets. This support has a catalytic impact on employment, food security, and stability, by mobilizing a country's own domestic resources, as well as private investment. In 2017, the GAFSP public

sector window completed its fourth round of funding and approved projects totaling $160 million in seven countries. The private sector window approved 11 investment projects with total funding of $73.2 million. In October 2016, GAFSP launched a $16 million Missing Middle Pilot Project Initiative, focused on participation between producer and value chain groups, and support to small- and medium-sized enterprises. All projects approved from 2016 onward will also use GAFSP's updated monitoring and evaluation plan, which improved measurement and accountability and increased the use of common indicators for better monitoring and the widespread use of impact evaluations.

To inform our country selection process, the interagency asked USG Posts to provide insight on how our food security investments would potentially complement or duplicate the activities of other donors. The interagency incorporated useful feedback from Posts into our analysis and final selection decisions. These findings are now helping inform our country plans and selection of zones of influence. Posts will continue to work with donors to ensure we are leveraging our resources strategically and integrating donor coordination into the target country planning process.

Leveraging the Private Sector under the Global Food Security Strategy

We know that lasting change means creating market-driven progress. As a result, we have worked closely with governments and the private sector to jump start economies and establish functional markets. Under the GFSS, we are continuing this catalytic partnership with the private sector to foster innovation, build the infrastructure needed to facilitate agriculture-led economic growth, and create and expand new markets for local and global consumers. Partnering with the private sector is also a win-win: our efforts foster investment at all levels--on farm and off, public and private -- to boost income growth in developing countries and increase demand for U.S. products and services, which increases American prosperity.

Over the past year, the interagency, led by the Department of State, USAID, USDA and others, has partnered with U.S., multinational, and local businesses to promote growth in new markets, increased investment in agriculture, and cutting-edge research and technologies that help nations meet their agricultural potential and, in turn, increase overall global stability. We helped build markets for U.S. businesses, created jobs, and contributed to economic opportunities and stability overseas. This past year, we continued to work with small- and medium-sized American firms, like Store It Cold, based in Denver, to enter Central American markets to sell their low-cost cold storage device, and with U.S. investors like Flow Equity, based in New York, to invest in poultry in Ethiopia, and Tolaro Global, based in Georgia, to invest in the production and processing of cashew nuts in Benin, among others.

Under the GFSS, we are continuing to leverage the expertise of U.S. and multinational companies such as Walmart, DuPont, Syngenta, and Keurig Green Mountain, and with Partners

in Food Solutions, a nonprofit consortium of leading global food companies like General Mills, Cargill, DSM, Bühler, and Hershey. These relationships have expanded Feed the Future's reach into food-insecure regions and leveraged millions of dollars in private capital for inclusive agricultural development and nutrition efforts. Feed the Future has served as the principal vehicle through which the United States contributes to the New Alliance for Food Security and Nutrition. The New Alliance, now transitioned to being fully led by the African Union (AU) Commission, brought together businesses, donors, civil society, and host country governments to unlock investment in African agriculture and reduce hunger and poverty by linking responsible private investment commitments to policy reforms from host country governments. The New Alliance secured more than $10 billion in commitments from more than 200 African, American, and other international businesses to invest in agriculture-related projects. So far, $2.3 billion has been invested.

Feed the Future will continue to engage with the AU Commission to ensure private sector development remains a food security development priority. Feed the Future has also partnered with USAID's Development Credit Authority (DCA), a flexible tool designed to mobilize local financing for the private sector by encouraging financial institutions to expand their lending to new sectors and regions, or to improve loan terms by using partial credit guarantees. Since 2010, DCA has 62 active guarantees in Feed the Future countries, which have leveraged over $468 million in private capital. Under the GFSS, Feed the Future will continue to leverage this and other innovative financing tools to sustainably improve food security and nutrition.

Members of the GFSS Interagency Private Sector Engagement Working Group are closely involved in the process of developing target country plans to identify and engage key stakeholders within the private sector. Local, American, and international companies are participating in stakeholder workshops to help inform and socialize the country plans.

Feed the Future partners with the private sector to co-invest in research critical to the future of developing country agriculture, as well as that of the United States. Research in agriculture is one of the most effective of all public investments in driving down poverty, hunger, and malnutrition. From the mechanization of farms, to the development of commercial fertilizers, to new high-yield and drought-resistant seeds, global agricultural research reduces poverty among 2.3 million people annually[13].

These partnerships are making America and the world more prosperous and secure.

[13] http://www.iita.org/news-item/impact-study-links-agricultural-research-poverty-reduction-sub-saharan-africa/

4. Legal and Regulatory Impediments to Implementation

We have not identified any legal or regulatory impediments to implementation of the GFSS, and we are not seeking any changes to existing laws or regulations.

5. GFSS Spending Report

This section and Appendix 2 respond to Section 8(a)(7) of the Global Food Security Act for "a transparent, open, and detailed accounting of spending by relevant Federal departments and agencies to implement the Global Food Security Strategy, including, for each Federal department and agency, the statutory source of spending, amounts spent, implementing partners and targeted beneficiaries, and activities supported to the extent practicable and appropriate." The following table includes a detailed accounting of budget authority appropriated for food security by the relevant Federal Agencies and Departments, and Appendix 2 includes a review by Agency and Department of implementing partners, targeted beneficiaries, and activities as part of each agency's GFSS implementation plan update.

Table 1. Assistance for global food security activities from FY 2012 to FY 2017, including Feed the Future (budget authority)

(Budget Authority in thousands)	FY 2012 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2013 Enacted* ($000s)	FY 2014 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2015 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2016 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2017 Estimate ($000s)
U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)[a]	1,754,378	1,547,056	1,594,287	1,587,049	1,468,261	1,322,200
Development Assistance	826,700	843,422	866,250	901,260	823,855	642,712
Economic Support Fund	343,206	275,013	228,306	185,834	122,025	168,888
Assistance for Europe, Eurasia and Central Asia	30,520	0	0	0	11,000	12,400
P.L. 480 Title II- Non-Emergency[b]	425,000	300,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000
Global Health Programs	128,952	128,621	149,731	149,955	161,381	148,200
U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)	420,501	428,126	322,126	329,626	386,626	367,626
Cochran Fellowship Program[c]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Borlaug Fellowship Program[c]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
McGovern-Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program[d]	174,501	185,126	185,126	191,626	201,626	201,626
Food for Progress Program	246,000	243,000	137,000	138,000	185,000	166,000
U.S. Department of Commerce[e]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U.S. Department of State	217,934	159,430	117,590	254,997	162,112	303,441
Contributions to International Organizations[f]	217,434	158,930	112,090	244,497	161,612	303,000

(Budget Authority in thousands)	FY 2012 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2013 Enacted* ($000s)	FY 2014 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2015 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2016 Enacted ($000s)	FY 2017 Estimate ($000s)
Diplomatic and Consular Programs[g]	500	500	500	500	500	441
Economic Support Funds	0	0	5,000	10,000	0	0
U.S. Department of the Treasury	165,000	156,646	163,000	30,000	74,930	53,000
International Fund for Agricultural Development	30,000	28,481	30,000	30,000	31,930	30,000
Global Agriculture and Food Security Program	135,000	128,165	133,000	0	43,000	23,000
Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)	[h]	[h]	[h]	[h]	[h]	[h]
Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)[i]	878	4,372	1,162	6,925	0	0
Peace Corps[j]	23,000	23,850	27,120	28,270	26,290	N/A
Office of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR)[k]	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF)	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]	[l]
U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)[m]	0	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal	2,581,691	2,319,480	2,225,285	2,236,867	2,118,219	2,046,267

Footnotes:

N/A = not available

*FY 2013 reported levels are post-sequestration.

[a]USAID levels reflect enacted levels supporting implementation of global food security activities, including agriculture, nutrition, and household-level water, sanitation, hygiene and environment programs, as defined by the U.S. Foreign Assistance Standardized Program Structure and Definitions (http://www.state.gov/f/c24132.htm). In general, over this period, USAID CBJ tables and descriptions of global food security funding provided the amounts for agriculture, which is the principal component of this funding.

[b]USAID P.L. 480 Title II - Non-Emergency enacted levels represent the minimum amount of Title II resources that should be used for development food assistance programs in Title II of P.L. 83-480, as amended. Appropriations to the Title II account do not specify the level of funding that should be directed to emergency versus non-emergency programming.

[c]The Cochran Fellowship Program and Borlaug Fellowship Program are not included in the Department of Agriculture's budget request. Program funds are from the USDA Foreign Agricultural Service Salaries and Expenses account. The topic of a fellowship is determined at the time it is awarded.

[d]Both the FY 2016 and 2017 totals include $5 million to carry out local and regional food procurement projects under 7 USC 1726 (c), as provided in the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2016 and the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2017, respectively.

[e]The U.S. International Trade Administration (ITA) conducts food security activities as part of its overall trade promotion and trade development efforts. Funding is not directly assigned to global food security activities' implementation, nor is the level of effort—such as number of hours per employee devoted to the strategy—readily available. ITA's appropriation is subdivided into an administrative program unit and three business units (Global Markets, Industry and Analysis, and Enforcement and Compliance); funding is not specified for particular programs, which are supported by staff assigned to specific units. Activities related to the U.S. Government Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) primarily take place within the Industry and Analysis unit. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) conducts activities identified in the Department of Commerce GFSS implementation plan as part of its overall capacity-building efforts. While these activities contribute to the GFSS, funding is not directly assigned to GFSS implementation. These activities are primarily funded through NOAA's Operations, Research, and Facilities appropriation, which is subdivided into NOAA's seven Line Office units. Each Line Office supports activities that contribute to the GFSS, such as capacity building for drought warnings and science-based aquaculture production. Funding, however, is not specified for that particular purpose.

[f]Funding supports food security efforts within the United Nations system, including through managing U.S. government interactions with food security agencies (i.e., the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization and the World Organization of Animal Health).

[g]Funding supports the promotion of agricultural biotechnology as a tool to increase long-term agricultural productivity and improve food security and nutrition and encourages countries to adopt transparent and science-based regulations and practices to improve food safety.

[h]Although MCC has obligated over $560 million in food security efforts from FY 2012 through FY 2017, MCC's enacted budget is planned at a country level and excludes sector-level detail.

[i]From FY 2012 through FY 2016, OPIC obligated a total of $13.3 million in budget authority (loan subsidy) for food security. This loan subsidy plus negative subsidy projects (as defined in OMB Circular A-11, Section 185.3 (v)) over this period represent over $800 million in financing for food security projects. In addition, OPIC provided $360 million in political risk insurance coverage for food security projects. The FY 2017 Estimate for OPIC is not yet available.

[j]Represents funding estimates for Peace Corps Volunteers working in agriculture, environment, health (nutrition and water/sanitation), community economic development, youth development, and education programs. Peace Corps' FY 2017 Estimate is not available at this time. Funding is attributed to Volunteer activities in all sectors related to food security programming indicators, which are reported on at the end of the fiscal year.

[k]USTR leads U.S. trade negotiations and oversees the development and coordination of U.S. international trade, commodity, and direct investment policy. Since trade can play a role in stimulating economic growth and strengthening food security, as part of its overall trade policy agenda, USTR works with trading partners to reduce barriers to trade and therefore increase the availability of food. Funding is not directly assigned to global food security activity implementation, nor is the level of effort available, such as number of hours per employee devoted to food security activities.

[l]USADF's enacted budget is planned at a country level and excludes sector-level details.

[m]No USGS-appropriated funds support global food security activities. Activities are supported by interagency transfers from USAID, as described in the USGS GFSS implementation plan, for the period covered in this table.

Appendix 1: GFSS Executive Summary (2016)

Our vision is a world free from hunger, malnutrition, and extreme poverty, where thriving local economies generate increased income for all people; where people consume balanced and nutritious diets, and children grow up healthy and reach their full potential; and where resilient households and communities face fewer and less severe shocks, have less vulnerability to the crises that do occur, and are helping to accelerate inclusive, sustainable economic growth. This *Strategy* builds on the USG's strong foundation of global food security and nutrition investments and aims to break silos, integrating programming across sectors and agencies for maximum impact and effective stewardship of United States taxpayer dollars. By implementing this whole-of-government strategy over the next five years, we believe that, together with our many partners across the globe, we can achieve this vision within our lifetimes.

This *Global Food Security Strategy* (GFSS) presents an integrated whole-of-government strategy and agency specific implementation plans as required by the Global Food Security Act of 2016 (GFSA). This *Strategy* reflects the unique skills, resources, and lessons learned from U.S. Federal Departments and Agencies that contribute to global food security, as well as input from partners throughout the private sector, academic institutions, and civil society. It charts a course for the U.S. Government (USG) to contribute to the achievement of global food security and the range of Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), together with partners across the globe.

Right now, the world is closer than ever before to ending global hunger, undernutrition, and extreme poverty, but significant challenges and opportunities remain, including urbanization, gender inequality, insecurity, weather variability, and environmental degradation. Despite our collective progress in global food security and nutrition over recent years, a projected 702 million people still live in extreme poverty, nearly 800 million people around the world are chronically undernourished, and 159 million children under five are stunted. Food security is not just an economic and humanitarian issue; it is also a matter of security, as growing concentrations of poverty and hunger leave countries and communities vulnerable to increased instability, conflict, and violence.

The USG, in partnership with other governments, civil society, multilateral development institutions, research institutes, universities, and the private sector, will build on experience to date to address these challenges, take advantage of opportunities, and advance food security and improved nutrition by focusing efforts around three interrelated and interdependent objectives:

- **Inclusive, sustainable, agricultural-led economic growth,** as growth in the agriculture sector has been shown in some areas to be more effective than growth in other sectors at helping men and women lift themselves out of extreme poverty and hunger. It does this by increasing the availability of food, generating income from production, creating employment and entrepreneurship opportunities throughout value chains, and spurring growth in rural and urban economies.

- **Strengthened resilience among people and systems,** as increasingly frequent and intense shocks and stresses threaten the ability of men, women, and families to sustainably emerge from poverty.
- **A well-nourished population,** especially women and children, as undernutrition, particularly during the 1,000 days from pregnancy to a child's second birthday, leads to lower levels of educational attainment, productivity, lifetime earnings, and economic growth rates.

Through this approach, we will strengthen the capacity of all participants throughout the food and agriculture system, by paying special attention to **women, the extreme poor, small-scale producers, youth, marginalized communities, and small- and medium-sized enterprises.**

Several key elements of our approach strengthen our ability to achieve these objectives. The first is **targeting our investments** in countries and geographic areas where we have the greatest potential to sustainably improve food security and nutrition **and strategically focusing our resources** on those approaches and interventions that evidence shows will reduce extreme poverty, hunger, and malnutrition at scale. The second is implementing a comprehensive, multi-faceted **whole-of-government approach** rooted in lessons learned and evidence to date that reflects emerging trends. The third is **country leadership**, recognizing that developing countries, above all others, must own, lead, guide, and invest in these efforts to drive progress. The fourth is **partnerships** with a wide range of development actors and groups, which will improve the reach, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of our efforts. This includes using foreign aid strategically to catalyze domestic resource mobilization and private sector-driven trade and economic development. The fifth is harnessing the power of **science, technology, and innovation** to improve food and agriculture system practices dramatically, as well as increase local capacity to address these issues. Finally, we will focus on the **sustainability** of our programs as we work to create the conditions where our assistance is no longer needed, including by reducing susceptibility to recurrent food crises and large international expenditures on humanitarian assistance and ensuring a sustainable food and agriculture system with adequate and appropriate finance available to key actors, especially from local sources.

To measure progress and remain accountable to the public, USG partner Agencies and Departments commit to continuing and strengthening our rigorous **monitoring, evaluation, and learning** (MEL) approach, which includes the following:

- A common Results Framework;
- A performance monitoring process and standard performance indicators;
- An evaluation approach that uses impact and performance evaluations;
- A learning agenda that prioritizes key evidence gaps; and
- A focus on strengthening target country data systems.

Appendix 2: GFSS Agency Implementation Plan Updates

This annex updates the USG Federal Department and Agency-specific progress in implementing the *Global Food Security Strategy* (GFSS) since submission in October 2016. This updates the implementation plans provided in Annex 1 of the GFSS.

U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID)

Since the submission of the GFSS in October 2016, USAID has worked to implement the *Strategy* by leading and coordinating the efforts of the interagency, while continuing its substantial food security investments in USAID Missions, regional platforms and centrally-managed programs.

USAID led the effort to design and implement a consultative, data-driven process for selecting Feed the Future target countries under the *Strategy*. Using the targeting criteria in the GFSS, guided by the GFSA, the interagency developed a three phase process, which involved selecting indicators, consulting with the field, aligning resources and engaging host governments. The process resulted in the selection of the 12 Feed the Future target countries, announced in August 2017 by USAID Administrator Mark Green.

In addition to coordinating and leading the selection of the Feed the Future target countries, USAID has launched an interagency effort to develop a strategy for strategic transition (i.e., graduation); develop five-year interagency country plans for the 12 Feed the Future target countries; develop detailed technical guidance to inform programmatic implementation of the GFSS; and develop, in close collaboration with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), of a new whole-of-government food security research strategy.

Supported Activities

The USAID Bureau for Food Security has served as the lead coordinator for the following GFSS implementation work streams:

1. Selecting Feed the Future target countries;
2. Designing Feed the Future strategic transition (i.e., " country graduation");
3. Developing five-year interagency country plans for the 12 Feed the Future target countries that outline an evidence-based, integrated, interagency approach for each one to achieve the GFSS goal of reducing poverty, hunger and malnutrition through the three GFSS objectives of agriculture-led growth, resilience, and nutrition;
4. Developing detailed technical guidance to inform the programmatic implementation of the *Global Food Security Strategy* in the field;
5. Developing a new interagency food security research strategy (co-led with USDA)
6. Developing of a new GFSS MEL approach and set of performance and context indicators; and

7. Coordinating and developing the one-year GFSA implementation report.

In pursuit of the goal and objectives of the GFSS, key USAID food security tools include the following: capacity building and extension; private sector and market development; financing and investment; policy/governance engagement; infrastructure—including information and communications technology; women's empowerment; multi-sectoral nutrition approaches; managing natural resources and land tenure; adaptive agricultural approaches across value chains; and resilience. These core programs and activities are primarily implemented through USAID Feed the Future Missions, supported by regional and Washington-based programs and activities.

These tools overlap with and complement the work of our partner Agencies and Departments, especially within and across Feed the Future Zones of Influence. The key food security tools outlined in USAID's GFSS Implementation Plan will continue to form the basis for USAID's contributions to the 12 five-year target country plans.

Implementing partners

USAID seeks to bring the best of American leadership, entrepreneurship, research, technology and talent to help some of the world's poorest countries and communities harness the power of agriculture and entrepreneurship to jumpstart their economies and create new opportunities for people at every level of their societies. USAID does this by doing the following:

- Engaging the private sector to strengthen markets, scale important technologies and drive sustainable private sector-led economic growth;
- Using our influence and technical expertise to help partner governments update policies and allocate their national resources in ways that will have even greater impact;
- Giving our local partners the tools and knowledge they need to create long-term, locally-led change in their communities;
- Supporting researchers in the United States and abroad to develop new approaches, tools and technologies to boost productivity, combat emerging threats and guide strategic investments;
- Connecting American companies, universities, farmers, ranchers and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) to global networks to share our American legacy of agricultural ingenuity and reap the benefits;
- Leveraging the contributions of other bilateral donors, multilateral organizations, and private foundations; and
- Using our influence, experience and resources to provide leadership on the global food security agenda.

Targeted beneficiaries

USAID's assistance through the GFSS is designed to benefit rural and urban people who are hungry, malnourished, and/or poor, including the most vulnerable, and with a focus on women, the extreme poor, youth, and small-scale food producers. It will also target people whose livelihoods will benefit from improved agriculture and food systems.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA)

USDA's coordination efforts included sustained participation in the GFSS interagency groups and sub-groups on monitoring, evaluation, and learning, private sector engagement, and strategy and policy conversations. During FY 2017, USDA worked with USAID to lead development of the Research Strategy. USDA's technical expertise has informed the GFSS technical guidance documents, including through new reports, like the USDA's Economic Research Service report on "Progress and Challenges in Global Food Security," which includes a chapter on the role of international trade as a tool for global food security. USDA Foreign Service Officers are contributing to in-country teams that are developing strategic work plans for implementing the GFSS in target countries.

Supported Activities

USDA is partnering in the implementation of the Global Food Security Act as described in the Department's Implementation Plan in the GFSS (pp. 63-67). This includes alignment of in-kind and programmatic contributions, and technical expertise, where appropriate, and raising awareness among the interagency of USDA's unique and world-class technical capabilities that can be leveraged to contribute to achieving the GFSS goals and objectives, such as the development of agricultural market information systems and rules-based regulatory systems for food and agricultural products, improved resilience and nutrition, and advancement of new technologies and innovative research.

Where appropriate, USDA continues to align its food assistance and technical assistance programs, namely the McGovern–Dole International Food for Education and Child Nutrition Program, Food for Progress Program, Cochran Fellowship Program, and Borlaug International Agricultural Science and Technology Fellowship Program – with GFSS.

These alignments are helping ensure the USDA contributes to the GFSS, while also providing leadership, expertise, and programs at the international level. USDA engages in multiple ways to benefit U.S. agriculture and producers, including building and increasing market access for U.S. agricultural exports, and ensuring the reliability of critical supply chains to meet U.S. food industry demands.

Implementing partners
USDA has a long history of collaborating with foreign governments, multilateral organizations, non-government partners, and other stakeholders to achieve food security goals, and will continue to work with its partners to benefit U.S. agriculture and improve global food security.

Targeted beneficiaries
The GFSS aligned efforts of the USDA aim to benefit U.S. agricultural stakeholders, including but not limited to U.S. farmers, ranchers, and exporters; at the same time, and in an integrated fashion, the efforts of the USDA are targeted to contribute to an enabling environment for global food security in low-income, food-deficit countries. These in-kind and programmatic contributions address institutional capacity building, education, child nutrition and development, technical assistance to public and private partners, and innovation through collaborative research.

U.S. Department of Commerce (DOC)

In Fiscal Year 2017, the Department of Commerce expanded its internal food security coalition to include two additional Bureaus. In addition to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the International Trade Administration (ITA), the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) and the Commercial Law and Development Program (CLDP) are supporting efforts to address global food insecurity by supporting increased U.S. exports and providing access to comprehensive global data.

Specifically, NOAA offered or participated in capacity-building assistance to address food insecurity through improved weather forecasting, drought early warning systems, and fisheries management and enforcement. ITA continued to bolster the creation of open and fair markets, support supply chains that allow for the free flow of U.S. goods and services, and grow the international customer base for U.S. exports in food insecure countries.

Supported Activities
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) highlights:

- The National Weather Service (NWS) continues to provide global capacity building, including for weather forecasting, hydrologic modeling and prediction, and drought early warning, to foster the application of this knowledge in risk management against damaging impacts of changing climate on food supplies (crops, livestock, and fisheries).
- The National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service (NESDIS) continues to facilitate domestic and international access to NOAA satellite data in support of weather forecasting and science and provides data to the Global Drought Information System, the Global Historical Climate Network (GHCN), the global Climate Data Record

(CDR), the International Comprehensive Ocean-Atmosphere Dataset (ICOADS). NESDIS also maintains many more international initiatives and partnerships.

- The Climate Program Office (CPO) within the Office of Oceanic and Atmospheric Research (OAR) manages competitive research programs in which NOAA funds high-priority climate science, assessments, decision support research, outreach, education, and capacity-building activities designed to advance understanding of Earth's climate system, and to foster the application of this knowledge in risk management against damaging impacts of changing climate on food supplies (crops, livestock, fisheries). CPO-supported research is conducted in regions across the United States, at national and international scales, and globally.
- The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) continues to foster the increase of sustainable marine aquaculture production through streamlined permitting, science-based management, and technology development and transfer.
- NMFS continues to participate in capacity building trainings and workshops in Southeast Asia, Africa, South America and the Caribbean on many topics relevant to food security, including: U.S. food safety; ecosystem approaches to fisheries management; fisheries enforcement; fisheries law development; illegal unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing; and marine special planning. These capacity building activities support increased profitability, market access, and employment for export partners by ensuring the safety and quality of seafood destined for U.S. markets. Additionally, these activities help to strengthen resilience relative to food security by improving sustainability, sharing state-of-art fisheries management and science in order to ensure long-term availability of global fisheries resources.

International Trade Administration (ITA), National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST), and Commercial Law and Development Program (CLDP) highlights:

- ITA continued Business-to-Business matching between U.S. companies and overseas local businesses through ITA's U.S. and Foreign Commercial Service. In addition, relevant U.S. Foreign Commercial Services posts, in coordination with headquarters-based country specific offices, joined in Feed the Future to assist its target countries in creating country specific implementation plans.
- ITA continued to contribute to general understanding of global market landscapes, including those in the U.S. and in food insecure countries, with publicly available publications housed at www.export.gov. Examples included Country Commercial Guides and Top Market Reports. These publications facilitate U.S. companies doing business with food insecure countries and help integrate them into the global economy.
- ITA and Bureau partners supported the introduction of relevant new U.S. technologies and services that addressed food insecurity and supply chain development, including cold chain innovations. Utilizing innovative U.S. private sector technologies, a NIST and

USAID partnership assisted Mali in the adoption of a warning system capable of alerting affected communities of adulterated food and pharmaceuticals.

- ITA continued to advocate for the interests of, and solicit support from, U.S. private sector companies with food security focus, during GFSS implementation to support the companies' market expansion capacity while securing their support for food security.
- ITA continued to facilitate the creation and education of U.S. disruptive technologies, focusing on financial inclusion that will help empower vulnerable populations in food insecure countries to enable their entry into the global commercial supply chain and strengthen their purchasing power for U.S. export goods.

Implementing partners

NOAA supports partners domestically and internationally through in-kind research collaboration and capacity building assistance, or through monetary grants. NOAA's partners include government officials, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), researchers at U.S. and foreign universities, and fishing groups (both large-scale and small, local communities).

ITA, NIST, and CLDP supported U.S. and international contributors to international processed food supply chains including private sector, entrepreneurs, NGOs, and academia.

Targeted beneficiaries

NOAA's targeted beneficiaries include fishermen and fishing groups, weather and fisheries researchers, U.S. and foreign government policy makers, and NGOs. NOAA targets these groups through in-kind research collaborations and capacity building assistance.

ITA/NIST/CLDP's targeted beneficiaries included U.S. and international contributors to international processed food supply chains including private sector, entrepreneurs, NGOs, and academia.

U.S. Department of State

The Department's mission is to shape and sustain a peaceful, prosperous, just, and democratic world and foster conditions for stability and progress for the benefit of the American people and people everywhere. The Department prioritizes food security as an issue of national security, and the Department's Washington-based officials, and those based at our embassies and missions worldwide, engage with foreign governments and in international fora to promote policies to improve global food security and nutrition. The Secretary of State is responsible for the continuous supervision and general direction of assistance programs under 22 U.S.C. § 2382, and has the lead role coordinating U.S. assistance under 22 USC § 6593.

In the context of the U.S. Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) 2017-2022, the Department of State promotes global, regional, national, and sub-national policies that foster sustainable reductions in hunger and malnutrition, and sustainable increases in agricultural development. The Secretary's Office of Global Food Security (S/GFS) coordinates the Department's global food security efforts under GFSS. S/GFS collaborates closely within the Department, and with other agencies and departments, to promote long-term global food security, nutrition, and sustainable agricultural development. The ongoing work on food security related to GFSS across various offices within the Department of State is highlighted below.

Supported Activities

S/GFS leads U.S. Government engagement on global food security and nutrition in some multilateral, regional, and bilateral fora. For example this year, S/GFS led U.S. government engagement in the G-7 Food Security Working Group. Food security was featured prominently in the G-7 Taormina Leaders' Communique, in which G-7 governments committed to take a variety of measures to reduce hunger and malnutrition, particularly in sub-Saharan Africa. S/GFS has engaged with economic officers at Post and desk officers in each regional bureau to identify and monitor food security and nutrition issues as they relate to the stability and development of the countries in which they serve. S/GFS monitors and identifies emerging issues as they relate to food insecurity, such as cholera epidemics among severely malnourished communities facing famine or pesticide outbreaks, like the fall armyworm, affecting harvests and agriculture-based economies. S/GFS has worked with other agencies and departments, such as USAID and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), to develop and support USG efforts to address these threats.

Finally, S/GFS has engaged with civil society, research institutions, and other stakeholders to promote awareness of and access to new technologies and practices for improving resilience in agriculture, fisheries, and aquaculture.

Regarding Feed the Future under the GFSS, S/GFS has worked closely with interagency coordinators to develop the monitoring, evaluation, and learning process for GFSS, and ensuring the Department is using established methodologies, collecting baseline statistics, evaluating impact, and reporting results. S/GFS participated in GFSS Washington-based support groups for each of the 12 Feed the Future target countries to help develop and provide policy guidance on food security for each of the country plans, and coordinated with economic officers at Post and regional desk officers on Feed the Future programming under the GFSS.

In the past year and in the year ahead, S/GFS has been identifying, analyzing, and taking action on emerging issues as related to global food security and the Department priorities, this includes the relationship between food security and urbanization, migration, national security, drought and protracted conflict, with particular emphasis on the four countries currently facing famine.

The Bureau of Economic and Business Affairs, Office of Agricultural Policy (EB/AGP) promotes trade and investment policy and linkages that improve global food security and open markets for U.S. firms. EB/AGP has worked with U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), USDA, and other U.S. agencies to promote global food safety standards and to remove barriers to trade to open markets for agriculture and food products. Included in the policy and regulatory outreach is the promotion of agricultural biotechnology as a tool to increase long-term agricultural productivity, improve food security and nutrition, and raise farmer incomes globally, including through the use of the Biotech Outreach Fund. EB/AGP used FY17 biotech outreach funds to host a biosafety workshop for regulators in Turkey to address barriers to trade and production of biotech food crops. Funds helped support an event at the Center for Strategic and International Studies that highlighted the potential of agricultural biotechnology for food security and economic growth and included participants from various countries in Africa. Finally, funds supported a Brazilian agricultural economist and biotechnology expert's efforts to promote biotechnology's potential for food security utilizing the positive example of South Africa at workshops in South Africa and Mozambique to promote agricultural biotechnology commercialization in Mozambique and address lingering trade issues in South Africa.

The Bureau of International Organizations Affairs, Office of Economic and Development Affairs (IO/EDA) serves as the policy lead on food security within the context of the United Nations system, including managing U.S. government interactions with the Rome-based food security agencies. IO/EDA also serves as the desk for our Mission to the UN Agencies in Rome (USUN Rome), providing guidance in the overall management of the relationship with the UN food security agencies. Through these international fora, IO/EDA, USUN Rome, and S/GFS have worked together to advance U.S. national interests in food security, national security, promote trade, and protecting the health of Americans. In FY 17, IO provided funding through the Contributions to International Organizations (CIO) account or the International Organizations and Programs (IO&P) account to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the World Animal Health Organization (OIE), among other agencies. Through these contributions to FAO, the United States has promoted agricultural development and sustainable management of resources via technical and policy capacity building, and the establishment of internationally recognized standards for food safety and animal and plant health. This has also supported FAO's work supporting disaster mitigation through rebuilding agricultural livelihoods, and providing capacity building to resist food security related shocks. Through the OIE, IO has promoted sustainable economic growth and food security via the animal husbandry sector by controlling and eliminating animal pests and diseases, including those that can infect humans.

The Department's functional bureaus advance specific areas of work on issues related to food security. The Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (OES), Office of Global Change (OES/EGC) and S/GFS have worked together on the planning of

resilient agriculture activities, including in Central America, and S/GFS has provided policy guidance on resilient agriculture projects. Additionally, the OES Bureau's Office of Conservation and Water (OES/ECW) leads U.S. participation in a range of intergovernmental and international processes to promote the conservation and sustainable use of shared natural resources, including soil, water, and genetic resources, such as seeds and other propagating materials, for food and agriculture; and the OES Bureau's Office of Marine Conservation has continued to work to secure the management, conservation and restoration of fish stocks to promote economic, food and livelihood security through bi-lateral and multi-lateral relationships and negotiations. Lastly, the OES Bureau's Office of International Health and Biodefense (OES/IHB) has worked to raise awareness of the linkages between food security and other global issues, such as zoonotic or drug-resistant disease, and biodefense. In the past year, OES/IHB has engaged with the Zoonotic Disease Action Package of the Global Health Security, the formulation of a new National Biodefense Strategy, the President's Advisory Council on Combating Antimicrobial Resistance, and projects in the Arctic Council and the Lower Mekong Initiative to operationalize One Health. While they focus on disease control and prevention, these work streams all recognize food safety and security as important co-benefits.

Implementing Partners

The Department of State generally works bilaterally and with multilateral organizations in developing policy and aligning foreign policy priorities that will then guide the work other agencies do with implementing partners. In some cases the Department does work directly with implementing partners. In those instances, the Department engages with civil society, private sector, international organizations, research institutions, and other stakeholders to promote awareness of and access to new technologies and practices for improving resilience in agriculture, nutrition, fisheries, and aquaculture. For example, S/GFS has collaborated with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology to provide "food computers" to two universities in Vietnam to research techniques to improve agricultural yields under climate stressors. Additionally, S/GFS worked with a research group from the University of California, Berkeley Goldman School of Public Policy on a study that compared stunting rates between urban and rural communities, and across income levels. Finally, S/GFS engaged Indiana University Bloomington to research ways to improve data on global food security and nutrition, which will be used to improve the Project 8 data-collection platform. Other offices such as, IO/EDA lead U.S. government relationships with the Rome-based food security agencies and work with multilateral partners, such as the World Food Program, the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), OIE, and other international organizations. EB/AGP worked bilaterally with other countries, such as Turkey, South Africa, Mozambique and Brazil to promote activities in agricultural biotechnology in the context of food security and economic growth, as described in the activities above.

Targeted Beneficiaries

The work of the Department of State targets a wide range of beneficiaries. More generally, the Department serves as the foreign policy lead within the U.S. Government where it works with other agencies to recommend and guide policy that impacts smallholder farmers, scientists, agricultural researchers, policy makers, etc.

U.S. Department of the Treasury

Through Treasury's participation on the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)'s Executive Board and in the IFAD-11 replenishment consultation, the Treasury Department is working to shape the fund's strategic direction and strengthen its contribution to reducing food security around the world. The department has been involved in the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP)'s decision making bodies and in examining, along with other stakeholders, potential ways to refine GAFSP's model and increase the program's effectiveness.

Supported Activities

The Treasury Department continues to support the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) primarily through engagement with the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program (GAFSP), as well as through oversight of the multilateral development banks (MDBs). IFAD is a multilateral fund that is dedicated to alleviating rural poverty; most IFAD projects are in remote rural areas where few donors operate. GAFSP is a multi-donor trust fund housed at the World Bank that supports projects aligned with the agricultural investment plans of poor countries.

The activities of IFAD and GAFSP remain highly relevant for delivering on the GFSS. For example, supporting agricultural-led economic growth, strengthening resilience, and improving nutrition—key results that the GFSS seeks to achieve—are common objectives in many of the investments of IFAD and GAFSP. Both IFAD and GAFSP seek to reduce food insecurity, and raise smallholder farmers' productivity and incomes to improve the quality of their lives.

The MDBs also contribute to advancing global food security through their investments across a range of sectors. Food security is a thematic priority for the new replenishments of the African Development Fund and Asian Development Fund, which the Treasury negotiated in 2016. In addition to direct investments in the agricultural sector, often alongside IFAD or GAFSP, Treasury supports MDB investments in water and transport infrastructure, agribusinesses and financing for small and medium enterprises, as well assistance with reforms to reduce non-tariff trade barriers, among others, to strengthen global food security.

Implementing partners
Treasury supports multilateral development partners that carry out projects and interventions in agricultural development and food security. These partners include the International Fund for Agricultural Development, the Global Agriculture and Food Security Program, and the multilateral development banks.

Targeted beneficiaries
Multilateral efforts supported by the Department of Treasury are dedicated to alleviating rural poverty. Most IFAD projects are in remote rural areas where few donors operate. GAFSP supports projects aligned with the agricultural investment plans of low-income countries. IFAD and GAFSP activities support smallholder farmers, small and medium enterprises, and agribusinesses with the goal of increasing smallholder incomes, improving food security, and reducing poverty.

The Millennium Challenge Corporation (MCC)

With the exception of the delayed entry into force of the Niger Compact, the GFSS-related efforts supported by MCC are progressing as planned. The Community Based Health and Nutrition to Reduce Stunting Project in Indonesia has trained 11,832 service providers in infant and young children feeding - 64 percent of a life of project target of 18,578. In addition it has engaged 1,727 stakeholders and policymakers on stunting prevention. Under the Green Prosperity Project Millennium Challenge Account Indonesia, the local implementing entity, has signed Memoranda of Understanding with 43 districts, 96 percent of the life of project goal of 45 districts.

In Indonesia, the Green Prosperity Project is working with companies such as Cargill, Mars, and Unilever and soliciting projects on a market and demand driven basis. These efforts have resulted in 70 active grant agreements in the areas of sustainable agriculture (cocoa, oil palm, rubber, coffee) and improved natural resource management, as well as on- and off-grid renewable energy, and peatland restoration.

In Zambia the Institutional Strengthening Activity of the Lusaka Water Supply, Sanitation and Drainage Project in on track to improve the financial sustainability, operations and maintenance and environmental management and social inclusion of the Lusaka Water Supply and Sewage Company. The project has issued grants totaling over $3.7 million, 62 percent of a target of $6.0 million.

Supported Activities
Only one MCC partner country, **Niger**, is a GFSS target country. The program in Niger, which includes a $254.6 million **Irrigation and Market Access Project**, designed to improve

irrigation in order to increase crop yields, sustainable fishing, and livestock productivity, as well as improve the road network to improve access to markets and services, and a $96.5 million **Climate-Resilient Communities Project**, focused on increasing incomes of small-scale agriculture- and livestock dependent families by improving productivity, sustaining natural resources critical to long-term productivity, and increasing market sales, is on track to enter into force by the second quarter of FY 2018..

The **Morocco** Land and Employability Compact entered into force in June 2017 and the $33 million **Rural Land Activity** and the $10.5 million **Land Governance Activity** under the Land Productivity Project are just underway. The goal of the Rural Land Activity is to increase rural productivity by streamlining the process for privatizing collective lands, while making it more inclusive and protective of the rights of landholders, including women. The Land Governance Activity will support legal, policy and institutional reforms that will improve the investment environment for investment in agriculture and food security.

In **Indonesia**, the $134.2 million **Community-Based Health and Nutrition to Reduce Stunting Project** (2013 – 2018) integrates sanitation, maternal and child health, and nutrition interventions with the goal of reducing stunting. As of the end of the second quarter of FY 2017, the Project's Supply-side Activity to improve the ability of health service providers to prevent, diagnose, and treat stunting, improve nutrition of pregnant women and infants, and improve sanitation behavior and reduce the incidence of diarrhea had trained 1,506 (97 percent) of a targeted 1,558 service providers to monitor growth and 11,832 (64 percent) of a targeted 18,578 service providers trained in infant and young child feeding. To date, the Project's Communications Activity had aired 1,379 television spots, 115 percent of the original target, and engaged 1,727 stakeholders and policymakers in stunting prevention, almost 7 times the original target of 240.

Also in **Indonesia**, the $312.7 million **Green Prosperity Project** (2013 – 2018) seeks to address critical challenges to economic growth while supporting the Government of Indonesia's commitment to a more sustainable, less carbon intensive future. Green Prosperity is designed to increase productivity and reduce emissions of land-based greenhouse gas emissions by expanding access to renewable energy and improving land use practices and management of natural resources to avoid deforestation and its negative effects. To achieve its objectives, Green Prosperity provides grants and supports activities that promote entrepreneurship and innovation, strengthen district-level spatial planning critical to long term investment, expand access to renewable energy and improve environmental stewardship. Partnering with and leveraging resources from the private sector is key to sustainability of these projects as well as maximizing the impact of U.S. Government funding. Working with companies such as Cargill, Mars, and Unilever and soliciting projects on a market and demand driven basis have resulted in 70 active grant agreements in the areas of on- and off-grid renewable energy, peatland restoration,

sustainable agriculture (cocoa, oil palm, rubber, coffee) and improved natural resource management. These projects are scaling up and piloting alternatives to rural economic growth models that have historically contributed to environmental degradation and together are targeted to leverage more than $70 million in external resources in Indonesia, establish administrative boundaries and map resources in 300 villages, generate over 27 megawatts in electricity from renewable resources, and reach over 250,000 beneficiaries and 498,000 hectares with improved and sustainable land practices.

In **Zambia** the $310.6 million **Lusaka Water Supply, Sanitation and Drainage Project** (2013 – 2018) has two activities. The goal of the Infrastructure Activity is to decrease the incidence and prevalence of water-related disease through increased access to clean water and decreased incidence of flooding. To date this activity has constructed or rehabilitated almost 6 km of drains and achieved a metering ratio of 66 percent, against a target of 90 percent. Under the Project's Institutional Strengthening Activity, the goal of which is to improve the financial sustainability, operations and maintenance, environmental management and social inclusion of the Lusaka Water Supply and Sewage Company, 128 (61 percent) of a targeted 210 people have been trained in social and gender integration and social inclusion and 65 (21 percent) of a targeted 310 people have been trained in hygiene and sanitary best practices.

Under the Threshold Program in **Sierra Leone**, the $16 million **Water Sector Reform Project** (2016 – 2020) is improving access to reliable and safe water and sanitation (WASH), services through water sector reform, improved utility management and efficiency, and improved WASH practices at the household level.

Implementing partners

MCC works with a wide range of implementing partners, representing both the public and private sector. For example, in Niger it is collaborating with the International Fertilizer Development Center to transform the fertilizer market. Partners in the Green Prosperity grants program in Indonesia include Cargill, Mars, and Unilever, as well numerous Indonesian firms and NGOs.

Targeted beneficiaries

MCC works with partner country governments to promote growth, help people lift themselves out of poverty, and invest in future generations. MCC activities target smallholder farmers and herders and their families, pregnant women and infants and the health service providers that care for them, and customers of urban water supply systems.

Overseas Private Investment Corporation (OPIC)

Under GFSS, OPIC co-chairs the Private Sector Engagement working group with USAID. OPIC continues to approve projects in the food security arena.

Supported Activities

OPIC, the U.S. Government's development finance institution, has mobilized private capital to help solve critical development challenges, and in doing so, advances U.S. foreign policy. Because OPIC works with the U.S. private sector, it helps U.S. businesses gain footholds in emerging markets and catalyze jobs and economic growth overseas and in the U.S. OPIC achieves its mission by providing investors with financing, political risk insurance, and support for private equity funds.

OPIC efficiently leverages federal dollars to mobilize external investments towards projects OPIC supports. For every dollar of OPIC project commitments, OPIC mobilized an average of approximately $2.60 from external capital sources. OPIC support includes direct loans, loan guarantees, insurance, and investments made through OPIC-supported investment funds.

Since 2003, OPIC's portfolio of projects in the agriculture sector has grown from under $10 million to almost $300 million. OPIC's active portfolio of clients in the agriculture sector reported employing a total of 9,300 people in host countries.

Implementing partners

OPIC works with a broad array of partners which include private sector entities (including large corporates and small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs)), NGOs and not for profits, U.S. universities, farmer groups, development finance institutions (DFIs), foundations, banks and other financial organizations, as well as private family offices.

For example, OPIC provided a $10 million loan to One Acre Fund to fund receivables from smallholder farmers in Burundi, Kenya, Rwanda, and Tanzania. One Acre Fund provides a market bundle on credit to individual farmers, which includes: 1) seed and fertilizer; 2) education on technical skillsets; and 3) market and trade practices. OPIC-supported Silverlands Fund invests across the value chain in the agricultural sector, with a core focus on farmland and primary production businesses. The Fund's investments have multiplier effects throughout the African regional economies by allowing companies to expand operations and provide more goods and services to customers.

Targeted beneficiaries

OPIC projects benefit cooperatives, small holder farmer, women and children, microfinance borrowers, agri-SMEs, as well as larger formal businesses.

When evaluating food security projects, OPIC measures development impact through five broad categories:

- Developmental Reach: This factor measures the extent to which a project improves the host country's infrastructure or provides specific benefits to lower-income or underserved geographies or segments of the population, including women.
- Jobs & Human Capacity Building: In addition to the creation of direct, permanent jobs, this factor takes into consideration the creation of temporary/construction jobs, female employment, and job quality as measured by benefits, human capacity building, and wages.
- Demonstration Effects: This factor measures a project's impact on technology and knowledge transfer; technical assistance to customers, suppliers, or borrowers; the introduction of new products, including financial products; alignment with the host government's initiatives in the sector; regulatory and legal reform; and the voluntary adoption of internationally-recognized quality or performance standards.
- Macroeconomic and Fiscal Impact: This factor measures a project's downstream impact through the procurement of local goods and services (both initial and operational), as well as a project's fiscal and foreign exchange impacts on the host country.
- Environmental and Community Benefits: This factor captures a project's environmental benefits, such as remediation of brownfield sites or use of energy-efficient equipment, as well as a project's philanthropic efforts to help the community in which it operates.

Peace Corps

Since October 2016, Peace Corps has finalized its food security strategy, ensuring it aligns with the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS). In addition, Peace Corps has created a framework that details how Peace Corps Volunteers in each sector (e.g., Agriculture, Community Economic Development, Education, Environment, Health and Youth in Development) work to improve the food security of the individuals and households in the communities in which they live and work. Peace Corps is also working to ensure that its monitoring system, staff and Volunteers are prepared for the change in indicators under the new GFSS Results Framework.

In the field, about 1,000 Volunteers have been implementing activities that will help the communities in which they serve have greater food security. For example, Volunteers have helped smallholder farmers increase agricultural productivity and income through activities such as improving soil fertility with on-farm, organic soil amendments; maximizing water availability and usage by employing drought-resistant crop varieties and using mulch and other simple and appropriate water conserving techniques; and, controlling pests, improving crop quality and increasing profitability by using companion planting, crop rotations and integrated pest management. Volunteers have also worked to integrate nutrition in agriculture programming by

promoting the production of nutrient-rich foods, especially in home and school gardens. Additionally, Volunteers in all sectors have incorporated activities to increase household and community resilience.

Supported Activities

Peace Corps is contributing on a global scale to mitigating food insecurity, improving nutrition outcomes for mothers and children, addressing climate change and resiliency, and reducing poverty. Since its inception, Peace Corps has promoted methodologies and approaches that are proven, evidence-based and considered among development practitioners to hold promise for positive results and impact. Peace Corps' approach is to build local capacity at the individual, group, and community levels. Peace Corps' comprehensive food security strategy is built around Peace Corps Volunteers' contributions to the four pillars of food security: availability, accessibility, utilization, and stability. As Volunteers focus their collective expertise on food security innovations and interventions, the agency is moving ahead to invest in, support and extend these activities, developing new, innovative, and contextually relevant program resources and materials for use throughout the world.

Peace Corps Volunteers have designed projects, incorporating behavior change principles, to support food security and improved nutrition by providing evidence-based technical assistance to individual farmers, farmer organizations and households via extension, demonstrations, direct/indirect advising/training methods, support groups, and counseling sessions. Volunteers have also worked to prioritize gender equity in all of their trainings and projects.

Peace Corps subject matter experts have collaborated with USAID and other interagency partners in drafting technical guidance on best practices for improving food security. In addition, Peace Corps monitoring and evaluation specialists have collaborated with USAID and other interagency partners in drafting indicators that align with the GFSS Results Framework. On the ground, Peace Corps continues to collaborate and partner with USAID to promote improved technologies and practices throughout the Feed the Future focus countries and beyond.

Implementing partners

Peace Corps Volunteers, in collaboration with their host country national community counterparts, serve as the "implementing partners" for Peace Corps' food security activities.

Targeted beneficiaries

Peace Corps Volunteers support a variety of beneficiaries through their activities, including: smallholder farmers, producer organizations, small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs), women of reproductive age, children under age 5 (especially those in their first 1,000 days), caregivers of children under age 5, youth, and vulnerable individuals, households and communities.

Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR)

In FY 2017, USTR worked to develop and maintain open and rules-based markets globally through its trade initiatives and participation in international organizations. USTR participates extensively throughout the year at the WTO Committees on Agriculture, SPS, and TBT to raise questions with other countries regarding domestic support, market access, export competition, and food, plant, and animal health measures. We also utilize the Trade Policy Review Body of the WTO, which regularly analyzes country implementation of these WTO commitments and raise questions of Members on any perceived lapses of implementation. USTR actively engages in the WTO accession negotiations of candidate countries seeking WTO membership, and ensures that such countries fully implement domestic reforms that support open and rules-based trade in agricultural goods. These WTO meetings provide opportunities to promote transparency and communication among all WTO Members regarding implementation of commitments under the WTO Agreements.

USTR promotes trade facilitation through its activities and work on multiple trade initiatives each year. In FY 2017, USTR held trade talks with multiple countries including Nepal and Bangladesh to promote expanded bilateral trade and investment in goods and services. USTR also led the U.S. delegation to the 2017 African Growth and Opportunity Act (AGOA) Forum to discuss how to promote stronger economic ties between the United States and qualifying sub-Saharan countries.

U.S. preference programs aim to support sustainable growth and economic development through trade, and in so doing to contribute to the alleviation of poverty and hunger in the beneficiary countries. Preferences are of crucial importance to a number of least-developed countries (LDCs) which do not as yet have the capacity to negotiate and implement comprehensive FTAs. The four major U.S. preference programs – the Generalized System of Preferences (GSP), the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act (CBERA), the Nepal Trade Preference Act, and AGOA – provided duty-free treatment to roughly $27 billion in imports from 126 beneficiary countries and territories in 2015. In 2016, the GSP program alone accounted for $18.95 billion worth of imports from 120 beneficiary countries and territories –44 of which are LDCs.[14] U.S. imports from sub-Saharan Africa under AGOA totaled $9.3 billion.[15] The top five AGOA beneficiary countries were South Africa, Angola, Chad, Nigeria, and Kenya.

[14] See https://ustr.gov/issue-areas/trade-development/preference-programs/generalized-system-preference-gsp.
[15] See http://trade.gov/agoa/.

Supported Activities

Consistent with the President's Trade Agenda, the Office of the United States Trade Representative (USTR) supports the Global Food Security Strategy (GFSS) through polices that help integrate developing economies, economies in transition, and emerging economies into the international trading system. USTR also encourages countries to develop transparent, rules and science-based trade and investment policies consistent with their international obligations, in order to realize the full benefits of trade liberalization.

USTR pursues these goals through trade initiatives that encourage developing countries to follow their WTO commitments and to follow the transparency and good governance elements of the World Trade Organization (WTO) agreements in order to develop accountable regulatory institutions which lead to improved food safety and public health and economic growth in the least trade distortive way. USTR also supports countries' efforts to strengthen their national animal and plant health and food safety regulatory frameworks through the adoption of international standards. USTR works with other U.S. agencies that provide technical assistance and support to trading partners that have free trade agreements with the United States in order to foster increased agriculture export opportunities and promote sustainable agriculture-led economic growth. Additionally, USTR administers U.S. trade preference programs as a way to promote partner countries' economic growth by offering special duty-free privileges to thousands of goods from developing countries meeting certain criteria.

Implementing Partners

Although USTR is not an implementing agency for GFSS, it participates and collaborates in the Washington-based Interagency Working Groups. USTR often collaborates with other U.S. Government agencies such as USDA and USAID in their trade capacity building initiatives to help partner countries develop harmonized, science-based standards for animal and plant health and food safety. In addition to direct bilateral engagement with other country governments through Free Trade Agreements and Trade Preference Programs, USTR works closely with other U.S. agencies as well as other countries in the WTO Committees on Agriculture, Sanitary and Phytosanitary Measures (SPS), and Technical Barriers to Trade (TBT).

U.S. African Development Foundation (USADF)

As of July 2017, USADF has invested $11.7 million in appropriated and leveraged funds into grants to smallholder producer groups in FY 2017.

Supported Activities

USADF is an independent U.S. Government agency that was created to help improve the lives and livelihoods of poor and vulnerable communities in Africa, and support community-led

economic development. USADF's core mission closely aligns GFSA objectives in three specific areas:

Catalyzing Inclusive Agricultural-led Growth to Promote Self-Sufficiency
Approximately 70 percent of USADF grants are focused on supporting agriculture-led economic growth for smallholder farmers. USADF grants assist hundreds of agricultural cooperatives to develop better enterprise management skills, improve production and distribution capabilities, and access larger markets. Through enterprise development and growth, USADF is helping communities to become self-sufficient and establish a pathway out of poverty.

Increasing Productivity, Incomes and Livelihoods for Small-Scale Producers
USADF extends the reach of GFSS intervention by working at the lowest level of the pyramid, working directly with small-scale producer groups to build enterprise capabilities – management, marketing, and productivity – to grow sales that create jobs and improve income levels. USADF grants serve to de-risk early-stage agriculture producer groups and prepare them for sustainable growth and self-sufficiency by helping the groups acquire training, technical assistance, better inputs, crop storage facilities, irrigation technology, equipment, access to bigger markets, and operating funds needed to grow their operations.

Coordinating Efforts for Efficient Use of Taxpayer Dollars
USADF collaborates with the 10 other GFSS implementing agencies to best utilize the unique capabilities of each participating agency to increase the overall impact of the GFSA. Additionally, USADF also leverages its involvement in other Congressional initiatives, such as Electrify Africa and AGOA, to link technology and trade to GFSA agricultural-led economic growth objectives.

Implementing partners
USADF has utilized local in-country management and technical partners to invest directly in early-stage grassroots enterprises and African entrepreneurs. In FY 2016, USADF helped grow local development institutions in 20 countries that support development efforts initiated by the communities themselves. USADF is pursuing numerous public-private partnerships (e.g., GE, Citi, African host country governments) that promote research, and engage the use of both public and private sectors funds to extend the impact of youth entrepreneurship initiatives, off grid energy projects, and GFSA focused enterprise development activities.

Targeted beneficiaries
Through enterprise creation and development, USADF has focused on improving lives and livelihoods for smallholder farmers and their families, by working either directly with farmers or through producer organizations. USADF grants assist hundreds of agricultural cooperatives develop better enterprise management skills, improve production, and access larger markets.

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS)

USGS receives funding from USAID for activities that include supporting the Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), as well as resilience initiatives in West (including RISE), East, and southern Africa, funded by Feed the Future. Since October 2016, USGS has successfully provided early warning information to FEWS NET regarding severe dryness in East Africa (southern Ethiopia, eastern Kenya, and southern Somalia), resulting in material presented in a Horn of Africa drought 'mapbook' and in briefings to the USAID Office of Food for Peace. USGS has expanded and improved its extensive agro-climatology knowledge base, providing both annual and historical context to precipitation and vegetation conditions for over 75 countries of interest to FEWS NET. USGS has also continued to lead monthly seasonal climate forecasts, and have participated in, and provided significant input to, monthly Crop Monitor for Early Warning.

USGS, USAID, and CILSS (Comité permanent Inter-Etats de Lutte contre la Secheresse dans le Sahel) recently published an atlas on the landscapes of West Africa, highlighting the success story of re-greening of farmland in Niger (i.e., farmers building resilience by protecting and managing trees on their cropland). Subsequently, in a speech to the President of Niger (and other government officials) in August 2017, the Minister of Environment highlighted the success of on-farm re-greening and called for farmers nationally to continue and to double their efforts to support the environment and resilience.

Supported Activities

- As an implementing science partner for the USAID-funded Famine Early Warning Systems Network (FEWS NET), USGS applies its expertise with satellite remote sensing, modeling, and geospatial methods to characterize climate variability and climate change in countries with sparse and/or late reporting surface instrument networks.
- USGS assists FEWS NET food security analysts in the interpretation of the agro-climatological significance of anomalous climatic events so that potential impacts can be factored into food security assessments and scenario development.
- USGS engages local experts to serve as full time FEWS NET regional and country scientists alongside their counterpart FEWS NET food security analysts in countries where FEWS NET has a presence. These scientists are able to give close, custom support in the use of observational and forecast products. They can also reach back to colleagues at science centers and universities in the U.S.
- FEWS NET regional and national scientists routinely organize workshops and training sessions for their counterparts in national ministries of agriculture and meteorological services. These activities build and update national capacity to use FEWS NET agro-climatological monitoring data and software tools.

- USGS leads a monthly review of seasonal climate forecasts, in partnership with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, for the development of the agro-climatological working assumptions necessary to project food security conditions eight months ahead in FEWS NET countries.
- Through the Group on Earth Observations, USGS and the University of Maryland (as FEWS NET implementing partners) play a key role in the international collaborative process to produce a monthly Crop Monitor for Early Warning (http://cropmonitor.org) describing the current consensus assessment of crop growing conditions in countries at risk of food insecurity. The process brings in the World Food Programme as well as African, Asian, and European counterparts.
- USGS and the University of California, Santa Barbara, apply their climate diagnostic capacity in support of the USAID "Planning for Resilience in East Africa through Policy, Adaptation, Research, and Economic Development" (PREPARED) climate change adaptation program with the East African Community. Country-level projections of mid-21st century growing conditions identify sub-national areas with negative trends due to climate change and those that are likely to remain viable. Characterization of risk in this way helps build resilience, for example, by showing where there are positive prospects for investment in sustainable intensification of agriculture.
- USGS supports the "Resilience in the Sahel-Enhanced" (RISE) program by mapping and monitoring land use; tree cover density; and soil, water, and vegetation conservation practices across RISE focus zones in West Africa. This evidence base helps guide RISE decision-making on where to make investments in improved soil and water conservation practices.

Implementing partners

- The USGS Earth Resources Observation and Science (EROS) Center in South Dakota leads FEWS NET agro-climatology activities, under an interagency agreement with the USAID Office of Food for Peace (FFP). A USGS cooperative agreement with the University of California, Santa Barbara, brings in the expertise of the Climate Hazards Group and makes possible the engagement of FEWS NET regional and national scientists. The USGS EROS Center integrates important FEWS NET scientific and technical contributions by the NOAA Climate Prediction Center in College Park, Maryland; the NOAA Physical Sciences Division in Boulder, Colorado; the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) Goddard Space Flight Center in Greenbelt, Maryland; and the University of Maryland. NOAA and NASA have their own interagency agreements with FFP for FEWS NET support.
- The USAID/Malawi Mission engages USGS support for mapping water and soil conservation, and on-farm greening, practices using the FFP interagency agreement.

- The USAID West Africa Regional Program engages USGS support for Feed the Future's RISE using an interagency agreement that is separate from the one FFP has for FEWS NET.

Targeted beneficiaries

USGS data and analyses are used by a wide range of stakeholders, including U.S. government and partner government policy makers, National Meteorological and Hydrological Services, and the global food security community (including international and national institutions, U.S. universities, and non-governmental organizations). Geographic zone of influence includes sub-Saharan Africa, Central America, Central Asia (Afghanistan and Tajikistan), and Haiti.

Appendix 3: GFSS Indicators

As described in Section 1, the interagency Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (MEL) working group has updated the Feed the Future standard indicators to be used for monitoring performance against the GFSS results framework. Indicators are listed in the tables below, prefaced by explanatory notes. Based on lessons learned through collecting and reporting on new indicators, adjustments may be made as appropriate. Any updates to indicators will be reported in future GFSS implementation reports.

Indicator type: We are proposing two sets of indicators, and they are listed separately in the table: "Performance" and "Context." "Performance" indicators are those for which we hold ourselves accountable to effect change and for which we set targets. In contrast, "Context" indicators are those we will observe to help inform our working environment and interpret our results, but do not hold ourselves accountable for, nor do we set targets for them. Note that many of our "Context" indicators are SDG indicators, which have definitions that are still under development. We will align with their definition and collection methodology once they are published.

Indicator level: Performance indicators marked with "IM-level" are Implementing Mechanism/ activity-level indicators. These indicators measure results for direct activity participants only and are reported annually by each Implementing Partner. Indicators marked with "ZOI-level" are measured across the population residing in our targeted sub-national geographic areas (known as the Zones of Influence) and will be collected periodically through a population-based survey (PBS). Performance indicators marked with "National-level" measure results country-wide and will be collected periodically. Timing for these indicators will vary by country, indicator, and data source.

Acronyms used: GDP = Gross Domestic Product GFSS = Global Food Security Strategy HAZ = Height-for-age Z-score IM = Implementing Mechanism PBS = Population-based survey PPP = Purchasing Power Parity SDG = Sustainable Development Goals USG = U.S. Government WAZ = Weight-for-age Z-score WHZ = Weight-for-height Z-score ZOI = Zone of Influence (i.e., targeted geographic area where we focus our efforts)

GFSS Performance Indicator Table

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
1	Goal: Sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty	Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) [ZOI-level]	Gendered household type
2	Goal: Sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty	Prevalence of moderate or severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES) [National-level]	Gendered household type
3	Goal: Sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty	Prevalence of stunted (HAZ < -2) children under five years of age [ZOI-level]	Sex
4	Goal: Sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty	Prevalence of stunted (HAZ < -2) children under five years of age [National-level]	Sex
5	Goal: Sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty	Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.90/day 2011 PPP [ZOI-level]	Gendered household type
6	Goal: Sustainably reduce global hunger, malnutrition, and poverty	Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.90/day 2011 PPP [National-level]	Gendered household type
7	Objective 1: Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth (Cross-linked to Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems)	Asset-based Wealth Index [ZOI-level]	Gendered household type
8	Objective 1: Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth (Cross-linked to Objective	Abbreviated Women's Empowerment in Agriculture Index (A-WEAI) Score [ZOI-level]	Age

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
	2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems)		
9	Objective 1: Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth	Annual percent change in value-added in the agriculture and food system ("Ag GDP+") [National-level]	TBD
10	IR.1: Strengthened inclusive agriculture systems that are productive and profitable	Proportion of producers in the targeted area who have applied targeted improved management practices or technologies [ZOI-level]	Management Practice or Technology Type Sex Age Commodity
11	IR.1: Strengthened inclusive agriculture systems that are productive and profitable	Number of individuals in the agriculture system who have applied improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance [IM-level]	Value chain actor type Management practice or technology type Sex Age Commodity
12	IR.2: Strengthened and expanded access to markets and trade (Cross-linked to IR.6: Improved Adaptation to and Recovery from Shocks and Stresses)	Total agriculture-related financing accessed as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]	Type of financing accessed Size of enterprise Sex of farmer or proprietor Age of farmer or proprietor
13	IR.2: Strengthened and expanded access to markets and trade	Kilometers of roads improved or constructed as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]	Construction type
14	IR.2: Strengthened and expanded access to markets and trade	Value of targeted agricultural commodities exported at a national level [National-level]	Commodity

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
15	IR.2: Strengthened and expanded access to markets and trade	Value of annual sales of farms and firms receiving USG assistance [IM-level]	Type of enterprise Sex of producer or proprietor Age of producer or proprietor Commodity
16	IR.3: Increased employment and entrepreneurship	Employment in the agriculture and food system [National-level]	TBD
17	Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems	Prevalence of wasted (WAZ < -2) children under five years of age [ZOI-level]	Sex
18	Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems	Proportion of households with the self-perceived ability to successfully manage future shocks and stresses [ZOI-level]	Gendered household type
19	Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems	Depth of poverty of the poor: Mean percent shortfall of the poor relative to the $1.90/day 2011 PPP poverty line [ZOI-level]	Gendered household type
20	IR.4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches	Yield of targeted agricultural commodities within target areas [ZOI-level]	Commodity Sex of producer Age of producer
21	IR.4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches	Yield of targeted agricultural commodities among program participants with USG assistance [IM-level]	Commodity Sex of producer Age of producer
22	IR.4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches	Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies with USG assistance [IM-level]	Type of hectare Management practice or technology type Sex of decision-maker Age of decision-maker

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
			Commodity
23	IR.5: Improved Proactive Risk Reduction, Mitigation, and Management	Number of host government or community-derived risk management plans formally proposed, adopted, or implemented with USG assistance [IM-level]	Stage of progress
24	IR.6: Improved Adaptation to and Recovery from Shocks and Stresses	Proportion of households with high social capital [ZOI-level]	Type of social capital Gendered household type
25	IR.6: Improved Adaptation to and Recovery from Shocks and Stresses	Proportion of households that believe local government will respond effectively to future shocks and stresses [ZOI-level]	Gendered household type
26	IR.6: Improved Adaptation to and Recovery from Shocks and Stresses	Number of individuals participating in group-based savings, micro-finance or lending programs with USG assistance [IM-level]	Sex Age Product type
27	IR.6: Improved Adaptation to and Recovery from Shocks and Stresses	Proportion of households participating in group-based savings, micro-finance or lending programs [ZOI-level]	Gendered household type Product type
28	Objective 3: A well-nourished population, especially among women and children	Prevalence of healthy weight (WHZ ≤ 2 and ≥ -2) among children under five years of age [ZOI-level]	Sex
29	Objective 3: A well-nourished population, especially among women and children	Prevalence of underweight (BMI < 18.5) women of reproductive age [ZOI-level]	Age
30	IR.7: Increased consumption of nutritious and safe diets	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet [ZOI-level]	Sex
31	IR.7: Increased consumption of nutritious	Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six	Sex

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
	and safe diets	months of age [ZOI-level]	
32	IR.7: Increased consumption of nutritious and safe diets	Prevalence of women of reproductive age consuming a diet of minimum diversity [ZOI-level]	Age
33	IR.7: Increased consumption of nutritious and safe diets	Percentage of female direct participants of USG nutrition-sensitive agriculture activities consuming a diet of minimum diversity [IM-level]	None
34	IR.8: Increased use of direct nutrition interventions and services	Percent of participants of community-level nutrition interventions who practice at least one promoted infant and young child feeding behaviors [IM-level]	None
35	IR.9: More hygienic household and community environments	Percentage of households with access to a basic sanitation service [ZOI-level]	Gendered household type Location
36	IR.9: More hygienic household and community environments	Number of people gaining access to a basic sanitation service as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]	Sex Location Wealth Quintile
37	IR.9: More hygienic household and community environments	Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members [ZOI-level]	Gendered household type Location
38	IR.9: More hygienic household and community environments	Percentage of households with soap and water at a handwashing station commonly used by family members [IM-level]	Location
39	CCIR 1: Strengthened global commitment to investing in food security	Value of funding to support food security and nutrition committed through bi-, tri-, and multilateral partnerships in which the USG participates [IM or Partnership-level]	Funding source
40	CCIR 1: Strengthened global commitment to	Value of new USG commitments and private sector investment	Funding source

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
	investing in food security	leveraged by the USG to support food security and nutrition [IM-level]	
41	CCIR 2: Improved climate risk, land, marine, and other natural resource management (Cross-linked to CCIR5: Improved Proactive Risk Reduction, Mitigation, and Management)	Number of people with legally recognized and documented tenure rights to land or marine areas, as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]	Resource type Sex/Tenure type Location
42	CCIR 2: Improved climate risk, land, marine, and other natural resource management (Cross-linked to CCIR5: Improved Proactive Risk Reduction, Mitigation, and Management)	Proportion of people who perceive their tenure rights to land or marine areas as secure, as a result of USG assistance [IM-level]	Resource type Sex/Tenure type Location
43	CCIR 2: Improved climate risk, land, marine, and other natural resource management	Number of hectares under improved management practices or technologies that promote improved climate risk reduction and/or natural resources management with USG assistance [IM-level]	Management practice or technology type
44	CCIR 3: Increased gender equality and female empowerment	Percentage of female participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources [IM-level]	None
45	CCIR 4: Increased youth empowerment and livelihoods	Percentage of participants in USG-assisted programs designed to increase access to productive economic resources who are youth (15-29) [IM-level]	Sex
46	CCIR 5: More effective	Institutional Architecture	TBD

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
	governance, policy, and institutions	(Modified) Score [National-level]	
47	CCIR 5: More effective governance, policy, and institutions	GFSS Policy Matrix Progress Score [National-level]	TBD
48	CCIR 6: Improved human, organizational, and system performance	Number of organizations with increased performance improvement scores [IM-level]	Type of organization
49	Output	Number of individuals participating in USG food security programs [IM-level]	Type of individual Sex Age
50	Output	Number of individuals who have received USG-supported degree-granting food security training [IM-level]	Sex Duration
51	Output (Cross-linked to IR.6: Improved Adaptation to and Recovery from Shocks and Stresses)	Number of USG social assistance beneficiaries participating in productive safety nets [IM-level]	Type of Asset strengthened Duration Sex of beneficiary
52	Output	Number of children under five (0-59 months) reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported nutrition programs [IM-level]	Intervention type Sex
53	Output	Number of children under two (0-23 months) reached with community-level nutrition interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]	Sex
54	Output	Number of pregnant women reached with nutrition-specific interventions through USG-supported programs [IM-level]	Intervention type Age
55	Output	Number of technologies in phases	Type of technology

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
		of development and dissemination [IM-level]	Phase of development

GFSS Context Indicators

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
1	Objective 1: Inclusive and sustainable agricultural-led economic growth (Cross-linked to Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems)	Asset-based Wealth Index [National-level]	TBD, depending on data availability
2	IR.1: Strengthened inclusive agriculture systems that are productive and profitable	Average income of small-scale food producers, by sex and indigenous status (SDG indicator #2.3.2) [National-level]	TBD, depending on SDG indicator definition
3	IR.1: Strengthened inclusive agriculture systems that are productive and profitable	Volume of production per labour unit by classes of farming/pastoral/forestry enterprise size (SDG indicator #2.3.1) [National-level]	TBD, depending on SDG indicator definition
4	IR.3: Increased employment and entrepreneurship	Percentage of 15-29 year olds who are Not in Education, Employment or Training (NEET) (SDG indicator #8.8.6) - [National-level]	TBD, depending on SDG indicator definition
5	Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems	Prevalence of wasted (WAZ < -2) children under five years of age [National-level]	TBD, depending on data availability
6	Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems	Depth of poverty of the poor: Mean percent shortfall of the poor relative to the $1.90/day 2011 PPP poverty	Gendered household type

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
		line [National-level]	
7	Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems	Number of people in need of humanitarian assistance in areas/populations subject to recurrent crises [ZOI-level, if possible; Otherwise, National-level]	Country
8	Objective 2: Strengthened resilience among people and systems	USG humanitarian assistance spending in areas/populations subject to recurrent crises [ZOI-level, if possible; Otherwise, National-level]	Country
9	IR.4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches	Percent deviation from rainfall norms [ZOI-level]	None
10	IR.4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches (but cross-linked to CCIR 2: Improved climate risk, land, marine, and other natural resource management)	Percent deviation from normalized difference vegetation index (NDVI) norms [ZOI-level]	None
11	IR.4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches	Percent deviation from temperature norms [ZOI-level]	None
12	IR.4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches	Yield of targeted agricultural commodities [National level]	Commodity

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
13	IR.4: Increased sustainable productivity, particularly through climate-smart approaches	Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture (SDG indicator #2.4.1) - [National-level]	TBD, depending on SDG indicator definition
14	Objective 3: A well-nourished population, especially among women and children	Prevalence of healthy weight (WHZ ≤ 2 and ≥-2) among children under five years of age [National-level]	TBD, depending on data availability
15	Objective 3: A well-nourished population, especially among women and children	Prevalence of underweight (BMI < 18.5) women of reproductive age [National-level]	TBD, depending on data availability
16	Objective 3: A well-nourished population, especially among women and children	Prevalence of undernourishment (SDG indicator #2.1.1) [National-level]	TBD, depending on SDG indicator definition
17	IR.7: Increased consumption of nutritious and safe diets	Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet [National-level]	TBD, depending on data availability
18	IR.7: Increased consumption of nutritious and safe diets	Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age [National-level]	TBD, depending on data availability
19	IR.7: Increased consumption of nutritious and safe diets	Prevalence of women of reproductive age consuming a diet of minimum diversity [National-level]	TBD, depending on data availability
20	CCIR 1: Strengthened global commitment to investing in food security	Food security and nutrition funding as reported to the OECD DAC [Global-level]	Country
21	CCIR 2: Improved climate risk, land, marine, and other natural resource management (cross reference to CCIR5)	Proportion of total adult rural farming population with secure tenure rights to land, with legally recognized documentation and who perceive their rights to land as secure [National-level]	Sex Type of tenure Farm size

Indicator Number	RF Level and Title in GFSS Results Framework (RF)	Indicator Title	Disaggregation Category
22	CCIR 3: Increased gender equality and female empowerment	Proportion of women who are empowered according to the five domains of the A-WEAI [ZOI-level]	Age

Appendix 4: Feed the Future Global Results

Select Feed the Future Annual Global Results **(A, B, C)** The data for output and outcome indicators below are directly attributable **(D)** to U.S. Government funding.						
INDICATOR **(E)**	2011 **(F)**	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016
Improved Agricultural Productivity						
Number of farmers and others who have applied improved technologies or management practices with U.S. Government assistance **(G)**	1,226,119	5,248,659	6,525,677	6,799,319	9,038,700	10,987,880
% Male	55%	73%	71%	64%	63%	63%
% Female	45%	27%	29%	36%	37%	37%
Number of hectares of land under improved technologies or management practices with U.S. Government assistance	2,397,456	3,241,549	3,747,065	3,177,123	5,329,462	6,294,660
% Male	n/a	68%	80%	64%	68%	67%
% Female	n/a	25%	15%	27%	32%	33%
Number of individuals who have received degree-granting agricultural sector productivity or food- security training supported by the U.S. Government	905	932	928	1,300	1,299	1,327

% Male	58%	58% **(H)**	56%	55%	56%	59%
% Female	42%	42%	44%	45%	44%	41%
Improved Use of Nutrition Services						
Children under five reached by U.S. Government-supported nutrition programs **(I)**	8,814,584	12,038,528	12,699,186	12,343,776	18,006,457	27,677,460
% Male	n/a	50%	50%	56%	49%	48%
% Female	n/a	50%	50%	44%	51%	52%
Health facilities with established capacity to manage acute undernutrition	85	1,141	848	2,029	2,959	2,743
People trained in child health and nutrition supported by the U.S. Government	9,865	221,962	566,242	1,441,042	2,681,398	3,763,480
% Male	41%	42%	22%	19%	24%	20%
% Female	59%	58%	78%	81%	76%	80%
Expanded Markets and Trade						
Value of smallholder incremental sales generated as a result of U.S. Government assistance **(J)**	$38,080,821	$100,366,589	$174,302,362	$532,082,927	$829,439,579	$906,119,798
Public-private partnerships formed as a result of U.S. Government assistance	442	544	1,149	1,294	1,563	1,439

Food security private enterprises (for-profit), producers organizations, water users associations, women's groups, trade and business associations, and community-based organizations that receive U.S. Government food security-related organizational development assistance	13,856	44,100	59,866	95,952	124,293	173,945
Number of micro-, small-, and medium-sized enterprises, including farmers, who have received agricultural-related credit as a result of U.S. Government assistance	6,740	205,991	332,489	883,423	1,227,391	666,743
% Male-owned	n/a	52%	64%	51%	56%	31%
% Female-owned	n/a	48%	35%	49%	44%	69%
Value of agricultural and rural loans (USD) as a result of U.S. Government assistance **(K)**	$208,750,220	$121,925,081	$184,813,765	$671,831,928	$877,871,314	$623,768,780
% Male Recipients	70%	88%	55%	71%	52%	52%
% Female Recipients	30%	12%	32%	28%	48%	48%
Value of new private- sector capital investment in the agriculture sector or food chain leveraged by Feed the Future implementation (USD)	$26,876,561	$115,301,742	$162,985,629	$151,752,806	$154,007,901	$218,630,486

FOOTNOTES

A U.S. Government Departments and Agencies that report into the Feed the Future Monitoring System (FTFMS) include USAID, U.S. Departments of Agriculture and the Treasury, MCC, Peace Corps and the U.S. African Development Foundation. Feed the Future began tracking results in Fiscal Year 2011, when the initiative developed multi-year strategies, defined its zones of influence, and implemented its monitoring and evaluation system. Some results from Fiscal Year 2011 to Fiscal Year 2013 have been revised based on additional information provided after publication for previous years. For more detailed information, visit the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook.

B Indicators are reported annually for Feed the Future focus and aligned countries. "Aligned countries" are those in which the U.S. Government supports ongoing agricultural-development programs but are not designated as Feed the Future focus countries. For a list of Feed the Future focus countries, visit www.feedthefuture.gov. Participating Agencies do not necessarily report on all countries where they have programs, and might only report on certain common indicators. USAID Office of Food for Peace additionally reports on Feed the Future indicators in non-aligned as well as non-focus countries where it has development programs, as do some other Feed the Future Departments and Agencies.

C Disaggregates - including by sex - are not reported for all activities and therefore often represent only a subset of activities.

D USAID defines "attribution" as ascribing a causal link between observed changes (results) and a specific intervention. A result is attributable to USAID, or USAID can claim credit for a result, even when other partners are involved in achieving the result, if USAID can claim that without USAID intervention the outcome would not have taken place.

E Full definitions of indicators are available in the Feed the Future Indicator Handbook https://feedthefuture.gov/resource/feed-future-handbook-indicator-definitions. Last year the set of indicators for Fiscal Year 2016 reporting went through a streamlining and redesign process. Indicator titles in this publication reflect these changes.

F Reporting was incomplete in 2011, the first year of the FTFMS. Figures do not reflect the full impact of Feed the Future programs that year.

G Some activities might not report some disaggregates, and the percentages here might only represent a portion of the total results.

H The 2016 Progress Report erroneously printed this as 25%. All other reports, including this one, display the correct figure of 58% males.

I This result is USAID-wide, and includes more than just those reached by activities funded by Feed the Future. This number represents the aggregate of country-wide results from nutrition interventions delivered through USAID Feed the Future, Food for Peace Development, and Global Health Nutrition programs as part of a multi-sectoral effort to combat malnutrition. Individual USAID projects are instructed to count children only once even if they are reached several times, although in some cases partner information systems are only able to track contacts, not individual children.

J Incremental sales can also be described as "new sales" because they reflect increases in sales above the value at baseline. They comprise a portion of total sales, which equaled $2.29 billion in Fiscal Year 2016.

K In a few cases, the percentages between male and female disaggregates will not add up to 100% because another disaggregate (e.g., “joint” or “not applicable”) is an option.